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## LIST OF WOOD-CUTS IN VOL. V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Woodcut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Pewt.</td>
<td>Page 246: Camel bearing the Hood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lattice Window at Cairo</td>
<td>Page 260: Chamelus Vulpes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Lattice-work at Cairo</td>
<td>Page 269: Locusta Stello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Specimen of the Laudian M.S.</td>
<td>Page 275: Ancient Roman Bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Laveratory at Selby</td>
<td>Page 280: Ancient Egyptian Bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>The Laver, after Thanean</td>
<td>Page 281: Modern Egyptian wooden Lock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>The Laver, according to Paine</td>
<td>Page 282: Qutipera Meripereina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Costume of a Laxaritan</td>
<td>Page 284: Acrifimum Lincola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Ancient Etruscan Knife</td>
<td>Page 285: Acrifimum Peregrinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Ancient Egyptians working in Egypt</td>
<td>Page 286: Locust flying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>Page 287: Dried Locusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>View of Lebanon</td>
<td>Page 288: Locust-eating Bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>A repentant Native of Lebanon</td>
<td>Page 289: &quot;Low's Wife&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Falling Trees on Lebanon</td>
<td>Page 290: Coin of Lycurus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Lectern at Ramsay Church</td>
<td>Page 291: Lych-gate at Blackford Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Coin of Macedonia</td>
<td>Page 292: Persepolitan Emblem of Macedon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Ancient Assyrian Knives</td>
<td>Page 293: Celtic at Hebron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Ancient Egyptian cooking Len-tiles</td>
<td>Page 294: Ancient Egyptian Culrana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847</td>
<td>Monogram of Christ</td>
<td>Page 295: Alouia Maureum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>The Lentile</td>
<td>Page 296: Atropa Mandragora Officinarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Jew's Mallow</td>
<td>Page 297: Tensurae Gallina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Syrian Panther</td>
<td>Page 298: Modern Egyptian Mantle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Sea-parslane</td>
<td>Page 299: Specimen of Odessa M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Victim of Abraham's Cemetery</td>
<td>Page 300: Specimen of Greek MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Levitical City, Diagram I. a.</td>
<td>Page 301:22: Mary Queen of Scots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Levitical City, Diagram I. b.</td>
<td>Page 302: The Weeping Lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Levitical City, Diagram II.</td>
<td>Page 303: Egyptian Knives and Lancesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Levitical City, Diagram III.</td>
<td>Page 304: Red Lion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Levitical City, Diagram IV.</td>
<td>Page 305: Persian Lion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Levitical City, Diagram V.</td>
<td>Page 306: Lion at Arva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Levitical City, Diagram VI.</td>
<td>Page 307: Lion on the Lion's Tail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Levitical City, Diagram VI 2.</td>
<td>Page 308: Rock of Massada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Syrian Ely Lamps</td>
<td>Page 309: Macc Corbel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Egyptian Knives and Lancesia</td>
<td>Page 310: Masonry at Hebron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Specimen of Odesan M.S.</td>
<td>Page 311: Ancient Egyptian Hoos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Specimen of Odesan M.S.</td>
<td>Page 312: Ancient Egyptian Panaquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Syrian Double Panaquin</td>
<td>Page 313: Ancient Egyptian Panaquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Syrian Double Panaquin</td>
<td>Page 314: Coin of Maximil II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:** The image contains a table listing various wood-cuts included in Vol. V of the book. The table includes page numbers and descriptions of the woodcuts, such as the Camel bearing the Hood, the Levitical City diagrams, and various other scenes and items from ancient Egypt.
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Kaab, a celebrated Arabian poet, author of one of the seven poems which were suspended in the temple of Mecca, was originally a strenuous opponent of Muhammad, whose doctrines and person he satirized. He, however, recanted by writing a poem in honor of the prophet. As a reward, the prophet gave him his green mantle, which one of the descendants of Kaab sold for ten thousand pieces of silver. He died in 662.

Kaaba (Arabic Al-Ka'bah, "Square House," or, more properly, now Beit-Allah, "House of God") is the name of an oblong stone building inclosed in the great mosque at Mecca. From time immemorial tradition makes it have been a place of pilgrimage from all parts of Arabia within a circuit of a thousand miles, interrupted only by the sea. The Kaaba, the Black Stone, and other concomitants of worship at Mecca have a similar antiquity (Muir, Makomet, i, 211).

There are intimations of the Kaaba to be found in Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus. It certainly existed before the Christian era (Sir W. Jones, Works, x, 356; M. C. de Pencival, i, 74; ii, 532). See Mecca.

Origin and History.—Mr. Muir (ii, 84) thinks the Kaaba to be of Yemen origin, and to have been connected with the systems of idolatry prevalent in the southern portion of the Arabian peninsula. The Mussulmans say that Adam first worshipped on this spot, after his expulsion from Paradise, in a tent sent down from heaven for this purpose. Seth substituted for the tent a structure of clay and stone, which was, however, destroyed by the Deluge, but afterwards rebuilt by Abraham and Ismael. But this tradition may have arisen in connection with a traditional Jewish inscription found on a stone in the Kaaba about forty years before Muhammad, and which would suggest the possibility that some remote Abrahamic tribe acquainted with Syrian may have been at an early period associated with aboriginal Arabs in the erection of the Kaaba. Some have supposed it to have been devoted to the worship of Saturn (Zebal). Certain it is that it has been the holy emblem at different periods of four different faiths. Buddhist, Hindu, Gueber, and Moslem have all held it in veneration (Burton, iii, 160). According to the Koran, it is "the ancient house," the first house built and appointed for God's worship (Sale's Koran, p. 276), and the guardianship of it was by express revelation given to Osman (Sale, p. 167).

It was originally without a roof, and, having suffered material damage by a flood, was considered to be in danger of falling. The treasures it contained were considered insecure, and some of them were alleged to have been stolen. In A.D. 603 Muhammad rebuilt the edifice, but in A.D. 1626 it was again destroyed by a great torrent, and in A.D. 1627 was rebuilt substantially after its present form.

Structure.—It stands now on a base about two feet in height, which is a sharp inclined plane; and, as the roof is flat, the building becomes an irregular cube, the sides of which vary from forty to fifty feet in height, and eighteen by fourteen paces in extent. It is inclosed by a wall some two hundred and fifty paces on two sides, and two hundred paces on the others.

The Kaaba has but one door, which is raised some four or five feet from the ground, and is reached by a ladder. It is allowed to be entered only two or three times a year, though it is reputed to be susceptible of a money influence, and to be opened clandestinely much more frequently. The door is wholly coated with silver, and has gilt ornaments. Wax candles are burned before it nightly, together with perfuming-pan containing musk, aloes, etc., and other odorous substances.

The Kaaba at Mecca.

Black Stone.—The most important feature of the Kaaba is the "Black Stone," which is inserted in the north-
east corner or the building, at the height of four or five feet from the ground. It is in shape an irregular oval, about seven inches in diameter. There are various opinions as to the nature of this stone. Burchardt supposes it to be a "lava" stone. Others suggest that it is an aerolite. Muir calls it "a fragment of volcanic salts sprinkled with colored crystals, and varied red flecks, and it seems to be thrown up against a ground of a lifeless color, as by some puerile perturbation of the ground." Burchardt thinks it looks as if it had been broken into several pieces and cemented. He says, however, that it is difficult to determine the quality of it, because it is so worn by the millions of kisses and touches of the pilgrims. Muir says it is worn "until it is uneven, and has a muscular appearance." It is bordered all round with a large plate of silver about a foot broad. The part or angle exposed is semicircular. So much of the merit of the Kaaba depends on this stone that at the time of the rebuilding of the edifice by Mohammed a great contest arose between the families of the Koreish for the honor of placing it in the new structure. Mohammed settled this dispute by placing it on his own mantle, and causing a chief of each tribe to lift it, and then put it himself in its position in the Kaaba. See Kuzzari. Pilgrims, on arrival at Mecca, proceeding to the Kaaba and making the circuit of it, start at the corner where the black stone is inserted. Fabulous stories abound relative to the black stone, such as that it was originally white, but became black because it was unseen tampered with, or went on account of the sins of men. This, however, only affected its exterior. Others attribute its change of color to the innumerable touches and kisses of the pilgrims. It is one of the precious stones of Paradise, which came to earth with Adam, and was miraculously preserved during the flood, and brought back to Meccas by the angel Gabriel, and given to Abraham to build originally in the Kaaba. It was taken at one time by the Karmathians (q. v.), who refused to release it for five thousand pieces of gold, but they finally restored it.VEILING.—There is a custom, very remote in its origin, of covering the outside of the Kaaba with a veil, which has at various times been made of Yemen cloth, of Egyptian linen, of red brocade, and of black silk. To supply it became at one time a sign of royalty, and it was accordingly furnished by the caliph of Egypt, and later by the Turkish sultan. There seems to be some conflict of authorities about some things pertaining to the custom of veiling. About one third from the top of the veil is a band about two feet in width, embroidered with texts from the Koran in gilt letters (see Mecca, p. 295, 300). Admission.—Since the ninth year of the Hegira an order has obtained that none but Islamites shall be admitted to the Kaaba. Formerly the General Assembly of Ocahad convened at Mecca. In it poets contested for a whole mouth for prises, and those poems to which the prizes were from time to time awarded were by public order written in letters of gold on Egyptian silk, and hung up in the Kaaba (Sale, p. 20). Other Features.—In the south-east corner of the Kaaba is a smaller stone, less venerable than the above, being touched only, and not kissed, by those walking round the Kaaba. On the north side of the Kaaba is a slight hollow, large enough to admit three persons, where it is specially meritorious to pray, it being the place where Abraham and Ishmael kneaded clay and mud for the original structure. From the west side of the Kaaba a water-spout carries rain from the roof and pours it on the reputed grave of Ishmael, and pilgrims are not unfrequently seen "fighting to catch it." This water-spout is said to be of pure gold, and is four feet in length and about six inches in width. It is declared to have been brought to the Kaaba by Jerald (A.D. 781). The pavement round the Kaaba is a mosaic of many colored stones, and was laid in A.H. 826. There is on one side of the Kaaba a semicircular wall, which is scarcely less sacred than the Kaaba itself. The walk round the Kaaba is outside this wall, but the closer to it the better. This wall is entitled El Hutun, and is of solid stone, five feet in height and four feet in thickness. It is incised in white marble, and inscribed with prayers. The Kaaba has a double roof, supported by pillars of aloes-wood, and it is said that no bird ever rests upon it. The whole edifice is surrounded by a low wall, formed of colored stones on one side where there are found three oratories, or places of devotion for different sects; also the edifice containing the well Zem-Zem, the cupola of Abbas, and the Treasury. All these are further inclosed by a splendid colonnade, some say a colonnade of pillars, all gilded and adorned with lamps, which shed a brilliant lustre at night. These surroundings, between which and the Kaaba run seven paved causeways, were first devised by Omar for the better preservation of the Kaaba itself. According to Burchardt, the same holy Kaaba is the scene of such indecencies as cannot with propriety be particularized; indecencies which are practiced not only with impunity, but publicly and without a blush. See MOHAMMEDANISM.

Since the second year of the Hegira the Kaaba has been for the Mussulman world the Kudsh, or place towards which all Moslems turn in prayer. See KEBLAH. See Narrative of a Pilgrimage to El Mecina and Mecca, by Richard F. Burton, vol. iii (London, 1855); Sale's Koran; Muir, Life of Mahomet, vol. i and iii (London, 1858); Sprenger, Life of Mahomet, ii, 7; Ley, De templi Moslemi excursus (Berlin, 1846, 4to). (J. T. G. C.)

Kaaš. See PULICAN.

Kabala. See CARAL.

Kabiller is the name of a nephew of Brahma, and one of India's greatest saints. His father was Karta-men, the ancestor of the Brahmin race. It is in the person of this Hindu that Vishnu took the form of man some twenty-four different times. See Vollmer, Wörterbuch der Mythologie, p. 987.

Kab'ziel (Heb. Keb'zel, קֶבֶּזֶל, a gathering of God, i.e. perhaps confluence of waters; Sept. Kaf'zele in Joshua, elsewhere Kaph'zele v. c. Kaf'zeleth, etc.), a town on the extreme south of Judah, near Idumaeans, and therefore probably included within the territory of Simon (Josh. xvi, 21); the native place of Beneiah (son of Jehoiada), one of David's chief warriors (2 Sam. xxiii, 20; 1 Chron. xvi, 22). It was inhabited after the captivity under the similar name of Jak'serel (Neh. xi, 42). It is unlikely can only be conjectured as being near the edge of the Ghor, south of the Dead Sea (see Mal.4, loc. cit.); the name and vicinity are probably still marked by the wady El-Ka'zel, a small winter torrent running into the Dead Sea from the south (Robinson, Researches, ii, 497). Here the boundaries of Palestine, Edom, and Moab would converge, as is implied in the above Scripture references, and the region is still the resort of wild animals (Lynch, Jordan, p. 319; De Saulcy, Dead Sea, 298), and characterized by a deep fall of snow in winter ("wad el--Jereb, Syria, p. 492). This is stated in the account of Beneiah's adventure with the lion.

Kad'sa (Ked'ja), a town of Palestine, apparently in the south (Judith i, 9); probably the same as KADESH-BAARNEA (q. v.).

Kad'esh (Heb. Kadesh, קָדָת, holy, perhaps as being the site of some ancient oracle [compare the early equivalent name "fount of judgment"]; Gen. xiv, 7; xvi, 14; xx, 1; Num. xxxii, 26; xx, 1, 14, 16, 22; xviii, 18; xxi, 18, 14; xx, 11, 10; Deut. xi, 16; xxxi, 18, 11; Judg. xi, 17; Ps. cviii, x; Ezek. xlvii, 19; xviii, 28; Sept. K'de's, but in Ezek. xlvii, 19, Kad'ja v. r. Ked'ja) or, more fully, KADESH-BAR'NEA (Hebrew Kadesh--Harne'a, קָדָשׁ--בָּרְנֵא, the latter portion of the name being regarded by Simonis, i.e. a.s. v. as compounded of Kadesh, open country, and 72, wandering; Num. xxxii, 8; xiv, 4;
KADESH

DEUT. 12, 19; 29; JOSH. x, 41; IV, 6, 7; XV, 8; SEP. KADESH [KADH]; BIRG. A site on the south-eastern border of the Promised Land, towards Edom, of much interest as being the point at which the Israelites twice encamped (their ninth and thirteenth years) in the march of entering Palestine, and from which they were twice sent back; the first time in pursuance of their sentence to wander forty years in the wilderness, and the second time from the refusal of the king of Edom to permit a passage through his territories. It is probable that the term "Kadesh," though applied to signify a "city," yet had also a wider application to a region, in which Kadesh-meribah certainly, and Kadesh-barnea probably, indicate a precise spot. Thus Kadesh appears as a limit eastward of the same tract which was limited westward by Shur (Gen. xx, 1). Shur is possibly the same as Sihor, "which is before Egypt" (xxv, 18; Josh. xiii, 8;Jer. xii, 18), and was the first portion of the wilderness on which the people emerged from the passage of the Red Sea. See SHUR. "Between Kadesh and Bered" is another indication of the site of Kadesh as an eastern limit (Gen. xvi, 14), for the point so fixed is "the fountain on the way to Shur" (v, 7), and the range of limits is narrowed by selecting the western one not so far to the west, while the eastern one, Kadesh, is unchanged. Again, we have Kadesh as the point to which the foray of Chedorlaomer "returned" (Gen. xiv, 9), implying that it was certainly visited but that it lay in the direction, as viewed from Mount Seir and Paran, mentioned next before it, which was that of the point from which Chedorlaomer had come, viz. the north. Chedorlaomer, it seems, coming down by the eastern shore of the Dead Sea, passed the Zuzims (Ammon, Gen. xiv, 5; Deut. ii, 20), and the Emims (Moab, Deut. ii, 11), and the Horites in Mount Seir, to the south of that sea, unto "El-Paran that is by the wilderness." He drove these Horites over the Arabah into the El-ith region. Then he turned and went to Lydda, or Laish, or Tamar, or Engedi (comp. Gen. xiv, 7; 2 Chron. xx, 2). It was from Kadesh that the spies entered Palestine by ascending the mountains; and the murmuring Israelites, afterwards attempting to do the same, were driven back by the Amalekites and Canaanites, and afterwards apparently by the king of Arad, as far as Hormah, then called Zephath (Numb. xxiii, 17; xiv, 40-45; xxii, 1-3; Deut. i, 41-44; compare Judg. i, 7). There was also at Kadesh a fountain (EX-MISHAPIT) mentioned long before the exode of the Israelites (Gen. xiv, 7); and the tradition of the name of Mount Hor at Kadesh (Ex. xvi, 20) and a second visit, which implies that at the first there was no lack of this necessary article. In memory of the murmurs of the Israelites, this fountain afterwards bore the name of "the Waters of Meribah" (Deut. xxxii, 51). The term "Kadesh barnea" may have derived its name from Kadesh, which is "a stronghold," and not, as some suppose, from the name of the plain (Ps. xxvii, 8). On the second visit to this place Miriam died there, and Moses sent messengers to the king of Edom, informing him that they were in Kadesh, a city in the uttermost part of his border, and asking i.e. to pass through his country, so as to continue their march round the wilderness which surrounded the coast from the east. This Edom refused, and the Israelites accordingly marched to Mount Hor, where Aaron died; and then along the Arabah (desert of Zin) to the Red Sea (Numb. xx, 14-29). The name of Kadesh again occurs in describing the southern quarter of Judah, the nise defining which is drawn "from the shore of the Salt Sea, from the bay that looked southward; and it went out to the south side of Akkrabim, and passed along to Zin, and ascended up on the south side to Kadesh-barnea" (Josh. i, 1-9; compare Num. xxxvii, 4, 4). In Gen. xiv, 7 Ido is connected with Tamar, or Dezon Tahron; just as we find these two in the comparatively late book of Ezekiel, as designed to mark the southern border of Judah, drawn through and terminating at seaward at the "river to," or "towards the great sea" (Ezek. xxvii, 19; xxxi, 29). There is one objection to this view. The Kadesh from which the spies were sent was in the wilderness of Paran (Numb. xiii, 26); Kadesh-barnea was in the wilderness of Zin (xx, 1). This is easily removed. Paran was the general name for the whole desert of that part of the Arabah, extending from Palestine to Sinai (Gen. xxii, 21; Num. xiii, 21; Josh. x, 1-3). If Kadesh was situated on the western side of the Arabah, then it might be reckoned either to Paran or to Zin; or, if we agree with Keil, Delitzsch, and others (Keil on Josh. x), that Paran was the general name for the whole, and Zin the specific name of a portion, the objection is removed at once.—KITTO; SMITH. Compare KADESH, l.

To meet these various indications, two places by the name of Kadesh were formerly supposed to exist; but the editor of the Pictorial Bible has shown (note on Numb. xxx, 1) that a single Kadesh would answer all the conditions, if placed on the western border of the Arabah, opposite Mt. Hor. Accordingly, Dr. Robinson locates it at Ain el-Weheb, which he argues coincides with all the circumstances mentioned (Researches, ii, 588). But this is somewhat too distant from the pass es-Sufa, which is probably the Zephath where the Israelites encamped the night before entering Canaan, and of which Raumer has with greater plausibility fixed Kadesh at Ain es-Ihub (Der Zug der Israeliten, Leipzig, 1843, p. 9 sq.). See EXOD. Mr. Rowlands, who travelled through this region in 1842, thinks he discovered Kadesh (as well as numerous other ancient localities in this vicinity) at a place which he calls Ain Kades (Williams's Holy City, 2d edit., i, 467). A writer in Fairbairn's Dictionary argues at length in favor of this position at Ain Gades, but all his reasoning partakes of the character of special pleading, and rests upon inconclusive grounds. His only real argument is that Kadesh is the middle place between wady Feiran (Paran) and Engedi (Hazezon-tamer), on Chedorlaomer's route (Gen. xiv, 7); but that route is given so vaguely that we can lay no particular stress upon it. The other arguments even tell the other way; especially do the passages deduced go to show that Kadesh was at the extreme east from Shur (Gen. xxx, 1) and el-Arish (Numb. xxxiv, 5, Josh. xxv, 6), and the same was the case with Zin (Numb. xiii, 21; xxxiii, 36). This position also is avoided not only inconsistent with the location of Huzeroth at Ain Hudheibrah, but even re- moving the borders of Edom from the supposed Edomite dominance (Numb. xx, 16), and actually to remove Mt. Hor from its well-defined traditional situation (Deut. i, 2). Capt. Palmer has more lately visited the site thus assumed for Kadesh, and particularly describes it (Quart. Statement of the "Palestine Exploration Fund," Jan. 1871, p. 20 sq.), as "consisting of three springs, or rather shallow pools, one of them overflowing in the rainy season; but his advocacy for the identity adds no additional argument. In fact, the agreement in the name is the only plea of any force. This is counterbalanced by the scriptural notice of the position of the plain, which is given by the historian, in the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1849, p. 377 sq.; also Palmer, Desert of Exodus, p. 296; comp. Kitto's Scripture Lands, p. 78-82; Ritter, Erdkunde, xiv, 1077-1089. Schwarz (Palestine, p. 23) endeavors, from Rabbinical authority, to locate Kadesh at a place named Bireia, about forty-five miles south of Gaza; but his whole theory is imaginary, besides indicating a position too far west for this Kadesh, and requiring another for En-Mishpat (p. 214), which is stated by Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v. Kadhe, Bephe, Cades) to have been in the vicinity of Mt. Hor. The above statement Stanley (Sinai and Palestine, p. 95) unwar- rantably infers that Kadesh was identical with Petra.

KADI (Arabic) is among the Mohammedans the title of an assistant judge of civil law, and, like the judge himself (molla), is classed among the higher clergy, be-
KADKOD

KADKOD. See AGADE.

Kadmil (Heb. Kadmil, קָדָמִיל, before God, i. e. his servant; Sept. Kaμμύς), one of the Levites who returned with Zerubbabel from the captivity (Neh. xii. 8), and assisted in the various reforms of that period, being always named in connection with Joshua (Ezra iii. 9; Neh. viii. 33; comp. Ezra iii. 9), sometimes only as a descendant in common of Hodaviah (Ezra ii. 40; Neh. viii. 43; comp. Ezra iii. 9), but once as a son (Neh. xii. 24). The length of time over which these notices seem to extend is vast. 536-410 B.C. leads to the suspicion that they relate to two individuals (perhaps a brother and also a son of the Levite Joshua), one of whom may have been concerned in the earlier events, and the other in the later.

Kadmone (Heb. Kadmone, קדמון, eastern, as in Ezek. x. 19, etc., or former, as in Ezek. xxxviii. 17, etc.; only once of a nation, collect. in the sing., Gen. xv. 19; Sept. קְדָמֹנִי, Vulg. Calmonia, A. V. "Kadmoneites"), the name of a Canaanitish tribe, who appear to have dwelt in the north-east part of Palestine, under Mount Hermon, at the time that Abraham sojourned in the land, and are mentioned in a more than ordinarily full list of the aborigines of the land, by an inventor of words (Gen. xv. 19). As the name is derived from קְדָמ, kadam, "east," it is supposed by Dr. Wells and others to denote a people situated to the east of the Jordan, or, rather, that it was a term applied collectively, like "orientals," to all the people living in the countries beyond that river. At least it may be a term of contrast with the more western Zidonians. As the term likewise signifies "ancient," it may designate the older or aboriginal races of that region in general, who were recognized as the eldest in origin. Both these explanations may be correct, as the Kadmoneites are not elsewhere mentioned as a distinct name. Indeed, a subsequent discontinuance of the term, in the assigned acceptance, may easily be accounted for by the nations beyond the river having afterwards become more distinctly known, so as to be mentioned by their several distinctive names. See HITHER. The reader may see much ingenious trifling respecting this name in Bochart (Canaan, i. 19); the substance of which is that Cadmus, the founder of Thebes, in Boeotia, was originally a Kadmone, and that the name of his wife, Hermione, was derived from Mount Hermon. By others the name Kadmoneites has been extended as equivalent to "the children of the East" (2 Macc. xii. 22), i.e. those living beyond the Euphrates (Ezra, Isr. Greek, 1. 900) [see TENSE], and Babel (2 Macc. xii. 24), and sought to identify them with the Nabataeans of Arabia; but these were Ishmaelites. It was probably applied collectively to various tribes, like the Saracens of the Middle Ages or the Bedouins of modern times (Ritter, Erdkunde, xx. 138). According to Dr. Thomson, the name is still preserved among the Nusairiyeh north of Tripoli, who have a tradition that their ancestors were expelled from Palestine by Joshua, and who seem in physiology and manners to belong to the most ancient inhabitants of the country (Land and Book, i. 242). See CANAANITE.

Kadroma is the name of a Thibetian Jewish divinity. Strangely enough, the Darwinian theory seems to have been entertained at a date considerably anterior to our century, for this goddess the Thibetians claim to have belonged to the ape race, and, after marriage to an ape, to have become the mother of the present population of Thibet. See Vollmer, Wörterb. d. Mythol., p. 990. See KADROMA.

Kaffres (from the Arabic Kafir, infidel, i. e. non-Mohammedan), a people in south-eastern Africa, who received this name from the Moorish navigators of the Indian Ocean. When the Dutch colonists came in contact with the most southern tribe of the Kaffres, the Koea, or Amakosa, the Moorship name was given to them exclusively, and in this restricted sense it is commonly used by the Dutch and English colonists. It is, however, well ascertained that not only the tribes now commonly called Kaffres, but the Tamboockies, Mahaockies, Zulu, Damara, the inhabitants of Delagoa Bay, and the numerous Bechuana tribes who occupy the interior of the continent to an extent as yet unexplored, are but subdivisions of one great family, allied in language, customs, and mode of life. The Kaffre languages (in the wider sense of the word) are divided by Forder into an Eastern, Middle, and Western group. The former comprises 1. the Kaffre languages (in the narrower sense of the word), embracing, besides the Kaffre proper, also the Zulu dialect; 2. the Zambesi languages, embracing the languages of the Barotse, Bayeye, and Mabonae; 3. the languages of Zanizier, or the Kaffres of the Kisuahili, Kikinua, Kiikamba, and the Kihian. The Middle group contains 1. the Bechuana languages (Sesuto, Sero, and Shlapi); 2. the Tekeza languages, embracing the languages of the Manco- roesi, Matapi, and Maslala. The Western group contains 1. the Bunda, Herero, and Londo languages; 2. the languages of Congo, Mongwe, Dikele, Isaba, and Fernando Po. The Kaffre languages are sonorous, flexible, and definite. The southern tribes have adopted the peculiar smacking sounds of the Hottentots, which frequently occur in the language of the Kaffre. The prestige of the Kaffre is feudal—an aristocracy of chiefs, acknowledging the supremacy of the sovereign, but, except on occasional occasions, acting independently of him. The general chief is the sovereign of the nation, and in a council of chiefs is very powerful, and is looked upon by all the nobles and people with unbounded respect. The kraals (hamlets) generally consist of a dozen low, conical huts, the diameter of which is no more than about ten feet, into which one has to creep through a low opening, closed during the night by a heavy stone, or the middle of the huts is roosted for the cattle. Wars generally arise out of the stealing of cattle. In personal appearance the Kaffres are a remarkably fine race of men. They are of dark brown color, have a beautiful and vigorous constitution, dark woolly hair, a lofty front, and bent nose. Like many other savage tribes they practice the worship of their ancestors, "They sacrifice and pray to their deceased relatives. Although it would be asserting too much to say absolutely that they believe in the existence and the immortality of the soul. In fact, their belief seems to go no further than this, that the ghosts of the dead haunt for a certain time their previous dwelling-places, and either assist or plague the living. No special powers are attributed to them, and it would be a misnomer to call them deities" [comp. Lubbock, Prehistoric Conditions of Men, N. Y. 1871, 500, ch. iv sq]. They practice circumcision, but only as a custom, not as a religious rite. Polygamy is allowed, and as the heavy work is chiefly performed by the women, it has proved a great obstacle to the introduction of Christianity. The various tribes of the Kaffre family are estimated by Dr. J. Freeman, secretary of the London Missionary Society, at 2,000,000, spread from the eastern frontier of Cape Colony beyond Delagoa Bay, and then across the whole continent, without break, to the Atlantic in latitude 20°. A part of the territory of the Kaffres, however, in particular, constant raids were made into English territory, was annexed to the British do
missions under the name of Queen Adelaide province. It was subsequently restored to the chief of the Kaffres: in 1847 it again became an English province, under the name of British Kaffraria, and King William's Town, on the Buffalo River, was made the capital and the military head-quarters. The capital has a population of 3,000, and a radius of influence of 50 miles. The population of the town consists chiefly of English and German settlers, while the country people are Kaffres. In 1857 the province numbered 1842 kraals, and had a population of 106,721, but a terrible famine, which was caused by a false prophet of the name of Umhlanga, reduced it in 1859 to 2,196 kraals, and a population of 62,899. In 1890 the province embraced about 1000 sq. miles, and a population of 122,159. The British influence more and more extends over Kaffraria proper, which is situated between British Kaffraria and Natal, and embraces about 1000 sq. miles and 840,000 inhabitants. North Natal and the Transvaal republic extends the land of other Kaffr tribes, the territory of which is estimated at 62,950 square miles, with a population of about 440,000. Cape Colony, according to the census of 1875, had a Kaffre population of 165,678.

As the Dutch government of Cape Colony was hostile to all Christian missions, the missions among the Kaffres did not begin until the government had passed under British rule. The Moravians, who then for the first time found the necessary protection for their re-education work among the Hottentots and Kaffres, in 1818 their labors also to the Kaffres, in particular to the tribes of the Fongus and Tambakia, whence in 1862 a station was established among the last name tribe of Independent Kaffraria. The missionary Von der Kemp, who in 1796 was sent out by the London Missionary Society, laid the foundation of the missions of this society among the Kaffres. The Wesleyan missionaries have since (1820) numerous stations in all parts of the Kaffre territory. Their missionaries have for a long time been almost the only ones who ventured to penetrate into the uncultivated districts of the free Kaffres. The Free Church and the United Presbyterians of Scotland have a number of stations in British Kaffraria, and have begun to extend their labors to (independent) Kaffraria, among the natives whom the British government has induced to settle there. The Berlin missions have also, since 1834, established a number of stations in British Kaffraria. The Anglican Church, which has bishops at Cape town (1847), Grahamstown (1850), and in the Orange Free State (1863), has stations both in British and in Free Kaffraria, and is eagerly proposed extending its labors to the former Church had done nothing for the Kaffres until the establishment of a special missionary board in 1863 (Syndalec Zemendi Comisii in Zuyd Africa), which displays a great zeal in the establishment of missions among the pagan population. More recently the German Baptists have sent out missionaries to British Kaffraria. The Roman Catholic Church has also a few stations in British Kaffraria. See Grundemann, Missionsatlas (2d number, Gotta, 1867); Newcomb, Cyclopaedia of Missions; Moffett's Southern Africa (Lond. 1845); T. B. B. of South Africa (Lond. 1871); Licentians, Travels in South Africa (Bucheller, Travels in South Africa. (A. J. S.)

Kagbossuam is the name of a crow which the Hindus assert embodies the soul of one of their celebrated sages; some of them say even of Brahmas himself. See Voilner, Wörterb. d. Mythol. p. 991.

Kahambincins, the Persian name for the period in which these are set. It was created, and was cosmogony, as in that of the Christian dispensation, covers six days; but, like some of our theologians, they say that each day of creation corresponds in length to a period of one month. See Zoroastrianism.

Kahler, Johannes, a Lutheran theologian of some note, was born at Wolmar, Hansa Casel, Jan. 20, 1649, and was educated at the University of Gisseng. He began his lectures at that university in 1673 on the Cartesian philosophy, and became one of its ablest exponents. In 1677 he was called as extraordinary professor of metaphysics to Rinteln, and shortly after was promoted to the full or ordinary professorship. In 1688 he published his chief work in philosophy, and became also, in 1692, rector of the university. It is the latter treatise that has been the subject of this paper. It was the first and only one of its kind, and was printed in two volumes. See Alpen, Hist. Lex. vol. iii, s. v.; Jöcher, Gelehrten Lexicon, vol. ii, s. v., gives a complete list of Kahler's productions.

Kaisersberg. See Gehrke.

Kaiserswerth. See Fliedner.

Kajumorata, the Persian name for the first man, who they say was a direct descendant of a bull (Abbad), and was both man and wife at the same time. So sacred was his person that even angels worshipped him. Ahriman, however, was bent upon his destruction, and for thirty years he persecuted Kajomurata, until successful in slaying him. But the seed of Kajomurata fructified the earth, the earth purified it, and after forty years a plant sprang up, which became a mighty tree, bearing, instead of fruit, ten human pairs, one of which, Mehsia and Mesihame, became the ancestors of the human race (see Vollmer, Wörterb. d. Mythol. p. 992). See ORMUZ; ZORASTRIANISM.

Kalnaas is the name of the third Buddha who preceded Gotama (q. v.), and, according to Major Forbes's (Journ. Asiatic Society, June, 1836) calculation of Hindu chronology, must have lived on the earth B.C. 3101 (see Hardy, Manual of Buddhism, p. 87, 96, et al.).

Kabula, the Hindu name for a place in hell to which the trespassers of Hindu tradition are consigned, particularly those who, after offering a sacrifice for their ancestors, dare to remove from the altar any portion of the offering which the flames might have left unconsumed. See Vollmer, Wörterb. d. Mythol. p. 993.

Kalderon (more accurately Calederon), the most celebrated poet of Spain, born of a noble family at Madrid Jan. 1, 1601, was educated at the University of Salamanca, but at length went into the army, and fought in Milan and Flanders, until in 1651 he entered the priesthood. Already, as a soldier, he had devoted much time to the cultivation of his poetical talents; now, as a priest, he devoted all his time to it, and his influence on the religious poetry of Spain, for his relation to the history of Roman Catholic poetry, that we make room for a short sketch of this religious (Roman Catholic) Shakespeare. Shortly after his admission to the priesthood he took a chaplaincy at Toledo, but the king, with whom Kalderon was in special favor, soon gained the poet for his court by assigning Kalderon a lucrative position in the royal chapel. He died about 1681, perhaps somewhat later. He wrote no less than five hundred dramas, many of which have a religious tendency, and display most accurately the religious and moral character of his time and people. Those of his productions which have been preserved are divided into three different groups. The first contains his comedies of familiar life; the second, the heroic; and the third embraces his religious works, or Sacred Letters or Treatises (sesiones Sacramentales), and these only concern us here. They are compositions which bear a strong resemblance to the miracle-plays of the Middle Ages, and are, like them, deformed by fantastic extravagances of religious opinion and feeling. Some of them, however, are beautifully poetical. One of the most characteristic, held also by some critics to be the best, is "The Devotion of the Cross," a strange farrago of the wildest supernatural inventions, and the most impractically-erected exhibitions of human conduct, but breathing a po-
etic spirit which is wonderfully impressive. One of its main incidents is the legend of one dead man shriving another, which had been used by another poet. Another successful effort of his is "The steadfast Prince." Both of these have frequently been translated into English and other languages. See, however, Ticknor, History of Egypt, on the body edited by the late H. T. Inman.

One of the ablest Roman Catholic critics, professor Frederick Schlegel, thus speaks of Kaldan's position as a Christian poet: "The Christianity of this poet, however, does not consist so much in the external circumstances which he has selected, as in his peculiar feeling, and the method of treating his subject, which is most common with him. Even where his materials furnish him with no opportunity of drawing the perfect development of a new life out of death and suffering, yet everything is conceived in the spirit of this Christian love and purification, everything seen in its light, and clothed in the splendor of its heavenly coloring. In every situation and circumstance, Kaldan is, of all dramatic poets, the most Christian, and for that very reason the most romantic." (History of Literature, p. 280, 281.) See also Eichenhorst, Gelehrte Schauspiele von Dichtern des 19. Jahrhunderts (Berlin: Schmidt, Schauspielerei der Bühne; Schmid, Schauspielerei der Bühne; Schmid, Schauspielerei der Bühne; Schmid, Schauspielerei der Bühne;).

Kaldan, Georg, a celebrated Hungarian Jesuit, was born at Tyrnav (Hungary) in 1570. After filling various positions in the Jesuitical order, preaching at Vienna, and teaching theology at Olmutz, he became at last rector of the college, and, at Pressburg, taught philosophy until his death in 1634. He was the first Roman Catholic to furnish his co-religionists a Hungarian translation of the Bible. It was published at Vienna in 1622, folio (the Protestant translation, by Visoli, was made in 1689). A portion of Kaldan's sermons were published at Pressburg in 1631.

Kalendar. See CALENDAR.

Kali (or Kali) is the name of one of the many forms of Durga, so popularly and variously worshiped in Hindustan.

Names and History.—Doorgi is the female principle in the production of the world who appears throughout the Hindu Shastras as Prakriti or Bhagavati. She is said to have had a thousand names, and to have appeared in a vast number of forms in different periods: thus, as Sati, she first became the wife of Siva, but renounced her life on hearing her father reproach her husband. She again appeared as "the mountain-born goddess" under the name of Parvati, and again married Siva. After her marriage with Siva, Soma, Ganesh, and Kali, she became renowned for her achievements in war against the giant enemies of the gods. This goddess assumed the name of Kali on the occasion of a battle with a thousand-headed giant demigod whom she slew. In her excessive delight over her victory, she danced till she shook the foundation of the earth, and the gods were compelled to induce her husband Siva to influence her to stop, which, however, he found no means of doing till he resorted to the expedient of throwing himself among the bodies of the slain. Kali, observing herself dancing on the body of her husband, was shocked, and, protruding her tongue in her surprise, stood still. In this attitude she is represented in the images of her now made, and sold, and worshiped throughout Bengal.

Images.—In allusion to the above contest with the giant, Kali is often represented as "a ten-armed goddess." Her image in this aspect is that of a yellow woman with ten arms, richly dressed and ornamented, standing erect, resting her left foot on the back of a prostrate buffalo, and her right on that of a couchant lion, holding in her hands a spear, an axe, a discus, a trident, a club, an arrow, and a shield.

Her most common image, however, is that of a black or very dark blue-colored woman with four arms; the upper left arm holding a cimeter, the lower left a human head by the hair. The other right arm is held up to indicate either that she is bestowing a blessing or the restoration of nature from the devastation which she has caused, and to which her lower right hand is pointing. All her hands are bloody. In this form she is standing on the body of a buffalo, which is white, and stretched ed at full length upon his back. Around her waist, as a covering, she wears a string of bloody human hands. She wears an immense necklace, reaching below her knees, which is composed of human skulls. In some images a pair of dead human bodies hang by the hair from her earring. Her tongue, which is above set forth, protrudes from her mouth upon her chin.

She appears, moreover, under other forms: sitting on a dead body, with two giants' heads in her arms; as a black female sitting on a throne, etc.

Character.—Kali, in Hindu mythology, is nothing more nor less than a female Durga. She is a very sanguinary goddess; her eyebrows are bloody, and blood flows in a stream down her breast. Her eyes are red, like those of a drunkard.

Sacredness.—Mr. Ward makes a summary from one of the Puranas. He says: "The Puranas represent the effect that a tiger's blood offered to her in sacrifice will please her for a hundred years: that of a lion, a redeer, or a man, a thousand years; and that of three men for ten hundred thousand years. In the event of a human person being offered in sacrifice, it must be performed in a cemetery, or at a temple, or in a mountain. The person of a good appearance should be offered. The victim should be adorned with chaplets and besmeared with sandal-wood, after various ablutions. The deformed, timid, leprous, or crippled must not be offered; nor must a priest, nor a childless brother. The victim must be prepared the day before the offering, his neck being besmeared with blood from the axe with which he is to be sacrificed. Besides this, however, persons may draw blood from their own bodies, or cut off their flesh, to be presented to this goddess as a burnt-offering, or burn the body by the flame of a lamp.

Worshippers.—Many Hindus adopt the ten-armed Doorgi as their guardian deity, and she is considered as the image of the divine energy. Her worship in Lower Bengal is so popular that on the occasion of a great annual festival all business is suspended, and even the European courts, custom-house, and other public offices are closed.

The professional robbers and murderers so long known and dreaded throughout India, and notorious elsewhere as Thugs, are the special devotees of the four-armed Kali. In the case of great crimes in Kalki, they consecrate to her their instruments of death, and their victims are held to be immolated in her honor. These men will join travellers, and accompany them for days, gaining their confidence if possible, under some disguise, until, watching their opportunity, they can administer drugs, or choke them with a small cord, and then rob them of all they possess. Formerly, it is supposed, the goddess rendered them much more assistance than of late, by putting out of the way the corpses of those slain; but, in consequence of one of their number looking behind him after a murder, she ceased to render them so certainly this assistance, as this was a violation of the express condition on which she kept secret all traces of their deeds. The accounts of the occasion of their losing her assistance in this particular are conflicting, and so very worthy of reproduction, that anyone wishing to trace the matter may refer to Illustrations of the History and Practice of the Thugs (London, 1837). See THUGS.

Ceremonies.—Distinct from the great festival alluded to above in honor of Doorgi as the "ten-armed goddess" is a famous and popular festal celebration held under the special form of Kali. It is observed with much the same form as the other. Annual sacrifices of sweetmeats, sugar, garments, rice, plantains, and peace are of-
KALI

KALMUCKS

feed in great abundance. The first day ends with singing, dancing, and feasting, and with the lower classes in great debauchery and shameless licentiousness, the crust, an intoxicating liquor, being consecrated to the idol goddess. On the second morning images of all sizes representative of the goddess are made, and, after consecration by the Brahmins, are carried through the streets in procession to the Hooghly River, and there, carried out in boats, are thrown into it, and with this act terminate these wild and terrible orgies. Immense sums are expended by many of these devotees during these festivals. Mr. Ward estimates as much as £9,000 sterling is expended annually at the single shrine in Calcutta, and narrates cases of individual offerings, at one time, of £10,000, comprising rich beds, silver plate, and food for the entertainment of a thousand persons.

Temples.—There are many buildings devoted to her worship. The greatest and most popular of these is that of Kali-Ghat, about three miles to the south of Calcutta. There are fifty other edifices in various parts of India devoted to Doorga under her variety of forms and names. All of these are said to have originated in an incident connected with her historical previous to her having assumed the shape of Parwati, when Vishnu severed her body into fifty-one separate pieces, which were strewn over the earth, and conferred a peculiar sanctity on the places where they happened to fall. All of these become shrines, the site of each being determined by lot; one of her thousand forms was set up. The whole of the country to the south of Calcutta, including the spot known as Kali-Ghat, was thus rendered sacred, the toes of the right foot being deposited at the latter place. The temple at Kali-Ghat consists of one room, with a large pavement around it. The image of Kali is in this temple (Ward, ii, 157).

There is, perhaps, no fabled impersonality in all the Hindu mythology exerting a greater or more gloomy influence over millions of men than Doorga under the title of Kali.


Kali. See FARCHED CORN.

Kalighi is the name of one (the tenth) impersonation of the Hindu god Vishnu. See KRISHNA.

Kaliph (more generally Caliph), originally a deputy or lieutenant, but afterwards applied chiefly to the successors of Mohammed. As a representative of the prophet and Islam, the caliph exercised a power which was primarily spiritual, and in theory, therefore, he claimed the obedience of all Mohammedans. In practice the claim was soon disregarded, and the Fatimite caliphs of Africa and the sovereigns of the Ommaid dynasty of Spain each professed to be the only legitimate representatives of Mohammedan, in opposition to the Abbaside caliphs of Bagdad. The latter caliphate reached its highest splendor under Haroun al-Raschid, in the 9th century; but his division of the empire among his sons showed how completely the caliph had lost sight of the spiritual theory of his office. For the last two hundred years the appellation of caliph has been swallowed up in shah, sultan, emir, and other titles peculiar to the East. See Brande and Cox, Dictionary of Science, Literature, and Art, i, 350.

Kalir, Eleazar Ha-, one of the oldest Jewish poets of Italy, generally regarded as the founder of the synagogal poetry of the Sephardite Jews in Europe. He is the author of the beginning of the Bible of Venice. Of his personal history nothing further is known. He wrote some one hundred and fifty different sacred poems, many of which were inserted in the liturgies of the Babylonian, Italian, German, and French Jews. He was a disciple of Jannai, and was greatly admired by his contemporaries. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, v, 181 sq.; Sachs, Religiöse Poesie d. Juden in Spanien, p. 180 sq.; Zunz, Synagogale Poesie d. Middelalters, p. 128 sq. See also LITURGY, JEWISH; MACHSOR; SYNAGOGAL POETRY.

Kalyyuga, or the Kali Age, is the fourth or last age of the Maha, or Great, Vedas, (see VEDAS), and bears some resemblance to the Iron Age of classical mythology. The Hindus, recognizing, like all religiousmen of antiquity, that man by sin has fallen from his high estate, have divided the world's existence into four periods, which are marked by successive physical and intellectual decrements and degenerations. They hold that the present period is the last one, that it consists of 432,000 solar sidereal years, and that the Kali Age began B.C. 3102. "In the Krita (or first) age," Manu says, "the (genius of) Truth and Right (in the form of a bull) stands firm on his four feet, nor does any advantage accrue to man from iniquity. But in the following ages, by reason of unjust gains, he is deprived successively of one foot; and even just emoluments, through the prevalence of theft, falsehood, and fraud, are gradually diminished by one foot, (i.e. by a fourth part)." The estimate in which the Kaliyauga, our present age, is held by the modern Hindus may be gathered from one of their most celebrated Purânas, the Padma-Purâna. In the last chapter of one of the books (Kriyâyogasâra) of this Purâna, the following account, which we take from Webster (v. 11), is narrated:

"In the Kaliyuga (the genius of) Right will have but one foot; every one will delight in evil. The four castes will be devoted to wickedness, and deprived of the nourishment which is fit for them. The Brahmins will neglect the Vedas, hanker after presents, be lustful and cruel. They will despise the Scriptures, gamble, steal, and desire intercourse with widows. . . . For the sake of a livelihood, some Brahmins will become arrant rogues. . . . The Śudras will endeavor to lead the life of the Brahmans, and, out of friendship, people will bear false witness . . . they will injure the wives of others, and their speech will be that of falsehood. Greedy of the wealth of others, they will entertain a guest according to the behest of the Scriptures, but afterwards kill him out of covetousness; they are indeed worthy of hell. The twice-born (i.e. the first three castes) will live up to the duties of each, and even their daughters. In this Yuga men will be under the sway of women, and women will be excessively fickle. . . . In the Kaliyuga the earth will bear but little corn; the clouds will shed but little rain, and that, too, only in one spot. The cows will be consumed before they are born, and give little milk, and the milk will yield no butter; there is no doubt of that. . . . Trees, even, will wither in twelve years, and the age of mankind will not exceed sixteen years; people, moreover, will become gray-haired in their youth; women will bear children in their fifth or sixth year, and men will become troubled with a great number of children. In the Kaliyuga the foreigners will become kings, bent upon evil; and those living in foreign countries will be all of one caste, and out of lust take to themselves many wives. In the first twilight of the Kaliyuga, men will slay each other, and in the middle of it no one will even mention his name." There is a remarkable identity of the Hindu belief with that of the Hebrew as to redemption from this sinful state by a Messiah. See Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, i, 303 sq., 329 sq.; Weber, Indische Studien, i, 411; Wilson, Asiatic Researches, x, 27 sq.; Alger, History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, p. 111 sq.

Kallah. See TALMUD.

Kall'ja (Heb. Kal'yaj', "driver; Sept. Kol'-laj"); a chief priest, son of Sallai, contemporary with the high-priest Joakin (Neh. xii, 20). B.C post 536.

Kalmucks (Tatar Kalmik, i.e. apostates), also called Olik or Ekaton, a Mongolian tribe of nomads,
a portion of whom live under Chinese rule, while the greater number, during the last two centuries, have settled in or belong to Russia. They are similar to the Mongols proper, but inferior to them in point of civilization. They are divided into tribes (Uluses), at the head of which are Tschails; and the tribes are subdivided into Aïnaks (of which there are families of each), and at the head of which are the Saisians. They call themselves Derben Eret (Dörbin-Girat), i.e. the four allies, because, from time immemorial, they have been divided into four chief tribes: 1. The Dzogars, after whom Dongariya is called, formerly the most powerful of the tribes, but subsequently subdued by the Chineze, and now existent only in small number. 2. The Koshotes (i.e. warriors), under princes from the family of Jenghiz Khan, numbering from 50,000 to 60,000; they voluntarily placed themselves under the sceptre of Russia, and are loyal subjects; their first name is Tchoum, (fermented horse milk). 3. The Derbets, living in the 16th and 17th centuries, on the Volga and Ural, now on the Don and the II. 4. The Torgota (Törga-Uten), or Kalmucks of the Volga, have, for the most part, left Russian territory; only the tribe Zoonoro, under the prince Dundukor, with the remainder of the people, remains. Dundukor himself was baptized, and, by order of Alexander I, the title passed over to his son-in-law Nor- Kasov. Some of the Kalmucks live scattered in the government of Simbirsk (15,000 souls, all in connection with the Greek Church), others east of the Ural, on the Jeth River (professing Islamism), and in the commercial towns of Russia, altogether about 120,000 souls, of whom 73 per cent. live in the government of Astrachan. The majority of the Kalmucks are still Buddhists. They were all originally adherents of that form of Buddhism known as Lamaism, which the Mongols in general received from Tibet. In Donugor they have two celebrated temples; the one is situated on the Tekes, the other on the II. In the latter resides the Tchamba Lama in the winter, and with him a number of priests, who here teach reading and writing. They are joined by pious pilgrims and merchants, who set up their shops round the temple. The chiefs of the Chinese Kalmucks used to receive from the mandarin the insignia of their rank, but of late the virtual independence of Donugor has severed the former relations to the Chinese government, and, after the occupation of Kutchu by the Russians in May, 1871, the Chinese Kalmucks generally declared their submission to the Russian government. The language of the Kalmucks is a branch of the Mongolian language; grammars of the language have been published by Bobrovnikov (Kasan, 1848) and Zweick (Don- auschekingen, 1857). The literature consists almost exclusively of translations of Buddhist writings from India. A collection of legends (Siddhi-Kür), with German translation, was published by Julig (Leipzig, 1860).

KALONYMUS BEN-KALONYMUS, a Jewish writer of some note, was born in Italy in 1297, but lived for some time in Southern France, and was there picked up by king Robert of Naples. He returned with the latter to his native land, and filled some important offices in his service. Kalonymus was an accomplished scholar, translated into Hebrew medical, astronomical, and philosophical works of the Arabs, wrote a number of scientific treatises on the low moral state of his contemporaries, and labored in this and other ways to ameliorate the miserable condition of his countrymen. He died about 1387. The best of his later works is יִּהְיָה יִבְנֵי, or The Stone of Weeping (Naples, 1489; translated into Jewish German, Frkft. 1746). He also edited with great ability a part of the Arabic Encyclopaedia of the Sciences (known as "Treatises of the Honest Brethren") for the use of the Italian Jews. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, vii, 305 sq.; Zunz, in Geiger's Zeitschrift, ii, 813; iv, 200 sq.; Flügel, Zeitschrift d. deutsch. Morgenländ. Gesellschaft, 1862.

KALONTOCOCRACY is a new word sometimes used instead of hierarchy. The word is derived from the French onctuol (cap, such as the Roman Catholic clergy wear), and the Greek sąpiræ (to govern).

Kalpa designates in Hindu chronology the Brah- mínical period of one day and night, and corresponds to a period of 4,292,800,000,000,000,000 years, or years of man, marking the duration of the world, and, ac- cording to many, including even the interval of its anni- hilation. The Bhāratiyā-Purāṇa admits of an infinity of kalpas; other Purāṇas enumerate thirty. A great kalpa comprises not a day, but a life of Brahmis. In Vedic literature, kalpa is a Vedânga (q.v.). See Hardy, Manual of Buddhism, p. 1 sq., 7 sq. See KALPA-SÜTRA.

Kalpa-Sútra is, in Vedic literature, the name of those Sanscrit works which treat of the ceremonies usual at a Vedic sacrifice. See VEDA. In Jaina literature it is the name of the most sacred religious work of the Jains (q. v.). It chiefly relates the historical history of the Jains, the last of their twenty-four great eras, the Jain saints, or Tirthankaras, but contains also an account of four other saints of the same class. The author of the work was Bhadrabahu, and it was composed, Stevenson assumes, in the year A.D. 411. It is held in high respect by the Jains, who, on the eighth day of the middle of the rains, they devote to the reading of their most sacred writings, allot no less than five to the Kalpa- Sûtra. See Stevenson, The Kalpa-Sûtra and Nara Tattva (London, 1848).

Kalteisen, Heinrich, a celebrated Dominican of the 15th century, was born near Coburgo, and educated at Vienne. In the latter city, he was afterwards professor of theology, preaching at the same time. Later he removed to Mentz, and became general inquisitor of Germany. He was present at the Council of Basle, and took quite a prominent part in the deliberations against the Hussites. He was one of the four doctors on the Roman Catholic side who disputed with the Bohemians. See Hussites; BÂBLE, COUNCIL OF. In 1448 pope Eugenius IV made him Magister sacri Pa- latii, and in 1452 pope Nicholas V created him arch- bishop of Droutheim. He died in 1465. Kalteisen's literary productions are generally spoken of as bad in state. He wrote much, but little has been published. See Basnage-Cansius, Lact. Antiqu. ii, 628 sq.; Quetif and Echard, Script. Ord. Pred. ii, 828; Schröckh, Kirchen- gesch. xxxiv, 707; Wetzer u. Weite, Kirchen-Lex. vi, 15.

Kama, the Hindu deity of love or deity of Love, one of the most pleasing creations of Hindu fiction, is, in the Sanscrit poetry of later periods, the favorite theme of de- scriptions and allusions. The genealogy of this deity is quite obscure; according to some Purânas, he was originally a son of Brahmi; according to others, a son of Dharma (the genius of Virtue), by Smûdhá (the ge- nius of Faith), herself a daughter of Daksha, who was one of the mid-born sons of Brahmi. The god Siva, being on one occasion greatly incensed at Kama, re- duced him to ashes; but ultimately, moved by the af- fliction of Rati (Voluptuousness), the wife of Kama, he promised her that her promised son should be the son of Krishna, and he was accordingly born under the name of Pradýumna, who was the god of Love. "But when the infant was six days old it was stolen from the lying-in-chamber by the terrible demon Sambhara; for the latter foreknew that Prádyumna, if he lived, would be the death of Siva. The boy was drowned in the ocean, and swallowed by a large fish. Yet he did not die, for that fish was caught by fishermen, and delivered to Mayavati, the mistress of Sambhara's household; and, when it was cut open, the child was taken from it. While Mayavati wondered what this could be, the di- vine sage Narada satisfied her curiosity, and counselled
her to rear tenderly this offspring of Krishna. She act-
ed as he advised her; and when Pradyumna grew up, and learned his own history, he fought the son of Kan-
bara. Mayavati, however, was later apprized by Krish-
na that she was not the wife of Sambara, as she had fancied herself to be, but that of Pradyumna—in fact, another form of flati, who was the wife of Kama in his female aspect. Mayavati was unable to find him holding in one hand a bow made of sugar-cane, and using it, in the other an arrow tipped with the blossom of a flower which is supposed to conquer one of the senses. His standard is, agreeably to the legend above mentioned, a fabulous fish, called Makara, a watersnake, or serpent—the symbol of voluptuousness. His epithets are numerous, but eas-
ily accounted for from the circumstances named, and from the effects of love on the mind and senses. Thus he is called Makaradwaja, 'the one who has Makara in his banner;' Maana, 'the madam,' etc. His wife, as before stated, is Rati; she is also called Kamakshi, 'a portion of Kama,' or Prati, 'affection.' His daugh-
ter is Tribsa, 'thirst or desire,' and his son is Aniruddha, 'the irresistible.'" See Müller, Chip., vol. ii, ch. i, p. 127-135; Volney, Mythol. Worterbuch, p. 143.

Kama. See TALMED.

Kamawachara, the Buddhist name of one of the three divisions of the Sakwala (q.v.), and refers to the worlds in which there is form, with sensual enjoyment. The Buddhist affirms that there are innumerable worlds, but only three kinds of them, viz. (1) worlds in which there is no perceptible form; (2) worlds in which there is form, but no sensual enjoyment; (3) and lastly, the Kamawachara explained above. See Hardy, Laws of Buddhism, p. 3 sq.

Kamenker. See MIR, MIES.

Kami (or Happy Spiritus) is the name given in Japa-
nese mythology to certain spirits or divinities who founded the first terrestrial courts. All primitive my-
thologies are coupled with and made to rise out of cosmogony. Unfortunately, however, the cosmogony of the Japanese is not only of the wildest sort, but so mixed with that of the Chinese that it is very difficult to speak with any certainty of this ancient religion. From primordial chaos, say the Japanese, there sprang a self-
created man, who fixed his abode in the highest heaven, and could not have his tranquillity disturbed by any cares. Next arose two plastic, creative gods, who framed the universes out of chaos. The universe was then governed for myriads of years by seven gods in succession. They are called the Celestial Gods. The most important of these, the greatest of all, and to him the earth we inhabit owes its existence. In what may be called the Genesis of the Japanese Bible the creation of the world is thus narrated:

"In the beginning there was neither heaven nor earth. The sea was vast; things both liquid and doubtful arose, similar to the contents of an undeveloped egg, in which the white and the yellow are still mingled together. Out of the infinite space which this chaos filled a god arose, called the divine Supreme Being, whose throne is in the utmost heaven. Then came Chaos. Then came Wisdom, exalted above the creation; finally, the terrestrial reason, who is the sublime spirit. Each one of these three prim-
itive gods had his own existence, but they were not yet revealed beyond their spiritual natures. Then, by de-
gree, the work of separation went on in chaos. The sea divided into oceans, the earth into different districts, flooded the heavens. The greater atoms, attaching themselves to each other, and adhering, produced the earth. The former, moving in rapid spaces which they have filled the firm-
ament which arches above our heads; the latter, being elated by this new seat of life, rose up and formed the earth until a much later period. When the earthly matter still floated as a fish that comes to the surface of the water, the image of the most famous statues on a limpid lake, there appeared between the heavens and the earth something similar to a piece of Reid, endowed with movement, and capable of transformation. It was changed into three gods, which are: the August one, reigning perpetually over the empire; he who reigns by virtue of water; and he who reigns by virtue of fire.
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much resembling the native dwelling-house. Three sides are closed, and one is open to sun and air. The woodwork is kept scrupulously clean, and the floor is covered with the finest matting. The altar, which stands alone in the centre, is ornamented with a plain cloth of white or green, bordered with one of red, or a symmetrical or symmetrical design, which is not yet clearly understood. The altar is surrounded by the elements of water and fire. The interior is generally hung with pictures, or with pictures of colored paper, the exact significance of which is not yet clearly understood. The bells are also ornamented with their pious votaries with colored lanterns, vases of perfume, and of flowers or evergreen branches, which are renewed as fast as they wither.

At the top of the altar is a heavy chest with a metal grating, through which fall the pieces of money contributed: it is hardly necessary to say that the priest carries a key to the box. These bells were originally commemorative chapels, erected in honor of Japanese heroes, like that of Tell by the lake of the Four Forest Cantons. The prince of the province which had given birth to the hero, or where his deeds had been performed, took upon himself the charge of keeping the chapel in repair; there was no priest to officiate at the altar of the kamis; no privileged caste interposed between the worshipper and the spirit. The kisseki, in fact, performed before the mirror (representing that bequeathed by the goddess Izanami to her children), passed beyond the guardian spirit of the chapel, and reached the supreme god above him. The chapel, therefore, was open to all; the worship was voluntary, and offered to the individual might choose, no ceremonial being proscribed. With the introduction of Buddhism, however, an important change took place. The new faith was sufficiently incorporated with the old to transfer the chapels to the special charge of the priests [called Kami-nabi, or 'ministers of the spirit'], and to introduce a rule of conduct, formless worship of the people, a system of processions, litanies, offerings, and even of miracle-working images. Indeed, almost the only difference between this system and the worship of the saints in Catholic countries lies in the circumstance that the priests who officiate only put on their surplice for the occasion, and become secular again when they leave the chapel" (Bayard Taylor's Japan, p. 255 sq., in the excellent collection of Scribner's Library of Wonders, Travels, etc., N.Y., 1872, 12mo). Compare Humbert, Sojourn in Japan, transl. in Ladies' Repository, Vol. 11, Lond. 1853; Mackenzie, Life of Shogun, Lond. Vol. 1, 1852 (5vo), p. 204 sq.; Siebold, Nippon, i, 3 sq.; ii, 51; Kämpfer, Japan, in Pinkerton, vii, 672 sq.; Taylor, Primitive Culture (London, 1871, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. ii (see Index).

Kamison. See CUMIN.

Kampaxton, ISAAC BEN-JACOB, a Jewish rabbi of some note, was born in Castile in 1560. Of his personal history but little is known. He was gaon of Castile, and is particularly noted for his contributions to Talmudic literature, and his influence, through his pupils, on Jewish literature of the 16th century in the Spanish peninsula. He died at Pamplona in 1623. One of his most important works is הירש וראוי (Ways of the Talmud, first published at Mantua in 1596), an introduction to the study of the Talmud (really a methodology). See Grätz, Gesch. d. Jud., viii, 152; Jast, Gesch. d. Jud. in Judenthum, i1, 87; Forst, Biblioth. Jud. i, 140. (J. H. W.)

Kamxin. See SIMOON.

Kamchatska, a peninsula in the extreme northeast of Asia, occupied by the Russians from 1696 to 1700, extends between the seas of Kamchatka and Ochotak, from latitude 51° to 61° N., and contains 20,800 square miles, and about 4,500 inhabitants, one third of whom are Russians. The former principal place, Nishnei Kamchatka, on the mouth of the Kamchatka River, has hardly 200 inhabitants. Petropavlovsk, the present capital, is the seat of a Russo-American trading company, and has a population of about 1000. Until 1856 Kamtchatka was a separate district; at present it constitutes the district Petropavlovsk, of the coast district of Kamtchatka. The Schwedens reside, besides Kamchatka, also a part of the Kurile Islands. They belong to the Mongolian race, are small, have thick heads, and, flat, broad faces, and small eyes, which are frequently inflamed by the snow. Though baptized, the Kamchatdales are still addicted to Shamanism (q.v.), and, in particular, practice sorcery. They are fond of hunting and fishing, good-natured, and hospitable. (A. J. S.)

Kana (Heb. עמה), the name of one of the later cabalistic works treating of the religious rites of the Jews, has attained considerable notoriety on account of its decided opposition not only to all the Jewish ritual, to Talmudical interpretation, and to the Talmud itself, but for its fierce attacks, even against Biblical Judaism. Its authorship is undetermined, but of late some Jewish critics lean to the opinion that Kana and another cabalistic work entitled Pelus (Pillar, published at Kores in 1784, and often, an interpretation of the first book of the Law (Genesis), were written by one and the same person, and belong to a Spanish Jewish heretic of the 18th century, or thereabouts. Joseph ibn Marzua, ibid., p. xxxix sq.) thinks both the products of an Italian or Greek Jew. See, for further details, Ginz, Gesch. d. Jud., viii, 238 sq., 458 sq. See also CABALLA. (J. H. W.)

Kana'ah (Heb. קנהא', surely, reedy), Sept. Cofeiv v. r. כנהא, the name of two places in Palestine.

1. A stream (בנה, torrent or wady, q. d. "the brook of reeds," as in the marg.) that formed the boundary between Ephraim and Manasseh, from the Mediterranean eastward to the vicinity of Tappuah (Josh. xvi, 8); lying properly within the territory of Manasseh, although the towns on its southern bank were assigned to the tribe of Ephraim (Josh. xvii, 9; see Keil, Comment, ad loc. prior.). See T Phụ. Schwarz says it is to be still found in the equivalent Arabic name Wady al-Kasnah (valley of reeds), that rises in a spring of the same name, Ain al-Kasnah, one mile west of Shechem, and, after flowing westward, acquiring a considerable breadth, and irrigating fields on its way, finally falls into the Mediterranean south of Caesarea (Palestine, p. 61). Other travellers, however, do not speak of such a stream unless it be the Nahar el-Reed (river of reeds) spoken of in the Life of St. Stephen, Lond. 1871, 2 vols. 8vo, vol. ii (see Index).

2. A town in the northern part of Asher, not very
Doubless his papers would have afforded a clear view of the state of his soul, but, according to his friends, towards the close of his life he destroyed all documents relating to this subject. He died Dec. 17, 1824. His other religious works are: *Sammlung wahrer und erz- zekicher Geschichten aus dem Reiche Christi und für dasselbe* (1815-17, 2 vols.; 1822, 2 vols.).— *Leben, und aus dem Leben marktwürdiger und erzwecker Christen* (1816- 17, 2 vols.; 1820-27, 2 vols.). *Von Rommen aus der Christenzeit aller Zeiten* (1817)— *Christus im A.T., or Untersuchungen über die Vorbilder und messianischen Stellen* (1818, 2 vols. 8vo)— *Biblische Untersuchungen oder Ausleungen mit und ohne Polemik* (1819-20, 2 vols. 8vo). He edited also the following: *Ausserreimische christliche Lieder* [Erlang. 1818]— *Weiswungen u. Verheissungen der Kirche Christi auf die letzten Zeiten der Heiden.*— *Katholische Rede-Encyklop.*, v. 1036.

Kanôn is one of the names by which the official list or register of the Church is known. It is also frequently spoken of as *κατάλογος ἰστορικός*, list of the priesthood, and hence spiritual persons were denominat- ed *κατάλογος*, canon, canonized, and *οὗτος κανών*, men of the canon, because their names were entered in the list. The word *κανών* had also other significations. The asent of the catechumens to a summary of the reading articles of the Canon was thus required, and this creed was variously designated; sometimes *κανών*, the rule, sometimes *πίστις*, the faith, and *σύμβολον*, a badge or token (see Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, s. v.). See *Canon*.

Kanzel, in Hindu mythology, is the name of a king of the race of Bhoja—considered also a *daon* (Kála- nemí) in human shape, and notorious for the audacity and violence towards the god Krishna [see Visnu], by whom he was ultimately slain.

Kant, Immanuel, designated by De Maistre "the philosopher of nebulous memory," acquired enduring renown as the author of the *Critical Philosophy*, as the father of the recent German or transcendental speculation, and as the most acute and profound metaphysician of the closing 18th century. The importance of his philosophical career is evinced by his furnishing the link of connection between the schools of Leibnitz, Locke, Berkeley, and Hume, and those of Hegel, Schel- ling, and Comte. He closes one great and brilliant era of metaphysical inquiry; he commences another with singular fulness of knowledge, breadth of comprehension, perspicacity of discernment, and logical subtlety and precision. He exposed invertebrate errors of procedure; he improved, sharpened, and refined the methods of investigation he surveyed and plotted the boundaries of metaphysical research; and he rendered more distinct and precise the nature of the inquiry, the sub- ject with which it is concerned, and the instruments at our command for its investigation. These are inestimable services, the benefits of which are still in the midst of the errors that have sprung from the system by which they were rendered.
KANT

Kant was born at Königsberg April 22, 1724, and spent his whole life there or in its immediate neighborhood, never having journeyed more than forty miles from his native place. He ended his tranquil life in the city of his birth, February 12, 1804. He was of Scotch origin. His father, John George Cant, removed from Frankfurt in 1710 to Königsberg, where his first settled, to Königsberg, and followed the saddler's trade with little worldly success. His pinched fortunes were enabled by stern and unostentatious integrity. All accounts commemorate the high character, intelligence, and austere piety of Anna Regina Reuter, the philosopher's mother—virtues effectively inculcated by her illustrious brother, the famous surgeon, who ascribes all that was best in himself to her example and instructions, and to the purifying influences of his childhood's home. He lost his mother when he was eleven years of age, his father in his twenty-second year (1746). They lived long enough to transmit to him the memory of their virtuous example—twas all they had to bequeath. After receiving the first rudiments of education at the charitable schools of the city, he was sent to the Frederick College in 1743, at the expense of his uncle, a substantial shoemaker. Here he remained under the tutelage of Dr. Schultz, an eminent adherent of Wolff, at the time when the Wolffian philosophy was a subject of acrimonious controversy. He devoted himself chiefly to the classics and mathematics, the essential foundation of all thorough instruction for the university student. From the Collegium Fredericianum he passed in 1740 to the University of Königsberg, and entered upon a course of theology; but his ill success in preaching discouraged him, and he attached himself to the mathematical and physical sciences, in the former of which his first distinction was gained. During the latter period of his university career he supported himself by teaching in the humblest grades, in consequence of the increasing penury of his father, whose death in 1746 compelled him to withdraw from the university, and to seek a living from his own exertions alone. For the nine following years he was employed as a private teacher in and near Königsberg, and finally in the noble family of Kayserling, by whom his merits were appreciated, and in whose society he acquired that polish of manner which distinguished him through life. He changed his family name of Cant to the more Germanic appellative Kaut, but he did not thus divest himself of the Scotch characteristics of mind and morals. In the second year of his engagement in private tuition he published his first work, Gedanken von der wahren Schätzung der lebendigen Kräfte (Thoughts on the true Measure of Living Forces, 1747), which did him much good as an undeveloped candidate to the famous controversy on the subject. In 1754 he discussed the question proposed for a prize by the Berlin Academy, Whether the Earth had undergone any change consequent upon its revolution upon its Axis. This essay facilitated his acquisition of the master's degree in the next year. At this time he returned to the university as privat-dozent, and maintained an uninterrupted connection with it thenceforth till the closing years of his life. He inaugurated his lectures by the composition of two essays: the first, De Igni; the second, Prioriatio de Principis Primis Cognitioiis Humanoe, which was the first manifestation of the direction of his mind to metaphysical inquiry, and also showed that he had fixed on the central point of all philosophy. While employed in private teaching he had diligently prosecuted his encyclopedic studies, and had acquired the English language by his own exertions, in order to master the speculations of Locke, Berkeley, and Hume. Another kindred treatise belongs to this year—Principiorum Primalrum Cognitioiis Metaphysisica Nova Dilucidatio, as also his Allgemeine Naturgeschichte und Theorie des Himmels (Universal Natural History and Theory of the Heavens). The last work was issued anonymously, with a dedication to Frederick the Great. It is remarkable for its bold views, and for announcing the probable resolution of the nebula into stars, and the probable discovery of new planets—scientific predictions fulfilled in much later years by Herschel and Leverrier. This production occasioned a correspondence with Lambert (1761), the singularly profound president of the Berlin Academy, who espoused similar opinions. For fifteen years (1756—1770) Kant, and so exclusively engaged with study and the duties of instruction, scarcely offers any events for biography beyond the development of opinions, the publication of the treatises in which such opinions are set forth, and the academic distinctions attained. The virulence for which he was supposed to be exhibiting the true Primrose's migrations "from the blue chamber to the brown," and hence is compelled to mark the critical moments of his career by the notice of the principal works as they appeared. Such indications, however, have a value of their own, as they reveal the growth of speculations, and their application in the course of time to the world, and mark the times and modes in which the revolutions of thought have been effected. In 1762 appeared Kant's criticism of the Aristotelian logic, in a treatise entitled Die Logische Sprachfähigkeit der vier syntaktischen, nach den Syllogistikfiguren (The Logiological Speech-ability of the four Syntactical, after the Syllogistic Figures). The cenotaphs of Aristotle have usually mingled both his doctrines and his aims, and have imagined to be erroneous dogmas which the Stagyrite had meditated more profoundly, and had treated with a juster regard to practical convenience than themselves. In the course of the next year, 1763, Kant gave to the public his Der einzig mögliche Begriffsgang zu einer Demonstration des Desensus Gotts (Ontological Demonstration of the Being of God), in which he repudiated alike the deductions à priori of Anselm, Des Cartes, and Clarke, and the inductions à posteriori of the natural theologians, and regarded the conception of the possibility of God as attesting the reality of his existence. This treatise still bears the impress of the dominant Wolffian philosophy, which he had imbibed from his early teacher Schultz. In this year he contended for the prize offered by the Berlin Academy, on the Principles of Natural Theology and Morals. (Untersuchung über die Deutlichkeit der Grundsätze der natürlichen Theologie und Moral) receiving the second honors, while the first were adjudged to Moses Mendelssohn. Three years more elapsed before he received his first public appointment as curate at the grammar school, an undervalued position to the sum of fifty dollars. In this year he exposed the pretensions of Swedish rationalism, being always ready to assail new-fangled delusions, whether stimulated by enthusiasm or by imposture. At length, when approaching the end of his forty-seventh year, he was promoted to the chair of logic and metaphysics in his own university, with a stipend of three hundred dollars. He had suffered two previous disappointments. He had failed to obtain the professorship extraordinary of logic in 1756, and the ordinary professorship in 1758, and had declined the professorship of history in 1754, from distrust of his aptitudes and acquirements. He had refused invitations from Erlangen and Jena, from reluctance to abandon his people and his native home. Custom demanded an inaugural dissertation from the professor elect. Kant's public hypothesis de politia et intelligibili forma et principiis. This essay contained the first distinct anticipations of his characteristic system, though his philosophy did not receive form or coherent development for many ensuing years. The remainder of his life was, however, consecrated to its definite constitution and expansion. He wrote his scheme in shape, for in 1772 he smoothed the way for a fuller discussion by his Schema of Transcendental Philosophy. No desire of change, no temptation of worldly ad-
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vancement and honor could seduce him from his calm lu-
cubrations. He refused to go to Halis, though a double salary was offered him. After an elec-
tion to the Order of Patient Meditators he produced in 1781 his Critique of the Pure Rea-
on (Kritik der reinen Vernunft), which proclaimed a new philosophy, and ushered in a new cycle of specu-
lation—noua ordo socraticorum metaphysicorum. The work was
modified in a second edition in 1787, to grade the
imputation of idealism and idealistic indolence objected to it as to the previous system of Wolf. It long
seemed as if this remarkable production—a revolution itself, and the parent of revolutions—would never reach a second edition.

For six years it lay so unheeded on the pub-
lisher's desk that its composer disiled it as waste paper, when a sudden demand relieved its anxie-
ties, and ordered a republication expedient. This timely
interest in the book was scarcely due to Kant's Pro-
logoema to Metaphysics (Prolegomena zu einer jeden
cünstigen Metaphysik, die als Wissenschaft werd aufge-
ten Lassen, 1783), but may be attributed to striking no-
tices of the doctrine in prominent German magazines.

In 1785 the practical side of his system was exposed in his
Metaphysics of Ethics (Grundlehrg zur Metaphysik
der Sitten), and in the following year its extension to
physiology appeared in a dissertation Ademungslehre der
Anatomie und Physiologie of Natural Science (Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der
Naturreitschaften). In 1788 the positive aspect of his
philosophy was presented in the Critique of the Practical
Reason (Kritik der praktischen Vernunft), which treats of
the principles and objects of the moral, and con-
structive ethics on the act, so that your principle
of action may serve as a universal law. The
foundation is narrow, and has the cold rigidity of Stoical pretension,
but it was a stern and strict rule in the concept of
it proprietor, and was borrowed from his own line of
conduct, and from the necessity virtuously imposed on
his home, as much as from the dictates of his reason.
The defects of this canon will be indicated hereafter.

The outline of the new philosophy was completed in 1790 by the
Critique of the Practical Judgment (Kritik der Ur-
theorikraf), which is in some respects the most satis-
factory work of the series. It is designed to unite the
practical with the theoretical reason, the freedom of
the will with the law of existence, by regarding the whole
order of creation as a system of means effectually adap-
ted to the attainment of beneficent aims. It is thus a
tract of teleology or of final causes. It is generally occupied with the theory of the beautiful and the sub-
line, and is in great measure a development of the Ob-
servations on the Beautiful and the Sublime (Beobach-
tungen über das Gefühl des Schönen und Erhabenen, 1764), and
the Metaphysics of Ethics (1785).

But the work of philosophy thus exhibited by him-
self in all its principal applications. It had attracted
general notice; it had gathered around it numerous and
enthusiastic disciples; it had secured for its author pro-
found respect and earnest admiration. Distinguished
men flocked to its lectures; princes and sovereigns com-
misioned learned scholars to take his teachings and
report his doctrines. His life was surrounded with ease,
and his days were crowned with honor. His salary
had been increased, and had given what was wealth to one
of his simple tastes and frugal habits. He had been
twice appointed rector of the university. His industri-
ous and meditative career had passed its grand climac-
teric, and was stretching serenely to its close. Just
when the aims of life appeared to have been won, Kant
was plunged into the most serious troubles which dis-
turb’d his tranquil existence. He became involved in a
great dispute which arose by a Bristol magazine, after wards reproduced in a volume under the
title of Religion within the Limits of Pure Reason
(De Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der Vernunft, 1798).

There was a ferment in the religious circles of Germany because of the growth of a religious spirit. He
excited alarms which appeared now to be justifed. A
doctrine which rejected the accepted arguments for the
being of God, the validity of revelation, the immortality of the
soul, and the creation of the world, offended too
many consciousnesses, to be of much importance of thought, and substituted too shadowy and too sub-
abstract speculations for accredited precepts and dogmas,
not to produce discontent and censure. Nor were the
alarms entertained unreasonable, as was shown by the
subsequent developments of the material philoso-
phy. The agitation excited by Kant's theological in-
novations was partially allayed by a royal mandate di-
recting him to observe silence on religious topics.
The king's interference is supposed to have been induced by
Kant's sympathies with the French Revolution, despite
the fact that he was a royalist. On August 10, 1790, when he
1790 he resumed his expositions, considering his engage-
ment as a personal one with that monarch. But before
this time he had narrowed the sphere of his activity.
In 1794 he withdrew from general society; in 1795 he
discontinued all his instructions except in logic and met-
aphysics, and he closed his academic labors altogether
two years afterwards. In 1798 he composed his Strife
of the Faculties (Der Streit der Facultäten), reviving the
religious dispute in which he had been entangled; and he
bade farewell to the public in his Pragmatical View
of Public Utility (Pr款matbciol View
of Public Utility (Prägnanturobikb View
of Public Utility (Prägnanturobikb View
of Public Utility (Prägnanturobikb View
of Public Utility (Prägnanturobikb View
of Public Utility (Prägnanturobikb View
of Public Utility (Prägnanturobikb View
of Public Utility (Prägnanturobikb View
of Public Utility (Prägnanturobikb View
des boys did not move towards the promulgation of
his doctrine, which gave to the new philos-
ophy the subjective or idealistic cast, against which his
own efforts had always been strenuously directed. In
this paper he manifested his own failing powers, and
the incapacity to appreciate other systems than his own
—a natural consequence of his habitual disregard of
the history of speculation. His pupils published several
other works from his notes and papers during the last
year of his life. That life was not long extended after
his retirement. His constitution was not wholly virtuous in
his health, so remarkably maintained, began to decline;
apetite, teeth, strength, sight, voice, memory, all failed,
and his pure, laborious, and honorable existence was ter-
m inated by an apoplectic attack, Feb. 12, 1804, when he
died at the age of eighty years. His death
produced profound emotion throughout Germany. The
whole city of Königsberg put on mourning; multitudes
clocked to his funeral, and his remains were
escorted to the grave by a solemn procession. A characteris-
tic medal was struck to commemorate his fame. It bore an
inscription to his memory, which is repeated to this day:
"Achtd volam Biai cum." He was worthy of such honor.
He left to his countrymen the example of a career rich in
wholesome fruits—simple, sincere, upright, laborious;
devoted singly to the promotion of truth, and to the re-
moval of error in the highest and most perilous regions
of speculation, erected by seventy years of strenuous
industry, and by half a century faithfully given to the
instruction of successive generations of the young in var-
ious branches of learning, from the humblest rudiments
of knowledge to the most recondite metaphysical research.
Humble, modest, and true, his life was a noble career to
his memory that the honors that men could bestow.
In person, Kant was small and delicately built. Hislue eyes expressed benevolence, but his features were
ruled, and seamed with the lines of habitual thought.
Lavater mistook his portrait for that of a noted high-
wayman. His manners were kindly and courteous. He
was very genial in company, full of mirth and innocent
wit, and scrupulously abstinent of learned or meta-
physical discourse. As a lecturer he was easy and at-
tractive, displaying nothing of the repulsive aridity and
elaborate awkwardness of his philosophical treatises.
He was a reverend observer of all things in the pr actice of
all justice. The like precise propriety regulated all his habits.
He was plain in his tastes, ab-
stemious in eating and drinking, chary of indulgences,
frugal in his expenditures, methodical in every arrange-
ment. "Everything had its set time," was his motto in
the course of his life. His hour for rising was four in summer
and five in winter; for bed, ten in summer and nine in win-

ter. By this regularity and moderation he reached ful-
ess of form with heart, cheerfulness, and perfect se-
remity. He seems to have been deficient in poetic sen-
sibility and poetic imagination. To this defect may be
ascribed several imperfections in the expostition of his
philosophy, and his total want of religious sentiment.
Shortly before his death he declared that he had no
determination to be certain, and only believed to
believe in metempsychosis. This was the flaw in his
mental and moral constitution which produced many
flaws in his speculation.

Like his illustrious contemporary Hume, whom he
surpassed nearly thirty years, Kant was never married.
He gave the "hostages to fortune," but it estranged Ba-
con's dictum, that "the best works, and of greatest merit
for the public, have proceeded from unmarried or child-
less men." Of the works constituting Kant's bequest to
posterity, the most noted and important are those that
exposed the "Critical Philosophy," and of this philoso-
phy a brief notice remains to be given.

**Philosophy.**—Kant's scheme of speculation is so com-
prehensive, so extensive, so intricate, so systematic, so
full of divisions and subdivisions, that it is impossible to
attempt an complete summary of it within the limits al-
lowed me. I have not attempted the fullest, but the most cer-
pact mode of exposition is required. Hence the notice
of the numerous treatises not directly employed in the
construction of the "Critical Philosophy" has been in-
troduced into the biographical sketch. Hence, too, the
recurring abstract outline of the system which must also
be referred to some of the numerous synoptical views
presented in German, French, English, and Latin. All
that can be aimed at here will be to give a cursory ac-
count of the distinctive peculiarities of Kant's scheme.
To do this, it may suffice to explain his relation to pre-
vious philosophy, to point out his characteristic method,
and to note the chief developments and applications of
that method.

To show the exact relation of Kant to antecedent and
contemporary modes of speculation would require a
detailed account of the fortunes of philosophy from Ba-
con, and Gassendi, and Des Cartes. This is more than
has been attempted by Rosenkrantz. It must suffice to
state that in the middle of the 18th century the Woflan
development and systematization of the philosophy of
Leibnitz was predominant in Germany; the scepticism of
Hume, the empiricism of the Scotchmen, and the ma-
rialism of D'Alembert, Diderot, and Condillac was fash-
inable in France. The philosophy of Leibnitz was an
effort to escape the pantheistic tendencies of Cartesian-
ism as evolved in the idealism of Spinoza and the the-
oscopy of Baruch Spinoza. Hume's philosophy was the
sceptical evolution of the sensationalism of Locke, gener-
ated by the collision between the *mechanicism* of Hartley
and the Pyrrhonism of Berkeley. The infidel doctrine of
the school of the French Encyclopaedia was the superfi-
cial deduction of the French intellectual anarchists from
the partial appreciation of the tenets of Locke, whose
own principles were vague and incoherent. The
problem presented for solution was to find some ground
of reconciliation between all these divergent opinions, to
detect and expose the fallacies on which they rested, to
avoid the mischiefs caused or portended by them, and to
discover a trustworthy and intelligible basis for human
knowledge.

The situation was in many respects anal-
gogous to that which characterized the Hellenic world at
the time of Socrates. Kant undertook the investiga-
tion of this arduous and urgent problem, and, like So-
crates, he proceeded by the critical investigation of the
nenature of knowledge and of the intellectual faculties
of man. By this procedure he was gradually led to the
determination of the conditions of the problem, and to
the discovery of a solution partially true, and which ap-
ppeared to himself complete and irrefragable. In meta-
physics, in its philosophical and Kant's meth-
method gave to his system the appropriate name of the Crit-
ical Philosophy.
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ing faculty in its adaptation to thought—empty of the matter of thought, and distinct from its experiences. It is the mill without the grain which is to be ground by it. In analyzing the principle of thought, Kant detects an active as well as a passive factor. In every act of thought there is the reception of the impression from the object of thought, and the subjective reaction thereon by excitement, which can be communicated from a mere form to the conclusion, and differentiates το φανημένον, the subject of thought, from το φανημένον, the object of thought.

Kant distinguishes the agencies which supply the elements of the idea of sense, understanding, reason. The distribution of the faculties of the mind is always hazardous, and often beguiling. The mind is one and complete. In the perceptions of sensation, the elements derived from the mind, and not from the impression, are space and time. Such elements are called transcendental because they transcend, precede, and formulate the experience. 

They are consequently the forms or conditions of sensations. They are not supplied by the sensation, but they are added to it by the mind in the act of perception. There are indications of this doctrine in Platonism (Democritus ii, 7, 9), Leibnitz (Nouve. Éth. liv. ii, ch. v), and in other thinkers. It is intimated, indeed, by Aristotle, and is a natural deduction from the Ideas of Plato. It is singularly corroborated by recent expositions of the physiology of nervous action. In Kant's theory the phenomena of the mind are divided into the subjective and the objective in space, the phenomena of the mind to the conception of time. The sensationalist is thus refuted, as space and time are not obtained from sensation. The dogmatic idealist is refuted, as the matter of knowledge must be supplied by external impressions.

The understanding coordinates the perceptions of sense, and forms them into judgments by giving to them unity and interdependence. The transcendental elements supplied in this action of the understanding are arranged by Kant in twelve categories. The name of categories is taken from the Organon of Aristotle, but Kant's categories are entirely diverse from Aristotle's. Kant observed that metaphysical science pursued a deductive round, without making progress or securing stability, while logic had received full, complete, and definite form from its great founder. He ascribed this difference of form in the science, that it was the result of the exposition of the procedure of the mind in reasoning. He concluded that equal validity would be conferred on metaphysics, if it were reduced to a 5 accurate representation of the procedure of the mind in the acquisition and employment of the knowledge of sense. Hence, he invented a forced analogy between the two branches of speculation, and rendered his theory intricate, arbitrary, and obscure by compelling it to assume a form fantastically corresponding with logical distinctions. In this spirit he devised his twelve categories, and arranged them according to the forms of propositions, in the manner exhibited in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logical</th>
<th>Transcendental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular</td>
<td>Reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Hypothetical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affermative</td>
<td>Causality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Disjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeterminate</td>
<td>Possibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Categorial</td>
<td>Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disjunctive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Modal.        |               |

All judgments are framed by the mind under the influence of these categories, four of them—one from each class—being inevitably applied in every instance. As, however, things are thought not as they are, but as the intellectual predispositions make them appear to be, knowledge is purely relative to the human mind—objective truth is not attainable, and all our experiences or knowledge have only a subjective validity. The mind cannot think except so far as it has been provoked by objective stimulation, therefore there is a real objective existence of things. It thinks under the control of the categories of the understanding, therefore knowledge is subjective in form, is moulded by the recipient mind, and cannot be known to correspond to the reality of things. The image is reflected from rationality, but the object represented may be magnified or diminished, or strangely distorted by the character of the mirror, without being altered in itself. The image is all that constitutes knowledge; there is, accordingly, no assurance of a reality between subject and object. Thus all knowledge is conditional only—conditioned by the forms of the understanding, which mould it into the form in which it is received. Some principle was required to give coherence, unity, confidence to the relative knowledge obtained through such mental experiences. This was supposed to be given by the consciousness of personality which bounded, adorned, and harmonized all the qualified judgments that could be entertained. It seems a mistake to an impression of the Kant, and at variance with his system, to claim any necessary truth for judgments formed in this manner. There can be no denying that a being exists in contingent necessity—an impossibility of thinking otherwise than the constitution of the mind necessitates.

In the highest region of the mind—the reason or the faculty of ideas—there is also subject to the control of knowledge the physical world. The phenomena of the reason pass beyond the limits of experience, and are only regulative. In this branch of the subject, which is designed to explain the combination of the judgments of the understanding into ratiocinative conclusions, Kant introduces three pure ideas, which are deemed to be analogous to the three forms of the axioms—categorical, hypothetical, and disjunctive. These ideas are, 1. Absolute unity, or simple being, the soul, which gives origin to Rational Psychology; 2. Absolute totality, the aggregate of phenomena in space and time, the world, which is the basis of Cosmology; and 3. Absolute reality, supreme existence, the First Cause, which is the subject of Theology. From this point the later German schools diverge by ascribing a real and not simply a subjective validity to the forms of the absolute. With Kant they are merely postulates of reason, having no necessary connection with the reality. In Kant's view, the discussion of the soul and world forms in space and time is to be simultaneous, and the theology only exhibits the phenomena of mental consciousness without guaranteeing anything in regard to the essential nature of the mind or to the immortality of the soul. Rational cosmology is equally unable to attain to any certain knowledge of the world. It lands us finally in four pairs of transcendental ideas, each pair producing twin contradictions. These are Kant's celebrated antinomies: 1. In quantity, it may be proved that the world is both limited and unlimited; 2. In quality, that its elements are ultimately simple and infinitely divisible; 3. In relation, that it is caused by free action, and by an infinite series of mechanical causes; 4. In modality, that it has an independent cause, and that it is composed of independent members. Which of these alternatives is asserted, it cannot be exclusively maintained, for it results in hopeless paradoxes. Both must be in some sense true, yet both cannot be simultaneously entertained, because they are contradictory. Hence no certainty, no complete comprehensive knowledge can be attained. Metaphysics is simply inquisitive, speculative, critical, showing the limitations of the human mind, and the impossibility of knowing the reality of things, but at the same time furnishing glimpses of a reality which the mind can not compass—of existence and truth beyond the range of finite comprehension. It is the confession, if not the demonstration of the intellectual weakness, but in the same negative result is reached in rational theology. The ontological argument for the being of God—that of Anselm and Des Cartes, derived from the notion of pe-
fect and independent existence—the cosmological argument of Clarke, which proceeds from the conception of contingent to that of necessary being—and the physico-theological argument of the natural theologians, which infers a supreme intelligent Designer from the evidences of design, contains, as Kant points out, all equally conclusive. "Thus the soul, the world, and God are left by Kant's speculative philosophy as problems not only unsolved, but demonstrably unsolvable." To furnish a positive support for convictions on this subject indispensable for human guidance, and to give an authoritative rule for action, Kant conceived, are equally conclusive.

(2) Critique of the Practical Reason.—Neither the name nor the conception of the practical reason was a novelty; both occur in Aristotle (De Anim. iii. 10; ὁ μὲν γὰρ Συμμετέχων νοεῖ οὐδὲν οὐλπράτερ, ibid. c. ix). They are found in Aquinas (Summ. Theol. ii. 1, 90), and especially 91,8), in Roger Bacon (Opus Majus, p. 35, 44), and in most philosophers, medieval and modern, who have accepted the Aristotelian doctrine. Whatever systems have recognized a moral sense, whatever theories have asserted a sustaining and guiding illumination of the conscience, whatever schemes acknowledge the inworking spirit, and whatever expositions of the mysteries of man assume an abiding faith as the foundation of moral action, entain substantially the same fundamental doctrine as Kant's, though it is differently applied by the characteristic feature of Kant's ethical system is what he terms the "Categorical Imperative." Speculative philosophy affords neither absolute truth nor certain guidance. Practical philosophy rests upon the enlightened conscience—enlightened by its own indwelling light. The "categorical imperative" is a rule of action—a moral law—deriving its authority from itself—intuitively received—determining action by the idea—governing by the rational form, not by the matter—thus advancing to the realm of the absolute, the unconditional, the noumenal, and bringing into practical consciousness the realities of action and duty. The formula of this "categorical imperative" is, Act so that your action may be applied as a universal rule. It is obvious that a precept so vague and so abstract may represent an essential characteristic or property of right conduct, but cannot be accepted as its principle. It is indefinite, and it wants the authority of sovereign command. It would require the omniscient comprehension of all contempaneous relations, and all possible consequences for the regulation of every act, and at best would result in transcendental utilitarianism. It is too abstruse to be practically applied to the circumstances of life, and by all grades of men. It is limited to finite intelligences, and is sufficiently elastic to allow each one's ignorance or obtuse conscience to be alleged as the individual rule of right. It might easily be stretched so as to sanction the Donatist thesis, "Quoque libet, licet." On such a scheme, to employ the expression of Lyly's Euphues, "it is the disposition of the mind that altereth the nature of the thing." Our morals would be shifting and casuistical. The wish would continually be the father to the thought; and all enthusiasm, all fanaticism, might be represented as the mere carry-over of the conception of duty. The conception of duty is the touchstone and stumbling-block of philosophy, and against it is shattered every scheme which does not rest upon the acceptance of revelation, and the acknowledgment of God, in whom we live, and move, and have our being. There is no other mode of passing the chasm which separates the negative results of speculative inquiry from the positive requirements of practical action. Speculative philosophy discusses the boundaries of the mind; practical philosophy is concerned with actions which are infinite in their consequences, and whose effects "wander through eternity."

(3) The Critique of the Judgment (Urtheilskrift—Faculty of Judgment).—This is the third of the systematic treatises devoted to the construction of the critical philosophy. The designation is infernicious and ambiguous. The Imagination would be more appropriate, but would scarcely be applicable without some violence to the whole scope of the inquiry proposed. The department corresponds to the ἀγαθοσθενία, or constructive science of the perceptive acquisition of knowledge, and connects the domain of the pure with that of the practical reason. The imagination is the faculty of connection—of re-creation—uniting in emotional delight the obligations of action with the highest discoveries of speculation. In Kant's critique of the judgment are included the doctrine of taste, the doctrine of the beautiful in general, the doctrine of beauty, the doctrine of the sublime, the doctrine of the beautiful in specific, or aesthetics, and the doctrine of final causes, or teleology. His theory of beauty accords in substance with that of Plato, or rather that of Plotinus, but from his own singular defect of imagination, and consequent limitation of view, it is denied the contained splendour, and loses the far-reaching suggestion which illustrate that magnificent exposition of the grandest and most resolute subject of metaphysical speculation. In beauty, Kant contemplates only the latent beneficial design, the harmony of means and ends, without dwelling upon the more significant conception of the primordial plan, the archetypal perfection, from which the whole creation has declined, but towards which man's ideal ever strives to return. The terms in which the doctrine is expounded are often confused and indistinct, but the essential principle is that in no things, but in the mind is the intuitive perception of the conception between the ideal perfection suggested and the order of the universe observed. The principle of the sublime is the intuition of the discrepancy between the finite powers of man and the infinite towards which he aspires, producing pain from the sense of limitation, but exalting from yearning towards the limitless, beyond sense and conception, which is felt to be his natural home, his ultimate destination. In the discussion of teleology proper Kant endeavors to restore some efficacy to that reasoning from final causes, which in earlier treatises he had repudiated. This part of the subject is inadequately understood, and presents many vast and suggestive views, and in some sort prepares the way for the last of Kant's treatises which can be specially noticed here.

(4) Religion within the Limits of Pure Reason.—This is Kant's theology, and is the most unsatisfactory of all his efforts. It was an attempt to reconstruct the foundations of religious belief, which had been sapped and in great measure overthrown by his critical investigations. It was the work of his old age, and at all periods of his life he seems to have been at least as deficient in religious enthusiasm as his other conceptions. The conception of God is closely allied to it. The work provoked much opposition at the time of its appearance, and caused the only serious annoyance of his life. It scandalized many religious minds, it was dangerously consonant with the revolutionary infidelity of France, and it presented the point of departure for the German rationalism of the 19th century. It treats the revelations of Scripture in regard to the fall of man, to his redemption, and to his restoration as a moral allegory, the data for which are supplied by the consciousness of depravity, and of dereliction from the state of those first persons in whose image he is formed. It is utterly inconsistent with any scheme of religion, and serves to show Kant's profound sense of the insufficiency of his own doctrine for the solution of the highest enigmas of humanity. The πάντα στάσει—"the solid locus stans" was wanting to his system. The philosophy was wholly critical in its procedure, and negative in its results. It weakened or undermined those intuitive convictions—inexippable, but irrefragable—which enable man "to walk by faith, and not by sight."

This notice is too brief to allow the exhibition of the incongruities or fallacies of the transcendental system, or the suggestion of rectifications, as it has been too brief for any detailed account of the several parts of his complex and elaborate scheme. That scheme is a wonder-
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ad monument of patient industry, acute discernment, perspicacious analysis, and of bold and honest thought. It was soon felt to be unassailable, and it engendered new swarms of speculative heresies; but its influences must be sought in Rosenkranz's history of Kant's doctrine, and in other treatises on the history of German speculative philosophy.

Literature.—The bibliography of Kant's philosophy would make the catalogue of an extensive library, and would include nearly everything in the highest branches of metaphysics which has appeared since the publication of the Critique of Pure Reason. In all the general histories of philosophy, matter of space is at present too limited to enumerate all the works which treat of Kant's doctrine. The following works, however, are of a particular interest, because they are all accessible in English translation.


KARAIITES

have been born as the son of Deravithi, and, again, is identified with one of the agnis or fires. Finally, it is said that there existed, in fact, two Capillas—the first an embodiment of Vishnu; the other, the igneous principle in human disguise. The probability is that Kapila was simply, like the great majority of his educated countrymen, a Brahman. Some dependence has been placed on the view of Kapila, as known to us in the Sankhya-sutras, and the Abhidharma, or the metaphysics of the Buddhists. He adds, however, that if any similarity of the two systems could be established, such proofs would be very valuable. "They would probably enable us to decide whether Buddha borrowed from Kapila, or Kapila from Buddha, and thus determine the real chronology of the philosophical literature of India, as either prior or subsequent to the Buddhist era." See Professor E. Hall, "Buddhism," pp. 132 sqq. Gallantyne, "Lecture on the History of Philosophy," pp. 132 sqq. Hardwick, "Christ and other Matters," i, 308 sqq.; Max Müller, "Chips from a German Workshop," i, 228 sqq. See also SANKHYA.

Kapnistorists, a sect of the Russian Church. See RUSSIAN CHURCH.

Karaite (Heb. קראית). Karam. i. e. Readers) is the name of one of the oldest and most remarkable sects of the Jewish synagogue, whose distinguishing tenet is strict adherence to the letter of the written law (as e.g. a sacred writings of the O. T.), and utter disregard of the authority of the oral law or tradition (q. v.).

Orig.—Up to our own day it has been impossible to determine the age in which the Karaites originated; certain it is that they existed before the 8th century, to which their origin was formally assigned. The Karaites themselves claim to be the remains of the ten tribes led captive by Shalmaneser. The Rabbins (e. g. Aben Ezra, Maimonides, etc.) unjustly assert that this sect is identical with the Sadducees (comp. Rule, Karaites, p. viii), and that they were originated by Ahnan (about A.D. 640), because the latter was ignored in the election of a new Rosh-Telaath (q. v.); but the investigations of our day lead us to believe that the Karaites must have originated immediately after the return of the Jews from Babylonian captivity, although they did not organize into a distinct sect until the middle of the 8th century. The Karaites have always been strict adherents of the letter of the written law, and of the oral tradition, and that for this, and no other reason, we find no mention of them as such in the New-Test. writings, nor in those of Josephus and Philo. Upon the completion of the Talmud it is well known that a great agitation prevailed in the Jewish community, especially in the western synagogues, and particularly at Constantinople, where, on the idea of Feuerbach, A.D. 629, Justinian was obliged to interfere, and actually prohibited the reading of the Mishna in the synagogue. In the conversion of the Khazars (q. v.) to Judaism, the Karaites, as we learn from the Talmud, were so called (Hebrew, Seraphim, or Lkvi), already appear as a distinct sect. From inscriptions collected and examined by Abraham Firkovitch, the celebrated Russian Jew, within the last twenty years, there are indications that in the Crimea at least Karaites may have flourished as early as the first half of the 4th century, if not earlier (see Rule, p. 83; N. Y. Notizbl., 1864, ii, 246). The external unity, however, of the Jewish Church was not broken apparently until the time of Ahnan ben-David. It is true, even in the days of Christ, the internal peace of the Jewish fold was much disturbed; synagogues differed greatly from each other, but ostensibly these differences were due to matters of secondary ignorance of the Hebrew, and the introduction of Greek and other foreign idioms, on doctrines and discipline there seems to reign universal harmony. Not so after
the publication of the Talmud. There were many who inclined to pay strict deference only to the inspired writings of the O.T.; and when, in the middle of the 8th century, a Luther in the form of Ahnahn ben-David arose in the Jewish midst and declared his opposition to the Rabbinites, a party was formed in his favor at Jerusalem itself, which spread itself over the whole of Aralasia, and even far away through all the East, as well as towards the West. The personal history of this great Jewish reformer is rather obscured by the fables of Arabos, and the calumnies of some Rabbinites; and it remains to be settled whether, as the Karaites assert, he was born on the banks of the Tigris, and sent forth from this centre of Judaism "letters of admonition, instruction, and encouragement to distant congregations, with zealous preachers who proclaimed everywhere the supreme authority of the Law, and the word of the Law," in the Talmud, or any other writings, was contrary to the law of Moses (comp. Pincher, L. Kadmonoth, or Zur Geschichte u. Liter., der Karaiten, Append. p. 38 and 90). Ahnahn died in 765, yet within that astonishingly brief period the Karaites had spread over Palestine, Egypt, Greece, Barbary, Spain, Syria, Tartary, Byzantium, Fez, Morocco, and even to the ranges of the Atlas, and by all the Karaites in these distant lands his death was mourned as the loss of a second Moses. Under Rabbi Solomon ben-Jeruhkim (born in 868) they prospered greatly in the 9th century, and even up to the 14th the Jews were to have increased, but thereafter their condition became obscure, and light first again breaks upon the Karaites' history with the opening of the present century (see below).

The reason why so little is yet known about the Karaites is that their writings are not generally accessible. Towards the close of the 17th century Protestant theologians interested themselves in their behalf, and in 1690 Peringer (then professor of Hebrew at the university at Upsala) was sent to Poland by the king of Sweden to make inquiries into their history. In 1698 Jacob Trigland (professor at Leyden) went thither for the same purpose and the results of his investigation, which remain of great value to this day, were published in the Theaurus der Oriental Antiquitates. Trigland says that he had learned enough to speak of them with assurance. He asserts that, soon after the prophets had ceased, the Jews became divided on the subject of works and supererogation, some maintaining their necessity from tradition, whilst others, keeping close to the written law, set them aside, and that thus Karaisms commenced. He adds that, after the return from the Babylonian captivity, on the re-establishment of the observance of the Sabbath, there were several parties and schisms for that end, and these, being once introduced, were looked upon as essential, and as appointed by Moses. This was the origin of Pharisiasm, while a contrary party, who continued to adhere to the letter, founded Karaisms. Wolfus, the great Hebrew bibliographer, depending on the Memoir of Marduchai ben-Nissim, a learned Karait (published by Wolf under the title of Notitia Curatorum, Hamburg and Leipzig, 1714, 4to), refers their origin to a massacre among the Jewish doctors under Alexander Januarius, their king; about a hundred years before Christ, because Simon, son of Sethach, and the queen's brother, making his escape into Egypt, there forgot his pretended traditions, and, on his return to Jerusalem, published his visions, interpreting the law after his own fancy, and supporting his novelties from the notices which God said, he had communicated by the mouth of Moses, whose repository he was. He gained many followers, and was opposed by others, who maintained that all which God had revealed to Moses was written. Hence the Jews became divided into two great sects, the orthodox and Tractate-Jews, the former called Sabaite, the latter Karait. Juda, son of Tabbai, distinguished himself; among the latter, Hillel (q. v.). In later history he agrees with what has been said above. It remains only to be stated that Wolfus reckons not only the Sadducees, but also the Scribes, in the number of Karaites. But such a classification of the writings, it is evident, will not sufficiently separate the Karaites from the Sadducees and the Scribes. Karaitism cannot be regarded as in any sense a product of Sadduceeism; the two are in principle identical, and in the public knowledge of the Sadducees and the Scribes, they would be regarded as in any sense a product of Sadduceeism. The Sadducees and Karaitism are just as real and true, and as many as the关闭en in themselves and the Scribes.

Doctrines and Uses.—Although the Karaites are decidedly opposed to assigning any authority to tradition, they by no means reject altogether the use of the Talmud, etc. Quite to the contrary, they gladly accept any light that they can get in their investigation of the word of God. They regard the T.-J. Scriptures, but it is only as exegetical aids that are ready to accept Jewish traditional writings. Selden, who is very express on this point, observes, in his Uozor Hebraico, that besides the mere text, they have also certain interpretations which they call heredity, and these, or a synagogal division, they regard as authoritative. They are divided into Doctors and Laymen. Their theology seems to differ only from that of the Rabbinites in being purer and free from superstition, as they give no credit to the explanations of the Cabalists, merical allegories, nor to any constitutions of the Talmud. In short, they accept only what is conformable to Scripture, and may be drawn from it by just and necessary consequences. The Karaites, in distinction from the Rabbinites, have their own Confession of Faith, which consists of ten articles. They are (as translated by Rule, p. 128) as follows:

1. That all this bodily (or material) existence, that is to say, they say, the living body, is of unbelief and faith.
2. That they have a Creator, and the Creator has his own soul (or spirit).
3. That he has no similitude, and he is one, separate from all.
4. That he sent Moses, our master (upon whom be peace).
5. That he sent with Moses, our master, his law, which is perfect.
6. For the instruction of the faithful, the language of the law, and the interpretation, that is to say, the reading or text and division, in solemn ceremonies (or verse) and the division of the day and the day of the month, which remain of great value to this day, were published in the Theaurus der Oriental Antiquitates. Trigland says that he had learned enough to speak of them with assurance. He asserts that, soon after the prophets had ceased, the Jews became divided on the subject of works and supererogation, some maintaining their necessity from tradition, whilst others, keeping close to the written law, set them aside, and that thus Karaisms commenced. He adds that, after the return from the Babylonian captivity, on the re-establishment of the observance of the Sabbath, there were several parties and schisms for that end, and these, being once introduced, were looked upon as essential, and as appointed by Moses. This was the origin of Pharisiasm, while a contrary party, who continued to adhere to the letter, founded Karaisms. Wolfus, the great Hebrew bibliographer, depending on the Memoir of Marduchai ben-Nissim, a learned Karait (published by Wolf under the title of Notitia Curatorum, Hamburg and Leipzig, 1714, 4to), refers their origin to a massacre among the Jewish doctors under Alexander Januarius, their king; about a hundred years before Christ, because Simon, son of Sethach, and the queen's brother, making his escape into Egypt, there forgot his pretended traditions, and, on his return to Jerusalem, published his visions, interpreting the law after his own fancy, and supporting his novelties from the notices which God said, he had communicated by the mouth of Moses, whose repository he was. He gained many followers, and was opposed by others, who maintained that all which God had revealed to Moses was written. Hence the Jews became divided into two great sects, the orthodox and Tractate-Jews, the former called Sabaite, the latter Karait. Juda, son of Tabbai, distinguished himself; among the latter, Hillel (q. v.). In later history he agrees with what has been said above. It remains only to be stated that Wolfus reckons not only the Sadducees, but also the Scribes, in the number of Karaites. But such a classification of the writings, it is evident, will not sufficiently separate the Karaites from the Sadducees and the Scribes. Karaitism cannot be regarded as in any sense a product of Sadduceeism; the two are in principle identical, and in the public knowledge of the Sadducees and the Scribes, they would be regarded as in any sense a product of Sadduceeism. The Sadducees and Karaitism are just as real and true, and as many as the
KAREAH

Population and Present Condition.—The number of the present adherents to Karaim has been variously estimated; but it is probable that they are between 1500 and 2000, and that all the Karaim belong to the sect known as the "Kareans". These tribes are supposed to number about five millions.

Origin.—There is much doubt as to their origin. There are amongst them many distinct traditions which would point to a Tiboan source. Mason (in Tenasserim) says that they regard themselves as wanderers from the north, and as having crossed a "river of running sand," by which name he says Fa Hian, the Chinese pilgrim who visited India about the 5th century, constantly speaks of the great desert to the north of Burmah, and between Chin and Thibet. Bruce says that they are a remnant of an Indian stock among the Musalmans of India and the inhabitants of Thibet (p. 145, 147). A portion of northern Burmah and Yunnan has been suggested as the probable original seat of the Karren race. Many authorities consider them as the aborigines of much of Burmah. Amongst the reasons assigned for this view are the following: (1) They received from the Burmese their name of Karen, which means first or original. (2) Their habits are much more primitive than those of the Burmese, and they dislike their subjugation to the latter. (3) They have traditions distinctly fixing their early location in the east, and as living on the other side of a range of water, which they call Karenko, which is so ancient a term that they have lost the meaning of it altogether, but the tradition itself shows that this was the Bay of Bengal. (4) The Moans or Tai-lings, a people who are older residents than the Burmese, have a similar name in Farrer India, and they were in the country when they first entered it, and were known as Pools or wild men by their forefathers (Journ. Am. Oriental Society, vol. iv.).

Description.—The Kares of the north are more advanced in the arts and in the habits of civilization than those of the southern district. They reckon themselves not by villages nor by cities, but by families, having a patriarchal form of society, single families, occupants of one house, often numbering from three to four hundred members. Their houses are immense structures, made of posts, with joints at a height of seven or eight feet from the ground, the sides being lined with mats, the roof being of palm-leaves, and the partitions of bamboo matting.

It is the southern section of these tribes, however, which is best known, especially those designated as Sgaw and Jarai, Sgaw being the latter name by which the Burmese Taung Karen, and are a vigorous people, robust, full-chested, with large limbs, square cheek-bones, thick and flattened nose, but not so prominently lips. The Sgaw, or pure Kares, are smaller, with a complexion lighter, and more remote, surrounded by a wild and a general language about their movements. Mr. Judson in 1833 wrote of them as "a meek, peaceful race, simple and credulous, with many of the softer virtues and few flagrant vices, greatly addicted to drunkenness, extremely filthy, indolent in their habits, their morals in other respects being so much improved to many more civilized races, though he was told that they were as untamable as the wild cow of the mountains" (Wayland, Judson, i, 542 sq.)

Religious Traditions.—They have amongst them a great number of religious traditions which bear a marked analogy to Biblical history. The tradition respecting the creation specifies that man was created from the earth, and woman from one of man's ribs. The Creator said, "I lose these, my son and daughter. I will bestow my life upon them," and then breathed a particle of his life into the frame of man and woman, and were men." God made food and drink; rice, fire, and water; cattle, elephants, and birds. Traditions concerning man's primitive state and first transgression, very similar to the Bible narrative, are also preserved amongst them. Noah, who answered the voice of God, is variously impersonated as sometimes male and sometimes female: man is located in a garden, with sev-
KARENS
20
KARENS

on different kinds of fruits of which he should eat, with
one exception. Nauk'plu meets him and tells him the charac-
ter of all the fruits, and assures him that the for-
bidden one is the most delicious of all. He prevails on
the woman first to taste this fruit. She gives it to her
husband, etc. On the morrow Yawah (on this name, see,
below: Religious Vices) comes, etc. The very de-
tail of the narrative is preserved to a marvellous de-
gree.

Other traditions point to a flood, in which the waters
‘rose and rose till they reached to heaven.’ Others refer
to the flood as an event of the human history. ‘Men
had at first one father and mother; but, because they did not
love each other, they separated, after which they did not
know each other’s language, and became enemies
and fought.’ Still another says that when they were
scattered, a younger brother, or the ‘White Westerner,’
came, begging the Karens to return to the place where
they left God; which tradition is said to have had much
to do with the early success of the missionaries amongst
these people, as the Karens applied these traditions to
them.

Religious Vices.—They have remarkably clear views
of God, whom they believe to be ‘immortal, eternal;
that he was from the beginning of the world. The
life of God is endless; generations cannot measure his
existence. God is complete and good, and through end-
less generations will never die. God is omnipotent, but
was not omnipotent when he created the world. God created
anciently. He has a knowledge of all things to the present
time. He created spirit and life.’ This God is known as
Yawah, ‘which approaches the word Jehovah as nearly
as possible in the Karen language.’ He was not, how-
ever, worshipped when the missionaries first went to the
Karens. A great power for evil (Satan) since the fall has
rendered relief to man by introducing charms against
sickness, death, and other misfortunes, and this person-
age, though without image, is widely worshipped. Thus
originated their demon worship. They appear to be
believe in the immortality of the soul, though it is doub-
ful if this obtains universally amongst them. Mr. Cross
doubts if they have any proper idea of the resurrection
of the dead. Transmission is not accepted amongst
them, and many think the soul ‘dies off in the air.’
They are thus distinguished from the Buddhists, though
long resident with them in Bumah.

Spirit Worship.—Besides the Yawah and the demons
above alluded to, they believe in many other spiritual
beings known as Kelah, or, speaking more definitely,
every object has a kelah, whether man, trees, or plants,
as well as inanimate objects, such as stones and knives.
The grain growing has its kelah, and when it does not
flourish it is because the kelah is leaving it, and it must be
called back by invocation. The human kelah is not
the soul, nor is the responsibility of human actions lodged
in it, nor any moral character attached to it. All this
is attributed to the Thah. The kelah is the author of
dreams; it is that nature which pertains to life, the
sensual soul, the animal spirits. It can leave the body at
will. When it is absent disease ensues; when yet
longer, death results. Kelah seems to signify life, or
animating force, or the internal or the individual. It is
more apt to forsake feeble persons and children. The
kelah of one person may accompany that of another in
going away, hence children are kept away from corps, and
the house where a person dies is abandoned. Great
efforts are made to induce a departed kelah to return.
Tempting food is placed on the public waysides or in
the forest, and various ceremonies and rituals are gone
through, which sometimes are thought to be successful in
securing the return of the kelah. One might almost
wonder that its return should be considered desirable
when we are told that the kelah are seven sepa-
rate existences in which endeavor to supersede
madness, recklessness, shamelessness, drinking propensi-
ties, anger, cruelty, violence, murder, and are constantly
bent on evil. But along with the kelah we learn of
Ze, which means power, and seems to be a personifica-
tion of reason. If the kelah becomes heedless or weak, or
is unfortunately circumstanced, then the kelah can do
mischief; but otherwise it is powerless for evil.

There are other spiritual beings, such as Kephoo,
a species of vampire, which is the stomach of a wizard,
and in the form of the host he can eat, and if hunting
goes out at night to seek food. It destroys human
kelahas. Theretas are spirits of those who have died by
violence, as by tigers or other wild beasts, by famine,
or sword, or starvation. These can neither go to the
upper regions of heaven, nor to that of the Fi, where men
are punished, but must remain on earth, as long as a ling
mortlal sickness. Offerings and supplications are made to.
Tahmas or Tah-kus are spectres of those who have been
dreadfully wicked in this life. They appear as appar-
itions only, in form of horses, elephants, dogs, crocodiles,
serpents, vultures, ducks, or colossal men. Sthahhas
are spirits of persons left unburied, and of infants or aged
persons who have become infirm because the teo has
left them. Phupho are inhabitants of the infernal re-
gion, and are spirits of all who go naturally to their
proper place, and renew their earthly employments,
budding, shooting rice, cutting rice, etc. Their location
is unknown; they are buried, and they live in a world
undeclared, but is above the earth, or below it, or beyond
the horizon. It is presided over by king Cootay or Thece-
do. At his call the kelahas must go, and men die.
Under his dominion they serve, as an intermediate state,
while in the mean time they await the coming of the
Lerah, which has two gradations of punishment, one be-
ing more severe than the other. Tah-nahas or Naahas
are the spirits of two sorts of fiends which take the form
of any animals they please, and prey upon men. The
Lord of men created them as a punishment in conse-
quence of a disobedience on the part of men to one of his
commands. They have a king who was the great
tempter of man in the garden. Mukkahas are the an-
cestors of the Karens who inhabit the upper region, and
are the creators of the present generation. Sometimes
they work imperfectly, and, as a consequence, ill-favored
and imperfect persons are found. They preside over
births and marriages, mingling together the blood of
two persons. They are worshipped with offerings.

The Kelapeko create the winds; the Thah Yoormi cause eclipses;
the Corda and Louphay preside over the wet and dry seasons.

Priesthood.—There are amongst the Karens a class of
people who serve as prophets, and assume conditions of
mind and body much like those affected by the ‘medi-
cine-men’ amongst North American Indians. What
they do with words accompanied by bodily gestures,
shouting at the mouth, etc., they are presumed to attain a state
of clairvoyance favorable to the prediction of coming
events. The prophecies uttered by these which are re-
tained in tradition mostly pertain to the deliverance of
the Karens from the oppression of the Burmees. These
prophets are of two classes. The vres compose ballads
and other poetry, and have great power in calling back
departed kelahas. The other class are known as book-
ho, and are rather priests than prophets, taking the lead
in the religious ceremonies of the people, instructing
them in the rules of life, the obligations, and are more res-
pectable classes, being heads of communities, though not
hereditary chiefs.

Missions.—Missionary work was commenced amongst
these tribes about 1826, by Messrs. Boardman and Jud-
son, who were succeeded by Messrs. Wade, Mason, and
Kincade. Twenty-five years ago our present missionary
Ko-thau-Ba, a native convert, met with wonderful suc-
cess amongst these people. Associated prominently with this
great movement was Rev. Mr. Vinton, who in six
years planted forty churches, opened forty-two houses
of worship and thirty-two schoolhouses, and saw be-
tween eight and nine thousand Karens raise to the
level of Christian worshippers. In 1852 alone he received
five hundred Karens into the Church. In 1868 the Bap-

tist Mission report showed that they had amongst this
people sixty-six native ordained pastors and evangelists; three hundred and forty-six native preachers unordained; three hundred and sixty-two churches; nineteen thousand two hundred and thirty-one church members, and nearly sixty thousand natives" of all ages known as Christians. A writer in the Madras Observer (India) stated that, in Oct. 1868, a gentleman, not in sympathy with the Baptists, but a great traveller, who forming his journeys on foot through Bencoolen while amongst these Karen districts, said that on one occasion "he found himself for seventeen successive nights, at the end of his days' journeys through the forest, in a native Christian village.

Karmathians. — See Saffron.

Kar'skor (Heb. Karkor', כּרָקֹר, foundation; Sept. Kaposis v. τ. Καρκώρ, Vulg. Cireai, Carea), a place situated at a bend in the southern boundary of Judah (I. e., Samaria-Palestine), between Adar and Azmon (Josh. xv. 8); probably about midway between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean, perhaps near the well marked as Bir Abu-Atrebi on Zimmermann's map. See Dure.

Karkhaphesan Version. See SYRIAC VERSIONS.

Karkom. See SAFFRON.

Kar'kor (Heb. Karkor', כּרָקֹר, foundation; Sept. Kaposis v. τ. Καρκώρ, Vulg. Cireai, Carea), a place beyond Jordan on the Midianitic border near Zohra and Zalmunna where they had retired with their remaining army after the first rout by Gideon, who pursued and routed them again in its victory (Judg. viii. 10). From the context it appears it has been situated not far beyond Succoth and Peniel, towards the south, in a naturally secure spot east of Nobah and Jogbeath; indications that point to a locality among the southern openings of Jebel Zarka, north-east of Rabban Ammon. Schwarz supposes (Patet. p. 223) that el-Kerak is meant, a place a few miles south-east of Dara or Edrei, in the Hauran; but this is too far distant north-east. Eusebius' comparison (Onom. vi. 17) between the castle-Carei (Carea) of el-Kerak and Gideon shows that one day's journey distant from Petra, is equally foreign; and this may be the modern Kerak of Moab. See KEKATH.

Kari-Borromaeus Union, a Roman Catholic association in Rhenish Prussia, formed for the purpose of effecting in Roman Catholic society the same results for which the Gustavus Adolphus Society of the Protestant Church was founded. Perhaps, in a measure, it was intended to oppose any inroads of the Protestant association among the Roman Catholics. It originated in 1844, and makes it special object to circulate at large the literary productions of Roman Catholics. The society publishes a monthly journal, and occasionally works of a religious character written in popular form. See Katholische Real-Encyclopaedie, x1, 835.

Karlowits, Christoph von. See MAURICE OF SAXONY.

Karlstadt, Andreas Rudolph Bodenstein. See CARLSBAD.

Karlstadt, Johannes. See DACOCTERUS.

Karmathians (so called from Abu Said Al-Jenabi, surnamed Al-Karmathia) is the name of a Mohammedan sect which originated in the 9th century, under the caliphate of Al-Mu'izz. Strictly speaking, the Karmathians were Shiites (q. v.); see also ISMAILI, for Karmathia, their founder, was one of the missionaries in the province of Kufa, appointed by one of the apostles (Hussein Abhari) of Ahmed, the successor of Abdallah Ibn-Malum, who flourished about the middle of the 9th century, and who first gave character to the Ismailian. It was he likewise who projected and prepared the way for a union of the Arabic conquerors, and the many races that had been subjected since Mohammed's death, and the enthronement of which later was called "Pure Reason" as the sole deity for worship. With an extraordinary knowledge of the human heart and human weakness, he found a way to attract the high and the low. To the believer he offered devotion; liberty, if not license, to the "free in spirit" philosophy to the "strong-minded!" mystical hopes to the fanatics; miracles to the masses. To the Jews he offered a Messiah, to the Christians a Paraclete, to the Moslems a Mahdi, and to the Persian and Syrian "pagans" a philosophical thelogy. The results of his exertions, so practical in tendency, were truly wonderful, and at one time it seemed as if Mohammedanism was doomed. It was soon persecuted by the authorities, and, driven from place to place, finally he died in Selamia, in Syria, leaving the work he had so successfully begun to his son,
Ahmed. This Ahmed, profiting by the experience of his father, carried on the work of conversion somewhat secretly; at least he did not dare to assume publicly the claims of an imam, as his father had done. He sent missionaries, however, to different parts of the country to gain adherents for this extinct religion. God did not have to do so, for the messengers clung all the more fervently to it. God’s decree had certainly permitted all these indignities to be put upon his house, but it was not for them to murmur. The stone gone, they covered the place where it had lain with their kisses.” Whenever Abu Tahir did not prevent them, he would defend, not the precepts of the House, his traditional annual pilgrimage, and Abu Tahir was finally persuaded to conclude a treaty permitting the pilgrimage on payment of five denars for every camel, and seven for every horse. But the black stone, notwithstanding all the efforts on the part of the court of Bagdad, he never returned. (See below.) Abu Tahir himself was a man of great daring, and so infatuated were his men with the personal bravery and divine calling of their leader that they blindly obeyed any demands he made upon them.

Abu Tahir died in 832 of the Hegira, master of Arabia, Syria, and Irak. It was not until seven years later (A.D. 950), under the reign of two of his brothers who had succeeded him, that the “black stone” was returned to Mecca for an enormous ransom, and fixed there, in the seventh pillar of the mosque called Rubbas (in honor of God’s mercy) but with a stipulation that the death of Abu Tahir, the star of the Karmathians, began to wane. Little is heard of them any import till 795, when they were defeated before Kufa—an event which seems to have put an end to their dominion in Irak and Syria. In 878 they were further defeated in battle by Asfar, and their chief killed. They retreated to Lahas, where they fortified themselves; whereupon Asfar marched to Elkatif, took it, and carried away all the baggage, slaves, and animals of the Karmathians of that town, and retired to Basra. This seems to have finally ruined the already weak band of that once formidable power, and nothing further is heard of them in history, although they retained Lahas down to 480, and even later. To our own day there still exists, according to Palgrave, some disaffected remnants of them at Hase (the modern name of their ancient centre and stronghold), and other tracts of the peninsula; and their antagonism against Mohammedanism, which they have utterly abrogated among themselves, so far from being abated, bids fair to break out anew into open rebellion at the first opportunity. Indeed, some of the most trustworthy writers on Eastern history say that the modern sects of the East have followed the Karmathians in their religious belief to the Karmathians (comp. Madden, Turkish Empire, ii, 210).

The religious belief of the Karmathians, so far as it has been preserved to us, seems in the beginning—before Islamism became a mixture of “naturalism” and “materialism” of whibon Sabism, and of Indian incursions and transmigrations of later days—to have only been a kind of “reformed” Islam. Their master Karmath, this sect maintained, had evinced himself to be a true prophet, and had brought a new law into the world. By this many of the Mohammedan tenets were altered, many ancient ceremonies and forms of prayer were changed, and an entirely new kind of fast introduced. Wine was permitted, as well as a few other things which the Koran prohibited, while many of the precepts found in that book were made more allegories. Prayer was abandoned, and the symbol of obedience, instead of scraping him off, and a massacre of the most fearful description ensued. With barbarous irony, he asked the victims what had become of the sacred protection of the place. Every one, they had always been told, was safe and sound, and had had the symbol of obedience on their foreheads. Why was he allowed thus easily to kill them—the race of donkeys? According to some, for six days; to others, for eleven or seventeen, the massacre lasted. The numbers killed within the precincts of the temple itself are variously given. The holy places were desecrated, almost irredeemably. But, not satisfied with this, Abu Tahir laid hands on the supreme palladium, the black stone itself. Yet he was apparently mistaken in his calculations. So far from turning the hearts of the faithful from a worship which was scarcely more than a quirk of fancy, God did not prevent the movement. One of the converts made was our Karmath, who gave new life to this undertaking. He quickly gathered about him a large number of converts, and, successful in securing their confidence, he soon made them the blind instruments of his will. He advocated, according to some authorities, absolute communism, not only of property, but even of wives, and founded one particular colony, consisting of chosen converts, around his own house at Kufa. (See below, Religious Belief.)
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idem, Geschichte der talmudischen Völker (Stuttgart, 1866, 8vo), p. 137 sq.; De Googe, Mémoire sur les Carmathes, etc.; Silvestre de Sacy, Réflexions sur les Juifs, etc.; Taylor, Hist. Mohammedanum, p. 229 sq.; Madden, Turkish Empire, ii, 164 sq.; Chambers, Cyclopaedia, x, 568 sq. See SHITTE.

KART, AARON JACOB, a Lutheran minister, was born in August, 1794, in Missouri. He dedicated himself to the service of the Lord, and, with a view to enter the Christian ministry, became a student in the institution at Gettysburg in the autumn of 1837, and was graduated from Pennsylvania College in 1842, and from the theological seminary in 1844. After his graduation he preached at the Lutheran Church at Pine Grove, Pa.; thence he removed to Canton, Ohio. In 1848 he took charge of the English Lutheran Church in Savannah, Georgia. Here he labored, enjoying the confidence of his people and the respect of the whole community, till his physical strength gave way, and advancing disease compelled him to suspend the exercise of his office. His congregation suggested a trip to foreign lands. They provided the expenses for the journey, and supplied for the pulpit during his absence. He traveled through France, Italy, Germany, and Holland, and his impressions derived no advantage from the tour, and he returned to his native country only to close his life surrounded by the tender sympathies of loved ones at home. He died at Chicago, Ill., Dec. 19, 1860. Karn was an able preacher and an excellent man. His ministry was fruitful in good results. During the prevalence of the yellow fever in Savannah in 1854 and 1856, he continued at his post, exhausting his time and his strength in ministering to the suffering and the dying, not only of his own congregation, but to others who were not in connection with any Church, amid scenes the most distressing and heart-rending. His baptismal records and registers in the sick and in the burial of the dead. It is supposed his physical constitution sustained an injury from the influences of the epidemic from which he never recovered. (M. L. S.)

Karnaim. See ASHURTH-R-KARNAIM.

Karnkowski, Stanislaus, a celebrated Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Bland in 1526. Of his early life nothing is known to us. In 1568 he was made bishop of Wladislaw, and became coadjutor to the archbishop of Gaeacen in 1571, and in 1581 sole occupant of the archbishopric and primate of Poland. In the civil history of Poland Karnkowski played no unimportant part. King Stefan (Batory) was crowned by him (May 1, 1576), immediately after the death of the king. Karnkowski himself assumed the reins of government until a royal successor was found in the person of the Swedish crown prince Sigismund, whom he also crowned. It is generally supposed that Karnkowski belonged to the Jesuitical order. In Kalisch he built a college for the Jesuits; he also founded two schools for the theological training of Roman Catholics. Under his protection the celebrated Jesuit Jacob Wujek translated the Bible into Polish, a work which to this day remains the only authentic edition in the Polish (Roman Catholic) Church. Karnkowski's will, in his own handwriting, is here recorded: De tunc etiam in aeternum, tunc etiam in infinitum, tunc etiam in sæcula sæculorum, tunc etiam in æternam æternitatem.—De ecclesia utroque; etc. See Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Leben, xii, 632.

Karo, Joseph ben-EPHRAIM, a Jewish Rabbi, one of the most celebrated characters in Rabbinic literature, was born in 1596, at Antwerp, of a family of note. Among the great persecutions which the Spanish Jews suffered in the early part of the 16th century, the Karo family were exiled, and settled finally at Nicopolis, in European Turkey. His early Talmudical education Joseph received under the instruction of his own father, and the youth quickly evinced, in the ready acquisition of Talmudic lore, a particular liking for tradition. The Mishna text, it is said, he learned by heart, and before he had reached the age of twenty-five he was ac-
cepted as a Talmudical authority. From Nicopolis Joseph removed successively to Adrianople and Salonica. While a resident of these places (about 1592-95) he became acquainted with the great cabalistic fanatic Salomo Molebo of Portugal, and he was finally induced to remove to Safet (q. v.), in Palestine, the great cabalistic centre in the 16th century. There he studied much with the Rabbinical authorities of Palestine, and during the controversy on the Jewish gnostic [see JACOB BERAN] Joseph Karo was one of the four disciples whom Jacob Berab ordained when forced by Levi ben-Chabib to quit the country. See ORDINATION, JEWISH. Previously infatuated with the Cabalistic Mesia
sic notions, and now (Jacob Berab died January, 1541, shortly after quitting Palestine) one of the four Rabbis ordained by the only authority competent to perform the sacred rite, he became satisfied that he was divinely chosen for some important mission, perhaps even the Messiahship itself. (He believed, says Grätz [see below], that he would die and be again raised up to become the leader of the nation.) Ever since 1522 he had been engaged in writing an extensive religious and ritual code, entitled חסיד וחסיד (Besh Joseph, first published at Saltomos, 1553, 4 vols. folio), a revision, correction, and enlargement of a like work by Asher; he now completed the compilation of this gigantic undertaking in the hope that its publication would lead his people to assign him at once the place to which he believed himself divinely called. He completed the work in 1542, but it gained for him only the recognition of being one of the ablest rabbis of Safet. Unremitt
antly he continued his labors, determined to bring about the result which he believed to be his mission—
the union of Israel—and with it hasten the days of the Messiah. In the 16th century the Talmud was exten
sively studied among the Jews. Every important con
gregation sustained not only a rabbi, but a college. Thus many lucrative positions were open to men inclined to study, and there resulted a general interest in the study of the Talmud. But many students imitate many interpreters, and thus it came that, after a time, each congregation and even every member of a college, had their own interpretation of the Talmudical precept, and Jewish orthodoxy was at a loss how to judge rightly. Joseph, comprehending the danger of a general division and a loose interpretation, determined to meet the case by a compilation of rabbinical law and usages, i. e. codification of the Talmudic literature on which the Talmud had received at the hands of the most distinguished teachers in Israel. At first he simply subjected his former work to a general supervision, which he completed after twelve years of hard labor. Finding, however, that this did not quite accomplish the desired result, he set about writing a new work, and after nine years of intense application presented his peo
ple with a compendium of rabbinical law and usage, enti
tled בעל נבואה (Shulchan Aruk, first published at Venice, 1565), which to this day remains a rabbinical authority. His name now became celebrated in all lands where Jews made their abode, and at Safet itself (which reaped the greatest fruit of his labors), he had been rec
corded the place of first authority, as a worthy successor of Jacob Berab. See, however, the article MOSES DE TRAHU. He died in 1575. One result Karo's labors had at least effected—the harmony of all Israelites in expounding the law through the Talmud—the estab
lishment of Rabbinical Judaism—after this, the Jewish religion from that revealed through Moses at Mount Sinai, foretold by the prophets, and taught by Moses Maimonides. For a long time the Shulchan Aruk was the text-book in all the Jewish schools, the accepted interpretation of the Talmud. Many of the editions that have been published of it, legions the schol
ars who have commented upon it. Karo's other work of note which deserves mention here is צמח עץ (Mishne), a commentary on Maimonides's יד יחציתא, which
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has frequently been published with the latter work. See Gritz, Geschichte der Juden, ix, 819 sq.; Zunz, Zur Geschichte u. Literatur, p. 290 sq.; Joel, Gesch. d. Juden-thums, iii, 129; Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. ii, 172 sq. (J. H. W.)

KARPAS. See GREEN; COTTON.

Kartah (Heb. Kartuk, אֵרְקַת, city: Sept. Kap-šôv v. r. Kârôq), a town in the tribe of Zebulen, assigned, with its suburbs, as one of the places of residence for the Levites of the family of Merari (Josh. xxii, 54).

It is there mentioned between Jokneam and Dinnah, the fourth city named being Nahalal; but the parallel passage (1 Chron. vi, 77) gives but two cities, and these different, namely, Rimmon and Tabor, the first of these being probably a preferable reading for Dinnah, and the latter a collective for two others, Jokneam being in the same connection (ver. 98) separately attributed to the latter from its junction with wady Melek; the ruins being on the tell Haretagh, on the opposite side of the river (Narrative, i, 289).

Kartan (Heb. Kartan, בָּרְקָת, double city, an old dual from בָּרְקָת; Sept. Кαρτάν v. r. Καρτάν and Нαυ-μων, a town of Naphtali, assigned to the Gereshonite Levites, and appointed to be one of the cities of refuge (Josh. xii, 32). In the parallel passage (1 Chron. vi, 78) it is called by the equivalent name of Kirjathaim.

The associated names suggest the probability of some locality near the north-western shore of the Sea of Tiberias, perhaps the ruined village marked as el-Katatam on Van de Velde’s map, on wady Furam, about midway between Lake Tiberias and the Huleh.

Kartikeya is the name of the Hindu Mars, or god of war, who is represented by the Puranic legends as the bedding-ground from Siva of the most miraculous fashion. The germ of Kartikeya having fallen into the Ganges, it was on the banks of this river, in a meadow of Sara grass, that the offspring of Siva arose; and as it happened that he was seen by six nymphs, the Krittikas (the Pleiades), the child assumed six faces, to receive nurture from each. Growth up, he fulfilled his mission in killing Tāraka, the demon-king, whose power, acquired by penances and austerities, threatened the very existence of the gods. He accomplished, besides, other heroic deeds in his battles with the giants, and became the commander-in-chief of the divine armies. Having been brought up by the Krittikas, he is called Kiritkeya, or Shānamātura, the son of six mothers; and, from the circumstances adverted to, he bears also the names of Gāmpere, the son of the Ganges; Sarabād, reared in Sara grass; Skamsukka, the god with the six faces, etc. One of his common appellations is Kumārī, youthful, since he is generally represented as a fine youth; and, as he is riding on a peacock, he sometimes embraces the epithet of Sīkhirāhama, or “the god whose the peacock.”

Kasimir, Nr. prince of Poland, noted in the annals of the Catholic Church for his great piety and asceticism, born in October, 1458, took no unimportant part in the efforts of the royal house of Poland to secure the throne of Hungary. Quite consistently with his saintly profession, he marched at the head of a large army towards the borders of Hungary in 1471. On his return, after the declaration of pope Sixtus IV in favor of the deposed king of Hungary, Kasimir practised even greater austerity than before; and died March 4, 1483, at Wilno, in Lithuania. Kasimir was canonized in 1522 by pope Leo X, and he is looked upon as the patron saint of Poland. See POLAND.

Kaspi. See IRS-KASPIL.

KATAYANA

Katan. See HAKATAK.

Katerkamp, Johann Theodor Hermann, an eminent Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Ochtrup, near Münster, Germany, Jan. 17, 1764; studied theology at Münster, and subsequently (1809) became professor of Church History in his alma mater. He had been ordained priest in 1787, and in 1825 he was appointed in the year 1821 dean of the cathedral at Münster. He died July 8, 1834. Katerkamp’s principal work is his Kirchengesch. (of which the introduction was published in 1819; and five volumes, bringing the work down to the second Crusade, from 1823-34, 8vo).


Katharinus, Ambrosius. See Catharinus.

Kathenotheinem (καθενόθεια, each one a god) is a term devised by Prof. Max Muller (Rig Veda, i, 164, 480) to designate the doctrine of divine unity in diversity as unfolded in the sacred writings of the Hindus. He rejects the term polytheism on the ground that the Hindus, in their worship, ever ascribe to one god the attributes of all the others. Thus in one hymn, ascribed to Manu, the poet says, "Among you, O gods, there is none that is small, none that is young: you are all great in deed." . . . "And what more could a πολυθεῖον be able to achieve," asks the professor, "in trying to express the idea of a divine and supreme power? . . . This is surely not what is commonly understood by polytheism. Yet it would be equally wrong to call it monothelism. If we must have a name for it, I should call it Kathenotheism." (Chips, i, 26). See also Tyler, Primitive Culture (London, 1871, 2 vols. 8vo), ii, 821. (J. H. W.)

Kathismokta (καθισμόκτα, σιτίνη) is a name which, in the early Church, according to Suicer, was applied to certain parts of holy Scripture, because, during the reading of them, the people stood. Other portions of Scripture were entitled elēgōv (standinga), because, during the reading of them, the people stood. It was usual in the early Church for all worshippers to stand during the reading of the gospels and the singing of the psalms.

Katona, Eneriz, of Abasuvay, a Hungarian Protestant controversialist, was born at Ufalon in 1572. He became rector of the college of Szepesi in 1598, but reigned but a month. He studied theology at the University of Heidelberg for two years and a half, and then returned to his country. He became successively rector of Pa- tak (in 1599), preacher at the court of George Ra- goz, prince of Transylvania, pastor of Szepesi, Goene- zin, and Karestus; and died Oct. 22, 1610. He wrote De libero Arbitrio, contra theses Andreae Starofii; Ant. papamut; Tractatus de Patrum, concionium et traditum Auctoriale circa sivea dogmata, cultus idem moraesque vierrimi (Francfort, 1611, 8vo, with a Life of the author by Pareus). See Civittering, Specimen Hungariae Literae, p. 199; Horanyi, Nova Memoria Hungarorum, ii, 504.

Katon Moed. See TALMUD.

Kastōth (Heb. Kastoth, גַּסְתּוֹת, small, for גַּסָּתָה; Sept. Kastōth v. r. Kastōth), one of the cities of Zebu- ulon, mentioned first in a list of towns apparently along the southern border from Mount Tabor westerly (Josh. xix, 15); and (notwithstanding the slight difference in radical) probably the same with the KARTAH (q. v.) of Josh. xxi, 94; perhaps also with KTITON (Judg. i, 21). See Dillmann, Atlas zu B. J. Seh. of the Talmud through the Talmud, seeks to identify it with Cana of Galilee.

Kātyāyana is a name of great distinction in the history of the literature of India, especially the ritual and grammatical literature of the Brahmanical Hindus, which has been greatly enriched by a writer or writers
of that name. Katayama is also the name of several of the chief disciples of the Buddha Sakyamuni.

Kautz, Jacob, an eminent German theologian prominent in the Anabaptist movement of the 16th century, was born at Bockenheim, Hesse Cassel, about 1500. He was a preacher at Worms when, in 1527, he identified himself with the Denk-Kerker movement in forming a strong opposition against infant baptism. Previously to this time, Kautz had estranged himself from the Lutheran reformers by his anti-Trinitarian heresies; now he openly broke with them, and went over to the Anabaptist movement. He was an Anabaptist. He published seven theses in defence of his peculiar views (comp. Arnold, Ketzerristoris, i, 68), and for the day of Pentecost invited the Lutheran ministers to public discussion. Although yet a young man, he had already obtained great celebrity as a public speaker, and no doubt took this course in order to increase the number of his followers. But the theses of Kautz were so decidedly opposed to Lutheran Christology and dogmas that the authorities interfered, incarcerated him, and finally obliged him to quit Worms. Wandering about from place to place, he found himself at Augsburg, then at Regensburg, and in 1528 finally at Strasbourg. Here he succeeded for a time in preaching his heretical doctrines, but in 1529, so great had his fanatical excesses become, that the city authorities felt obliged to interfere, and he was arrested and compelled to leave the city. After losing sight of him, we find him in 1532 again knocking at the gates of the city of Strasbourg, and vainly seeking admission. From this time all traces of him are lost, and neither the time nor the place of his death is known. Kautz was quite intimate with Capito, the eminent coadjutor of the Reformers G场景ampliand and Bucer, and at one time it was even asserted by the Anabaptists that he had succeeded in winning him to their side. Capito, however, does not deserve this reproach. On the contrary, he did all in his power to restrain Kautz in his fanaticism. See Trench, Auctoriandiarum, i, 18 sq.; Keim, in the Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol., i, 271 sq.; Stud. und Krit. 1841, p. 1080 sq. See also Denk; Hitzel. (J. H. W.)

Kay, James, a Unitarian minister, was born at Heap Fold, in Lancashire, England, June 21, 1777, and was reared in the Church of England. At the age of seventeen, however, he became a dissenter, and at once prepared to enter the ministry. In 1799 he was dismissed from a Calvinist congregation in Kendal, Westmoreland, but he resigned this charge in 1810, and, with about one third of his congregation, joined the Unitarians, and two years later became pastor of a Unitarian congregation at Hindley, Lancashire. In 1821 he emigrated to this country, but never succeeded in securing work. He died Sept. 22, 1847, at Trout Run, Pa. "He fell asleep with the accents of a devout faith on his lips, and, we doubt not, with the trustful spirit of a disciple in his heart." — Christian Examiner, 1848, p. 157.

Kaye, John (1), D.D., an English divine, was born at Hammersmith, London, in 1785, and was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge (graduated in 1804 with high honor and distinction). In 1814 he was elected master of his college, and afterwards filled the office of vice-chancellor. In 1816 he was chosen regius professor of divinity, and in 1820 became bishop of Bristol; was translated to Lincoln in 1827, and died in 1833. Besides his professional labors, Kaye did a great deal of literary work. Many of his writings are of special value, characterized as they are by clearness and precision, by accuracy and fairness, combined with the necessary flexibility, so thinking mind can fail to be enriched by them. His principal writings are: Historical History of the 2d and 3d Centuries, illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian (Camb. 2d ed. 1826, 8vo; 3d ed. 1845); Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr (London. 2d ed. 1836, 8vo; 3d ed. 1853); A Charge delivered at the primary Visitation in 1836 (Camb. 1828, 8vo); A Charge to the Clergy, delivered at the triennial Visitation in 1843 (London, 1843, 8vo). He also published some anonymous Remarks on Dr. Wiseman's Lectures, and a Reply to the Travels of an Irish Roman Catholic Polemic, the gentleman Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s. v.; London Gentleman's Magazine, 1858 (April, May, and August). (J. L. S.)

Kaye, John (2). See CAJUS.

Kayita. See Fruit.

Kazin. See ITAH-KAZIN.

Keach, Benjamin, an eminent English Baptist divine, was born at Stokeham, Buckinghamshire, Feb. 25, 1646. He does not appear to have followed any regular course of study; his parents were so poor that they could not aid him in a collegiate education. He paid particular attention to the Scriptures. In 1658 he became a preacher, and in 1668 was chosen pastor of a congregation in Southwark, of which he had for three years previously been a member. After the Restoration he suffered in common with all nonconformists, and fled from the country, where the persecutions were unbearable, to the metropolis. Here he became pastor of a small society, which met in a private house in Tooley Street. Successful as a minister, he soon moved his fast-increasing flock to a church built at one time of wood, and then of brick, in 1670 to a large new church in Horsley Down, Southwark. He died July 18, 1704. Keach belonged to the Particular or Calvinistic Baptists, and was considered a man of great piety and learning. His principal works are: Prophesiosa, Answer to the Mediator Metaphors (London, 1682; best edition 1773, fol.—very scarce; and reprinted in 1836, 8vo)—The Marrow of true Justification, or Justification without Works (London, 1692, 4to)—The Aze laid to the Root, or one more Blow at the Foundation of infant Baptism and Church-membership (London, 1698, 4to)—Light broke forth to Wales (London, 1696, 8vo; an answer to Mr. James Owen's book, entitled Children's Baptism from Heaven)—The Display of glorious Grace, in 14 Sermons [on Isa. lv, 10] (London, 1698, 8vo)—Gospel Mysteries Unveiled, or an Exposition of all the Parables, etc. (London, 1701, fol.; 1856, royal 8vo)—Mingled with unquestioned reverence for the divine Word, and much good material of which the judicious student may avail himself with advantage, there is a large share of fanciful exposition and of unwise spiritualizing" [Kittto]—A Golden Mine opened, or the glory of God's rich mercy in the more dispensations (London, 1894, 4to)—The French Impostor detected, or Zach. Housal tried by the Word of God, etc. (London, 1703, 12mo)—Believer's Baptism, wherein the chief arguments for infant baptism are collected and combated (London, 1706, 8vo)—The Travels of Thomas and a Tract of Unitarianism, after the manner of Bunyan's (often reprinted); also with Notes and Memoirs of the author, by the Rev. Howard Malcolm (N. Y. 1831, 18mo)—Exposition of the Parables (London, 1704, fol.). Keach also figured in his day as a hymnologist, but his sacred songs were rather mediocrity. See Stoughton, Essays, History of Eng. li, 455 sq.; Crosby, Hist. of the Baptists; Wilson, Hist. of Dissenting Churches; Allibone, Dict. Eng. and American Authors, a. v.; Kite, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. a. v. (J. H. W.)

Keating, Geoffrey, an Irish divine and historian, flourished in the early part of the 17th century (died about 1625, or somewhat later). He is noted as the author of a great history of Ireland, in which the ecclesiastical history of that country is treated in detail. It was translated into English by Dermot O'Conor (London, 1728, fol.; Westm. 1726, fol.; 1738, fol.; Dubl. 1809, 2 vols. 8vo; 1811, 8vo).—Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, a. v.

Keblah is a term by which the Mohammedans designate the direction towards which they are commanded to turn their faces in their devotions. "At first," says Sale (Koran, p. 17), "Mohammed and his followers observed no particular rite in turning their faces towards any certain place or quarter of the world when
they prayed, it being declared to be perfectly indifferent. Afterwards, when the prophet fled to Medina, in direct opposition to the will of Jerusalem [probably to ingratiate himself with the Jews], which continued to be their Kebelah for six or seven months; but, either finding the Jews too intractable, or despairing of otherwise gaining the pagan Arabs, who could not forget the example of the day before, he turned towards the north, and took with him prayers for the future should be towards the last. This change was made in the second year of the Hegira, and occasioned many to fall from him, taking offence at his inconstancy. See Kaaba.

Kebie, John, the sweetest and most Christian poet of his age, was born in Falmouth, Cornwall, on May 25, 1792. His father was a clergyman of the Church of England. He was educated at Corpus Christi College, and at the age of forty years was called to the cure of the parish of St. Alwina, and lived until his ninetieth year. His mother was the daughter of a clergyman. Thus on both sides he came of a pastoral stock; and it is worthy of note that his only surviving brother, Thomas, like himself became a clergyman (rector of Bisley), that his brother's son also took orders, and that Mr. Kebie himself, like his father, married a clergyman's daughter. Young Kebie was prepared for college by his father, and entered the University of Oxford, and in due time gained himself by a remarkable display of talent and application. When only eighteen, full four years below the customary age for graduating, John Kebie won the highest intellectual rank the University can bestow, that of a "double-first-classman," his name appearing in the first as well as in the second class of mathematics. This distinction had never been achieved up to that time except in the case of Robert Peel. April 20, 1811, wanting a few days of the completion of his nineteenth year, he was elected probationer fellow of Oriel, and took his place at the high table, and in the senior common room of that celebrated college. He latterly entered it with him, and these two were the deemstris to whom all paid an almost obsequious deference. In 1812 he won the prizes for both the bachelors' essays — the English on Translation from Dead Languages, the Latin a comparison of Xenophon and Julius Caesar as Military Chroniclers. In the annals of Corpus twice only has such a triumph been won, one instance that of young Kebie, and the other no less a man than Henry Hart Milman, the late celebrated dean of St. Paul's Cathedral. At the unprecedented age of twenty-two—in deed it was the short of it—it so happened that the University of Oxford one of its public examiners. Thus did Kebie attain a success which we believe has never been equalled for its precocious ability. In 1815 he was ordained deacon, the following year priest, and soon after the first as a tutor, and then as a curate in a re-sided there. He became his father's curate, and lived with him in that capacity nearly twenty years. He turned aside from the numerous paths of ambition which were open to him, and gave himself to parochial work as the employment of his life. In 1835 Kebie's father died. He was now offered and accepted the vicarage of Hurley, and married. His parish was obscure, thirty miles from Oxford. There was not, it is said, a single cultivated family in his charge, so that his labors were altogether among the humbler and poorer classes, but under his indefatigable ministrations it became one of the model parishes of the diocese. In 1857 he became the author of the Christian Year and the Lyra Innocentium that Kebie will be most widely and permanently known. The former was published in 1827. It is probable that most of the poem was written at Oxford. Its success was so great that a second edition was published in 1828, and the hundred editions of the first have been sold. Of course Kebie might have realized a fortune from the sale of this extraordinary book; but in this, as in everything else, he showed his disinterestedness. When, in 1838, Kebie came to Hurley, he found a church not at all to his mind. It is described as a plain and anything but beautiful building of flint and rubble. He at once determined to have a new one built, and, in order to carry out this project, he employed the profits of the last edition of the Christian Year; and when the building was finished, his friends, in token of their respect for him, filled all the windows with stained glass. On Friday, the 6th of April, 1866, he was buried in the church-yard of Hurley, where he had officiated as minister for nearly thirty years. It was on the 29th of March, 1866, that he died. On the eve of a great Christian observance, he, the singer of Christian observations, passed away to rest his character. The Kebie's poetry may be surmised from his life and opinions; it is gentle, sweet, devotional, and highly cultivated; it translates religious sentiment of the most spiritual kind, the exclusively Hebrew dialect into the language of modern feeling. A deep tone of home affection runs through all his poems. The highest culture of which man is capable, and the most refined thought in him, had not weakened, but only made natural affection more pious and intense. Never, perhaps, except in the case of George Herbert, has a character of such rare and saintly beauty concurred with a poetic gift and power of poetic expression of the highest order. John Kebie is noted also as the leader of the original band of Oxford scholars and divines who began the spiritual movement in the English Church. He contributed to the famous Tracts for the Times (1834-1836), and it is to Kebie's influence over Newman that the latter ascribes his conversion to Romanism, dating it from July 14, 1858, when Kebie preached his sermon on the Roman Apostasy. He was one of the editors of the Biblische Patrum Ecclesiae Catholicae (begun in 1838). His works are, On Translation from the Dead Languages (an Oxford Prize Essay, 1812; Oxuf. 1812) — The Christian Year: thoughts in verse for the Sundays and holy days throughout the year (1827, 2 vols.; 56th ed. 1852, 2 vols.) — The Child's Christian Year (4th ed. 1841, 1vo) — Primitive Tradition recognized in Holy Scripture; a Sermon (on 2 Tim. i, 14; 4th ed., with a Postscript and Catenia Patrum [No. 3 of the Tracts of the Times], 1839, 18mo; originally published [1837] as No. 78 of the Oxford Tracts for the Times) — The Pilgrim and Paulina of David, in English Verse (1839, sm. 8vo; 3d ed. 1840, 18mo) — Selections from Richard Hooker (1839, 18mo; 2d ed. 1848, 18mo) — an edition of Hooker's Works — Prelectorum Academicae Oronii Habita (1842-43, 2 vols. 8vo; 1844-45, 2 vols. 8vo) — Good Friday, a Lecture on Thoughts on Verse, on Children, their Ways and their Privileges (1846, sm. 8vo, Anon.) — Sermons Academici and Occasional (1847, 8vo; 2d ed. 1848, 8vo) — A very few plain Thoughts on the proposed Addition of Dissenters to the University of Oxford (written from his position as High-Brown, 1848). See Coleridge, Memoirs of the Rev. J. Kebie (1869, 2 vols. 8vo); Sharpe, Memoir (in Studies in Poetry and Philosophy); Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s. v.; Church Review, Oct. 1866, art. i; Amer. Lit. Review, April, 1870, art. i. (E. E. F.)

Keckermann, Bartholomaeus, a reformed German theologian, was born at Danzig in 1571, and educated at Wittenberg, Leipsic, and Heidelberg. In the last place he became professor of the Hebrew language about 1592. In 1602 he accepted the rectorate of the gymnasium at Danzig, where he died August 25, 1609. Keckermann wrote many theological and philosophical works, the principal of which are: Proefenomakon (Berlin, 1615, 4to), and Rhetorica Ecclesiastica (Hanau, 1600, 1618, 8vo). These are circulated very extensively, and prove him to have been a writer of great originality and ability. He argued in behalf of a separate ecclesiastical order for the priests and theologians. On the other hand, it is a misfortune to Christianity such as scholasticism had caused, and in his Systema Ethicus (ibid. 1610, 8vo) he pleads for the separation of ethics, as a philosophical science, from theology; the latter, he argues, must confine itself to the inner religious life, the former to the "boum circle" (Opera, ii, 285 sq.). In view of these, his own teachings, it is unjust to classify this writer, as some
have done, among the originators of Protestant scholas-
ticism. Of value, also, are Kockerman's speculations
on the Trinity (comp. Baur, „Dvě víry a jedna světelná“,
iii, 306 sq.). His works have been published entire (Opera Om-
sia) at Geneva in 1614. See Herzog, „Real-Encyklopä-
die“, iv, 463.

Kedar (Heb. Kedar, יְדֵּר, dark-skinned; Sept.
Ke'dôp), the second son of Ishmael, and founder of the
tribe that bore his name (Gen. xxv, 18). B.C. post
1601. The name is used in Scripture as that of the
Bedouins generally, whose characteristic traits are as-
crude as their manners. Cant. i, 5; Isa. xxvii, 7;
Jer. ii, 10; xlix, 28; Ezek. xlviii, 21; more fully, "sons
of Kedar" (יִדֵּר, יִדְוּר, Isa. xxvi, 17); in Psa. cxx, 5, Ke-
dar and Mesec are put for barbarous tribes. Rabbin-

Kedesh (Heb. Kedesh, כְּדֶשֶׁ֥ה, sanctuary; Sept.
Kê'dêx, but Kêdêx in Josh. xxi, 32; Kê'dêx in Judg. iv, 6, v. r.9;
Kê'dî in v. 1 in Chron. vi, 72), the name of three towns
in Palestine.

1. A city in the extreme southern part of the terri-
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KEDRON

Kedron was introduced as the birthplace of Tobias. The text is exceedingly corrupt, but some little support is lent to this reading by the Vulgate, which, although omitting Kedesh, mentions Saced—post viscum qua duci a ad Occidentem, in siniasto habens civilitant Saphech.

"The name Kedesh exists much farther north than the possessions of Naphthali would appear to have extended, belonging to a lake of considerable size on the Orontes, a few miles south of Hums, the ancient Enessa (Thomson, in Ritter, Dacmacus, p. 1002 sq.); the lake was well known under that name to the Arabic geographers, see, besides the authorities quoted by Robinson [iii. 296, new ed.], Abulfeda in Schultens's Index Geographicus; Flavius Orontes," and "Kuduanum," and they connect it in part with Alexander the Great. But this and the origin of the name are alike uncertain. At the lower end of the lake is an island which, as already remarked, is possibly the site of Kedesh, the capture of which by Sisaios I is preserved in the records of that Egyptian king." (Smith).

Kedron. See Kedron.

Keel, Tyrlens, was the earliest native Method- olist itinerant in Canada. He first appears in the Minutes of 1795 on the Bay of Quinte Circuit. "He proceeded to the Canadian Chronicle of the Church, "a good and faithful minister of Christ." He labored about twelve years in the itinerant work, and then retired into the local ranks, compelled by the growing necessities of his family to resort to other means of support. He did not, however, abandon his Sabbath labors, but continued to preach at his own home. After his family grew up and were able to provide for themselves, he extended his efforts to greater distances from home, carrying the Gospel to the distant settlements of immigrants beyond the Rideau. He died in the faith. Keeler had no advantages of early education; he had, however, endowments, natural and of divine bestowment. His person was commanding, and his voice clear, melodious, and strong. His spirit and manners were the most bland and engaging, and his zeal and fervor knew no bounds and suffered no abatement.

Keeling, Isaac, an English Wesleyan minister of note, was born in the latter half of the last century, and entered the ministry in 1811, but it was not until after many years of hard labor that he rose to any prominence. In 1848 he was elected president of the Conference; shortly after his health began to fail, and he was obliged to relinquish his ministerial responsibilities. He died in 1869. "Mr. Keeling was sagacious, discriminating, cautious, profound, and intensely original. His sermons were models of pure diction, exact thought, luminous arrangement, careful definition, and varied instructiveness. He was a man of retiring habits and cold exterior, but he had a warm heart, and a keen relish of the pleasures of friendship."

Keene, Edmund, D.D., an English prelate, and native of Lynn, Norfolk, was born in 1718. He became master of Peter House in 1748, bishop of Chester in 1752, and was thence transferred to Ely in 1770. He died in 1780. He delivered five Occasional Sermons (1748, 1755, 1757, 1757, 1757).

Keeper, in his widest sense, corresponds to the Heb. בְּנִים, son, Gr. γενέας; in a special sense to בְּנִים, a watchman, as often rendered; בְּנִים, is a shepherd; while בְּנִים, is a guard over prisoners. These words are frequent occurrence, besides others in certain peculiar senses or combinations, the meaning being clear from the connection.

Kehel‘ath, or, rather, Kehel‘lah (Heb. Kehel‘lah), בְּנִים, assembly, only with יִמָּנָה, יִמָּנָה, 28

Kedesh‘akdah, Septuag. Μακελοθ, Vulg. Geothes), the twenty-third station of the Israelites in the desert, between Rimnah and Mt. Shapher (Num. xxxix, 22, 29); perhaps at the mouth of wady el-Hasana, west of Jebel Achmer. See EXODE.

Keil, Karl August Gottlieb, an eminent German theologian, was born at Gosenhain, near Dresden, Saxony, April 23, 1754, and was educated at Leipzig University. Three years after graduation he obtained a privilege as tutor at his alma mater, and at once opened a course of lectures on exegesis and hermeneutics. In 1785 he was appointed professor extraordinary of philosophy, in 1786 professor extraordinary of theology, and in 1786 was finally promoted to the full or ordinary professorship. He died at Leipzig April 22, 1834. His works, especially those which are Systematische Verzeichnis derjenigen theologischen Schriften d. Krenzels allgemein wichtig und nützlich ist (Stendel, 1783, 1792, 1806);—De exemplo Christi recte imitandi Dissert. (Lpz. 1792, 4to);—De Doctoribus veteris Ecclesiæ culpa corrupta per Flavianum Sententiae theologice interpretate et lectiones biblicæ stirpem (Lpz. 1792, Schiöller, 1798, + Latin by Hempel);—Lehrbuch der Hermeneutik d. N. T. nach Grundzügen d. grammatisch-historischen Interpre- tation (Leipzig, 1810, 8vo; Latin translation by C. A. G. Emminger, Lpz. 1811, 8vo), a very useful and important contribution to the department of hermeneutics, which he made his specialty, and in which he has justly become very celebrated. After his death his occasional writings were collected by J. D. Goldhorn, and published under the title of Opuscula academica ad N. T. interpretationem grammatico-historicam et theologice Christianam originem (Leipzig, 1821, 2 vols. 8vo). They consist of treatises on topics of hermeneutical interest, this volume contains several exegetical essays, and an elaborate dissertation, De Platonicis philosophis ad theolog. Christ. opus vest. eccles. scriptor a ratione. "Keil," says Prof. W. L. Alexander (in Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. vol. ii, s. v.), "is a perspicacious writer, and his works, though cold and formal, are full of good sense and solid learning." In connection with H. G. Tischler, Keil also published a theological journal under the title Anzeiten f. d. Studium d. exegetischen u. systematischen Theologie (Leipzig, 1812, 12mo. See Hoefer, New Biog. Gérman, xx, 503; Herzog, Real-Lexikon, v. 504.

Keilah (Heb. Keilah), קִלָּה [in 1 Sam. xxii, 5, 6, proh. cod. "Kilah"; Septuag. Κιλάδα, or Κιλάδα, n. in 1 Sam. xxii, 5, 6, Proh. Cod. "Kilah") in the south of Judah (Josh. xv, 44), bordering on the southern portion of the highlands (see Keil's Comment. ad loc.). It appears to have been founded by Naham the Garmite, brother of Hodiah, one of the wives of Mered (1 Chron. iv, 19). "The Philistines had fallen upon the town at the beginning of the harvest of Ephraim, laid the corn from its threshing-floor, and driven off the cattle (1 Sam. xxii, 1). The prey was recovered by David (ver. 2-5), who remained in the city till the completion of the ingathering. It was then a fortified place, with walls, gates, and bars (1 Sam. xxii, 7, 9, 14, 16). During this time the massacre of Nob was perpetrated, and Keilah became the repository of the sacred ephod, which Abiathar the priest, the sole survivor, had carried off with him (ver. 6). But it was not destined long to enjoy the presence of these brave and valorous inhabitants, nor indeed was it entitled to long enjoy such good fortune, for the inhabitants soon plotted David's betrayal to Saul, then on his road to besiege the place. Of this intention David was warned by divine intimation. He therefore left (1 Sam. xxiii, 7-18). It will be observed that the name "Vostii" is used by David to denote the inhabitants of Keilah in this passage (ver. 1, 12; A. V. 'men'), possibly pointing to the existence of
Cananeites in the place" (Smith). See Baal. Kellaiah was so considerable a city in the time of Nehemiah as to have two prefects, and was mentioned as one of the places on the reconstruction of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 17, 18), and existed in the days of Eusebius and Jerome, who place it eight (the former, s. v. καὶ Ἰδρα, less correctly, seventy) Roman miles from Eleutheropolis, on the road to Hebron (see Pusey, p. 605). Hebron itself is called Cilla (Kīlāa, Ant. viii. 18, 1). The prophet Habakkuk is said to have been buried here (Sozomen, Hist. vii. 29; Nicephorus, Hist. xii. 48), but see Hooke.

The above notices all point to a locality at a fork of wady el-Farari, a little N. of Idnah (Jedna), "where on the height of a hill to the S.W. of the town is a stone tower" (Robinson, Researches, ii, 473), which Van de Velde learned at Hebron still was called Kellah (Memoir, p. 828). This is confirmed by Toliher (Dritte Wanderung, p. 150 sq.), although he remarks (p. 467) that Van de Velde, on the first edition of his Mose, had placed it too far south (S.E. of Idnah). A writer in Fairbairn's Dictionary (s. v.) argues in favor of the locality of Khauecii-Lebh (see Rimmer), but this is utterly out of the required region, being in the Simeonitish portion of the tribe. See Judah.

Keir, George (1582-1639), a Presbyterian minister, was born at Buckleyvye, Stirlingshire, Scotland, Feb. 2, 1770, educated at the University of Glasgow, studied theology under Rev. A. Bruce, professor of theology in the General Associate Synod, and was licensed at Glasgow in 1607. In 1608 he was appointed missionary to Nova Scotia, B. P., whither he immediately proceeded. In the spring of 1609 he preached at Halifax and Merigomish, and later took charge of the societies at Princetown and St. Peter's, Prince Edward Island, and in June, 1610, was ordained and installed as pastor, which position he held for nearly fifty years. In addition to his pastoral duties he filled the position of professor of theology in the Presbytery of Nova Scotia, to which he was appointed in 1643. He died Sept. 22, 1658. "Mr. Keir, as a lecturer, left upon the minds of the students a deep impression of the duties and responsibilities of the sacred office."—Wilson's Preb. Hist. Aintearn, 1855-56, p. 294.

Keith, George, the noted leader of a faction of the Quakers, was born of Presbyterian parentage, in Aberdeen, Scotland, in 1638. He was a man of superior intellect, who enjoyed the advantages of a superior education, not only in the University of Edinburgh, but in the National Church of Scotland, but also at the University of Aberdeen. In the year 1664 he came as a minister from the south of Scotland to his friends in Aberdeen, and, adopting the views of the Quakers, was involved in controversy. In consequence, having been imprisoned, he fled to London to escape the persecution of that persecuted people. He wrote and published several tracts in vindication and explanation of the principles of that respectable body of Christians, and in 1675 was engaged with the celebrated Robert Barclay in a dispute with the students of the University of Aberdeen in defence of the Quaker doctrines. He also, about this time, with William Penn, George Whiting, and Stephen Crip, engaged in a discussion with the Baptists in London. About the year 1682 he removed to England, and took charge of a school at Edinburgh, established by the Society of Friends. He was soon persecuted, however, for preaching and teaching without a license, and refusing to take the oath, was committed to jail. In 1684 he removed to London, but was imprisoned five months in Newgate for nonconformity. After his liberation he emigrated to New Jersey, and was there appointed pastor of a church in Barnegat, N. J. He took a very active part in determining the boundary-line between East and West Jersey. In 1689 he removed to Philadelphia, where he took charge of a Friends' school, a liberal salary, but resigned his position at the end of the school year, and travelled in N. E. England, and, in the following year, visited London, where he conducted a theological conversation with the religious professors. He is noted for his defence at this time of the Quaker tenets against Incease and Cotton Mather. On his return to Philadelphia he became involved in a controversy with his own denominations on the question of discipline and church government. He charged them with doing away, by allegory, with the narrative of the real sufferings of Christ, and consequently the doctrine of a real atonement. He also suspected them of being infected with the spirit of Deism. Penn, being in his home time in London, recommended John Turner, a justice in Philadelphia, in which he defends "honest Geo. Keith and his Patiotic studies," but afterwards, becoming acquainted with the merits of the dispute, decided against Keith. Keith returned to London, where he soon came in collision with Penn himself. A quarrel ensued, and Penn having read an extract from the text "Christ's Son cleanseth us from all sin," his exposition being strictly orthodox on their principles, namely, that "the blood is the life, and the life is the light within them," Keith took up the subject, and showed that "sin was cleansed by the blood of the true Christ actually shed on Calvary." Penn is reported to have started from his seat, and, as he himself afterwards stated in the annual meeting, being "so transported by the power of God that he was carried out of himself, and did not know whether he was sitting, or standing, or on his knees," he desired forthwith that this apostate, Keith, should be delivered over to him to be tried as an apostate, over the head of the tree. The great body followed Penn, and Keith was condemned by an edict of the annual meeting. He was not, however, in his own defence, but denounced the society as Deists, and was subsequently allowed to prove it (see Keith's Deism of William Penn, and Mosheim, vol. v. cent. xvii. ch. iv, sect. ii, part ii), and formed a society of his own, known as Christian Quakers, Baptist Quakers, or Keithians (q. v.). Still dissatisfied, he finally entered the Church of England, and became a regular priest. In the years 1702, 1703, 1704, he performed an important and successful mission on the American continent, under the care of the Episcopal Society for propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts. He was especially successful in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Seven hundred Quakers were through his instrumentality converted from Quakerism and baptized (see Humphry's History of the Quakers, Lond. A.D. 1730; Christian Observer, April, 1816). Returning to England, in 1706 he was appointed rector of Estburton, in Sussex, and there died about 1715. Bishop Burnet, who was educated with Keith at the University of Aberdeen, in his History of his Own Times (1700, ii, 144), says that Keith "was esteemed the most learned man that ever was in that sect; he was well versed both in the Oriental tongues, in philosophy and mathematics." Keith wrote a great many theological tracts, and was very zealous in directing against the Quakers, for a list of which see Watts, Bibl. Brit. The most important of all is The Standard of the Quakers examined (Lond. 1702, 8vo), which is a refutation of Barclay's Apology. See Janney, History of the Friends (Philad. 1867, 4 vols 12mo), iii, 71 sq. (E. de F.)

Keith, Isaac Stockton, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Newton, Pa., Jan. 29, 1750, graduated at Princeton College in 1775, entered the ministry in 1778, and was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian church in Alexandria in 1780. In 1788 he went to Charleston, Sc., to organize the Congregational church in that city, and at the same time engaged in the study of medicine. In 1792 he entered the ministry of the General Association of Georgia. In 1794 he became a member of the Society of Friends, and was elected a delegate to the annual meeting of the Society of Friends in Alexandria, where he became professor of pulpit eloquence and pastoral theology there, and in 1827 was made D.D. by
KEITH

his alma mater. For upwards of twenty years he continued to discharge his duties, when his mind became unstrung in regard to his salvation, and the cloud was removed by death Sept. 3, 1842. He published a Translation from the German of Hengstenberg's Christology of the Old Testament (Alexandria, D. C., 1836, 3 vols. 8vo). See Sprague, Amanti, vol. 629.

Keith, Robert, primus bishop in the Scotch Episcopal Church, was born at Uras, Kirkcudbright, in 1681. He studied at the University of Aberdeen, and in 1718 became pastor of a congregation in Edinburgh. In 1727 he was ordained bishop of Caithness, Orkney, and in 1738 became bishop of Fife. He died in 1757. His principal works are, History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland from the beginning of the Reformation to the Restoration of Queen Mary into England, anno 1608 (Edinb. 1734, fol.);—Historical Catalogue of the Scotch Bishops down to the Year 1688, etc. (Edinb. 1755, 4to; new ed. 1784, 8vo).—Chambers and Thomson's Biography, Dict. of Eminent Scotmen, iii, 305; Hook, Eccles. Biog. vi, 397.

Keith, William, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Easton, Mass., Sept. 15, 1776, entered the itinerancy in 1798, withdrew from the connection in 1803, and returned to it in 1805. He became a traveling missionary. In 1809 he was stationed in New York, where he died, Sept. 7, 1810. He was a man of fine abilities, of comprehensive mind, and logical power. His piety was deep and sincere, and his preaching talents elocution and always useful.—Minutes of Conference.

Keithiana, a party which separated from the Quakers in Pennsylvania in the year 1691. They were headed by the famous George Keith (q. v.), from whom they derived their name. Those who persisted in their separation, after their leader deserted them, practiced baptism, but received the Lord's Supper. This party was the last one in the United States. Keithianism was pronounced by an unqualified body of clergy to have retained the language, dress, and manner of the Quakers.

Kalah. See KAREMS (Spirit Worship).

Kalai'ah (Heb. Kelyayāh, g'ly-ya, perh. despised by Jehovah; Sept. Kelyān v. r. Kelyān), one of the Levites who divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity, otherwise called Kelātā (Exra x, 22).

Kaleb. See Dog.

Kaleuma (καλουμα, call). See Call.

Kell. See Talmud.

Kel'ītah [some Kel'ītah] (Hebrew Kelītāh, n'k'ly-ūth, dārīf; Sept. Kelītā, Kālītās, Kālītas, Kālītās), one of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (Neh. viii, 7), and joined the sacred covenant (Neh. x, 10); he was also one of those who had divorced their heathen wives (Ezra x, 29, where it is stated that his name was likewise Kellītān).

B.C. 450-410.

Kell, John, a Reformed Presbyterian minister, a native of South Carolina, was educated in the University of Glasgow, Scotland, and, with a view to enter the ministry, he pursued a theological course of study under the direction of the late Rev. John McMillan, then professor of theology in the Reformed Church of Scotland. On his return to this country he was ordained and installed pastor at Beech Woods, Ohio, which he left a few years later, to become pastor at Princeton, Indiana, a charge held by him for more than 20 years. He died Nov. 6, 1842. "Mr. Kell was ardent in temperament, and by constitution and habit generous. He was never neutral in the cause which he believed to be right, and, while zealous, he was liberal. Strict in regard to himself, towards others he was indulgent."—Wilson, Presb. Hist., 1864, 279.

Keller, Benjamin, D. D., a prominent minister of the Lutheran Church, was born in Lancaster, Pa., March 4, 1794. Under the faithful ministry of Rev. Dr. H. E. Muhlenberg, he made a public profession of religion, and from that time felt an earnest desire to devote himself to the work of preaching the Gospel. His classical course he pursued under the direction of Rev. Dr. D. F. Scheffer, of Frederick, Md.; his theological studies with his pastor, Dr. Muhlenberg. In 1814, before he had reached his 21st year, he was commissioned by the Synod of Pennsylvania to preach. His first charge was Carlisle, Pa. He subsequently labored in Germantown, Pa., Gettysburg, and Philadelphia, and in each charge he was pre-eminent as a pastor. For a season he was most successfully engaged as general agent of the Parent Education Society, and at a later period his services were secured by the Synod of Pennsylvania in its efforts to endow a German professorship in the institution at Gettysburg. By his uniting devotion to the work, his perseverance and tact, the object was readily attained. For some years he was also engaged in the work of the Lutheran Publication Society, in a general agency and superintendence of its interests. He died July 2, 1864, after a service of fifty years in the Gospel ministry. (M. L. S.)

Keller, Emanuel, a Lutheran minister, was born at Harrisburg, Pa., Sept. 30, 1801. Blessed with pious and faithful parents, his thoughts and desires were early shaped to the profession of the ministerial dignity. He studied theology and languages, and in 1828 was ordained at Dickinson College, Carlisle, and the study of divinity under the instruction of his pastor, Rev. Dr. Geo. Lochman. In 1828 he was inducted into the sacred office. He labored in the ministry successively at Manchester, Md., and Mechanicaps, Pa.; at the latter place he died. April 11, 1852, because the poor man of the earth the Church mourned for one of her most useful and devoted ministers. Through his direct and personal instrumentality a large number of individuals were introduced into the ministry. (M. L. S.)

Keller, Ezra, D.D., an eminent minister of the Lutheran Church, was born in Middletown Valley, Md., June 12, 1799. When young he was apprenticed to a bookseller, but his love for the profession of the Gospel was such as to cause him to leave the trade. He was licensed to preach the Gospel, the most formidable obstacles could not deter him from his purpose. While at Pennsylvania College (he graduated in 1835) he began the study of theology, and then entered the seminary at Gettysburg. After his licensure to preach he devoted himself for a season to the arduous work of an itinerant missionary for the Western States. In this work he was very successful, especially as he preached in German as well as English. Subsequently he was engaged in the pastoral work, first at Taneytown, Md., and then at Hagerstown. His residence at both places was very efficient. In 1844 he accepted the presidency of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, a literary and theological school called into existence to meet the wants of the Lutheran Church in the West, a position for which he was re- garded as admirably fitted. At the time of his death few men in the Church gave greater promise of extensive and permanent influence. Ezra Keller died Dec. 29, 1848. He received the degree of D.D. from Jefferson College in 1845. (M. L. S.)

Keller, Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, the son of Benjamin Keller, was born in Carlisle, Pa., April 19, 1819; he graduated at Pennsylvania College in 1838, and studied theology at the seminary in Gettysburg. For a brief season he engaged in the work of teaching at Wayneborough, Pa., but was licensed to preach in 1842; and having received a unanimous call to Trinity College, Princeton, N.J., he entered upon the duties assigned him as an assistant to Rev. Dr. Miller. On the death of Dr. Miller in 1850, St. James's Church was organized, of which he became pastor. This congregation, with others in the vicinity, he continued to serve with a fidelity and a diligence that never faltered, till his death, March 18, 1864. (M. L. S.)

Keller (Cellarius), Jacob, a German Jew, was born at Säckingen, in Swabia, in 1568, and entered the Jesuitical order when only twenty years old. He gained an unenviable notoriety by his controversies with
Protestants; most prominent among them is his public dispute with Jacob Heilbrunner. The Jesuits claim that Keller silenced the Protestant, but evangelical writers all deny the truth of this assertion. Be this as it may, Keller himself became a great favorite in his order, and was honored with a professorship of theology at Regensburg, and later with the rectorate at Munich. He was in great favor also with the duke of Bavaria. Kloze (in Herzog, Real-Encyclop. vii, 508) accuses Keller of having contributed, both in pen and by word of mouth, towards the feeling of hatred which divided Protestants and Romanists just before the Thirty Years' War. Keller died Feb. 23, 1631.

Kellerman, Georo, a celebrated Roman Catholic, was born Oct. 11, 1776, near Munster (Germany), and was educated at the University of Munster and in the Roman Catholic seminary of that place. He was ordained priest Aug. 2, 1801, but did not hold any priestly office until 1811, filling up to this time the position of private tutor in the family of the celebrated count of Solberg, and to Kellerman, no doubt, is due the strong Roman Catholic tendencies of the Solberg family. In 1813, as he was returning from Castile, arrested and imprisoned, those of the professorship of New-Testament exegesis in the Roman Catholic theological school at Munster, which in 1836 he exchanged for those of pastoral theology. December 15, 1846 he was elected bishop of Munster, but resigned the following January after, March 29, 1847.

Presbíteri (Munster, 1830, 3 vols. 8vo; 1831, and 1833):

Gesch. d. A. u. N. Test. (an abridgment of the large work of Overberg, and extensively used as a text-book in Roman Catholic schools); and edited several works of others.—Weitzer und Weibe, Kirchen-Lex. xii, 641.

Kelley, Chas. H., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Loggan Co., Ky., 1821; emigrated to Indiana in 1829; was converted in 1836; entered the Indiana Asbury University in 1845, but his health soon failed, and he left; entered the Indiana Conference in 1846; was transferred to the Missouri Conference in 1849, and appointed to St. Joseph station; in 1850 was stationed at St. Louis; in 1851 at Independence; and in 1852 at Logrango Mission. While on this work he was arrested, on Feb. 18, 1853, by a band of ruffians, on a pretended suspicion of his identity with Chas. F. Kelley, who had recently escaped from the state-prison at Fort Madison. Thither he was forced on a stormy night, and though the state officers instantly set him at liberty, the outrage and exposure of the eighteen hours he was in the hands of the mob threw his feeble system into sickness, and he died shortly after, Sept. 17, 1853. He was a good man, an able and faithful preacher, and much lamented by his countrymen. —Minutes of Conf. V. 1853 (G.T.)

Kells (originally Kielme) is the name of an ancient Irish town in which a very important synod was held A.D. 1152. It was convoked by Papprio ( Paparo?), cardinal priest, and the pope's (Eugenius III) legate, for the formal reception of the Irish Church into the see of Rome. The Church of Ireland, which had been founded A.D. 439, remained until the close of the 9th century, and even later, almost entirely isolated from the rest of Christendom. Through these long years, bishop Usher says (iv, 325), "All the affairs of the bishops and Church of Ireland were done at home . . . the people and the kings made their requests to the bishops." All this to the Church, in her isolation and poverty, grew from infancy to maturity, following the plain scriptural teachings of her unlettered founder, without perhaps knowing anything of the refinements and innovations which were arising on the Continent. The irruption of the Danes in A.D. 796 brought the Irish Church into closer communion with the Church, into more general communication with continental Europe; and when, towards the close of the 9th century, many of the colonists in Ireland embraced Christianity, their clergy applied to the English, whom they claimed as their kinsman, for ordination, and A.D. 1065, Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, ordained for them Donatus as the bishop of Dublin. On his consecration Donatus made the following declaration: "I, Donatus, bishop of the see of Dublin, in Ireland, do promise canonical obedience to you, O Lanfranc, archbishop of the holy church of Canterbury, and your successors" (Hist. Men of Ireland, i, 255). This was the first promise of fealty on the part of any church in Ireland, and it was made by a foreigner (no native had ever made such a pledge), and gave rise to two Church organizations, the old one founded by St. Olaf, and the new Dublin-Irish Church started by this action of the archbishop of Canterbury. The Synod of Kells was called to bring about a union of the two branches, or, at least, to establish on a permanent basis the claims of Romanism. We cannot tell who composed this celebrated synod at Kells, for from this time forward all the records were in the keeping of the new organization; those of the old were either accidentally or intentionally lost. It is not, however, very probable that the old Irish government of nearly seven hundred years' standing would at once dissolve itself and merge into the new one, whose purposes they had so long resisted. Besides, nearly twenty years afterwards, in A.D. 1170, we find the old Synod of Armagh still in existence, deploring and protesting against the slaughterings and devastations of the English under Henry II, whom the popes had then sent to Ireland to bring the people under canonical conformity." Papprio clearly recognized it as his task to establish a hierarchy where none had ever existed before, and for this purpose he attempted to suppress most of the former Irish bishops, and to create four great archiepiscopal sees—those of Armagh, Cachel, Dublin, and Tuam—by instituting a system of tithes, claiming Peter's power, and requiring conformity in all Church matters "to the one catholic and Roman office." He brought also with him the palliums or investitures from the pope for the four newly-created archiepiscopal sees; the reception of these was regarded as so many pledges of fealty and obedience to the popes of Rome. The public presentation and reception of these badges had long been an object of great solicitude on the part both of Rome and of several of the prominent bishops in England and Ireland; for, in their estimation, until this was done, there seemed to have been something wanting in regard to a full and complete union. All of these measures, as we have seen, were, however, inaugurated and carried forward by the Dano-Irish and a small Romanizing party in Ireland. The native clergy, with few exceptions, actively opposed them had they not looked upon the Danes as mere colonists. To their sorrow, the Irish learned, when too late, that the Roman hierarchy had been successfully established in Ireland by the action of the Synod of Kells. See ancient History of the Irish Church, p. 6. See Ireland. (D. D.)

Kelly, John, a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born at Rocky Creek, Chester District, S. C., in 1772, and was educated abroad (at Glasgow College, Scotland), as was the custom and necessity in his day. His theological studies he pursued under the direction of the Rev. Dr. McMillan, of Stirling, Scotland. He returned to North Carolina in 1809, and at Chocowinity, Pitt County, on June 18, 1809, was licensed to preach. Two years later he was ordained and appointed missionary in the Western States and Territories, and settled finally at Beech Woods, Butler Co., Ohio. He was released from active service in 1837, but continued preaching up to the time of his death, Nov. 5, 1842. "His life was one of piety and usefulness, active and under his faithful ministry many a spot in the wilderness was seen to bud and blossom as the rose."—Sprague, Amala, ix (Ref. Presb.), p. 65.

Kelly, Thomas, was born in Queen County, Ireland, about 1769, and was the son of Judge Kelly, of Keltville. He graduated at the Dublin University with the highest degree in law. He entered the Temple, London, and while there en-
joyed the friendship of his celebrated countryman, Edmund Burke, but before the completion of his legal studies, his mind having been strongly exercised upon the subject of religious liberty, he entered upon a course of theological reading, and in 1788 was ordained a clergyman of the Established Church. Kelly became one of the most popular preachers in Dublin, and crowds flocked to his church Sunday after Sunday to listen to his fervent appeals. In 1827, he was elected president of the University of Dublin. He was also skilled in music, and composed a volume of airs for his hymns which were remarkable for their simplicity and sweetness. In October, 1854, while preaching to his own congregation, he was seized with a slight stroke of paralysis, which gradually lessened his strength, till he died May 14, 1855. Mr. Kelly was the author of *Andrew Duns*, a controversial work on Romanism, and of *The Dialogue on Imputed Righteousness*, but as a writer he is best known as the author of *Hymns on Various Passages of Scripture* (the last edition, published in Dublin, 1853, contains seven hundred and sixty-five hymns).

**Kelpies**, in Scotch mythology a name for departed spirits, who are said to return to this world in the shape of river-horses. They correspond to the Nok of Norwegian mythology. See Thorpe, *Northern Mythology*, ii, 22.

**Kelsey, James**, a Methodist Episcopal minister, born at Tyringham, Mass., Oct. 18, 1782, was converted in 1796, entered the Philadelphia Conference in 1806, and labored with great success. He died in 1840 (?). James Kelsey was a good man, and through a long service was intent on the work of saving the souls of men.

—Minutes of Conferences, iii, 146.

**Kelso, George W.,** a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Louisa County, Va., in 1815, and emigrated while young to Tennessee. He was educated at the Nashville University, joined the Tennessee Conference in 1835, was transferred to the Virginia Conference in 1843, and died at Richland, Va., Aug. 10, 1845. He was a soul-saved, faithful and very successful minister, not brilliant, but sound and equitable, and very trustworthy in all things.

—Minutes of Conferences, iii, 460.

**Kemp, James, D.D.,** a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Aberdeen, Scotland, in 1764, of Presbyterian parentage; graduated at Aberdeen University (Marischal College) in 1786, and the year following came to this country. At first he engaged in teaching, but, finally deciding to join the Episcopal Church, he prepared for the ministry; was ordained by bishop White Dec. 26, 1789, and the year following became rector of Great Choptank parish, Maryland, where he remained for more than twenty years. In 1802 he received from Columbia College the degree of D.D. Two years later he was elected suffragan bishop with bishop Coggins, of Maryland, with the understanding that he was to succeed the latter in case he was the survivor. He was consecrated for this position at New Brunswick, New Jersey, Sept. 1, 1814. The jurisdiction of bishop Kemp was exercised especially over the parishes on the Eastern Shore; in 1816, however, on bishop Coggins's death, the whole diocese came under his charge, and by his prudence and moderation he conducted the church and laity. In 1816 he accepted the provostship of the University of Maryland, and held it until the time of his death, Oct. 28, 1827. (J. H. W.)

**Kemp, Thomas Williams,** a minister of much promise in the Lutheran Church, was born in Frederick Co., Md., July 23, 1840. He was brought up in a Christian home, and his religious nurture his religious principles were successfully developed, and the foundation of his character laid. His childhood and youth were characterized by an exemption from everything vicious, by unusual sprightliness, and an eager desire for study. For four years he was a pupil of Dr. Mary's (Quaker) School. He subsequently entered Pennsylvania College, and graduated in 1854. He commenced his theological studies under the direction of Drs. Morris, Seiss, and Webster, at the time pastors in Baltimore, and completed them at the seminary in Gettysburg. He was licensed to preach in 1855. For a brief period he was associated with Dr. Stork in the pastoral work in Philadelphia. He subsequently took charge of a Mission Church in Chicago, Illinois, but the climate proving unfavorable to his health, he was obliged to retire from the field. He visited foreign lands, but returned from his pilgrimage to die amid the scenes of his childhood and the embrace of loved ones at home. He passed peacefully away Sept. 15, 1861. (M. L. S.)

**Kemp, van der, John Theodore, a Dutch missionary, was born at Rotterdam in 1748, and studied Oriental languages and theology at the University of Leyden, but his graduation was delayed by his entrance in a regiment of dragoons, in which he soon attained the grade of lieutenant. He left the army, however, and turned to the study of medicine at Edinburgh, and in 1751 commenced practicing at Dort; but, in the end, he turned to theology. The loss of his wife and daughter, who were drowned together, so affected him that he devoted himself exclusively to the service of his divine Master. About this time he wrote a work on St. Paul's theodicy (published in 1758), and later he went as a missionary to the Hottentots. Arriving at the Cape of Good Hope, he obtained leave from a Dutch frere king to settle in his states, but was subsequently driven away by the jealousy of the Dutch settlers. Retained at the Cape by governor Jansens until 1806, he was then permitted by the English governor Baird to settle at Batavia, where he lived until his death, at his mission, which he drew up in 1809, does not show him to have been particularly successful in his attempts to civilize the natives. He died at the Cape Dec. 7, 1811. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxix, 359. (J. N. P.)

**Kemppe, Stephan, one of the leaders in the German Reformation of the 16th century, the founder of Protestantism in the city of Hamburg, was born towards the close of the 15th century. He was educated at Rostock, and became a Franciscan monk in 1528; but, while on business for his order at Hamburg, he became acquainted with the reformer Joachim Stüter, and soon was himself one of the most enthusiastic preachers of the new religion. To Kemppe belongs the glory, indeed, of the evangelization of Hamburg. One of his ablest assistants in the glorious work was Ziegenhagen (q. v.). In 1528 they had so far gained the upper hand that the Roman Catholics were obliged to leave the city altogether in their hands. In 1529, also, Kemppe aided the good cause of the Lutherans; in fact, wherever, in the immediate neighborhood of the Hanse cities, his assistance was needed to further the reformation movement, it had not to be asked for twice. He died at Hamburg October 23, 1540. He wrote a narrative of the Reformations in Hamburg, which was published by Mayer in *Das Evangelische Hamburg* (Hamburg, 1593, 12mo).

**Kemper, Jackson, D.D., LL.D., first missionary bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, was born at Pleasant Valley, in Dutchess County, New York, Dec. 24, 1759. When about twelve years of age he was sent to the Episcopal Academy, Amherst, Conn., and remained there two years; after that he was put under the charge of Rev. Dr. Barry, a graduate of
Trinity College, Dublin, at that time one of the most distinguished classical teachers in the country; entered Columbia College in 1805, and graduated in 1809. He began the study of theology under the care of bishop Moore and the clergy of Trinity parish, there being no theological seminaries in those days. As soon as he had reached the age of twenty-five he was ordained deacon at the hands of bishop White, in St. Peter's Church, Philadelphia, on the second Sunday in Lent, 1811. He was immediately called to the assistantship under bishop White, and held that position till June of 1811, when he accepted the rectorship of St. Paul's Church, Norwich. In 1829 he was elected the first missionary bishop of the American Church. His jurisdiction comprised "the North-west." Out of it have been formed the dioceses of Missouri, Indiana, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska. Early in the winter of this year bishop Kemper reached St. Louis, where he took up his residence until he removed to Wisconsin in 1844. Meanwhile (about 1838) he had been elected to the bishopric of Maryland, but this honor he declined, preferring the more burdensome but less honorable position of missionary bishop. In 1847, Wisconsin having been organized into a diocese, the Primary Convention elected bishop Kemper diocesan. This was also declined; but in 1854, being again unanimously elected, he accepted, only upon condition that his acceptance should allow him to remain missionary bishop. The Convention acceded, he resigned his office as missionary bishop, and from that time until his death, May 24, 1870, his labors were confined to the diocese of Wisconsin. He was active in the establishment of a theological seminary within the bounds of his diocese; and when, in 1845, it was founded at Nashotah, Wisconsin, the bishop took up his residence on a farm adjoining.

Kempis, John a, a German monk, brother of Thomas a Kempis (q. v.), was born at Kempen, near Cologne, in 1480. About 1830 he came to Deventer, and was admitted by Gerard Groot among the Brethren of the Common Life. He became successively one of the first members of the Canons Regular of Windesheim in 1505; prior of the Convent of Mariabrunn, near Arnhem, in 1529; and of the new Convent of Mount St. Agnes, near Zwol, in 1299. Here he remained nine years, during which he caused the building, etc., of the convent to be finished. He subsequently directed four other establishments of his order, and died at Zwol, near Arnhem, Nov. 4, 1482. It was John a Kempis who drew up the rules of the chapter of Windesheim, the central establishment of his order. Gerson pronounced his eloquence in the Council of Constance. See Buschius, Chronicon Windesheimense; Rosweide, Vita Joh. a. Kempis (Appendix ad Anima Thome a Kempis, Chirn Mone Montis St. Agnetis); Mooren, Nachrichten über Thom. a. Kempis, p. 134.—Hofer, Novi. Biogr. Général. xxvi, 542. (J. N. P.)

Kempis, Thomas a (so called from his native place, Kempen, a village in the diocese of Cologne; his family name was Hämerken [Latinized Mallecorus, Little Hammer]), one of the most celebrated mystics and forefathers of the Reformation of the 16th century, was born about 1480. Thomas's parents could ill afford the aspiring youth any superior advantages of education, but, trained by a pious mother, he had early inclined to the priesthood, and, aware of the advantages afforded young persons by the monastic brotherhood known as the Brethren of the Common Life (q. v.), he quitted his parental roof at the age of thirteen to seek further educational advantages than he had enjoyed at his home, under the instruction of the celebrated John Bekehme, then at the head of a school at Deventer, superintended by the "Brethren of the Common Life," and at school, and his life he devoted to the study of Florentius, one of the principal disciples of Gerhard Groot, and the superintendent of the brotherhood, whose protection Thomas was enjoying.
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tius, not at low to discover in Thomas' abilities of a high order, embraced every opportunity to draw the pious youth closer to his side, and in 1586 finally offered him a home at his own house, the head-quarters of the brethren, to study and watch more closely the character and inclinations of the youthful stranger. Surrounded by pious companions, Thomas formed with Mount St. Agnes a friendship that lasted the rest of his life. Thomas was soon inclined to a life of asceticism. "Examples," says Thomas a Kempis himself, "are more instructive than words" (Voll. ßioar. xxv, 1, p. 93). Possessed of a boiling mind, and animated by a pious so fervent as to press and, from time to time, shake the best of others, such was the effect produced upon him by the brethren's whole manner of life, that the seven years he spent in the zealous exercise of piety and the prosecution of his studies at the school and brother-house of Deventer were his seven years spent in an actual paradise. About 1400 he petitioned father Florentius for a recommendation to admit him into the convent of Mount St. Agnes, near Zwol, of which his brother John a Kempis (q. v.) was then prior, and with a hearty welcome he entered this monastery as a novice among the regular canons. Strangely enough, however, the vow he was bent upon his vocation, and although both nature and previous education had perfectly adapted him for it, he did not plunge into it without consideration. Debarred even in his youthful zeal, he spent five years in a student's life at the monastery of Mount St. Agnes, near Zwol, in 1299. He was not until about 1413 that he was ordained to the priesthood. Before this ordination he had buried himself, like all worthy disciples of the brotherhood, in the copying of MSS. and in the performance of religious exercises. Now that he was a priest, his chief occupation became the delivery of religious discourses and the duties of the confessional. He continued, however, copying religious MSS. Thomas a Kempis, indeed, applied himself with vigor to this labor, to which he brought a quick eye and a skilful hand. He copied out the whole Bible, a missal, and a multitude of other works, which the monastery of Mount St. Agnes preserved; but, in performing this office, he also practiced the advice of one of the ancients, who, in writing out books, did not only seek by the labor of his hands to gain food for his body, but also to refresh his soul with heavenly nourishment. He was humble, meek, ready to give consolation; fervent in his exhortations and prayers, spiritual, contemplative, and his efforts in this direction have been set in the composition of an original treatise, which to this hour remains one of the most perfect compositions in religious literature, by many considered the most beautiful uninspired production—the Imitation of Christ (see below). In 1425 Thomas was appointed subprior, an office which intrusted to his care the spiritual progress of the brethren and the instruction of novices. A difficulty having occurred between the pope on the one side, and the chapter and nobility of Utrecht on the other, about the election of Rudolph of Diepholz as archbishop, the diocese was put under interdict, and the canons of Mount St. Agnes in 1429 to retire to Lunskerke, in Frieland, and, but returned in 1432, when Thomas became procurator of the convent. But, as the duties of this office appeared to absorb him too much from meditation and his more profitable labors as an author, he was about 1449, resigned in the subpriorate, and, on October 19, 1471, until his death, July 26, 1471. "From the nature of the case, we have little to say of Thomas' cloistered life. Without any considerable disturbance, it flowed on like a limpid brook, reflecting on its calm surface the unclouded heavens. Quiet industry, lonely contemplation, and secret prayer filled up a day that was like another." Among his contemporaries Thomas was eminently distinguished for sanctity and ascetic learning.
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Works.—The reputation of a Kempis, however, rests not upon his ascetic character, but rather on the productions of his pen—his sermons, ascetical treatises, pious biographies, letters, and hymns—and from these only one need be selected to claim for him the mastery as a writer. In the first volume of his works, the Life of Christ, there are, for fifteen years, only one short and half as no doubts, and as even its effects have demonstrated it to do, in point of excellence far above all the rest, the purest and most finished production of Thomas; a work which, next to the sacred Scriptures only, has had the largest number of Paraphrases and translations into modern literature, and at any rate, or modern, can furnish an example. In its pages, says Milman (Latin Christianity, vi, 482), “are gathered and concentrated all that is elevating, passionate, profoundly pious in all the older mystics. No book, after the holy Scripture, has been so often reprinted; none translated into so many languages, ancient and modern,” extending even to Greek and Hebrew, or so often retranslated. Sixty distinct versions are enumerated in French alone, and a single collection, formed at Cologne within the present century, comprised, although confessedly incomplete, no fewer than 500 distinct editions. Indeed, it may be somewhat of a surprise to some to learn that this book has had an important influence on the mind of John Wesley and on the origin of Methodism. Wesley published a translation of it, entitled The Christian’s Pattern. It was one of the most important rules by which he lived, and which he himself enunciated, and is still on their catalogue. “It should be,” says one of the most distinguished American Methodistists, “in the hands of every Methodist.”

Strange, indeed, it seems, that the authorship of a work so popular and so widely noted, and of comparatively recent origin, should ever have been a subject of doubt and long controversy. Shortly after the death of Thomas a Kempis a violent dispute arose between the Canons Regular of St. Augustine and the Benedictines, the former claiming De Imitatione Christi as the work of Thomas a Kempis and the latter assigning it to have been the production of the celebrated John Gerson (q. v.), chancellor of the University of Paris, who died in 1429. These two persons were generally cited as its authors until the beginning of the 17th century, when the Spanish Jesuit Manriquez discovered a MS, which credited it to John Gerson, or Gerson, abbe of Vercellin in the early part of the 16th century. Since that time (1604) three competitors have divided the voices of the learned—not alone individuals, but public bodies, universities, religious orders, the Congregation of the Indies, the French Academy; and the assertions of these respective claims have carried into the controversy no trifling amount of polemical acrimony. So much has been written on the subject, especially by French and Netherland antiquaries, that its discussion and bibliographical work would make up quite a little library. Among the French writers the tendency of opinion has been to give the merit of this celebrated work to John Gerson. “Kempis,” argued Messieurs Barther and Leroy, “was an excellent copyist; his copy of the Bible—the labor of fifteen years—was thought a master piece of typography. And he was merely employed in transcribing the work of Gerson, basing their inference mainly on the name and date of an ancient MS of the De Imitatione preserved in the library at Valenciennes. German writers, on the other hand, have always been decidedly in favor of assigning the work to Thomas Kempis and to the discovery by bishop Malon of a MS in the library at Brussels, bearing the name of Thomas a Kempis as author, the Belgians have joined the Germans. The proofs in favor of Thomas a Kempis are thus stated by M. Ernest Gregoire (in Hoeder, Nouv. Biblio. Gen., xxvii, 545 sq.).

A. the Direct Testimony of his Contemporaries.—1. John Buschius, canon regular of the monastery of Windsheim (1420-79), positively declares in his Chronicle of that convent that Thomas wrote the Imitation. As he knew him intimately, and had often occasion to see him, his testimony is important. They were of the same congregation, and Buschius was in the principal convent, where was held the general chapter, in which Thomas, as subprior, took part. Moreover, he resided there for fifteen years, only one year being absent, and half from Mount St. Agnes, where Thomas lived at the same time. It was said by some that the passage referring to Thomas was afterwards added in the chronicle; but a well-authenticated deed, drawn up in 1760, literature, and which also certifies that the subscription of the chronicle of the convent, compiled by Burchius’s own hand contains the passage written in the same hand, with the same ink, and in full, without erasure, insertion, or parenthesis. The same has been proved concerning a MS copy of the Chronicle of Windsheim, written in 1477, and another written in 1478, which was sold at Cologne in 1829. 2. Hermann of Ryd, who wrote in 1454 a description of the convents belonging to the Canons Regular of Windsheim, states as positively as Burchius that Thomas, with whom he was personally acquainted, wrote the Imitation. 3. Gaspard Pfarhein, at the end of his translation of the first three books of the Imitation, written in 1448, declares that it was the work of Kempis. 4. The author of an anonymous biography of Kempis, written before the year 1488, counts the Imitation among the works of Thomas. His testimony is the more valuable, as he had expressly gone to Mount St. Agnes, to learn all he could about Kempis. He justified Kempis from those who had lived with him. 5. Albert of Hordenberg, a disciple of the celebrated Wessel, who was himself a disciple of Thomas, wrote the following decisive passages: “The reputation of the excellent brother Thomas a Kempis attracts many people to him. About that time he was writing the book of the Imitation of Christ, commencing Qui aspiratur me. Wessel used to say that this book first rendered him zealously pius, and decided him to become better acquainted, and even familiar, with master Thomas, so much so that he actually embraced monastic life in the convent of St. Agnes.” again: “The monks of Mount St. Agnes have shown me several writings of the very pious Thomas a Kempis, of whom they have preserved, among others, the truly estimable work of the Imitation of Jesus Christ, to which Wessel owed his taste for theology. The reading of this work lasted a whole year, while yet quite young, to go to Zwolle to study belles-lettres, and to enjoy the friendship of the pious Thomas a Kempis, who was then canon of St. Agnes. Wessel had the highest regard for him, and preferred dwelling there rather than anywhere else. That he was a canon regular, who was a novice of Mount St. Agnes under Renier, which latter had lived there six years with Thomas a Kempis, quotes, in his Rosetum spiritualium exercitiorum, printed in 1491, three passages of the Imitation, naming Kempis as its author. In his Catalogue des homines illustris de la congragation de monseigneur de Windsheim (Windeheim) he names three books of the Imitation, separately, as the work of Thomas.

These various testimonies are all derived from learned and trustworthy men, all of whom, with the exception of one, were personally acquainted with Thomas a Kempis, or with persons who lived with him. They are, moreover, given with a simplicity which shows that they did not consider the question as one at all likely to give rise to controversy. They appear so conclusive that it is hardly necessary to mention other writers of the 15th century who testified to the same effect. Tribula (De Script. Eccles. c. 707) informs us that in his day Kempis was universally considered as the author of the Imitation; and though after 1441 some MSS. and subsequently some editions bore the name of John Gerson, every time that question was raised, the authorship of the 15th century it was decided in favor of Kempis. Thus Peter Schott, canon regular of Strasbourg, in the preface to his edition of the works of John Gerson in 1488, says: “Some treatises are attributed to John Gerson, though well known to have been written by other-
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fiies; such, for instance, is the work De Contemptu Mus-
di, which is proved to have been written by a canon
regular called Thomas à Kempis. The publishers of the
French translation of the Imitation (Paris, 1483) ex-
pressly states that Thomas à Kempis was the author.
The publisher of the Nuremberg edition, 1494, does the
same. Finally, Francis of Tollen, successor of Thomas
as subprior of Mount St. Agnes, gives the MS. copies of
the Imitation in Thomas's own handwriting as a proof
against Gerson.  

B. Indirect Proofs from the Various MSS. and Edi-
tions.—The oldest MS. of the Imitation we now posses-
s is that known as Kirchheim's (in the Bourgogne Li-
brary, Brussels, as No. 15,187); it contains only the first
three books of the work, but the text is of a high order
and a note to the effect that it is the genuine edition is
left unexpressed. "Be it remarked that this treatise is the
work of a pious and learned man, master Thomas of Mount
St. Agnes, and canon regular of Utrecht, called Thomas
à Kempis. It was copied from the author's autograph in
the diocese of Utrecht in the year 1429, in the cen-
tral house of the province." Another MS. of the same
period was discovered in 1852 [by bishop Müller, of
Münster], in the gymnasium of Gadesdonk, near Goch:
it contains the first four books of the Imitation: the
first he copied in 1425, and the last in 1427. It does not
give the name of Gerson, but to say he was the autho-
riser of the work is a fact that is attested by the Procanus
Regular of Bethlehem, near Dottinham, in the neighborhood
of Mount St. Agnes. Among the other MSS. we notice, in
the first place, that belonging to the Jesuits of Anvers,
who used it in their lectures on the subject and re-
respecting the authorship. It is now in the Bourgogne
Library, Brussels, as No. 5855-5861. It is all in Thom-
ass's own handwriting, and, besides the first four books
of the Imitation, it contains some other treatises of Kemp-
isis. It closes with these words: "Finitus et compositus
Anno Domini 1441 per manus fratris Thomas Kempen-
isis in Monte S. Agnesia prope Zwolana." Some have
considered this as a proof that he only copied it, for
he had used the same formula concerning the copies of
the missal and Bible which he wrote in 1417 and 1488; but
it has been ascertained that he used it also in all copies of
his own original works. The Bourgogne Library,
Brussels, preserves as No. 4585-4587 a MS. of Thomas
à Kempis containing a collection of his essays, and
which ends as follows: "Anno 1446 finitus et scriptus
per manus fratris Thomas Kempenisis, without otherwise
naming the name of the other, without even mentioning
therefore, proves nothing either for or against the claims
of Kempis. But it is worthy of notice that the authorship
of the ascetic treatises contained in the Anvers MS. af-
ther the four books of the Imitation has always been
unanimously ascribed to Kempis, and he would certainly
not have put at the head of them the work of anoth-
er which he had merely copied, or he would be open to
the charge of deception. There are other MSS., dated
1441, 1442, 1445, 1447, and 1451, as also seven between
1453 and 1468, which name Kempis as the author of the
Imitation. Among the many MSS. of the 15th cen-
tury which bear no precise date, but testify to this au-
thorship, we shall mention only that of Dalheim, copied
by a priest who said a mass for Kempis two months af-
ther the latter's death, and that of the canons of St. Mar-
in of Louism, which they received in 1570 from the last
remaining member of the congregation of Mount St.
Agnes. It is in Kempis's own handwriting, and con-
tains the first draft of the fourth book of the Imitation—
the first he prepared in composing the work. Among
the many editions of the Imitation published in the 1441
the name of Gerson is not used, but a very similar, and
among these we find the oldest of all, published by
Zainer (Agube, 1468-1472).  

C. Proofs drawn from the Doctrines held and the
Expressions used in the Imitation.—The principles ad-
vanced in the Imitation are so perfectly in accord with
those held by the founders of the orders proposed of the
Breviary of the Common Life, Gerhard Groot, Floren-
tius Radewinns, and John van Heusden. It may even
be considered only as a commentary or exposition of
their doctrines. In judging it thus, criticism, how-
ever, does not detract from the value of this kind of
the pièce de force that the kind of piety Groot sought to
develop among his disciples, and the latter took the name of
decreti. Now, in the Imitation we find some ten places where the
expression decreti is used to designate a particular class of
persons who applied themselves zealously and ceaselessly
to the practice of religious exercises, and to which the
author himself belonged. Some eleven other passages,
and a whole chapter even, show, moreover, that the book
was written for a religious community of which the
author was also a member, a fact quite incompatible with
the opinion which considers Gerson as the author. We


can quote here only three of the most conclusive pas-
sages: "Sepe sentimus, ut meliores et puriores in initio
conversionis nos fuisse inveniamus, quam post multos
anos professionis" (lib. i, ch. 11). "O quantus fervor
omnia religiosorum in principiis sua sancte institu-
untur, sicut etiam ab urbe et tamen ex deserto
quod tam eloquensam nostris praevia fervore" (lib. i,
ch. 18). "Suscepi, suscepi de manu tua crucem; por-
tabo et portabo eam usque ad mortem, sicut impro-
susteni milii. Vere vita boni monachi crux est; sed
arx paradisi adstante aeternius, perfessa simul; Jesu
nuntiob trinomium. Propter Jesum suscepiinmanu tua crucem; propter Jesum perseveremus in cruce" (lib. iii, ch. 56). Another and strong proof in favor of Kempis is the fact that the principles advanced in those of his treat-
ises the authorship of which has not been contested
are precisely the same as are advocated in the Imita-
ion. More than twenty chapters in these various
three treatises have almost the identical headings of some
of the Imitation. Some have accounted for this on the
ground of his familiarity with De Imitatione by copy-
ning; but this theory fails to the ground when we con-
sider that in all his other treatises, more than forty in
number, he nowhere refers to or quotes the Imitation,
which he would not have failed to do if it were the pro-
duction of some other writer. Next to the general re-
semble of these productions with regard to their ten-

ture and topics, their style is one of the most striking
points in their favor. The Imitation consists wholly of a series of separate
maxims, pious reflections, advice, axioms, without any
special connection of the several parts. A number of
MS. copies bear the title Liber sententiarum de Imita-
tione Christi et spiritu salutaris, and spirituum.
But this is exactly Thomas à Kempis's style. The
writer's own description of his manner of writing is evidently
that of the author of the Imitation: "Vario etiam
sermo et sequentia, nunc locum nunc disputantur, nunc
orantur, nunc colloquentur, nunc in propria persona, nunc
in pergamina, placido stylo textum praemittere circim flexi." (Prolog. Solilqui A mine). Some object to Kempis on the
ground that he was a mere copyist, who spent his
life peaceably in a convent, and could not have known
so intimately and accurately the yearnings, the sublime
outbursts of the human heart which fill every page of
the Imitation. We must remark, however, that none of the
Canons Regular were mere copyists, as the word is
understood in our time, but rather intelligent publish-
ers of the works they copied, and often men of great
learning. They compared and corrected the works
which came into their hands by the best authorities, and, according to Thomas, their principal
occupations were orarre, meditare, studere, scribere. Thom-
as, as we have seen, was especially intrusted with the in-
struction of the novices, and, it seems, preached on all
these absorbing large and small points. He who seriously studies his own heart, moreover, does
not need to go abroad in the world to become thorough-
ly acquainted with human nature, with its varied struggles, emotions, and yearnings. "I have," says Kempis himself, "everywhere sought rest, and found it only in solitude and among books" (De Imitat. Christi, i, 22, 6, 23, 1 sq.; iii, 84, 1-8). The Imitation, says a writer in the Revue Chrétienne (Feb. 1861), "is a great and good book for those who are not the monks of the monastery of God.

The author, whoever he may be, has sounded the depths of this abyss of love, and the abyss attracts instead of frightening him. In this faith resting on God one feels a passionate casting aside of the things of this world, and a fervent yearning for the realities of a future life.

Another book has been published by assigning the work directly to German ground, and therefore also to Kempis, are the many Germanisms occurring in the Imitation. We shall mention only five, but these are sufficient to show that the writer was thoroughly conversant with German idioms: Coder super; in, which is as common a thing as jacere in, far to depend on; gravitas, for difficulty; leviter, for easily; and, finally, aere exterius, for to know by heart.

This last is a literal translation of the German idiom (unintelligible in any other) and should have been memoriter aere. Some have, on the other hand, pointed out that in the Imitation, but the University of Paris was at that time the centre of theological knowledge, and it is no wonder if some French idioms became current expressions in the schools, while this could not be the case with German, see Gansow.

The other works of Thomas à Kempis, which are all of equal sanctity, especially with the exception of two, have been collected in several editions, none of which, however, is quite complete. Among the most important editions are those of Ketelaer, published at Utrecht a few years after Kempis' death: of Paris (1493, 1520, 1521, 1523, 1549), Nuremberg (1494), Venice (1538, 1568, 1576), Antwerp (1574). That published at the same place in 1600 by the Jesuit Sommaliis is considered the best, though it is not complete; it was reprinted at Antwerp (in 1607 and 1615), at Douay (1635), Cologne (1660, 1728, 1754), etc. A German translation of Kempis' complete works was published by Silber (Vicenza, 1864, 4 vols. 8vo). One of the latest editions was prepared by Krans, Opera Omnia (Treves, 1868, 1860), but the most remarkable modern edition is a Heptaglot, printed at Sulzbach (1857), containing, besides the original, later versions in Italian, Spanish, French, German, English, and Greek. As for the De Imitatione, it has continued in print to the present time in nearly all the languages of the civilized world.

Doctrines.—Supposing, then, that Thomas à Kempis, of whose life and principal work we have just treated, according to the 14th century standards of our age, and as seen in how far his doctrinal views entitle him to prominence in the Christian Church, and to a place among the forerunners of the great Reformation. "It is true that with him (Kempis), in common with all eminent men, a few governing thoughts constitute the kernel of his intellectual being . . . but then . . . what we find in him is practical wisdom . . . sustained by a determinate general tendency of life and spirit." It must be confessed, also, that Thomas' whole theory of Christian life and faith, in so far as we see it developed in his writings, cannot be properly called canonical, for "he draws continually from the great traditional stream." "But," says Ullmann (ii, 132), "even though the material be not to any great extent original, it yet acquires through the individuality of Thomas, compacting it into a beautiful unity, a new soul, something peculiarly lovely, amiable, and fresh, a tone of truth, a cheerfulness, and gentle warmth of heart, by virtue of which it produces quite a peculiar effect.

For a decided inclination to asceticism we always look in characters of the age to which Thomas à Kempis belonged; we do not, therefore, marvel at a delineation of this part of his character, but will treat hastily only his peculiar views on fellowship with God.

"Where," asks he, "can man find that which is truly good, and which enduringly satisfies? Not in the multitude of things which distract, but in the One which collects and unites. For the one does not proceed out of the many, but the many out of the one. That one is the one thing needful, the chief good, and nothing better and higher either exists or can even be conceived.

Comparing the fruits of the creation with the contents of the Word of God, a man is repeatedly told that he becomes anything when in fellowship with him. Whatever is not God is nothing, and should be counted as nothing" (De Imitat. Christi, iii, 82, 1). Here we find Thomas agreeing in words with Eckart of the Brethren of the Free Spirit. Both say God is all and man nothing. But with what difference of method! Instead of making the proposition metaphysically; Thomas understands it morally. "According to Eckart, man only requires to bear in mind his true and eternal nature in order to be himself God; according to Thomas, God, as himself the most perfect person, in the exercise of his grace, from fulness of the blessings that reside in him, is pleased to impart personality to men in order that, although, morally considered, they are themselves nothing, they may through him, and in voluntary fellowship with him, attain to true existence and eternal life. To enter God, according to Eckart, means to become a sort of image of blessedness, and to become one with him, is the basis of all true contentment. But how can two such parties, God and man, the Creator and the creature, be brought together? God is in heaven and man on earth; God is in the unseen world, man in the visible world. Thus, man must, therefore, be mediation—some way in which God comes to man, and man to God, and both unite. This union of man with God depends upon a twofold condition, one negative and the other positive. The negative is that man wholly renounces what can give him no true peace. He must forsake the world, which offers to him such hardship and distress, and whose every pleasure turn into pains; he must detach himself from the creatures, for nothing desites and entangles the heart so much as impure love of them; and only when a man has advanced so far as no longer to seek consolation from any creature does he enjoy God, and find consolation in him; he must, in fine, deny himself, and wholly renounce—be dead to—selfishness and self-love, for whoever loves himself will find, wherever he seeks, only his own little, mean, sinful self, without being able to find God. This last is the hardest of all tasks, and can only be attained by deep and earnest self-acquaintance. But however strictly exercises self-examination will infallibly come to recognise himself in his meanness, littleness, and nonentity, and will be led to the most perfect humility, entire contrition, and ardent longing after God. But even then it remains to be seen how far he has followed the way. For, if he has renounced all this world, and is joying in his own eyes can God become great to him; only when he has emptied himself of all created things can God replenish him with his grace . . . Having condensed his whole doctrine into the short rule, Porta with oil, and then find all, he immediately subjoins, Lord, this is not to work a day, nor a game for children. These few words include all perfection." Here, accordingly, an efficacy must intervene which is superior to human strength. This efficacy is divine love imparting itself to man, and becoming the mediatrix between God and him, between heaven and earth. Love brings together the holy God who dwells in heaven and the sinful creature upon earth, uniting that which is most humble with that which is most exalted. It is the truth that makes man free, but the highest truth is love. Divine love, bringing the man and the creature into union, is God. God天府s love for his love into the heart of man, who thereby acquires liberty, peace, and ability for all good things; and, made partaker of this love, man reckons as worthless all that is less than God, loving God only, and loving himself no more, or, if at all, only for God's sake. He who does not seek himself in anything, but only desires that God may be glorified. He cares not to have joy in himself, but refers all to God, from whom, as their source,
all blessings flow, and in whom, as their final end, all saints find a blissful repose" (Ullmann, ii, 140 sqq.).

Naturally enough, Thomas à Kempis shares the notion of his day—that almost the whole medieval period—in reckoning monachism the highest stage of the Christian life, and the monk the perfect Christian. But this is due, first of all, to the high ideal which Thomas had of monachism, and of which he was himself no mean exponent. Amonstrous, therefore, characterizes all that he writes.

Indeed, even a tint of the Pelagianism of the mediaval theology fastens also upon him, and is especially manifest in those of his writings which are devoted to the delineation and recommendation of the monastic life, where the notion of merits plays a not unwarranted part. Monachism, as he sees it, is a religious system, not justification by faith, but reconciliation by love.

It is even true that "Thomas was a strict Catholic, and directly impugned nothing which had received the sanction of the Church," and that "he practiced with great zeal the whole divine worship as it then obtained, and which, as such, appeared to him just what it ought to be. He insists with particular urgency upon what is so characteristically Roman, prayers for the dead offered through the medium of the mass, especially the adoration of the saints, among whom was, of course, the patronage of the Church, his own monastery, and, most of all, the service of Mary, to whom he ascribes so important a share in the divine government of the world as to say of her, "How could a world which is so full of sin endure unless Mary, with the saints in heaven, were daily praying for it?" (De Discipl. Chremat. cap. 55, Spec. Corp. Diat. i, 2, p. 84; and see also Trithemius, De Script. ced. c. 707, p. 164; Specul. Exemplar. Diat. x, § 7). He no less acknowledges the existing hierarchy and ecclesiastical constitution in their whole extent, together with the priesthood in its function of mediating between God and man; but, if he does not attack, neither does he defend or establish, any, in many respects, he may be said, by his negative position, to have not only actually destroyed the influence of the Church, but really to have paved the way for reform. However true it be that Thomas is "literally a reformer," he nevertheless is a reformer, for he desired the same objects as Luther; for the former, like the latter, everywhere insists upon the Christian principles of spirituality and freedom which formed the very basis of the Lutheran Reformation. In the 12th century mysticism was the dominant principle of the Church, but not so the practical mysticism of the 15th century, as exhibited by the Brethren of the Common Life, and especially by Thomas. By this time the tables had turned completely. The position once occupied by scholasticism was now assumed, in a measure, by the Common Life, and was adopted, both consciously and unconsciously, the opponent of the Church: it founded or gave life to the institutions which sent forth the most influential precursor—the very leaders of the great German reform—and in many other respects directly or indirectly exercised a positive influence upon the Reformation. For did not the Brethren of the Common Life labor in many new ways to prepare the way for the great reforms of the 16th century? Who but they afforded religious instruction to the people in their mother tongue, and sought their improvement by every means—educated the young, and circulated the Bible? "And, inasmuch as à Kempis also belongs to that side, inasmuch as he is manifestly anti-scholastic, gives prominence to the religious and moral import of the dogmas, and applies it almost exclusively to the use of the mystical and ascetical life, we must, from the very context, regard him as the opponent of the Church, as the opponent of the Church, and not as the Church, inasmuch as, although an indirect influence on the dissolution of the creed" (Ullmann, ii, 158).

See Brewer, Thomas à Kempis Biographia; Ullmann, Reformers Before the Reformation, ii, 114 sq.; Bähring, Thomas à Kempis und seine Umgebung, etc.; Lehen Sargstellet (Berlin, 1854, 3vo); Moore, Nachrichten zu Thomas à Kempis (Crefeld, 1855, 12mo); Rosweydo, Vindiciae Kempeanae; J. Fronteau, Kempis Vindicatus; Hesse, Döpstrà Kempis; Th. Carrel, Thomas à Kempis in seipso restituitus; Lus, Amor, Pensieri in Fiere heat, ambizius non controverse qua de auctore libelli de Imitatione Christiani agitur; et al. Delprat, Verhandeling oor het Broederschap van G. Groof (Leiden, 1686); Scholz, Disseratio qua Thomas à Kempis sententia de re Christiana exponeat; et al. (Groningen, 1693); Gansser, Werke der ehemaligen und der heutigen Erziehungs- und Bildungskunde, ii, 4, p. 347; Hodgson (William), Reformers Before the Reformation (Philadelphia, 1867, 12mo), chap. x; Kuhn, in the Rev. Chr. Aug. 1857; Contemp. Rev. Sept. 1866; Meth. Quart. Rev. Oct. 1866, p. 624; Am. Presb. Review, Jan. 1849, p. 164; Jahrb. deutsch. Theol. x, 1. (J. H. W.)

Kemw'el [some Kem'wel] (Heb. Kemwûl, קמע'ל, perhaps helper of God, otherwise assembly of God; Sept. Qum. 858), the name of three men.

2. The name of Abraham's son Nahor, and father of six sons (Gen. xxii, 21), all unknown except the last, Bethuel, who was the father of Laban and Rebekah (Gen. xxiv, 15). B.C. cir. 2050. As the name of Aram, the first-born, is also the Hebrew name of Syria, some commentators have most strangely conceived that the Syrian race was descended from him; but Syria was already people ere he was born, Laban (Gen. xxvii, 5) and Jacob (Deut. xxvii, 5) being both called "Syrians," although neither of them was descended from Kemuel's son Aram. The misconception originated with the Septuagint, which in this case renders בַּעַל תָּא (bâ‘ol 'âm, "father of Aram," by way of Tâkâwân, "father of the Syrians." See ARAM, II.

2. Son of Shiphtan and phylarch of Ephraim, appointed commissioner on behalf of that tribe to partition the land of Canaan (Num. xxxvii, 24). B.C. 1618.

3. A Levite, father of Haashabiah, which latter was one of the royal officers under David and Solomon (1 Chron. xxvii, 17). B.C. 1014.

Ken, Thomas, D.D., bishop of Bath and Wells, a distinguished nonjuror divine, was born at Berkhamsted, Herts., in July, 1829. From 1855 to 1859 he was a student at Winchester School and New College, Oxford. About 1666 he entered the Church, and became chaplain to bishop Morley, who in 1669 secured for him a prebend in Westminster. In 1674 he visited Rome, and on his return in 1679 was made D.D. About the same time he was appointed to the household of Prince Ormolu; but the strictness of his moral and religious principles having displeased prince William, he soon left Holland, and accompanied lord Dartmouth in his expedition against the pirates of Tangier. On the recommendation of the latter, he was, on their return in 1684, appointed chaplain to Charles II, and knew how to maintain the dignity of his office unspotted in the midst of that monarch's licentious court. It is said that once, as the king was on a visit to Winchester, Ken refused to receive the favorite, Eleonora Gwyn, into his house; the king, however, praised highly the dignity of the prelate's character instead of resenting this refusal, and only remarked, "Miss Gwyn will find other lodgings." In the very same year (1684) Ken was promoted to the bishopric of Bath and Wells. During the reign of James II, when the Church of England seemed threatened with invasions from the popaty, bishop Ken stood forth one of the most zealous guardians of the national Church, stoutly opposing any attempts to introduce popery into Great Britain. He did not, indeed, take an active part in the famous papist controversy which agitated the reign of James II so briskly, but he was far from being unmindful of the
danger, and while others worked by their pen, he as actively labored in the pulpit, and boldly took every opportunity to combat the errors of the day. He was an author, and did not hesitate, when the danger of the hour seemed to require it, to set before the royal court its injurious and unmanly politics in ecclesiastical affairs. Some have asserted that bishop Ken was at one time won over to the papal side, either at this time or later in life, but against this assertion speaks his devoted stand in 1688, when he protested energetically against the Edict of Tolerance, and his refusal, when the Declaration of Indulgence was strictly commanded to be read, by virtue of a dispensing power claimed by the king, to comply with the demand of his king. Bishop Ken was one of the seven bishops who signed a petition to the king protesting against the act, and who were imprisoned in the Tower for their insubordination. After the Revolution, however, he proved his steadfastness to his royal master by his refusal to take the oath of obedience to William and Mary, and thereby lost his bishopric. Even his political adversaries, however, could not but respect such conduct, and queen Mary, whose chaplain he had been, provided for him pension. He retired to Longleat, in Wiltshire, and there died, March 19, 1711. Ken was an author, a preacher, and possessed of rare learning and talents. While in the bishopric he published an *Exposition of the Church Catechism* (London, 1686, 8vo), and *Prayers for the Use of Bath and Wells* (London, 1686, 12mo, and often). Later he composed a *Manual of Prayers* (London, 1715, 12mo) — *Exposition of the Creed* (London, 1682, 12mo, etc.). He also wrote much poetry, which remains popular to this day. His works were first published at London in 1721, in 4 vols. 8vo; also *Prose Works* (London, 1838, 8vo). See W. L. Bowles, *Life of Thomas Ken* (London, 1880-81, 2 vols. 8vo); *Life of Thomas Ken*, by a Londoner (London, 1861, 8vo); Haukina, *Life of Ken* (1718); Daykinck, *Life of Bishop Thomas Ken* (N. Y. 1859); Burnet, * OWN TIMES; Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. lxxxiv; Stoughton, *Eclogae, Hist. of the Eng. Church of the Restoration* (London, 1870, 2 vols. 8vo); *s. et al.*, *Allibone, Dict. of English and American Authors*, ii, s. v.; Strickland (Agnes), *Lives of the Seven Bishops* (London, 1866, 12mo), p. 234 sq. (J. H. W.)

**Ke’nan** (1 Chron. i, 2). *See CAINAN.*

**Ke’nath** (Heb. *Kenath*, קְנַּע, possession; Sept. *Kênâ*), a city of Gilead, contained, with its environs, from the Cannities by Nobah (apparently an associate or relative of Jair), and afterwards called by his name (Num. xxxiii, 42; compare Judg. viii, 11) although in the *Revised Version* (1 Chron. ii, 25) the figure seems not to be distinguished from the explots of Jair himself, a circumstance that may aid to explain the apparent discrepancy in the number of villages ascribed to the latter. See Jair. Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v.) call it *Kenath* (Kenâ or Kenat), and reckon it as a part of Arabia (Trachonitica). It is probably the *Canatha* (Κανάθα) mentioned by Ptolemy (v. 15, and 23) as a city of the Decapolis (v. 16), and also by Josephus (War, i, 19, 2) as being situated in Coele-Syria. In the time of the latter it was inhabited by Arabsians, who defeated the *legions* led to revenge them by Herod the Great. In the Peutinger Tables it is placed on the road leading from Damascus to Bostra, twenty miles from the latter (Reland, *Pol. de 421*). It became the seat of a bishopric in the 5th century (Sud. p. 682). All these notices indicate some locality in the Hauran (Auranitaa) (Reland, *Pol.,* p. 681), where Burekhart found, two miles northeast of Suweidah, the ruins of a place called Kummat (Truev, in Syria, p. 83-8), doubtless the same mentioned by Rev. E. Smith (*Robinson's Researches*, iii, Appendix, p. 157) in the Jebel Hauran (see also Swartzer, *Asian* p. 295). The present situation is true, is rather that north-easterly for Kenath, which lay not far beyond Jegobehah (Judg. viii, 11), and within the territory of Manassseh (Num. xxxiii, 38-42), but the boundaries of the tribe in this direction seem to have been quite indefinite. See Maassoom. Kenath seems, however, to have been first made by Gesenius in his notes to Burchhardt (A.D. 1823, p. 505). Another Kenawat is marked on Van de Velde's map about ten miles farther to the west. The former place was visited by Porter (Damasus, ii, 87-110), who describes it as "beautifully situated in the midst of oak forests on the western declivities of the mountains of Bashan, twenty miles north of Bozrah. The ruins, which cover a space a mile long and half a mile wide, are among the finest and most interesting east of the Jordan. They consist of temples, palaces, theatres, towers, and a hipped-podrome of the Roman age; one or two churches of early Christian times, and a great number of massive private houses, with stone roofs and stone doors, which were probably built by the ancient Rehiphaim. The city walls are in some places nearly perfect. In front of one of the most beautiful of the temples is a colossal head of Asheroth, a deity which seems to have been worshipped here before the time of Abraham, as one of the chief cities of Bashan was then called Asheroth-Karnaim (Gen. xiv, 9). Kunawat is now occupied by a few families who cultivate learnings to the temple (Handbook for Pilots, p. 512 sq.; comp. Kitter, *Pol. and Syr.,* ii, 931-939; Buckingham, *Travels among the Arab Tribes*, p. 240).

**Ke’naz** (Heb. *Knez*, קְנֶז, hunter; Sept. *Knu’z*), but in Chron. i, 36 v. *Knu’z(i)*, the name of three or four men.

1. The last named of the sons of Ephraim, Esau's firstborn; he became the chief of one of the petty Edomith tribes of Balaam (Num. xxxvi, 11, 15; 1 Chron. i, 36). B.C. probably 1905. "The descendents of Esau did not settle within the limits of Edom. The Itu means migrated northward to the borders of Damascus; Amalek settled in the desert between Egypt and Palestine; Teman went westward into Arabia. We are justified, therefore, in inferring that Kenaz also may have led his family and followers to a distance from Mount Seir. Forster maintains (Geography of Arabia, i, 43) that the tribe of Kenaz, or Al-Kenaz with the Arabic article prefixed, are identical with the Lekeni or Leenini of Ptolemy, a tribe dwelling near the shores of the Persian Gulf (Geo., vi, 7), and these he would further identify with the *Kenaz* (properly *Anazeh*), the largest and most powerful tribe of Bedawin in Arabia. It is possible that the Hebrew Kop may have been changed into the Arabic Ain; in other respects the names are identical. The *Kenaz* conquer the desert from the Ephrata to Syria, and from Aleppo on the north to the mountains of Nejd on the south. It is said that they can bring into the field 10,000 horsemen and 90,000 camel-riders, and they are lords of a district some 40,000 square miles in area (Burchhardt, *Notes on the Bedawins and Wahabys*, i sq.); Porter, *Hunt for Syria and Pilots, p. 586 sq.* (Kito). See KENZITE.

2. Successor of Pinon, and predecessor of Teman among the later Edomitish emirs ("dukes"), who appear to have been contemporary with the Horite kings (Gen. xxxvi, 42; 1 Chron. i, 50). B.C. considerably ante 1600 B.C.

3. The younger brother of Caleb and father of Othniel (afterwards judge), who married Caleb's daughter (Josh. xv, 17; Judg. i, 13); he had also another son, Seirah (1 Chron. iv, 19). B.C. post 1658. On account of this double relationship Caleb is sometimes called a KENZITE (Num. xxxiii, 12; Josh. xiv, 5, 14), whence some have maintained that he was the son rather than brother of Kenaz.

4. Son of Eleah, and grandson of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (1 Chron. iv, 15), where the margin understands even *Kenaz*, קְנֵז, as a proper name. *Kimah*. B.C. post 1618.
KENNEDY, Samuel, a Congregational minister, was born at Sherburne, Mass., July 11, 1768, of humble parents. Young Kennedyl labored hard to secure for himself a college education. He entered Washington College, and, with a view to entering the ministry. When about ready to go to college the Revolution broke out, and he entered the army. He finally went to Cambridge University when 25 years old, and graduated in 1782; studied theology under the shadow of the same institution, and settled over the Congregational Church at West, Mass., as an ordained pastor, Nov. 5, 1788. In 1806 Yale College conferred the degree of D.D. on Mr. Kennedy. He died Feb. 15, 1814. He published many of his Sermons (from 1783—1813). Dr. Kennedy "stood high among the clergy of the Western Church by reason of his religious opinions, Dr. James Kennedy says (in Sprague, Annals, viii. 180), he was classed with those who are denominated 'liberal,' and was probably an Arian, though I think he was little disposed either to converse or to preach on controversial subjects."

Kennedy, George (1), D.D., an English Calvinistic divine, who flourished at the middle of the 17th century, was a prebend of Exeter and rector of Bilsland, Cornwall, at the Restoration, when, on account of nonconformity, he was ejected. He died in 1668. He is noted as the author of an able treatise on the Calvinistic faith, entitled A Defence of the Doctrine of Predestination (Lon. 1653, fol.). Another noted work is his reply to John Goodwin, Defence of the Doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints (Lon. 1654, fol.). See Allibone, Dict. of Amer. and Eng. Authors, ii, s.v.

Kennedy, George (2), a Methodist minister, was born about the year 1815, was converted, with a view of serving his country, and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1845 he joined the Southern Church. He was licensed to preach about 1858, and upon the reorganization of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Georgia after the war, he was among the first to return to the Northern Church. He was succeeded by deacon by bishop Clark at Murfreesboro, Tenn., and continued to labor as a missionary among his people until the organization of this Conference, when he was received on trial and appointed to Clayton Circuit. In 1868 he was appointed to Clark Chapel, Atlanta, and in 1869 and 1870 to White Water Circuit. He died there April 12, 1871. His dying words, "The gates are open and I must go," give assurance that he passed away as one of the fathers, after a useful and happy life, to the rest that remaineth to the people of God.—Minutes of Conferences, 1871, p. 278.

Kennedy, John, a prominent Quaker, was born in Cokettsch, Eng.; came to America in 1605; was a resident of various places in England when 21 years old, and in 1650 accompanied Daniel Stanton on a religious visit through the northern parts of England. He was active in the work for over sixty years, and encouraged many "to the exercise both of civil and religious duties." He died Jan. 27, 1615.—Janney, Hist. of the Friends, iv, 44 sq.

Kennedy, Bennett, an early Methodist Episcopalian minister, was a native of Mecklenburg Co., Va.; entered the itinerancy in 1789; was stationed at Wilmington in 1802; at Charleston in 1803-4; at Columbia in 1805; residing elder on Camden District in 1806, and died April 5 of that year. The date of his birth is not given, but he was dead young. He was a man of much gravity, piety, and intelligence, and was a studious and skilful preacher of the Word. His ministry was very useful, and his early death was a loss to his Conference and the Church.—Min. of Conferences, i, 156 (G. L. T.)

Kendrick, Mr., was born in Baltimore, Md., Oct. 6, 1775. After teaching school for some time, he finally turned his attention to preaching, and became pastor of the Baptist Church at Poultney, Vt., where he was ordained, May 20, 1802. He had in 1810 been appointed a delegate to the Vermont Association, of which he was a member almost}
be so, then the Kenites were the older tribe. They were nomads, and roamed over the country on the northern border of the Sinai peninsula along the eastern shores of the Gulf of Akabah. This region agrees well with the prophetic description of Balaam: "And he looked on the Kenites, and said, Strong is thy dwelling-place, and thou puttest thy nest (πτόνος, kēs, alluding to their name) in a rock" (Numb. xxiv, 21). The wild and rocky mountains along the west side of the west side of the Gulf of Akabah, were the home of the Kenites. The connection of Moses with the Kenites, and the friendship shown by that tribe to the Israelites in their journey through the wilderness, had an important influence upon their after history. Whether Moses invited Jethro to accompany him to Palestine; he declined (Numb. x, 29-32), but a portion of the tribe afterwards joined the Israelites, and had assigned to them a region on the southern border of Judah, such as fitted a nomad people (Judg. i, 11). There they had the Israelites on the one side, and the Amalekites on the other, occupying a position similar to that of the Tartar tribes in Persia at the present day. One family of them, separating themselves from their brethren in the south, migrated away to Northern Palestine, and pitched their tents beneath the oak-trees on the undulating plains of the Kinnereth district (Judg. i, 11), where we should translate: "And Heber the Kenite had severed himself from Kain of the children of Hobah, the father-in-law of Moses, and pitched," etc. It was here that Jael, the wife of Heber, their chief, slew Sisera, who had sought refuge in her tent (verse 17-21). It would appear from the narrative that along the Kenite's preserved their old friendly intercourse with the Israelites, they were also at peace with the enemies of Israel— with the Canaanites in the north and the Amalekites in the south. When Saul marched against the Amalekites, the Kenites warned the Kenites to separate themselves from them, for, he said, "Ye showed kindness to all the children of Israel when they came up out of Egypt" (1 Sam. xv, 6). The Kenites still retained their possessions in the south of Judah during the time of David, who made a similar exemption in their case in his fiefdomed attack (1 Sam. xxvii, 10; compare xxx, 20), but we hear no more of them in Scripture history. If it be necessary to look for a literal fulfillment of the sentence of Balaam (Numb. xxiv, 22), we shall best find it in the accounts of the latter days of Jerusalem under Jehoahaz and the Kenite Rechab was so far "wasted" by the invading army of Assyria as to be driven to take refuge within the walls of the city, a step to which we may be sure nothing short of actual extremity could have forced these Children of the Desert. Whether "Ashur carried them away captive" with the other inhabitants we are not told, but it is at least probable.

Josephus gives the name Κηνήτιτης (Ant. v, 5, 4): but in his notice of Saul's expedition (vi, 7, 8) he has τοὺς Σιχημῶν Ἐφραῖος—the form in which he elsewhere gives that of the Shechemites. In the Targums, instead of Kenites we find Skiharim (אֶשֶׁרִים), and the Talmudists generally represent them as an Arabian tribe (Lightfoot, Opera, ii, 429; Reland, Palest., p. 140). The same name is introduced in the Samarit. Vers. before "the Kenite" in Gen. xv, 19 only. Periplus describes the Kenites as holding the country about Petra and Cades (Kadesh), and bordering on the Amalekites (id. Græc. ed. Diodorus, note) on the east. The name has long since disappeared, but probably the old Kenites are represented by some of the nomad tribes that still pasture their flocks on the southern frontier of Palestine. The name of Bu-Kain (abbreviated from Bene el-Kain) is mentioned by Diodorus (i, 53, note) as borne in comparatively modern days by a tribe of the desert; but little or no inference can be drawn from such similarity in names.

The most remarkable development of this people, ex-

emplifying most completely their characteristics—the Bedouin hatred of the restraints of civilization, their fierce determination along the eastern shores of the Gulf of Akabah. This region agrees well with the prophetic description of Balaam: "And he looked on the Kenites, and said, Strong is thy dwelling-place, and thou puttest thy nest (πτόνος, kēs, alluding to their name) in a rock" (Numb. xxiv, 21). The wild and rocky mountains along the west side of the Gulf of Akabah, were the home of the Kenites. The connection of Moses with the Kenites, and the friendship shown by that tribe to the Israelites in their journey through the wilderness, had an important influence upon their after history. Whether Moses invited Jethro to accompany him to Palestine; he declined (Numb. x, 29-32), but a portion of the tribe afterwards joined the Israelites, and had assigned to them a region on the southern border of Judah, such as fitted a nomad people (Judg. i, 11). There they had the Israelites on the one side, and the Amalekites on the other, occupying a position similar to that of the Tartar tribes in Persia at the present day. One family of them, separating themselves from their brethren in the south, migrated away to Northern Palestine, and pitched their tents beneath the oak-trees on the undulating plains of the Kinnereth district (Judg. i, 11), where we should translate: "And Heber the Kenite had severed himself from Kain of the children of Hobah, the father-in-law of Moses, and pitched," etc. It was here that Jael, the wife of Heber, their chief, slew Sisera, who had sought refuge in her tent (verse 17-21). It would appear from the narrative that along the Kenite's preserved their old friendly intercourse with the Israelites, they were also at peace with the enemies of Israel—with the Canaanites in the north and the Amalekites in the south. When Saul marched against the Amalekites, the Kenites warned the Kenites to separate themselves from them, for, he said, "Ye showed kindness to all the children of Israel when they came up out of Egypt" (1 Sam. xv, 6). The Kenites still retained their possessions in the south of Judah during the time of David, who made a similar exemption in their case in his fiefdomed attack (1 Sam. xxvii, 10; compare xxx, 20), but we hear no more of them in Scripture history. If it be necessary to look for a literal fulfillment of the sentence of Balaam (Numb. xxiv, 22), we shall best find it in the accounts of the latter days of Jerusalem under Jehoahaz and the Kenite Rechab was so far "wasted" by the invading army of Assyria as to be driven to take refuge within the walls of the city, a step to which we may be sure nothing short of actual extremity could have forced these Children of the Desert. Whether "Ashur carried them away captive" with the other inhabitants we are not told, but it is at least probable.

Josephus gives the name Κηνήτιτης (Ant. v, 5, 4): but in his notice of Saul's expedition (vi, 7, 8) he has τοὺς Σιχημῶν Ἐφραῖος—the form in which he elsewhere gives that of the Shechemites. In the Targums, instead of Kenites we find Skiharim (אֶשֶׁרִים), and the Talmudists generally represent them as an Arabian tribe (Lightfoot, Opera, ii, 429; Reland, Palest., p. 140). The same name is introduced in the Samarit. Vers. before "the Kenite" in Gen. xv, 19 only. Periplus describes the Kenites as holding the country about Petra and Cades (Kadesh), and bordering on the Amalekites (id. Græc. ed. Diodorus, note) on the east. The name has long since disappeared, but probably the old Kenites are represented by some of the nomad tribes that still pasture their flocks on the southern frontier of Palestine. The name of Bu-Kain (abbreviated from Bene el-Kain) is mentioned by Diodorus (i, 53, note) as borne in comparatively modern days by a tribe of the desert; but little or no inference can be drawn from such similarity in names.

The most remarkable development of this people, ex-

Keni'tzite (Heb. קִנֵּיתִי, Keniziti, patronymic from Keniz, the appellation of two races or families.

1. (Sept. Ken'aresta, Vulg. Cenemæi, Auth. Vers. "Kenizites.") Dr. Wells suggests that they were the descendants of Kenaz (Geogr. i, 169). Mr. Forster adopt this view (Geography of Arabia, ii, 45), but it is clearly at variance with the record of the Moslem rabbis. In the words of the covenant made with Abraham were: "Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates, the Kenites, and the Kenizzites," etc, plainly implying that these tribes then occupied the land, whereas Kenaz, the grandson of Esau, was not born for a century and a half after the Kenizites were thus noticed. Forster's idea that the promise to Abraham was proleptical cannot be entertained. Nothing further is known of their origin, which was probably kindred with that of the other tribes enumerated in the same connection. As the name signifies hæter, it may possibly be a general designation of some nomadic tribe. The sacred writer gives no information as to what part of the country they inhabited, but, as they are not mentioned among the tribes of Canaan, they were actually dispersed by the Israelites (Exod. iii, 8; iv, 24; Num. xxxii, 10; Judg. iii, 9), and it is inferred that the Kenizites dwelt beyond the borders of those tribes. The whole country from Egypt to the Euphrates was promised to Abraham (Gen. xv, 18); the country divided by lot among the twelve tribes extended only from Dan to Beersheba, and consequently by far the larger portion of the "land of promise" did not then become the "land of possession," and, indeed, never was occupied by the Israelites, though the conquests of David probably extended over it. Bochart supposes that the Kenizites had become extinct between the times of Abraham and Joshua. It is more probable that they inhabited some part of the Arabian desert on the confines of Syria to which the expeditions of Joshua did not reach (see Bochart, Opera, i, 307). This is the view of the Talmudists, as may be seen in the quotation from their writings given by Lightfoot (Opera, ii, 429).

2. (Sept. Ken' equation, but ἐσωχρωμότως in Numb.: Vulg. Cenemæus, Auth. Vers. "Kenezeit鞄.") An epithet applied to Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (Numb. xxxii, 12; Josh. xiv, 6, 14): probably designating his twofold relation to Caleb and the Kenizzites: see further above under Ed- kvad, xvi, 158). "Ewald maintains that Caleb really belonged to the tribe of the Kenizites, and was an adopted Israelite (Isr. Gesch. i, 298). Prof. Stanley (Lectures
on Jewish Church, i, 360) holds the same view, and regards Caleb as of idumean origin, and descended from Kemuz, Easu's grandson. But a careful study of sacred history proves that the Edomites and Israelites had marrying even then, and his history, as far as practicable, to literary pursuits. He was converted, under the ministry of the Rev. Dr. Heman Bange, in the John Street Methodist Episcopal Church; was licensed to exhort the year following; joined the New York Conference in 1839; was stationed on Kingston Circuit, 1839; 1843, Bloomingburgh Circuit; 1840, transferred to Philadelphia Conference, and appointed that and the following year at Patterson, N. J.; 1828-29, Newark, N. J.; 1830-31, Wilmington, Del.; 1832, Morristown, N. J.; in 1833, transferred to New York Conference, and stationed in Brooklyn. 1835-36, pastor, in charge of New York East Circuit, embracing all the churches east of Broadway; 1837-38, Newburgh, N. Y.; in 1839, transferred to Philadelphia Conference, and that and the following year stationed at Union Church, Philadelphia; 1841-42, Trinity Church, Philadelphia; 1844, second time at Wilmington, Del.; at the close of his pastoral term the church was divided peacefully, and a new church organized, called St. Paul's, and for the two following years Dr. Kendall was its pastor; 1847-48, again pastor of Union Church, Philadelphia; 1849, Nazareth Church, in that city; 1850, transferred to New York East Conference, and that and the following year was pastor of Pacific Street Church, Brooklyn; 1852-53, returned to Washington Street Church; 1854-55, First Church, New Haven, Conn.; 1856-57, second time to Pacific Street Church, Brooklyn; 1856-59, third time to Washington Street Church, Brooklyn; 1856-51, reappointed to First Church, New Haven, Conn.; 1862, Hartford, Conn.; and in 1863 he was appointed presiding elder of Long Island District, which office he was administering at the time of his decease. The noticeable fact of the record is the number of times Dr. Kendall was returned as pastor to churches that he had previously served. Of the forty years of his ministerial life, twenty-two years, or more than half, were spent in five churches. No fact better attests his long-continued popularity and his power of winning the affections of the people. "A true Episcopalian, a true Episcopalian," says the bishop. Kendall was eminence in his gifts, in his attainments, and in his devotion to his sacred calling, and in the seals God gave to his ministry. In the pulpits he was clear; in the statement of his subject, abundant and most felicitous, clear, and connected, and his discourses and his applications. His oratory was of a high order. Out of the pulpit, the ease and elegance of his manners, the vivacity and spiritfulness of his conversational powers, the tenderness of his sympathy, and the kindness of his conduct towards the afflicted and needy . . . made him a greatly beloved pastor." He died Nov. 13, 1864. —Conference Minutes, 1864, p. 89. (J. H. W.)

Kennedy, B. J., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Bolon,Va., Aug. 16, 1808; was converted in 1842; served the Church faithfully as a local preacher until 1860, when he joined the Erie Annual Conference, and filled with great success the pulpits at Beinbridge, Mansfield, Madison, and Hudson successively. He died at Hudson, Ohio, Nov. 30, 1869. The chief elements of Kennedy's power with the people were purity of life, cheerfulness, broad Christian sympathies for fallen humanity, and strong convictions of the saving efficacy of Jesus and his Gospel. He sustained a high position in the history of his Conference.—Christian Advocate (N. Y.), 1870.
KENNEDY

29, 1806-87). See Summers, Sketches, p. 131; Stevens, History of the M. F. Church, iv, 206. (J. L. S.)

Kennedy, William Sloane, a Presbyterian minister (N. S.), was born in Manay, Pa., June 5, 1822; graduated at Western Reserve College in 1846; was licensed by the Cleveland Presbytery in 1848, and soon after in- stallated pastor of the Congregational Church in Bucks- ville, Ohio. Here he labored earnestly for four years. In 1826 he accepted a call to Sandusky, Ohio, where he ministered with great success until his removal to Cin- cinnati in 1855. His work there seemed to promise well, his congregations increased, and his influence was strong; but in the spring of 1860 his health began to fail, and for fourteen months he struggled against disease, preach- ing even the Sabbath before his death. He died July 30, 1861. He was a thorough scholar, a profound theolo- gian, and an instructive and impressive preacher. He wrote Mesianic Prophecies—a History of the Plan of Union—Life of Christ; and Sacred Analogies.—Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862.

Kennel, Philip, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Augusta Co., Va., Oct. 18, 1769; converted in 1793; entered the Methodist College in 1796; and in 1806, on account of ulcerated throat, located and settled in Logan Co., Ky. In June, 1821, he re-entered the itinerancy in the Kentucky Conference, but died on the 6th of the ensuing October. "But his work was done in the appointed limits of time, and when the purpose that he had purposed was accomplished, and his sun went down without a cloud." During his long location his labors were "very extensive and useful." "He was a good preacher, full of faith and of the spirit of Christ."—Minutes of Conferences, i, 399.

Kennett, Basil, an English divine of note, younger brother of the following, was born Oct. 21, 1674, at Post- ling, in Kent; entered Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1691; took the master's degree in 1696, and the year following entered the ministry. In 1706 he was, by the interest of his brother, appointed chaplain to the English factory at Leghorn, where he so soon arrived than he met with great opposition from the papists, and was in danger of the Inquisition. This establishment of a Church of England chaplain was a new thing; and the Italians were so jealous of the Northern heresy that, to give as little offence as possible, he performed the duties of his office with the utmost privacy and caution. But, notwithstanding this, great offense was taken at it, and several attempts were immediately made to prevent Florence and Rome, when both the pope and the court of Inquisition declared their resolution to expel heresy and the public teacher of it from the confines of the holy see, and secret orders were given to apprehend and hurl him across the sea. His felicity and safety is supposed to have been instrumental to some privilege to prisoner, to hurl him alive, or otherwise dispose of him in the severest manner. Upon notice of this design, Dr. New- ton, the English envoy at Florence, interposed his of- fices at that court, where he could obtain no other an- swer but that "he might send for the English preacher; and keep him in his own family as his domestic chap- lain; otherwise, if he presumed to continue at Leghorn, he must take the consequences of it, for, in those matters of religion, the court of Inquisition was superior to all civil powers." When the earl of Sunderland, then secre- tary of state, was informed of this affair, he sent a menacing letter by her majesty's command, and the chaplain was permitted to continue to officiate in safety (Life of Bishop Kennett, p. 33 sq.). In 1718 Kennett's failing health obliged him to quit Leghorn, and he returned to Oxford, to be elected only the year following, president of his college. He died shortly, perhaps, after, either towards the close of 1714 or the opening of 1715. He wrote in the theological department an Exposition of the Apostles' Creed.—Paraphrase on the Psalm. in verse (1706, 5vo); and published shortly before his death a Manual of Sermons on several Occasions (1715, 1716, 1780). He also furnished English translations of I. Puffendorf's Law of Nature and Nations;—2. Pla- cette's Christian Cursit.—8. Goeckes' Pastoral Instructions;—4. Pascal's Thoughts on Religion, to which he pre- fixed an account of the manner in which those thoughts were delivered by the author.—5. Bataille's Pli dei, with an account of his life and writings.—6. The Maturity of Thomas and Isai, from a Latin poem of Mr. Cam- den. Dr. Basil Kennett is said to have been a very amiable man, of exemplary integrity, generosity, and mod- esty. See Dr. Kay's Dictionary, Dict. Engl. and Am. Authors, s. v.; Gen. Dictionary; Hook, Eclog. Biog. vi, 426. (J. H. W.)

Kennett, White, D.D., an eminent English prelate and writer, was born at Dover Aug. 10, 1666. He studied at St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, and while there attracted attention by publishing in 1680 a pamphlet against the Whig party, entitled Letter from a Student at Oxford to a Friend in the Country, in vindication of his Majesty, the Church of England, and the Establishment. Through the influence of Sir William Glynne he was appointed vicar of Abromden, Oxfordshire, in 1684, and obtained a prebend in the church of Peterborough, but returned to Oxford, where he became vice-principal of Edmond Hall, the college to which he became rector in 1689; and was of the number in the Oxford diocese who refused to read the declaration for liberty of conscience. He subsequently (1700) resigned Abromden, and settled in London as minister of St. Botolph's, Aldgate, where he became the boldest champion of the Established Church, and was the re- cessively archdeacon of Huntingdon in 1701, and in 1707 dean of Peterborough, and finally, in 1718, bishop of Peterborough. He died Dec. 19, 1728. Bishop Kennett was a man, as his biographer says, "of incredible dili- gence and application, not only in his youth, but to the very last, the whole disposal of himself being to perpet- ual industry and service, his chiefest recreation being variety of employment." His published works are, according to his biographer's statement, fifty-seven in number, including several single sermons and small tracts; but perhaps not a less striking proof of the indefatigable industry ascribed to him is to be seen in his manuscript collections, mostly in his own hand, now in the Lansdowne department of the British Museum Library of Manuscripts, where from No. 385 to 1042 are all his, and most of them containing matter not incor- porated in any of his printed works. The principal among the latter are: Parochial Antiquities attempted in the History of Ambroden, Burcetce, etc. (Oxford, 1685, 4to; 1818, 4to) Eccleristic. Synods, etc., of the Church of England vindicated from the False Representations, etc. (London, 1720, 4to); Occasional Letters.—To the Subject of English Consecrations (London, 1701, 8vo), and a num- ber of occasional letters and sermons Morituri and Aides delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Peter- borough, etc. (London, 1729, 4to): On Lay Impropri- orations (see below): Complete History of England (London, 1712, 8 vols., fol.), etc. Bishop Kennett, in 1718, had made a large collection of books, maps, etc., with intent to write A full History of the Propagation of Christianity in the English American Colonies, but, for some reason unknown to us, the plan was never executed. It is to be regretted that the bishop did not carry out the project; to judge from vol. iii of the History of England which he prepared, the contribution would have been valuable to American Church history. In 1860, S. F. Wood and Ed. Baddeley published from bishop Kennett's MSS. his Lay Impropriations (London, 1720). See William Newton, Life of the Right Rev. Dr. White Kennett (London, 1730, 8vo); Wood, Athena Oxonienses, vol. ii; Chalmers, Gen. Biog. Dictionary; Hoefer, Newer. Biog. Générale, xxvii, 563; English Cyclopaedia; All- bone, Dict. of Engl. and Amer. Authors, s. v.

Kennedy, Padton T., a Methodist Episcopal minis- ter, was born in New Bedford, Mass., Sept. 5, 1810. He embraced religion at the tender age of seven, but gradu- ally lost interest in it and its personal enjoyment until his nineteenth year, when he was restored to the di-
vishing favor. He was licensed to preach in 1820; entered Wilfrid Academy, and in 1837 Middlesex University. In 1833 he joined the New England Conference, was appointed to Towson, Md., and in 1833, Hennock; 1833, East Windsor; 1836, Mystic; 1837, North Norwich; 1838-39, Chicopee Falls; 1840-41, Williamantic; 1842, located; 1844, readmitted and sent to Manchester; 1843-46, Mystic Bridge; 1847, Westerly Mission; 1848, Falmouth, Mass.; 1849-50, New London; 1850, New London Central; 1852-55, Sandwich District; 1856-57, North Manchester; 1858-59, Stafford Springs; 1860-61, Allen Street, New Bedford; 1862-65, Sandwich District; 1866-68, New London District. In 1869 he removed to the Baptist City, New York, and started a school, with the prospect of his being the head of the most important and our esteemed in their office, but their labors were attended with success. As a presiding elder, his executive ability gave general satisfaction.

Kenna, A. B., D.D., one of the most eminent Biblical scholars, was born of humble parents at Tones, in Devonshire, England, Apr. 4, 1718. At quite a youthful age he succeeded his father as master of a charity school in his native place, and here continued until 1744, when, having previously given proof of possessing a genius for the liberal arts, he was called into the neighborhood of several gentlemen who interested themselves in his behalf, and opened a subscription to defray his educational expenses, enabled to go to the University of Oxford. He entered at Wadham College, and applied himself to the study of divinity and the Hebrew; with great diligence, and while yet an undergraduate published Two Dissertations: On the Tree of Life in Paradise, with some Observations on the Fall of Man; On the Oblations of Cain and Abel (2 2. 8vo), which came to a second edition in 1747, and procured him the degree of bachelor of arts, and in 1750 the degree of M.A. By the publication of several sermons at this time he acquired additional fame, but his great name is due to his elaborate researches for the improvement of the text of the Hebrew Bible, for which he laid the foundation in 1758. It was in this year that he inaugurated his great undertaking by giving to the public the first volume of his dissertations, entitled The State of the Printed Hebrew Text Respecting the Origin of the Masora, and the First Editions (2 vols. 8vo). In this work he evinces the necessity of the undertaking upon which he had set his heart by refusing the popular notion of the absolute integrity of the Hebrew text. In the first volume he institutes a comparison, based on homonymy, of the various editions and manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible, and maintains that numerous mistakes and interpolations disfigure the sacred Scriptures of the O. T.; in the second volume he vindicates the Samaritan Pentateuch, proves the corruption of the printed copies of the Chaldee paraphrase (the accuracy of which with the text of the O. T. was boasted of as evincing the purity of the latter), gives an account of the Hebrew MSS. supposed at his day to have been extant, and closes with the proposition to institute a collection of existing Hebrew MSS. for the purpose of securing a correct edition of the O.-T. Scriptures in the original; extended the same to the N. T. and maintained the importance of the Hebrew text in the works of Jewish writers, and the importance of the Hebrew text in the works of Jewish writers are likewise subjects of critical inquiry. To the second volume Kennicott added a Dissertation Generalis, in which an account is given of the manuscripts and other authorities collated for the work, and also a history of the Hebrew text from the time of the Babylonian captivity. This dissertation, which the best Biblical scholars regard as able and valuable, was reprinted at Brunswick, Germany, in 1788, under the superintendence of professor Bruns. The faults attaching to this great work of Dr. Kennicott are thus commented on. Davidson (Bibl. Hebr. 1886, p. 188), in his masoreoth (q. v.), states that Kennicott (q. v.) as if it were wholly worthless. In specifying his sources, he is not always consistent or uniform in his method. Some MSS. are only partially examined. Neither was he able to procure us a complete list of the manuscripts from his copies. Where several letters are wanting in MSS., there is no indication ascribing the defect to textual or other reasons. The MSS. corrected by a different hand are rejected without reason. Of Kennicott's MSS. are neglected; they would have contributed to the value of the various readings.
Van der Hooght's text is not accurately given, since the marginal lexis, the vowel points, and the accents, have been left out. The Samaritan text should have been given in Samaritan letters, that readers might see the origin of many of the various readings. The edition wants extracts from ancient versions, which is a serious defect, for no one, at least, reads the M.S. and determining the age, quality, or value, are defective. In applying his copious materials he often errs. He proceeds too much on the assumption that the Masoretic text is corrupt where it differs from the Samaritan Pentateuch and ancient versions, and therefore sets about, not merely to correct it, but to formulate a new text. Yet," Dr. Davidson continues, "there can be no doubt that Kennicott was a most laborious editor. To him belongs the great merit of bringing together a large mass of critical materials. The task of furnishimg such an apparatus, drawn from so many sources scattered through the libraries of many lands, was almost Herculean, and the learned author is entitled to all the praise for its accomplishment." An important Supplement to Kennicott's Hebrew Bible was published by De Rossi, under the title of Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti (Parma, 1764, 8vo); 2nd ed., 4to, with notes, 1768. The works of Kennicott and De Rossi are, however, too bulky and expensive for general use. An edition of the Hebrew Bible, containing the most important of the various readings in Kennicott's and De Rossi's volumes, was published by Wetstein and Malmsten in 1768; but the text is incorrectly printed, and the paper is exceedingly bad. A far more correct and elegant edition of the Hebrew Bible, which also contains the most important of Kennicott's and De Rossi's various readings, is that of Jahn (Vienna, 1866, 4 vols. 8vo). Dr. Kennicott, during the progress of this work, resided at Oxford, where he was librarian of the Radcliffe Library after 1767, and canon of Christ Church. He died there Sept. 18, 1783. Kennicott's other works are, The Duty of Thanksgiving for Peace, etc. (Lond. 1749, 8vo)—A Word to the Hutchisonians, etc. (London, 1756, 8vo)—Christian Fortitude: a Sermon in Rom. viii. 37 (Oxford, 1757, 8vo)—A sermon preached before the University of Oxford at St. Mary's Church, May 19, 1755 (Oxford, 1765, 8vo)—Observations on 1 Sam. vi, 19 (Oxford, 1768, 8vo)—Ten Annual Accounts of the Collection of the Hebrew Miss. of the O. Test. 1760-1769 (Oxford, 1770, 8vo)—Critical Essays, or Short Intro, to Hebrew Criticism (London, 1774, 8vo)—Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, etc. (Oxonii, 1776-80, 2 vols. fol.)—De Interpretatione in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, etc. (Epistolae, fac. in Bibliotheca sacra, vol. ii. part ii) (Oxonii, 1777, 8vo)—Editiones Veteris Testamenti Hebraicorum cum varvis lectionibus brevem definition, contra Ephemeridem Coetitumiam criminative (Oxonii, 1782, 8vo)—The Sabbath, a Sermon (Oxonii, 1781, 8vo)—Remarks on select Passages in the O. T., to which are added eight Sermons (Oxonii, 1787, 8vo), of which more than one hundred pages are occupied with a translation of thirty-two psalms and critical notes on the entire book. It is worthy of the author's reputation." See Dr. Paulus, Memorabilia, No. i. p. 191-198; Gent. Magazine, 1768; North Amer. Review, x. 8 sq.; Welch, Neueste Religionsgeschichte, i. 319-410; v. 401-584; Eckhorm, Einleitung in das A. T. vol. i.; Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, i. 1721; English Cyclopaedia; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclopaedia, vol. ii. 3; v. c.

Kennon, Robert Lewis, a Methodist Episcopal minister, born in Granville County, N. C., in 1789, was converted in 1801, entered the South Carolina Conference in 1808, and in 1813 was ordained elder, and located on account of ill health; then studied medicine and practiced as a physician, preaching in his health periods, and as, he has not forfeited his claims to the crown, also a prince, so that he could with propriety be called both.
But in every stage of his divine-human development the Son’s oneness of being and of will with the Father remained, and by this very fact he was in his human teaching and conduct the express image of the invisible God, the personal revealer of him who is the Son of God in the form of human existence. According to this view, the immediate relation of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost did not suffer any change by the laying aside of the divine form of existence on the part of the Son, nor during the time of his existence in human form. Only according to this view also have the words of the incarnate Son of God their full force: “Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; if not, believe me for the works’ sake.” The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the works” (John xiv, 10, 11). If it be objected that the really human development of Jesus is inconsistent with or excluded by the continuance of the eternal self-consciousness of the Logos in the incarnation, we answer that this inference does not necessarily follow. There is nothing self-contradictory in the assumption that the incarnate Logos had in his one Ego a consciousness of his twofold nature. Even if we cannot explain how the Logos was conscious of himself as the eternal Son of God, and yet had this self-consciousness only in a human form, yet this is not inconsistent with the fact that he possessed the mediatorial office of the incarnate Logos; he was to know himself according to his absolute divinity and his human development; and if we suppose that of his divine self-consciousness only so much as was necessary for his mediatorial office passed over into his human self-consciousness, this double self-consciousness is in perfect agreement with his purely human life and with his mediatorial office. As to the divine attributes or powers that are connected with the divine self-consciousness, there is nothing self-contradictory in the supposition that these attributes are likewise possessed by the human Jesus, in so far as the powers of human nature, with human self-consciousness, and human volition, if we adopt the above-mentioned relative self-limitation of the divine knowledge and will as necessary for the mediatorial office. But even if by this view of the person-nature of the divine and the human in Christ the metaphysical difficulty should not be fully removed, we would prefer confessing the unfathomable depth of this mystery to any philosophical solution of the problem which we could not fully reconcile with the plain teachings of the Word of God.

One of the most fascinating and most challenging presentations of this self-abnegation on the part of our Lord is that found in Henry Ward Beecher’s Life of Jesus (i, 50), which we here transcribe, omitting its monotlimistion and anthropomorphism: “The divine Spirit came into the world in the likeness of man and was manifest as the Deity of Deity in their full disclosure and power. He came into the world to subject his spirit to that whole discipline and experience through which every man must pass. He veiled his royalty; he folded back, as it were, within himself those inefhible powers which belonged to him as a free spirit in heaven. He went into captivity to himself, wrapping in weakness and forgetfulness his divine energies while he was a babe. ‘Being found in fashion as a man,’ he was subject to that gradual unfolding of his buried powers which belongs to infancy and childhood. ‘And the child grew and was strong in spirit.’ He was subject to the restrictions which hold and hinder common men. He was to come back to himself little by little. Who shall say that God cannot put himself into finite conditions? Though a free spirit God cannot grow, yet as actuated in the flesh he may grow, if all things united with him be restored to their undisturbed glory, he exchanged, at his incarnation and during the time of his sojourn on earth, for his human form of existence, for the form of the servant. Into this his undisturbed glory, however, he re-entered (John xxvi, 5) on his going forth to his Father (John xiv, 28). Also the capacity of the exalted Son of man (Phil. ii, 9).
closure of the full power and glory of God's natural attributes, but the manifestation of the love of God, and of his grace, and of his justice, which is the divine heart would submit, in the bearing up of his family of children from animism and passion. The incessant looking for the signs of divine power and of infinite attributes in the earthly life of Jesus, whose mission it was to bring the divine Spirit within the conditions of feeble humanity, is as if one should search a dethroned king in exile for his crown and his sceptre. We are not to look for a glorified, an enthroned Jesus, but for God manifest in the flesh; and in this view the very limitations and seeming discrepancies in a divine life become connected with the whole sublime history of Jesus.

Most theologians, however, will see in this progressive development of Jesus rather the growth of the human faculties as shown by the inward sun of divine life; and in the alternate lights and shades of the Redeemer's career, not much of the circumstances imposed upon the enfranchised Deity by the earthly abode, as the mutual play of the divine and the human natures, now one and now the other specially manifesting itself. Indeed, the theory of a somewhat double consciousness, if we may so express it, or at least an occasional (and in each case a partial) withdrawal of all of the divine cognitions from the human intellect, and thus of the full divine energies from the human will, seems to be required in order to meet the varying aspects under which the compound life of Jesus presents itself in the Gospels. Certainly the conception of the divine Spirit with a mere human body is a bitter heresy, and should be rejected.

Indeed, the "flesh" which the Saviour assumed, in its Scriptural sense, has reference to human nature as such, its mental and spiritual faculties not less than its physical. The problem, therefore, still is to adjust the God to man. This, of course, can only be done by conceiving of the infinite as assuming finite relations, and this, in short, is the meaning of kenosis. See HUMILITAS.

This topic became a subject of controversy in the first part of the 17th century between the theologians of Gesner and those of Tübingen; the former (Menzel and Feuerborn) contending that Christ during his state of earthly humiliation actually directed himself (κινομας proper) of omnipotence, omniscience, etc.; while the latter (Luke Osandier, Theodore Thummius, and Melchior Nicolai) maintained that he still continued to possess these divine attributes, but merely concealed them (κρυφα) from men (see Thummius, De latiinoglogia fvgc loccti, Tübingen, 1623; Nicolai, De ctvnom Catristi, ib. 1622). For details of the controversy, see Herzog, Real-Encyc., vii, 511 sq.; xiv, 766 sqq. On the subject itself, see De Regnum Christi, ii, 29; Schröck, Kirchengesch., iv, 670 sqq.; comp. Bib. Repos., July, 1867, p. 413; Amer. Presb. Rev. July, 1861, p. 551; Meth. Quart. Rev., Jan. 1861, p. 148; April, 1870, p. 291. The treatise of Bodmer, Die Lehre von der Kenosis (Göttingen, 1860), is of a very vague and general character. See CHITOSOLOGY, vol. ii, p. 281, 292.

KENRICK, FRANCIS PATRICK, D.D., an American Roman Catholic prelate of great note, was born in Dublin, Ireland, Dec. 8, 1797, received a classical education in his native city, and in 1815 was sent to Rome to study divinity and philosophy. There he spent two years at the House of the Lazarists, and four years in the College of the Propaganda. He was ordained in 1821, and immediately thereafter came to the United States to assume the charge of an ecclesiastical seminary just starting at Bardstown, Ky. He soon distinguished himself as a pietistic writer, and his Letters of a Father to Omegas, written in defence of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, in reply to attacks by Dr. Blackburn, president of Danville College, Ky., under the signature of "Omegas." On June 6th, 1830, at Bardstown, he was consecrated bishop of that see, and was made coadjutor to the right reverend bishop Connell, of Philadelphia, whom he succeeded in 1842. During his episcopate there occurred the anti-Catholic riots, and by his firmness and promptness of effort his people were prevented from being in any way molested. In 1858, Kenrick was transferred to the archiepiscopal see of Baltimore. In 1852, as "apostolic delegate," he presided over the first plenary council of the United States held at Baltimore, and in 1859 the pope conferred upon him and his successors the "primacy of honor," which gives them precedence over all Roman Catholic prelates in this country. He died at Baltimore July 7, 1863. Archbishop Kenrick was regarded as one of the most learned men and theologians of his creed in this country. He is equally distinguished as a controversialist and a Biblical exegete. He published a series of letters On the Primary of the Holy See and the Authority of General Councils, in reply to bishop Hopkins, of Vermont, subsequently enlarged and reprinted under the title of The Primary of the Apostolic See and the Authority of General Councils, in reply to Dr. Hopkins' End of Controversy Controversied. The works, however, which constitute his chief claim to theological eminence are his Latin treatises on dogmatic theology, Theologia Dogmatica (4 vols. 8vo, Phil. 1869, 1871), and Principles of Moral Theology (1840) an abridgment and revision of the latter, which form a complete course of divinity, and are used as textbooks in nearly all the Roman seminaries of the United States. An enlarged edition of these works has been published both in Belgium and in this country.

This contains many valuable additions, among them a catalogue of the fathers and of theological dissertations, with an accurate description of their genuine works. At the time of his death he was engaged in revising the English translation of the Scriptures, of which the whole of the N. T. and nearly all of the O. T. have been published.

It is illustrated by copies of the Douay Version, and superseded the Douay version in general use." His other works of a sectarian and controversial character are Catholic Doctrine on Justification Explained and Vindicated (12mo, Phil. 1841);--Treatise on Baptism (12mo, New York, 1845). Kenrick was distinguished both for his sagacity and moderation in counsel, "and for his indefatigable efforts in extending the power and influence of his Church." While in Philadelphia "he founded the theological seminary of St. Charles Borromeo, and introduced into his diocese the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, who devote themselves to the care of Magdalen asylums." During the period of our civil war we were unsparing in his loyalty to the Union, and never failed to inculcate obedience to the laws in the face of the opposition of many of his people.—Allibone's Dict. of Authors, a. v.; Appleton's New Amer. Cyclopaedia, x, 186; Annual Register, 1839.

KENT, ABBEY, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in West Brookfield, Mass., May 9, 1780. In 1801 he was licensed as an exhorter, and appointed to Weatherfield Circuit, Vermont; in 1802 he joined on trial the New York Conference, and was appointed to Whitingham Circuit. The following year he became a member of the old New England Conference, and during the thirty-six years succeeding filled appointments at Barnard, Vt.; Athens, Vt.; Lunenburg, Vt.; Asburburnham, Mass.; Salisbury, Mass.; Salem, N. H.; Lynn, Mass.; Bristol, R. I.; New London, Conn.; Nantucket, R. I.; Middleborough, Rochester, Mass.; Chestnut Street, Providence, R. I.; Elm Street, New Bedford, Mass.; Newport, R. I.; Charlestown, An- dock, Mass.; and Erldogtown, Martha's Vineyard. During this period, ill health, brought on by the strain of indefatigable labors upon a naturally delicate constitution, compelled him after a long service (1839) to write The Letters of Clement to Omega, in refutation of calumnies and superannuated relations. In 1814-17 he was presiding elder of the New London district. He was a delegate to the General Conference in New York in 1812, and also in Baltimore in 1816. From the date of his last appointment, in 1929, to his death on Sept. 1, 1860, he was always laboring when his health would permit. He wrote much for Zion's Herald and the
Christian Advocate and Journal. His productions were characterized by a clear, concise, unornamental style, freshness of thought, and deep spirituality. Not ostentatious in the expression of his religious convictions and experiences, he claimed personal knowledge of the doctrine of entire sanctification. "Uniformly cheerful, full of hope in Christ, he always was remarkably sedate."—Meth. Minutes for 1861, New York Christian Advocate.

Kent, James, a distinguished English composer of Church music, was born in Winchester in 1700, and at an early age employed as chorister in the cathedral of that city. His talents secured him admittance to the Chapler House of London, where he enjoyed the instruction of the celebrated Dr. Croft. After completing his education, he was chosen organist of Finden, in Northamptonshire, and subsequently was appointed organist of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1737 he was elected to fill the same situation in the cathedral of his native place, which he accepted and held until 1774. He died in 1776.

Mr. Kent greatly assisted Dr. Boyce in the preparation of his magnificent work, the collection of Cathedral Music, and his services are duly acknowledged by that learned editor. Mr. Kent published a volume of Twelve Sonatas (London, 1773, 4to), among which are, 'Hear my Prayer, When the Son of Man, My Song shall be of Mercy, and others which are favorites with the congregations of English cathedrals. After his decease, a Morning and Evening Service, and Eight Anthems, composed by him for the Winchester choir, were collected and printed by Mr. Corfe, of Salisbury; but the probability is that the author never intended them for publication, as they are not equal to his other published productions. "Mr. Kent was remarkably mild in his disposition, amiable in his manners, exemplary in his conduct, and conscientiously diligent in the discharge of his duties. His performance on the organ was solemn and impressive, and he was by competent judges considered one of the best musicians of the age in which he lived" (Harmonicon). (J. H. W.)

Kentigern, St., a Scottish prelate who flourished toward the close of the 6th century, was actively engaged in the interests of the Christian Church among the natives of Scotland. He was a man of great means and great influence, and he had many active converts while bishop of Glasgow. Bishop Kentigern died about A.D. 600.

Kephar (קֵפָר, village), a frequent prefix to the Heb. name of hamlets or small places in Palestine, as in that here following; and many others mentioned by Roland (Polest. p. 684 sq.) and Schwartz (Polest. p. 115, 119, 150, 177, 177, 177, 177, 190, 200, 201, 204, 235). See Carsam, etc.

Kephar-Chananiah (קֵפָר-חַנָּנִיאָה, i.e. village of Hamanah), a place named in the Talmud, and now called Keif Aman, 5 miles S.W. of Safed, containing the ruins of a synagogue (Schwarz, Polest. p. 157; compare Robinson, Later Bib. Rev. p. 78, note).

Kephir. See LION.

Kepler, Johann, the celebrated astronomer, deserves a place here not so much on account of his services to the science of astronomy as for the relation he sustained to, and the treatment he received from the Christian Church of the 16th century. He was born near the imperial city of Weil, in Wurttemberg, Dec. 27, 1571, and in his childhood was weak and sickly. He was sent to school in 1577, but the strained circumstances of his father caused great interruption to his education. He was soon taken from school, and employed in menial services at his father's tavern. In his twelfth year, however, he was again placed at the same school, but in the following year was seized with a violent illness, so that his life was for some time despaired of. In 1586 he was admitted to the monastic school of Maulbronn, where his expenses were paid by the duke of Wurttemberg. The three years of Kepler's life following his admission to this school were marked by a return of several of the disorders which had well-nigh proved fatal to him in his childhood. To add to his misfortunes, his father left home in consequence of disagreements with his mother, and soon after died abroad. After the departure of his father he mother quarrelled with her relations, "having been treated," says Hantisch, Kepler's earliest biographer, (in his edition of Andreas and J. Kepler, etc. [Leips. 1718]), "with a degree of barbarity by her husband and brother-in-law that was hardly exceeded even by her own perversities." As a natural consequence, the family affairs were in the greatest confusion. Notwithstanding these complications, young Kepler took his degree of master at the University of Tbingen in August, 1591, holding the second place in the examination. While at the university he had paid particular attention to the study of theology, and no doubt intended to enter the ministry; but, annoyed by the strife which the controversy on the Formula of Concord occasioned, and opposed to the doctrine of ubiquity, at that time made an article in the confession of Wurttemberg's state religion, he failed to secure a position as minister. He now turned to mathematical studies. His attention was first directed to astronomy by the offer of the astronomical chair at Graz; the chief astronomer of Austria. At that time he knew very little of the subject, but, having accepted the lectureship, he was forced to qualify himself for the position. While engaged in these investigations, he came by degrees to understand the superior mathematical perfection of the Copernican system to that of Ptolemy. His general views of astronomy, however, were somewhat mystical, as may be seen in his Prodomus. He supposed the sun, stars, and planets were typical of the Trinity, and that God distributed the planets in space in accordance with regular polyhedrons, etc.

In 1595 Kepler completed his Mysterium Cosmographicum, in which he details the many hypotheses he had successively formed, examined, and rejected concerning the number, distance, and periodic times of the planets, and endeavors to demonstrate the correctness of the Copernican system, which at that time was still discredited and rejected as un-Biblical by both Romanists and Protestants. To avoid persecution, Kepler took the precaution to secure the opinion of eminent theologians of both churches before publication, and for this purpose submitted the MS. to the faculty of Tbingen University. Of course they quickly condemned the sacrilegious effort and daring of the young astronomer (see below), but not so thought Duke Louis of Wurttemberg, who not only approved of the work, but furnished the means (in 1596) to defray the expense of printing it. It must be borne in mind, in the 16th century, that ecclesiastical truth was equally unknown to the clergy and the laity, and that the motion of the earth and the stability of the sun were doctrines apparently inconsistent with holy Scripture. Besides, in those days the truths of religion were guarded by a sternness of discipline and a severity of punishment which have disappeared in more enlightened times. In order to form a correct judgment respecting the causes which led to the opposition to Kepler by the Church, and the subsequent trial and condemnation of Galileo, (q. v.) in the 17th century, it is necessary to go back to the period when they first submitted their opinions to the public. The philosophy of Aristotle was then prevalent throughout Europe. It was taught in all its universities by professors lay and clerical, and every attempt to refuse their doctrines exposed its author to the opposition of the learning and statesmen of the day. One of the principal dogmas of the Aristotelian philosophy was the immutability of the heavens. The brilliant discoveries of Kepler and Galileo struck a blow at the ancient philosophy, and consequently exposed them to the hostility of the Peripatetic philosophers. Now when we reflect that the minds of all thinking men were then completely moulded by that philosophy, and that these, again, governed the reflections of those immediately beneath them, and from them the results
of Aristotelianism, mingling up, as they did, especially with the religious opinions of the day, thus reached the whole of the popular intellect, we will find it no matter of surprise that the zeal of these innovators met with the most determined opposition. "The Aristotelian professors, the temporizing Jesuits, the political churchmen, and that vast mass of reasoning, bought, half at all times dreaded innovation, whether it be in legislation or in science, entered into an alliance against the philosophical tyrants who threatened them with the penalties of knowledge." "He who is allowed to take the stunts of his species," says Sir David Brewster, "and to penetrate the veil which conceals from common minds the mysteries of nature, must not expect that the world will be patiently dragged at the chariot-wheels of his philosophy. Mind has its inertia as well as matter, and its progress to truth can only be insured by the gradual and patient removal of the difficulties which embarrass it." Those Protestants, therefore, who are so ready to censure the Church of Rome for its action with regard to these great men should remember that it was but carrying out the spirit of the age, and a measure which the sins of the people demanded. Surely Protestantism has but little to boast of in this matter. More than half a century later we find that the great and good Sir Matthew Hale condemned to death two women for witchcraft on the ground, first, that Scripture had affirmed the reality of witchcraft; and, secondly, that the vision prophecies of the Old Testament persons criminally accused of the crime. Sir Thomas Browne, the celebrated author of the Religio Medici, was called as a witness at the trial, and swore "that he was clearly of opinion that the persons were bewitched." Not only so, but Henry More and G. G. Dawe expressed their belief in the reality of witchcraft; and, more than all, Joseph Glairide, probably the most celebrated theological thinker of his time, wrote a special defence of the superstition, without doubt the ablest book ever written on that subject. As late as 1699 nineteen persons were executed and one preserved to death in Massachusetts on the same plea for witchcraft. See Salem. "To deny the possibility, nay, actual existence of witchcraft and sorcery," says Sir William Blackstone (Commentary on the Laws of England, bk. iv. ch. iv. sec. 6), "is at once fatally to contradict the revealed Word of God and passages both of the Old and New Testament." See Witchcraft.

In 1597 Kepler married Barbara Muller von Muhlacker. She was already a widow for the second time, although two years younger than Kepler himself. In the beginning of his marriage, being the most eminent of the troubled state of the province, arising out of the two great religious parties into which the German empire was then divided, he was induced to withdraw into Hungary. The Jesuits, anxious to secure for the Roman Church the learning and renown of Kepler, earnestly worked in his behalf, and secured permission for his return to Graz. Very independent in character, Kepler was not the man to eat the bread of his opponents, and upon his frank refusal to join the Romanists he was visited with still fiercer opposition. In 1600 he paid a visit to the emperor and was received with kind consideration; the latter was appointed assistant imperial mathematician by emperor Rudolph II. Upon the death of Tycho in 1601, Kepler succeeded him as principal mathematician to the emperor, and took up his residence at Prague. The special task intrusted to Kepler at this time was the reduction of Tycho's observations relating to the planet Mars, and to this circumstance is mainly owing his grand discovery of the law of elliptic orbits, and that of the equable description of areas. These continued studies, his searchings after harmony, led him at last to the discovery of universal harmonies, which were remarkable truths called Kepler's Laws. (For an account of these, and the steps that led to their discovery, see the English cyclopaedia, s. v., where also will be found a list of Kepler's works.) In 1624 he went to Vienna, the emperor finding it improper to make good his promises to assist Kepler, to secure the necessary means to aid him in the completion of the Rudolphine Tables; it was not, however, till 1627 that these tables—the first that were calculated on the supposition that the planet moves in elliptic orbits—made their appearance; and it will be sufficient to say that Kepler aimed at that in this place, that h. Heliocivic Copernicus, in the course of his whole life but construct these, he would have well earned the title of a most useful and indefatigable calculator. He died at Ratisbon, Nov. 15, 1630, and his body was interred in St. Peter's churchyard of that city. "Ardent, resolute, burning to distinguish himself by his discoveries, he attempted everything; and, having once obtained a glimpse, no labor was too hard for him in following or verifying it. All his attempts had not the same success, and, in fact, that was impossible. Those which have failed seem to us only fanciful; that which has been more fortunate appear sublime. When in search of that which really existed, he has sometimes found it; when he devoted himself to the pursuit of a chimera, he could not but fail; but even there he unfolded the same qualities, and that obstinate perseverance that must triumph over all difficulties but those which are insurmountable." See Breitschwerdt, Johann Kepler's Lebens u. Wirke (Stuttgart 1831); Brewster, Lives of the Martyrs of Science (London 1841); Bailly, Histoire de l'astronomie moderne, ii. 4 sq.; Bayle, Hist. Dict. s. v.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexic. s. v.; Hevelius, Astronomiae s. v.; Menzel, Gesch. der Deutschen, v. 104 sq., 327 sqq.; 471; v. 10 sq.

Korach. See CHORAZIN.

Koralay, Dr., a French Roman Catholic missionary, who flourished in the early part of the 19th century, joined the Congregation of Foreign Missions, and in 1760 was appointed to a mission at St. Petersburg. In 1777 he was consecrated bishop of Rosalia, and became coadjutor to M. de Ciré, apostolic vicar of Siam, whom he succeeded in 1777. The court, which had at first appeared favorably inclined towards the Christians, soon found its annoyance, and the painter sacrificed the mission violently. The missionaries were forbidden publishing any books in the Siamese language, or teaching their doctrines to the people. Inscriptions insulting to the Christian faith were placed on the front or inside of the churches. Koralay himself also was repeatedly summoned before the authorities, to answer for his infringements of their regulations, but he displayed throughout great firmness and patience. The death of the king and the civil war which followed gave the Christians some respite, but after a short time persecutions began again, and it was during the last persecution that he died at Juthia, Nov. 27, 1787. See Lettres édifiantes; Henriet, Hist. des Missions; Pallegoix, Description du royaume Thai (Paris, 1864, 12mo); Hoeffer, Nouv. Bioî. Générale, xxvii, 596. (J. N. P.)

Kerazin. See CHORAZIN.

Kerchiev (only in the pl. Kerachiev, mispadoch), so called from being spread out; Sept. erekhâvou, v. r. wqâhâvou, The verb kerachin is an article of apparel or ornament that occurs only in Ezek. xiii, 18, 21, where it is spoken of as something applied to the head by the idolatrous women of Israel, but the meaning of which it is difficult to discover. Some of the ancient versions (e. g. Symmachus, the Vulgate, etc.) understand pillows or cushions for the head, as in the parallel member (so Rosenmüller, Gesenius, etc.); others (e. g. the Sept., Syriac, etc.) think that mantles or coverings for the head are intended. Hitzig understands the tali, or long cloth worn by Jewish worshippers. See Fausset, A Critical and Exegetical Dictionary of the Bible, and the fact that the article might be torn (ver. 21), shows that it was long, loose, and flexible, like the shawl with which Oriental women envelop themselves (Ruth iii, 15: Isa. iii, 22); and the statement that they were adapted to be placed "upon the head of every stature" (Lev. iv. 37).
to us by the Jews of olden times. On this subject we substantially adopt Ginsburg’s article in Kitto’s Cyclopedia, s. v. See Masora.

I. Signification, Classification, and Mode of Indication of the Keri and Kethibh. — The text וּרְשָׁפֶס, kethibh, may be either the imperative or the participle passive of the Chaldean verb כָּלַע, to call out, to read, and hence may signify “Read,” or “It is read,” i. e. the word in question is to be substituted for that in the text. ובָּרָא, kethibh, is the participle passive of the Chaldean verb כָּלַע, to write, and signifies “It is written,” i. e. the word in question is in the text. Those who prefer taking the word as participle, do so on the ground that it is more consonant with its companion ובָּרָא, which is the participle passive. The two terms thus correspond substantially to the modern terms scopicus (Keri) and text (Kethibh). We may add that the Rabbis also call the Keri מִקְרָא, mikra, scripture, and the Kethibh מִקְרָא, manorah, tradition; but, according to our ideas, these terms should be reversed.

The different readings exhibited in the Keri and Kethibh may be divided into three general classes: a. Words to be read differently from what they are written, arising from the omission, insertion, exchanging, or transposition of a single letter (בָּרָא ובָּרָא ובָּרָא); b. Words to be read, but that are not written in the text (בָּרָא ובָּרָא ובָּרָא); and c. Words written in the text, but that are not to be read (בָּרָא ובָּרָא ובָּרָא).

a. The first general class (variations) comprises the bulk of the various readings, and consists of:

1. Corruptions of errors arising from mistaking homonyms, e. g. כָּלַע the negative particle, for the similarly sounding כָּלַע, the pronoun, of which we have fifteen instances (comp. Exod. xxii. 29; Lev. xxvi. 17; Num. xx. 16; 1 Sam. ii. 3; 2 Sam. xvi. 18; 2 Kings viii. 10; Ezra iv. 2; Job xiii. 15; xl. 4; Ps. c. 8; xxix. 16; Prov. xix. 7; xxvi. 2; Isa. ix. 2; Jer. ix. 9), and two instances in which the reverse is the case (1 Sam. ii. 16; xx. 2).

Besides noticing them in their respective places, the Masora also enumerates them all on Lev. xi. 15. The Talmud (Sopherim, vi) gives three additional ones, viz., 1 Chron. xx. 21; Job vi. 21; Isa. lxv. 5, 8, which for four instances (1 Sam. xx. 24; 1 Kings iii. 33; Job vii. 1; Isa. lxv. 7; Ezek. ix. 5).

2. Errors arising from mistaking the letters which resemble each other, e. g. כ for כ for כ (comp. Prov. xxii. 29; for י (Ezek. xxx. 7); כ for כ (1 Sam. iv. 13); כ for כ of, which the Masora on Prov. xix. 19, and Jer. xxxi. 40, gives four instances (2 Sam. xiii. 37; 2 Kings xvii. 6; Jer. xxxi. 40; Prov. xix. 19); כ for כ (Jer. xxiv. i, xxiv. 11); כ for כ (2 Sam. xxii. 13); כ for כ, of which the Masora on Prov. xx. 21 gives four instances (2 Sam. xiii. 87; Prov. xx. 21; Cant. i. 17; Dan. ix. 24); כ for כ (1 Sam. xiv. 32); כ for כ in innumerable instances; כ for כ in eleven cases (Josh. iv. 18; vi. 5, 15; 1 Sam. xi. 1; 2 Kings vii. 14; Ezr. viii. 14; Neh. iii. 90; Esth. iii. 14; Job xxx. 13; for כ (Isa. xxx. 32); for כ (2 Kings xx. 4); for כ twice (Jer. ii. 20; Ezr. viii. 14); for כ (Eccles. xii. 6); for כ (2 Kings xxiv. 14; xxv. 17; Jer. lii. 21).

3. Errors arising from exchanging letters which belong to the same organs of speech, e. g. כ for כ, of which the Keri exhibits one instance (Josh. xxxii. 7), and vice-versa, of which the Great Masora, under letter כ, gives six instances (Josh. iii. 16; xxiv. 15; 2 Kings xv. 12; xii. 10; xxvii. 33; Dan. xiv. 18); for נ for נ (2 Kings xvii. 21); for כ for כ (1 Sam. xx. 24; 1 Kings iii. 38; Job vii. 1; Isa. lxv. 5; Ezek. ix. 5); for כ for כ (Isa. lxv. 4).

4. Errors arising from the transposition of letters,
which the Masorah designates דַּרְשָׁה, and of which it gives sixty-two cases, as, for instance, the textual reading, or Kethib, is בַּלּוֹ, the text, and the marginal reading, or Keri, transposing the letters ב ל, has בַּלּוֹ, these (comp. Josh. vi. 13; xxii 8; xxii 27; Judg. xvi. 26; 1 Sam. xiv. 27; xvi. 18, 22, 23 [twice]; xxvii. 16; 2 Sam. iii. 25; xv. 30; xviii. 17; xviii. 8; 14; xxiv. 16; 1 Kings v. 45; 2 Kings xii. 2; xiv. 6; 1 Chron. i. 46; iii. 24; xxv. 29; 2 Chron. xxv. 28; 8, 18; xxiv. 6; Ezra ii. 46; iv. 4; vii. 17; Neh. iv. 14; Ruth ii. 14; 7 [twice]; i. 14; iii. 14; Ruth iii. 14; iv. 14; xxxix. 13; 11; xxviii. 27; Eccles. iv. 4; Isa. xxxix. 27; Jer. ii. 15; vi. 8; 7, xv; vi. 22, xxvii. 13; xxvi. 23; xxvii. 23; xii. 20; 13; Ezek. xxxvi. 14; xi. 16; xii. 18; xiii. 15; Dan. iv. 9; 7, 16 [twice], 29).

5. Errors arising from the small letter ב being dropped before the prepositional ל from plural nouns, and making them to be singular, of which there are a hundred and thirteen instances (it is very strange that the Masorah Magna only enumerates fifty-six of these instances) (Gen. xxxiii. 4; Exod. xxvi. 11; xxviii. 28; xxxii. 19; xxxix. 8, 43; Lev. ix. 22; xv. 21; Num. xii. 3; Deut. ii. 32; iii. 6; v. 12; vi. 10; xxxii. 5; Josh. iv. iii. 13; iv. 11; xiv. 13; Ruth iii. 11; iv. 14; [twice]; i. 13; iii. 14; Ruth iii. 11; iv. 14; xxvi. 5; 7 [twice], 11; 16; xxxvi. 5 [twice]; xxxvi. 6; 2 Sam. i. 11; iii. 23; iii. 12; iv. 9, 20; xxxiv. 8; vii. 18, 17; xiv. 19; xx. 8; xxxii. 9, 11; xiv. 14, 22; z Kings v. 17; xxvii. 27; xxvii. 12; 2 Kings iv. 14; xvi. 18; Ezra iv. 7; Job ix. 13; xiv. 5; xv. 19; xi. 11, 20; xxi. 24; xxvii. 14; xxxvi. 21; xxxvi. 12; xxxvii. 41; xxxvii. 29; 30; 17; Ps. x. 5; xxxiv. 6; lviii. 8; cxi. 46; xxxvi. 4; cxlvii. 19; xxvii. 2; Prov. vi. 18 [twice]; xxii. 24; xxiv. 24; Isa. iii. 5; lviii. 10; Jer. xv. v. 20; xvii. 10; li. 44; xxxvi. 4; iv. 14; xiii. 4; iii. 25; vii. 17; Lam. ii. 82, 39; Ezek. ii. 20; xxvii. 21; xviii. 23, 24; xxxvi. 5; xxxix. 13, 16; xxxvii. 10 [twice]; 19; x. 22 [twice]; 26; xili. 11; [thrice]; 26; xlvi. 5; xili. 11; Dan. x. 10; Amos ii. 6, 8; Obad. v. 11; Hab. iii. 14; as well as from the insertion of ב before the prepositional ל and before the prepositional ל in singular nouns, and making them plural; the Keri exhibits seven instances of the former (1 Kings xvi. 25; Ps. cxviii. 17, 25; Prov. xvi. 27, xxxii. 20; Ezcl. iv. 17; Dan. iv. 18) and eight of the latter in the word וַיִּכְבִּשׁ (Judg. xliii. 17; 1 Kings xxvii. 20; xxxii. 13; Ps. cxlix. 147, 161; Jer. xv. 16 [twice]; Ezra x. 23).)

6. Errors of a grammatical nature, arising from dropping the article מ where it ought to be, of which the Keri exhibits fourteen instances (1 Sam. xiv. 82; 2 Sam. xxxiii. 9; 1 Kings iv. 7; v. 20; xviii. 18; 2 Kings xii. 20; xv. 26; Acts. xxxii. 15; Jer. x. 18, xvii. 19, 21; l. 3, iii. 82; Lam. i. 16; Ezek. xviii. 20), or from the insertion of it where it ought not to be, of which there are ten instances (1 Sam. xxxii. 12; 1 Kings xxi. 8; 2 Kings xvii. 12, 13, 18; xxv. 25; Eccles. vi. 10; x. 3, 20; Isa. xxxix. 11; Jer. xxxviii. 11) or from the dropping of the מ after הָאוֹרָה, or writing נְרוּי instead of נְרוּי when used as feminine.

7. Errors arising from the wrong division of words, e.g. the first word having a letter which belongs to the second, exhibited by the Keri in three instances, and stated in the Masorah on 2 Sam. v. 2; v. 2. Job xxxviii. 12; Lam. iv. 16), or the second word having a letter which belongs to the first of which there are two instances (1 Sam. xxi. 12; Ezra iv. 12), or one word being divided into two separate words, of which the Keri exhibits by 2 Chron. xxvii. 4, xxxix. 14. Eight instances (Judg. xvi. 29; 1 Sam. ix. 1, 28; xxxvi. 8; 1 Kings v. 5; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 6; Isa. ix. 6; Lam. i. 6; iv. 3), or two separate words being written as one, exhibited by the Keri in fifteen instances (Gen. xxxi. 11; Exod. iv. 2; Deut. xxxvii. 2; 1 Chron. ix. 4; xxxvii. 12, Neh. ii. 28; Job xxxviii. 11; xi. 16; Ps. x. 10; lv. 16; cxxiii. 4; Isa. iii. 15; Jer. vi. 29; xviii. 8; Ezek. viii. 6).

8. Exegetical Keri or marginal readings which substitute euphemisms for the cacophonous terms used in the text, in accordance with the injunction of the ancient sages, that "all the verses wherein indecent expressions occur must be displaced by decent words [קְרֵי כָּתוּב] (of which the Keri exhibits four instances, viz. Deut. xxxviii. 80; Isa. xii. 16; Jer. iii. 2; Zech. xiv. 2), [קְרֵי כָּתוּב] of [of which the Keri exhibits six instances, viz. Deut. xxviii. 27; 1 Sam. v. 6, 9; vi. 4, 5, 17; omitting, however, one Sam. v. 12], [קְרֵי כָּתוּב] of [of which the Keri exhibits one instance, viz. 2 Kings vi. 25], [קְרֵי כָּתוּב] of [of which the Keri exhibits two instances, 2 Kings xviiii, 27; Isa. xxxvii. 12], [קְרֵי כָּתוּב] of [of which there is one instance, 2 Kings x. 27, comp. Mekilta, 2b)."
el points attached to the one \( ^{1} \); whilst in 2 Kings vii, 15, where the reverse is the case, the marginal reading having fewer letters, and hence fewer vowels than the textual reading, which takes the vocal signs of the former, the Kethib is pronounced \( \text{ביים} \), and the Masorah has no vowel sign at all. There is a peculiarity connected with the double indication of the textual variations, which consist in the diminution or addition of a single letter. When a letter is dropped from a word in the text, the whole word is given in the marginal reading with the letter in question, and the remark \"Read so\" as, for instance, in 1 Sam. xiv, 32; Prov. xxiii, 34, where the \( מ \) according to the Masorah, is dropped from \( בֵּיתָי \), and \( ו \) from \( בָּשׁדֶּל \), as indicated by \( הָיָה \) and \( וַיְיָה \); the marginal glosses are \( בֵּיתָיָה \) and \( בָּשַׁדֶּל \); but when the reverse is the case, if a letter has crept into a word, the whole word is not given in the marginal gloss, but it is simply remarked that such and such a letter is redundant (\( מְכַסֶּנֶק \) or \( אוֹנְכֵּסֶנֶק \)), as, for instance, in Eccles. x, 20; Neh. ix, 17, where the \( מ \) according to the Masorah, has crept in before \( בַּשָּׁדֶּל \), and before \( בָּשַׁדֶּל \), the marginal gloss simply remarks \( מְכַסֶּנֶק \) or \( אוֹנְכֵּסֶנֶק \). Upon this point, however, the greatest inconsistency is manifested in the Masoretic glosses; compare, for instance, the Kethib \( בֹּקְרָה \) and \( בֹּקְרָה \) in Eccles. iv, 8, 17, both of which, according to the Keri, have a redundant \( ו \), and are singular nouns, yet the Masorete note upon the former is \( בֹּקְרָה \) exhibiting the whole word, whilst on the latter it simply remarks \( מְכַסֶּנֶק \).

The second class (\textit{insertions} directed), which comprises \textit{entire words} that have been omitted from the text, exhibits ten such instances which occur in the Hebrew Bible, as follows: Judges xx, 13; Ruth iii, 5, 17; 2 Sam. viii, 3; xvi, 33; xviii, 20; 2 Kings xix, 31, 37; Jer. xxxii, 38; 1, 29. Besides being noted in the marginal glosses on the respective passages, these omissions are also given in the Masorah on Deut. i and Ruth iii, 15. They are also enumerated in the Talmud (Tract Sopherim, vi, 8, and in Nedairim, 37 b.). In Nedairim, however, the passage which refers to this subject is as follows: \"The insertion of words in the text (\( יִנְחָמָה \) is exhibited in \( יִנְחָמָה \) [2 Sam. vii, 3]; more (ibid. xvi, 23); \( יִנְחָמָה \) [Jer. xxxii, 38]; \( יִנְחָמָה \) [ibid. i, 29]; \( יִנְחָמָה \) [ibid. iii, 5, 17]; thus omitting four instances, viz. Judg. xx, 13; 2 Sam. xviii, 39; 2 Kings xix, 31, 37, and adding one, viz. Ruth ii, 11, which is neither given by the Masorah nor in Sopherim.\"

This class of variations is indicated by a small circle or asterisk placed in the text with the vocal signs of the word which is wanting, referring to the margin, where the word in question is given. Thus, for instance, in Judg. xx, 13, where, according to the Keri, the word \( יִנְחָמָה \) is omitted, the Kethib is given \( יִנְחָמָה \) upon which the marginal gloss remarks \( יִנְחָמָה \)

O. Of the third class (\textit{omissions suggested}, exhibiting \textit{entire words} which have crept into the text, there are right instances, as follows: Ruth iii, 12; 2 Sam. xiii, 38; xv, 21; 2 Kings v, 18; Jer. xxxviii, 16; xxxix, 12; 13; 3; Ezek. xviii, 16. These variations are not only noted in the marginal glosses on the respective passages, but are also given in the Masorah on Ruth iii, 12. The passage in Nedairim, 27 b, which speaks of this class of variations, remarking, \"Words which are found in the text, but are not read (\( יִנְחָמָה \), but are exhibited in \( יִנְחָמָה \) [2 Kings v, 18]; \( יִנְחָמָה \) [Jer. xxxix, 11]; \( יִנְחָמָה \) [ibid. ii, 3]; \( יִנְחָמָה \) [Ezek. xviii, 16]; \( יִנְחָמָה \) [Ruth iii, 12]) omits 2 Kings xiii, 38; xv, 21; and Jer. xxxviii, 10; xxxix, 12; and adds Jer. xxxix, 11, which does not exist in the Masorah; whilst Sopherim, vi, 9, which remarks that \( יִנְחָמָה \) in 2 Sam. xiii, 38; Jer. xxxix, 12; 2 Sam. xv, 21; Ruth iii, 12; 3; Ezek. xviii, 16; omits 2 Kings v, 18, and Jer. xxxix, 12.

This class of variations is not uniformly indicated in the different editions of the Bible. Generally the word in question has no vowel signs, but an asterisk or small circle is put over it, referring to the margin, where it is simply remarked \( יִנְחָמָה \), \textit{written in the text}, but not [\textit{to be read}] in one or two instances, however, the word is repeated in the margin. Thus in 2 Kings v, 18, where we have it \( יִנְחָמָה \), \textit{written in the text}, but [\textit{is not to be read}] in one or two instances, however, the word is repeated in the margin.

II. Number and Position of the Keri and Kethib.

A great difference of opinion prevails about the number and position of these various readings. The Talmud, as we have shown above, and the early commentators, mention variations which do not exist in the Keri and Kethib of the Masorah. This, however, is beyond the aim of the present article, which is to investigate the Keri and Kethib as exhibited in the Masorah and in the editions of the Hebrew Bible. From a careful perusal and collation of the Masorah, as printed in the Rabbinic Bibles, we find the following to be the number of the Keri and Kethib in each book, according to the order of the Hebrew Bible:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Keri</th>
<th>Kethib</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Samuel</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Samuel</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chronicles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chronicles</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>1332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The disparity between Abrahams's calculations about the number of Keri and Kethib, leading him to the conclusion that the Pentateuch has 65, Jeremiah 81, and 1 and 2 Samuel 138 (\textit{Introduction to Jeremiah}), and the numbers which we have stated as existing in these books, is easily accounted for when it is remembered that this Pentateuch commentator died fifteen years before the publication of the laborious Jacob b-Chajim collated and published the Masorahs on the Hebrew Scriptures, and therefore had no opportunity of consulting them carefully. But we find it far more difficult to account for the serious difference in the calculations of later writers and our results, as may be seen from the table on the following page.

For the collation of Bomberg's Bible, the Plantin Bible, and the Antwerp Bible, we are indebted to the tables exhibited in Cappellano's \textit{Critici Sacri}, p. 70, and Walton's \textit{Prolegomena} (ed. D'Ambrissi, 1682, 1478); and though we have been able by our arrangement to correct their blunder in representing Elias Levi as separating the Five Megilloth from the Hagiographa, and giving the number of Keri to be 329 exclusive of the Megilloth. the marginal indications of which are obliged to descend from the Masoroth apart from the Hagiographa, to which they belong according to the Jewish order of the Canon. Elias Levi's own words on the numbers are as follows: \"I counted the Keri and Kethib several times, and found that they were in all 848; of these, 55 are in the Pentateuch, and 329 in the Hagiographa. It is surprising that there should only be 66 in the Pentateuch, 22 of which refer to the single word \( בְּרֵשֵׁית \), which
same view. It is in accordance with this
recollect sense ascribed to the origin of the
Keri and Kethib that Raish remarks
on Gen. viii, 16, "The Keri is בְּנִי, the
Kethib בָּנִי, because he was first to tell
them to go out; but if they should refuse to
go, he was to make them go." Kimchi,
however, is of the opposite opinion. So
far from believing that this view
proceeded from the sacred writers
themselves, who designed to convey thereby
various mysteries, he maintains that the
Keri and Kethib originated after the Bab-
yonian captivity, when the sacred books
were collected by the members of the
synagogue. These editors of the long-lose
and mutilated inspired writings "found dif-
ferent readings in the volumes, and adopt-
ed those which the majority of copies had,
because these, according to their opinion,
exhibited the true readings. In some
places they wrote down one word in the
text without putting the vowel signs to it,
or noted it in the margin without insert-
ing it in the text, whilst in other places
they inserted the reading in the margin in
the text" (Introduction to his Commentary on
Joshua.) Ephod" (Bourch 1891-1430), who maintains
the same view, remarks that Ezra and his followers "made
the Keri and Kethib on every passage in which they
found some obliteration and confusion, and were not
sure what the precise reading was." Abrahanel, who
will not admit that the Keri and Kethib proceeded
from the sacred writers themselves, nor that they
took their rise from the imperfect state of the
codices, propounds a new theory. According to him, Ezra and his
followers, who undertook the editing of the Scriptures,
found the sacred books entire and perfect; but in per-
using them these editors discovered that they con-
tained irregular expressions, and loose and ungrammat-
ical phrases, arising from the carelessness and ignorance
of the inspired writers. "Ezra had therefore to explain
these words in harmony with the connection: this
is the origin of the Keri which is found in the margin
of the Bible, as this holy scribe feared to touch the
words which were spoken or written by the Holy Ghost.
These remarks he made on his own account to explain
those anomalous letters and expressions, and put them
in the margin to indicate that the gloss is his own.
Now, if you examine the numerous Keris and Kethibas
in Jeremiah, and look into their connection, you will
find them all to be of this nature, viz., that they are to
be traced to Jeremiah's careless and blundering writing.
... . From this you may learn that the books which
have most Keris and Kethibas show that their authors
did not know how to speak correctly or to write properly
(Introduction to his Commentary on Jeremiah.)

Though Abrahanel's hypothesis has more truth in it
than the other theories, yet it is only a combination
of the three views that the origin of the Keri and
Kethib can be traced and explained. For there can be
no doubt that some of the variations, as the Talmud,
Raish, etc., declare, have been transmitted by tradition
from time immemorial, and have their origin in some
recollect meaning or mysteries attached to the
passages in question; that some, again, as Kimchi, Ephod,
etc. rightly maintain, are due to the blunders and corrup-
tions which have crept into the text in the course of
time, and which the spiritual guides of the nation tried
to rectify by the addition of corrections (Keri and Kethibas)
according to the Talmud (comp. Jerusalem Meguilah, iv. 2;
Sopherim, vi. 4); and that others, again, as Abrahanel
marks, are owing to the carelessness of style, ignorance
of idioms and provincialisms, which the editors and suc-
cessive interpreters of the Hebrew canon discovered in
the different books, may properly be considered as
which were at variance with the grammatical rules and exc-
geital laws developed in aftertime by the Masoretes. Such, however, was their reverence for the ancient text, that these Masoretes who made the new additions to it left the text itself untouched in the very places where they believed it necessary to follow another explanation or reading, but simply inserted the emendation in the margin. Hence the distinction between the ancient text as it was written, or Kethib (הִכְתָּב), and the more modern emended reading, or Kethib (קְרֵבָה); and hence, also, the fact that the Kethib is not inserted in the synagogal scrolls, though it is followed in the public reading of the Torah.

IV. Importance of the Keri and Kethib, especially as relating to the English Version of the Hebrew Scriptures.

—Some idea of the importance of the Keri and Kethib may be gathered from the following analysis of the seventy-six variations which occur in the Pentateuch. Of the seventy-six Keras, twenty-one give נֵבֶט instead of נֵבֶט (Gen. xxiv. 14, 16, 28, 55, 57; xxxiv, 8 [twice], 12; Deut. xxxii, 15 [twice], 16, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26 [twice], 27, 28, 29), which was evidently epicene in earlier periods (comp. Gesenius, Gramm. sec. 23, sect. 82, 3; Ewald, Lehrbuch, sect. 175, b); fifteen have the plural termination נִבְּט affixed to nouns of the singular form only in the text (Gen. xxxiii. 4; Exod. xxvii. 11; xxviii. 28; xxxii, 19; xxxix, 4, 53; Lev. ix. 23; xvi. 21; Num. xii. 16; 9; Deut. iii. 9; xiy, 10; vii, 9; vii, 8; xxvii. 10; xi, 10; vii, 9), which seldom think it is no real variation, since in earlier periods the termination נִבְּט was both singular and plural, just as נֵבֶט stands for both נֵבֶט and נֵבֶט; seventeen give more current and uniform forms of words (Gen. xi. 17, x; xix, 8; xix, 8, 33 with 1, 36; xxx, 23 with xxxii, 11; xxviii, 8 with 5, 7; xxvii, 29 with the same word in the next clause; xxxvi. 5, 14 with ver. 18; xxxix, 26, 29; liii, 38 with xxvii, 29; Exod. xxvi. 2; vii, 7 with Numb. xvi, 11; Numb. xiv, 36 with xv, 24; Numb. lii, 82 with xxxii, 39; xxxii, 7 with xxx, 6; Deut. xxxii, 18 with Amos iv, 13); five substitute the termination third person singular, for נֵבֶט (Gen. xlix, 11 [twice]; Exod. xxiii. 26; xxxii, 17; Numb. x, 36), which is a less common pronounal suffix (comp. Gesenius, Gramm. sec. 91; Ewald, Lehrbuch, sect. 217, a); two make two words of one (Gen. xxxii. 11; Exod. iv, 2); two have נֵבֶט instead of נֵבֶט (Exod. xvi, 13; Numb. xl, 39); three give plural verbs instead of singular (Lev. xxii. 5; Numb. xxxiv, 4; Deut. xxxii, 7), which are no doubt an improvement, since Numb. xxxiv, 4 is evidently a mistake, as may be seen from a comparison of this verse with verse 39, and substitute the relative pronoun יִבְּט for the negative particle יִבְּט (Exod. xxii, 8; Lev. xi, 21; xxx, 50), which is very expressive; two substitute euphemisms for cacophonous expressions (Deut. xxvii, 28; and 20); and are purely traditional, viz. Numb. i, 16; xxvi, 9. The Pentateuch, however, can hardly be regarded as giving an adequate idea of the importance of the Keri and Kethib, insomuch as the Jews, regarding the law as more sacred than any other inspired book, guarded it against being corrupted with greater vigilance than the rest of the canon. Hence the comparatively few and unimportant Keri when contrasted with those occurring in the other volumes. Still, the Pentateuch contains a few specimens of almost every kind of the different Kerias.

As to the question how far our English versions have been influenced by the Keri and Kethib, this will best be answered by a comparison of the translations with the more striking variations which occur in the Prophets and Hagiographa. In Josephus, v. 7, when the Pentateuch reading is "still we were passed over," the Kethib has נֵבֶט, "until they passed over;" and though the Sept., Vulg., Chaldean, Luther, the Zurich Bible, Coverdale, the Bishop's Bible, the Geneva Version, etc., adopt the Kethib, the A. V., following Kimchi, adheres to the Kethib; whilst in Josh. vi, 7, where the textual reading is and they said (םָאִי) unto the people, and the marginal emendation is and he said (םָאִי), and when in the Vulg., Chaldean, Luther, the Zurich Bible, Coverdale, the Bishop's Bible, and the Geneva Version again adopt the Keri, as in the former instance, the A. V. abandons the textual reading and espouses the emendation. In Joshua, xiv, 47, where the Keri is the bordering sea (ניִבְּט הַנַּחַל) and its territory, and the Kethib has and the great sea (ניִבְּט הַנַּחַל) and its territory, which is again followed by the ancient versions and the translations of the Reformers, the A. V., without taking any notice of the textual reading in the margin, as in Joshua, xii, 16, adopts the emendation, whereas in Joshua, xv, 38 the A. V. follows the textual reading (ניִבְּט הַנַּחַל) Janamu, noticing, however, the emendation (ניִבְּט הַנַּחַל) Janama in the margin. All the ten emendations of the second class, which propose the insertion of entire words into the text (ניִבְּט הַנַּחַל), are adopted in the A. V. without the slightest indication by the usual italics that they are not in the text. Of the eight omissions of entire words in the third class (ניִבְּט הַנַּחַל), nothing decisive can be said, inasmuch as six of them refer to simple particles, and they might perhaps be recognised by translators or not without its being discernible in the version. The only two instances, however, where there can be no mistake (Jer. xii, 8; Ezek. xlviii, 16), clearly show that the A. V. follows the marginal gloss, and accordingly rejects the words which are in the text. Hence the limits of this article allowed us, we could have shown still more unquestionably that, though the A. V. generally adopts the marginal emendations, yet in many instances it proceeds most arbitrarily, and adheres to the textual reading; and that, with very few exceptions, it never indicates, by italics or in the margin, the difference between the textual and the marginal readings.

Intention to the Keri and Kethib has given rise to the most fanciful and absurd explications, of which the following may serve both as a specimen and a warning. In looking at the text of the Hebrew Bible, it will be seen that there is a final Mem (מ) in the middle of the word יִבְּט הַנַּחַל, Isa. ix. 6. We have already alluded to the fact that it exhibits one of the fifteen instances where the Kethib, or the textual reading, and the Keri, or the emended reading, proposes two words (see above, sec. 1). Accordingly, יִבְּט הַנַּחַל stands for יִבְּט הַנַּחַל, i.e. "to them the dominion shall be great," corresponding to the common abbreviation יִבְּט הַנַּחַל for יִבְּט הַנַּחַל. The question is whether יִבְּט may be considered as an abbreviation of יִבְּט, seeing there are no other examples of it; suffice it to say that Jewish scribes and critics of ancient times took it as such, just as they regarded יִבְּט הַנַּחַל (Isa. xxxiii, 7) as a contraction of יִבְּט הַנַּחַל (comp. the Syriac, Chaldée, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Vulgate, Elias Levita, etc.); and that the Sept. read it as two words (i.e. מִבְּט הַנַּחַל). Subsequent scribes, however, found it either to be more in accordance with the primitive reading, or with their exegetical rules, as well as with the usage of the prophet himself (comp. Isa. xxxiii, 20), to read it as one word; but their extreme reverence for the text prevented them from making this alteration without indicating that some codices have two words. Hence, though they joined the two words together as one, they yet left the final Mem to exhibit the variation. An example of the reverse occurs in Neh. ii, 18, where יִבְּט הַנַּחַל has been divided into two words, יִבְּט הַנַּחַל, and where the same anxiety faithfully to exhibit the ancient reading has made the editors of the Hebrew canon retain the medial Mem at the end of the word. It was to be expected that those Jews who regard both readings as
Commentary on Joshua: Abramzoo, too, has a lengthy disquisition on this subject, in the Introduction to his Commentary on Jeremiah. He was followed by the laborious Jacob ben-Chajim, who fully discusses the Keri and Kethib in his celebrated Introduction to the Robbinic Bible, translated by Ginsburg in the Journal of Sacred Literature, vol. 4 (for July, 1863); and by the erudite and bold Elias Levita, who gives a very comprehensive treatment of the Keri and Kethib in his Massoeth Ha-Massoreth, ed. Sulzbach, 1771, p. 8 a sq.; 21 a, sq. Of Christian writers are to be mentioned the masterly treatises by Cappellus, Critica Sacra, lib. iii. cap. ix. sq.; Buxtorf, Tiberius, cap. xii. Buxtorf the younger, Arcanae (Basleol, 1658), cap. iv. 448-509; Hilleri De Arcano Kethib et Keri (Tub. 1692); Walton, Biblia Polyglotta, Proleg. (Cantab. 1826), i. 412 sq.; Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraica, i. 507-583; Frankel, Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta (Crap. 1841), p. 219 sq.; Steich, De Keri et Kethib (Alhena, 1768); and against him Drescher, Septuaginta Stichich, etc. Lipsa (1768); Triggari, De xaip Bt (Grph. 1775); Wolffdrat, De Keri et Cthib (Ros. 1788). See Various Readings.

Keri, Francis Borgia, a learned Hungarian Jesuit, in the beginning of the 18th century, in the county of Zemplin, Hungary, entered the Jesuitical order when yet very young, and became an instructor of philosophy in the gymnasia of his native town at Tyrnau. In 1769 he emigrated to Italy, and resided at Leghorn. Keri distinguished himself greatly as a historian, especially by his Imperatorum Ottomani a capta Constantinopolis (Tyrnau, 1749, 9 pts. folio). He wrote also Imperatorum Orientalis compendio exhibitus, et complures Graeciae praeclares scriptoriorum, a Constantino Magno ad Constantem VIII ultimum tyrmann. (Tyrnau, 1744, 4to.). See Hoefcr, Nov. Biog. Gen. xxvii, 612: Horangri, Nova Memoria Hungarorum, ii, 332.

Keri, Janos, a noted Hungarian prelate, born in the first half of the 17th century; entered as a mere youth, in 1666, the order of St. Paul, became afterwards director of the establishment, and held successively the bishoprics of Sirmium, Csanud, and Waizen. He died in 1685. Bishop Keri wrote Ferocia Martia Turrici (Pos. 1672, 8vo)—Philosophia scholastica (Presb. 1673, 3 vols. fol.), etc.—Hoefcr, Nov. Biog. Gen. xxvii, 612: Czirwinger, Hungarica Literata, p. 208.


1. A town in the south of Judah (hence probably included within Simeon), mentioned between Hadassah and Hebron (Josh. xv, 25). From the absence of the copulative after it, Reland (Polest, p. 700, 708) suggested that the name ought to be joined with the succeeding, i.e. cities of Hebron, i.e. Hazor itself, as in several ancient versions (but see Keil, ad loc.); and Maurer (Comment. ad loc.) has defended this construction, which the enumeration in ver. 32 requires, i.e. Kerioth-Hazor = Hazor-Abam. See JUDAH, TRIBE OF. It seems to be the place alluded to in the name of Judas Iscariot (Iacsepa=, i.e. מְשַׁמֶּרֶת, "naive of Keriót), Dr. Robinson conjectures (Bibl. Researches, ii, 472) that the site is to be found in the ruined foundations of a small village discovered by him on the slope of a ridge about ten miles south of Hebron, and still called by the equivalent Arabic name el-Kiryatia (comp. De Saulcy's Dead Sea, i, 431; Van de Velde, Narrative, ii, 82). This agree the plural form of the word, the associated epithets, and the frontier position, suggesting that the place was a fortification of contiguous hamlets for nomads rather than an individual city. See CITY; HAZOR.

2. A strong city of the land of Moab, mentioned in connection with Beth-gamul and Beth-shan (Josh. xvi, 24), in the prophecic denunciations of its overthrow by the Babylonian invaders on their way to Palestine (Jer. xlviii, 41; Amos ii, 2). But for the mention of Kiri-
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George (2), a Methodist minister, was born in Ireland in 1819. His parents, who emigrated to Canada in 1822, intended him for the mercantile profession; but, converted when seventeen years old, and shortly after impressed with the conviction that he was called to preach, he came over the States, and settled at Winestead, Conn., was made a local preacher, and in 1844 joined the New York Conference. In 1866 he was superannuated, and made Hudson, N.Y., his residence. He died while on a visit to his friends in Ireland, Sept. 8, 1869.

Kerr, Henry M., a Presbyterian minister, was born in York District, S. C., Dec. 30, 1782. In very early life his mother had consecrated him, as Hannah did her Samuel, to the Lord, and had often expressed her desire to him that he should be a minister of the Gospel of the King and his people. Being in moderate circumstances, and the eldest of eleven children, he was compelled to labor for their maintenance; hence his education was much neglected in his earlier years. He went first to an academy in Roman County, N. C.; then he repaired to Fiddell County, and enjoyed the advantages of instruction under the celebrated James Hall, D.D. Here he completed a very extensive course of scientific study, and was readily received as a candidate for the ministry by Concord Presbytery in 1811. He pursued his theological course part of the term with the Rev. Dr. Kilpatrick, and part of it with James McKee, D.D. In 1814 he was licensed by Concord Presbytery. At that time he was residing in Salisbury, N. C. He remained there, teaching and preaching, until the spring of 1816, when he removed to Lincoln County, and he was ordained in November of that year pastor of Olney, Long Creek, and New Hope Churches. In 1819 he removed to North Carolina, and took charge of several small congregations, and in 1823 with his family removed to East Tennessee; but, not finding his ministerial associations pleasant, he travelled further west, and settled in Hardeman County, West Tennessee, in 1835. Here he performed much missionary labor in all the surrounding counties, and organized many churches. The infirmities of age made it necessary for him to abandon, in part, his evangelistic labors, and he devoted the last years of his life to Bethel and Aimwell churches, in McNairy County. In the fall of 1860 he settled near Watervelly, in the Presbytery of North Mississippi. He was buried here on January 28, 1865. Trained under the classical system, he made no effort at rhetorical display. His discourses were pre-eminently scriptural. He used the "sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God," and it was sharp in the heart of the King's enemies. His work was peremptory and persistent; and his life was often perilous. The providence of God cast his lot chiefly in destitute portions of the land, and his labors were evangelistic. He organized more churches, it is believed, than any
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other member of the Presbytery. For many years he was stated clerk of the Presbytery of Western Tennessee District, and his acquaintance with the form of government and discipline was so perfect that his word was taken as the solution of all doubts and difficulties."—Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1860, p. 588.

KERR, James, a Presbyterian minister, a native of Scotland, was born in 1805, and was educated in the University of Glasgow, where he took his A.B. in 1822. In his twenty-fifth year he emigrated to the United States, and shortly after entered the Western Theological Seminary, was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Baltimore, April 27, 1836, and was ordained an evangelist by the Presbytery of Winchester at Martinsburg, Va., April 22, 1837. He labored first as a missionary in Hampshire County, Va., for two years, and was successful in his ministry, planting the standard of the Cross in many portions of that hitherto forsaken country. He was next invited by the Church of Cadiz, Ohio; began his ministerial work in this congregation Dec. 2, 1838, and was regularly installed June, 1839. He died April 19, 1855. Kerr was the author of *Mode of Baptism*, and a small work on *Psalmody.* "He was a good presbyter, and made an excellent preaching officer of an ecclesiastical court, to which both the members of the Presbytery of Alleghany and Synod can testify. His opinions were uniformly correct, and his thorough acquaintance with the government and polity of our Church gave him a superior influence in all her judicial meetings upon which he was called to attend. He was remarkably conscientious in every sphere of life, whether, as a citizen, a Christian, or a minister. So decided was he against reading sermons, or even taking the smallest abstract into the pulpit, that he invariably voted against the licensure and ordination of any young man that did commit this 'great mistake,' as he sometimes termed it. As a preacher he was clear and logical, plain and interesting, in his statements of the great truths of the Gospel. His pulpit productions thoroughly partook of his own character, and came forth as the result of close application and much study; and on no occasion would he agree to preach, if it could at all be avoided, without special preparation."—Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1867, p. 160.

KERR, John, a Baptist minister of Scottish descent, was born in Caswell County, N. C., Aug. 14, 1872, converted in 1800, baptized in 1801, and at once licensed to preach. "Determined to avail himself of every means in his power to render his ministry efficient and useful, the Baptist preacher set sail bravely across the sea to see the excellent Marshall and listen to his preaching, and thence to Georgia to form the acquaintance of the distinguished and venerable Mercer. Returning from the South, he visited Virginia, and became personally known to the lamented Scaple and other valuable ministers of the state. Wherever he went his preaching produced a thrilling effect. His youthful appearance, the ardor and gracefulness of his manner, and the beauty of his diction, attracted universal attention. There are not a few who still remember his visit to Eastern Virginia, when he enkindled the spirit of the state almost half a century." In 1811 he embarked on the stormy sea of politics, consenting to become a candidate for Congress, and was twice elected thereto. He was a member of that body during the War of 1812, and served his country at that critical period with a fervent and enlightened patriotism. At the close of his Congressional career he returned to Halifax, and served the churches at Arbor and at Mary Creek. In March, 1825, he removed to the city of Richmond, and became the pastor of the First Baptist Church. Here his fine pulpit talents were brought into a full and successful career, and he went on from triumph to triumph with delight on his ministry. In less than a year more than five hundred members were added to the Church, two hundred and seventeen of whom were white. This successful work continued until dissenion was sown among his parishioners by the preaching of Alexander Campbell, whose efforts finally drew from Kerr's church nearly half of its members (in 1881). By the close of 1892 he had grown weary of the controversies to which the division had given rise. and resigned his charge. He died Sept. 29, 1842. He was naturally of a frank, open, and disinterested disposition. Inca- capable of artifice himself, he was not always guarded against it in others. His temperament, peculiarly ardent, sometimes perverted his judgment. His manners were uniformly bland, gentle, and conciliating. In so- cial intercourse he was highly gifted for a pleasing and imparting an interest and a charm to conversation. He was dignified without ostentation, and cheerful without levity. "As a Christian, he imbibed in a high degree the spirit of his Master. His piety was not the dwarfish and stunted growth of sectarianism—morose, censorious, and persecuting, but the product of enlarged and liberal views—cheerful, candid, and conciliatory. Though he was firm in his convictions as a Baptist, he was remarkably free from bigotry, and was a lover of good men of every communion. As a preacher he possessed commanding talents. A fine person, a sonorous voice, and a great power of oratory, once possessed him in his favor. His apprehension was quick, his perception clear, and his imagination remarkably vivid. He is ranked among the most popular preachers of his day in Virginia, and for more than thirty years he rarely if ever failed to attract the most important meetings to preach on occasions of the greatest interest."—Sprague, *Amaids*, vi, 446 sq.

KERR, Joseph, D.D., a prominent minister of the Associate Reformed Church, was born in Antrim County, Ireland, in 1778; educated at the University of Glasgow, and, with a view of entering the ministry, pursued theological studies under the direction of the Associate Presbyterian of Denny. He came to this country in 1811, and was licensed by the Second Presbytery of Pennsylvania shortly after. His appointment lay over a vast area of country west of the Alleghenies, a work for which he seemed to have been endowed by nature. In 1804 he was called to Mifflin and St. Clair as regular pastor, and, accepting, was installed October 17. When the Presbytery decided to establish a theological school at Pittsburg, they looked to him for its head, and felt constrained to urge his removal to that place, and appointed him professor of theology, a post which he successfully filled until his death on Nov. 13, 1829. "The death of Dr. Kerr shed a gloom not only over the large circle of his friends and acquaintances, and the families of his pastoral charge, but over the entire Synod of the West, as it seemed at once to dash the brightening prospects of the infant theological seminary intrusted to his super- vision. . . . With an athletic physical constitution, of more than ordinarily prepossessing appearance, he was endowed with intellectual powers of the first order, highly cultivated, and possessed of all the essential elements of a natural orator. With undoubted yet unostenta- tious piety, mild, kind, affable, affectionate, benevolent, liberal, and hospitable almost to a fault, he at once won the friendship and affection of his acquaintances, and the confidence of the congregations to whom he ministered, and, without assuming it, or even being apparently conscious of it, he occupied from the commencement of his ministry to the close of a master's life, which was accorded to him without envy and without opposition by his co-presbyters."—(Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1863, p. 872 sq.)

KERR, Joseph R., son of the preceding, and also a minister of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born in St. Clair township, Alleghany Co., Pa., Jan. 18, 1807, and is the son of Dr. Crow of the presbytery of Pennsylvania, where he graduated in 1826 with the highest honors of his class. In the fall of 1827 he entered the theological seminary at Pittsburg, founded then only a short time, over which his father presided,
and was licensed Sept. 2, 1829. Only two and a half months later his father died, and young Kerr was called to fill his place in the church. After finding the preferred place, he was ordained July 29, 1830. "This called
by Providence to fill the pulpit of such a man as his father, he succeeded, from the very first, in giving entire satisfaction to his people, and soon became one of the most, if not altogether the most, popular of the preachers in the state. This was at the expense of such exhausting toil as contributed slowly but surely to under
mine a constitution at best but delicate. From being a student of divinity, and without any experience, he entered at once on the pastoral oversight of a large congrega
tion, and all the duties connected with the office of the ministry. In the preparation of this pulpit he was a close, unwavering student. He was ambi-
tuous of excellence in whatever he attempted connected with his office, and became a workman that needeth not to be ashamed" (Sprague, Annals [Associate Ref. Presb. Church], ix, 162. His health, however, failed him, and in 1832 he was obliged to take an assistant, Moses Kerr (q.v.), a younger brother. His health, notwithstanding
this timely precaution, continued to fail, and he died June 14, 1843. Kerr published an address, Responsibility of Liberd Men (1856), and a sermon on Dudding (1860). [J. W. H.]

Kerr, Moses, a minister of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, third son of Dr. Joseph Kerr (q.v.), was born in St. Clair, Pa., June 30, 1811. Naturally of a serious and thoughtful cast of mind, and manifesting in very early life decided piety, his education was directed from the first with a view to qualifying him for the sacred ministry. Signs of failure in health, however, induced him to devote himself to mercantile life, but it soon proved as unfavorable to his health as his application to study, and he engaged in farm-work. His health becoming restored, he entered the Western University of Pennsylvania, and graduated in 1836. In the fall of the same year he began the study of theology in the seminary then under the care of his father; was licensed to preach on the 26th of April, 1831, and shortly after was called as pastor to Allegheny. But when the Presbytery met to ordain and install him, he returned the call on account of a hemorrhage of the lungs. The Presbytery, however, proceeded with his ordination to the office of the ministry. This was on the 9th of October, 1832. Shortly after he sailed for Europe, and on his return, with every appearance of restored and established health, resumed preaching, and finally accepted a call by the large and influential congregation of Robinson's Episcopal Church, Pittsburg, September 2, 1834. But a little more than six months later he was again attacked with hemorrhage of the lungs, and demitted his pastoral charge. During a vacancy he discharged for a time the duties of professor of languages in the Western University of Pennsylva
nia; afterwards of Biblical literature and criticism in the theological seminary, Allegheny. But his tastes and talents were for the pulpit, and he again accepted a call as a preacher, this time from the Third Church, Pittsburg, 18th of October, 1837. With that congrega
tion he closed his life on the 26th of January, 1840. Moses Kerr, a student from the love of study, and a careful reader of the best writings not only in theologi
y, but in literature generally. With a becoming appreciation of the demands of his profession, he aimed to store his mind not only with the matter of the best
works of the schools, but with the fresh discussions of living divines, and at the same time keep up with the general advance of literature and science in the world. As a preacher he had capabilities which, with ordinary health and an ordinary length of life, must have rendered him eminent in his profession.----Sprague, Annals, ix, 166.

Kesey, Jesse, a minister of the Society of Friends, was born at York, Pa., in 1768. In his early youth his heart was given to God. In his seventeenth year he experienced a call to the Gospel ministry, but still re
mained an apprentice to the trade of a potter about four years, and afterwards taught school. In 1784 he sailed for England on a Gospel mission. In 1805 he returned to America, and in 1814 went on a religious mission to the Southern States, afterwards returning to his home, and continuing to labor and preach. He died near Kennet, Pa., in 1845. As a minister, Mr. Kesey's affability of manners, his grave and dignified deport
ment, the soundness of his principles, the beauty and simplicity of his style of address, heightened in their ef
fect by the depth of his devotional feelings, gave an in
terest and a charm which gained him many admirers. See Jamney, Hist. of the Friends, iv, 116. (J. L. S.)

Kerykthyst (from εκτραπησις, to preach), i.e. the art of preaching, is a modern name for Homiletics, first intro
duced by Sirer (Kerykthik, 1830, 1846). See Homiletics.

Kesop. See Silver.

Keseth (קֶשֶת, A.V. "piece of money," "piece of silver"). The meaning and derivation of this word, which only occurs thrice in the O.T., has been a subject of much controversy. The places where it is found----Gen. xxxi, 19, recording Jacob's purchase of a piece of ground at Shechem; Josh. xxiv, 32, a verbal repetition from Genesis; and Job xili, 11, where the presents made to Job are specified, and it is joined with rings of gold--indicate either the name of a coin or of some article used in barter. The principal explanations of the word are:

1. That it means "20th and all the silver which render it "a lamb," either the animal itself or a coin bearing its impress (Hofftinger, Diss. de Numm. Orient.), a view which has been revived in modern times by the Danish bishop Munter in a treatise published at Copen
hagen, 1824, and more recently still by Mr. James Yates, Proc. of Numism. Society, 1867, pp. 141. The entire want of any etymological ground for this interpretation has led Bochart (Hierozoic, i, 2, c. 6) to imagine that there had been a confusion in the text of the Sept. bet
ween "iarkon μων and iarkon ἀρσων, and that this error has passed into all the ancient versions, which may be supported by the singular fact that in Gen. xxxi, 7, 41, we find "יָדוֹנָי יָדָוֶנָי (A.V. "ten times," "twelve, how
ever, more usually standing for a particular weight) translated by the Sept. σεκα ἀρσων, which it is difficult to account for on any supposition save that of a mistake of the copyst for μων. See Sirer.

2. Others, adopting the rendering "lamb," have imagined a reference to a weight formed in the shape of that animal, such as we know to have been in use among the Egyptians and Assyrians, imitating bulls, antelopes, geese, etc. (see Wilkinson's Anc. Egypt., ii, 10; Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 600-602; Lejeanis, Denkmale, iii, plate 89, N.o 3).

3. Faber, in the German edition of Hermmer's Obs. ii, 15-19, quoted by Genesius (Theolaur. p. 1241), connects it with the Syriac κεστα, Heb. לַָתֵן, "a vessel," an etymology accepted by Grotfend (see below), and considers it to have been either a measure or a silver vessel used in barter (comp. Eilam, i, ii, 4, 22).

4. The most probable view, however, is that supported by Genesius, Rosenmiller, Jahn, Kalisch, and the majority of the soundest interpreters, that it was, in Grotfend's words (Numism. Chron. ii, 248), "merely a silver weight of undetermined size, just as the most an
cient shekel was nothing more than a piece of rough silver without any image or device." The lost root was perhaps akin to the Arabic καυστ, "he divided equally." Bochart, however (ut supra), is disposed to alter the punctua
tion of the Sk. and to connect the word with לַָת, "truth," adding "potsh" לַָת id est terea moneta qua
cunque habuit justum pondus, et etiam moneta sincera et et ἁθροί/θροι

According to Rabbi Akiba, quoted by Bochart, a cer
tain coin bore this name in comparatively modern times, so that he would render the word by פש וט, ותנוכרי, "a piece of money, "a piece of silver"
Kitto, a. v. See Kitto, Daily Bible Illustrations, s.d loc.  

Kesseler, Christian Rudolph, a German Reformed minister, born February 20, 1823, in the Canton of Graubuenden, Switzerland, was educated in the best schools of his native land, and afterwards spent some time at the University of Leipzig; came to America with his parents in 1841; studied theology at Mercerburg, Pa.; was licensed and ordained in the spring of 1848, and took charge of congregations in Pendleton County, Va. In 1844 he became associated with Dr. Bibighaus as assistant pastor in the Salem congregation, Philadelphia. His health failing, in 1848 he removed to Allentown, Pa., to establish a female seminary. In this enterprise he was remarkably successful. He died March 4, 1855, leaving the institution he had founded in a flourishing condition.

Kessler (Athenaeus), Johann Jacob, was born at St. Gall in 1502, and studied theology at Basle. In 1522 he went to Wittenberg to hear Luther, and on his way fell in with him at Jenins, yet without knowing him. In 1523 he returned to St. Gall, but his inclination to the reform doctrines would not conscientiously permit him to enter the priesthood, and he became a saddler. At the request of his compatriots, he finally, in 1524, began Sunday evening meetings for the study of Scripture, which, on account of the general interest, were in 1525 transferred to the Church of St. Lawrence. He was some what opposed at first by a few narrow-minded theologians, and at their request even discontinued his meetings for a time; but the public, determined to hear the preaching of the Gospel, insisted on his entering the ministry, and he became, in 1535, evangelical pastor of the Church of St. Lawrence, and dean of St. Gall in 1573. He died March 15, 1574. Kessler wrote Sababthurin, St. Gallische Reformationchronik. See J. J. Bernet, J. Krahert (St. Gall, 1826); Herzog, Reut.-Encyklop. viii, 495; Priorer, Universal Lex. a. v.

Kethem. See Gold.

Kethib. See Kahl.

Kethubim. See Hagadah.

Kethuboth. See Talmod.

Ketsach. See Fitches.

Ketsiyah. See Casmia.

Kett, Henry B.D., a learned English divine, was born at Norwich in 1761; studied at Trinity College, Oxford, of which he became fellow, and afterwards obtained the living of Charlton, Gloucestershire. He was drowned, while bathing, in 1826. His principal works are: History, the Interpreter of Prophecy (London, 4th ed., with additional notes, 1861, 2 vols. 8vo);—Sermons preached, 1790, at the Lectures founded by the late Rev. John Brompton, M.A. (London, 24 ed. 1792, 8vo)—Elements of general Knowledge (London, 8th edit. 1815, 2 vols. 8vo).—Allibone, Dict. Eng. and Amer. Authors, s. v.

Ketterings, J. W., bishop of Minnesota from 1853 to 1877, though a layman, was promoted to the presbital dignities with the request of the duke of Cleve. He was one of the most enlightened minds of this period in the Roman Catholic Church, and himself inclining to the Reformation, in concert with the duke of Cleve, persuaded Cassander (q. v.) to use his influence and his pen to prevent further advancement in the Church of those who had left the Romanists. At Rome he was disdained for his mildness towards the Reformers, and finally quit the bishopric.

Kettenbach, Heinrich von, an eminent German writer of the period of the Reformation, was probably of French extraction. Little is known of his life. He became a Franciscan, and in 1521 went to Ulm in the place of one of the brethren expelled by the general of the order for holding evangelical opinions. Kettenbach, however, soon followed the example of his predecessor: he preached against the papacy and the monks, and, having thus aroused the enmity of the Dominicans, was in turn obliged to leave Ulm the same year. He then went to Wittenberg, where he openly joined the Reformation, took part in all the movements in favor of emancipation from Rome, and was probably killed in the peasants' war. Kettenbach was a very popular preacher, and made many converts. He wrote a book, which he attacked in Vergleichung des Allerheiligsten Herrn u. Vaters Vater gegen d. seltsamen u. freunden Gla. in d. Christenheit, genannt Jesu, etc. (Wittenb. 1523).—Practica: Neue Apostolische u. Verantwortung Martini Lu. wider d. Papisten Moraltsschrei (1528). It is generally supposed that Kettenbach wrote largely that his works have been lost. His influence among the Reformers must have been great, or he would not have been among the persons cited by Eek to appear with Luther before the Reichstag at Augsburg. See Priorer, Univ. Lex. s. v.; Veesenmeyer, Beiträge z. Gesch. d. Lutheriter u. Reformer in d. 16. Jh. p. 79 sq.; Reim, in Herzog, Reut.-Encyklop., s. v.

Kettle, "(774, dud, so called from boiling), a large pot for cooking purposes (1 Sam. ii. 14: elsewhere rendered "pot," Psa. lxxxi, 6; Job xii, 20; "caldron," 2 Chron. xxxiv, 18). The same term in the original also signifies "basket" (2 Kings x, 7; Jer. xxxiv, 2; probably Psa. lxxxi, 6). From the passage in 1 Sam. ii. 15, 14, it is evident that the kettle was employed for the purpose of preparing the peace-offerings, as it is said (verse 14), "All that the flesh-hook brought up the priest took for himself." In the various processes of cookery represented on the monuments of Egypt, we frequently see large sauce-pots placed over a fire in a similar manner. See Flesh-pot.

Kettlewell, John, B.D., an eminent English divine (nonjuror), was born at Northallerton, Yorkshire, March 10, 1653; studied at St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, and in 1675 became fellow of Lincoln College. Still but a youth, he distinguished himself by the publication of his celebrated Essay on the Menaces of Christian Obedience. He was generally noticed, and in 1682 lord Digby presented young Kettlewell with the vicarage of Coleshill, Warwicksire, but he was deprived of it soon after the Revolution on account of his refusal to take the oath of obedience to William and Mary. He removed to London, and died there April 12, 1685. His principal works have been collected and published under the style, Works printed from Copyes revised and improved by the Author a little before his Death (Lond. 1715, 2 vols. fol.):—The Duty of Moral Rectitude (Tracts of Augt. Fawcett, iv, 219). Said that Kettensia Bibliothecarum, ib. 1725: Macaulay, Hist. of England, vol. iv (1846); Nelson, Life of Kettlewell (Lond. 1718).

Kettner, Friedrich Ernst, a German theologian, was born at Leipzig Jan. 21, 1671, and educated at the university of that place. He was licensed in 1697, and became immediately a superintendent in Quellinburg and first court preacher. He died July 21, 1722. His writings are mainly confined to local Church History.—Allgemeine Hist. Lex. iii, 22.

Ketura (Heb. Keturah, נִיהָד, gireled, otherwise Xeru-ta'ia), "the second wife, or, as she is called in 1 Chron. i. 32, the concubine of Absa-
ham; by her he had six sons, whom he lived to see grow to man's estate, and whom he established 'in the east' (Gen. xxx, 1-6). B.C. cir. 1997 et post. As Abraham was 100 years old when Isaac was born, who was given to him by the special bounty of Providence when 'he was as good as dead' (Heb. xi, 12); as he was 140 years old when Sarah died; and as he himself died at the age of 175 years, it has seemed improbable that these six sons should have been born to Abraham by one woman after he was 140 years old, and that he should have seen them all grow up to adult age, and have sent them forth to form independent settlements in that last and feeble period of his life. It has been supposed that, as Keturah is called Abraham's 'concubine' in Chronicles, and as she and Hagar are probably indicated as his 'concubines' in Gen. xxx, 6, Keturah had in fact been taken by Abraham as his secondary or concubine wife before the death of Sarah, although the historian relates the incident after that event, that his leading narrative might not be interrupted. According to the standard of morality then acknowledged, Abraham might quite as properly have taken Keturah before as after Sarah's death (Kitto); although, it is true, this would hardly lack some force in comparison with his first marriage, with Sarah's feelings, and would have been likely to introduce into the family another scene of discord such as he had seen with Hagar. In opposition to these and similar arguments, however, which are maintained by Prof. Bush (Note on Gen. xxx, 1), Dr. Turner justly urges (Commen. on Gen. xxx, p. 298 sq.), that the evidence of the narrative, the occasion offered by the death of Sarah, which preceded Abraham's demise thirty-six years, and the emphatic manner in which Keturah is introduced as a full wife, with lawful heirs, although of less esteem than Sarah, is opposed to the object drawn from the import of Abraham in consequence of advanced age, it is readily removed by the implied renewal of his vigor at the promise of an heir by Sarah (compare Heb. xi, 11); and, if sound, it would prove too much, for it would require the birth of all the six sons by Keturah to be dated before that of Isaac. See ABRAHAM.

On the Arabian affinities of Keturah, see the Journal Asiatique, Aug. 1838, p. 197 sq. "Her sons were 'Zimmran, and Jokshan, and Marden, and Midian, and Ishbak, and Shuah' (Gen. xxx, 2); besides the sons and grandsons of Jokshan, and the sons of Midian. They evidently occupied the desert to the Persian Gulf, and the region of the Arabian sea. They were divided into the tribes of the Arabs, and of a young girl [or slave] of Abraham; and, it is added, her descendants are the Turks!" M. Causin de Perceval (Essai, i, 179) has endeavored to identify her with the name of a tribe of the Amalekites (the 1st Amalek) called Kâthûra, but his arguments are not of any weight. They rest on one word, and are contradicted by the statements of Arab authors, as well as by the fact that the early tribes of Arabia (of which is Kâthûra) have not, with the single exception of Amalek, been identified with any historical names; while the exception of Amalek is that of a tribe in the desert, and not of a pre-Israelite Arabian people as recorded in the Bible; and there are reasons for supposing that these early tribes were aboriginal" (Smith). See ABRAHAM.

KEUCHENIUS, Petrus, a learned Dutch theologian, was born at Dois-le-Duc August 22, 1625, and studied at Leyden and Utrecht. He was a successor minister at Alen, Tiel, and Arnhem. He died March 27, 1689. He wrote Amontata in omnes N. T. libros, the second and only complete edition of which, superintended by Alberti, appeared in 1697. In these annotations is to throw light on the N. Test. by determining the sense in which words and phrases were used at the time it was written, and among those with whom its writers were familiar. For this purpose he compares the language of the N. Test. with that of the Septuagint, and the ancient versions. His notes are characterized by sound learning and great good sense. Alberti commends in strong terms his erudition, his candor, solidity, and impartiality."—Kito's Biblical Cyclopaedia, ii, 729. Kewley, John, D.D., a Roman Catholic priest, was born a Catholic priest, and an Augustinian, and was in early life a Jesuit. He afterwards renounced the doctrines and communion of the Church of Rome, joined "Lady Huntingdon's persuasion," preached somewhat among that body and the Methodists, and, coming to the United States, was admitted to holy orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church by bishop Claggett (about 1804); in 1809 became rector of an Episcopal Church in Middleburgh, Conn., and in 1818 of the parish of St. George's, New York, where he continued till he sailed for Europe in 1816. He afterwards became reconciled to the Church of Rome, and returned to his original ecclesiastical connection, in which he continued till his death. Kewley was a man of great meekness and gentleness, always untiring in the discharge of his holy functions, and fervent and effective in his preaching. He published a Sermon delivered at the consecration of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Maryland in 1806; also a sermon entitled Messiah the Physician of Souls, preached at Midletown and Cheshire in 1811. See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpite, v, 545. (J. L. S.) Key is a common heraldic bearing in the insignia of sees and religious houses, particularly such as had been attached to the patronage of St. Peter. Two keys in sallet are very frequent, and keys are sometimes interlaced or linked together at the bowes, i.e. rings. Keys inlaided are placed side by side, the wards away from each other. Key (Titus, 2 Peter, 1 Peter, 1 Peter, 1 Peter) is the name of an "opener," Judg. iii, 25; Isa. xxxii, 22; "opening," 1 Chron. ix, 27; xxiv, from its use in shutting, Matt. xvi, 19; Luke xi, 52; Rev. i, 18; iil, 7; ix, 1; xx, 1), an instrument frequently mentioned in Scripture, as well in a literal as in a figurative sense. The keys of the ancients were very different from ours, because their doors and trunks were generally closed with bands or bolts, which the key served only to loosen or fasten. Chardin says that a lock in the East is like a little harrow, which enters half way into a wooden staple, and that the key is a wooden handle, with points at the end of it, which are pushed into the staple, and so raise this little harrow. See LOCK. Indeed, early Oriental locks probably consisted merely of a wooden slide, drawn into its place by a string, and fastened there by teeth or catches; the key being a bit of wood, crooked like a sickle, which lifted up the slide and extracted it from its catches, after which it was drawn back by the string. But it is not difficult to open a lock of this kind even without a key, by the tongue, which is shaped in paste or other adhesive substance. The passage Cant. v, 4, 5 is thus probably explained (Harmer, Obs. iii, 81; vol. i, 394, ed. Clarke; Rauwolff, ap. Ray, Tran. ii, 17), Ancient Egyptian keys are often found figured on the monuments. They were made of bronze, iron, and consisted of a straight shank, about five inches in length, with three or more projecting teeth; others had a nearer resemblance to the wards of modern keys, with a short

Iron Key. (From Ancient Thebes, in Egypt.)
KEYS, POWER OF THE

The term "key" is frequently used in Scripture as the symbol of government, power, and authority. Even in modern times, in transferring the government of a city, the keys of the gates are delivered as an emblem of authority. In some parts of the East, for a man to march along with a large key upon his shoulder signifies claims to him to be a person of consequence. The size and weight of these oftentimes require them to be thus carried (Thomson, Land and Book, i, 493). So of Christ it is said, "And he clave the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open" (Rev. iii. 7). He also has the "keys of hell and of death" (Rev. i. 18; comp. ix. 1; xx. 1). Our Saviour said to Peter, as the representative of the apostles generally, upon whom collectively the same prerogative was on another occasion conferred, "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18) — that is, the power of preaching the Gospel officially, of administering the sacraments as a steward of the mysteries of God, and as a faithful servant, whom the Lord hath set over his house. This general authority is shared in common by all ministers and officers in the Church. The grant doubtless likewise included the authority to establish rules and constitutional orders in the Church, to which Christ himself gave no special ecclesiastical form, but left it to be organized by the apostles after his own resurrection. This power, too, in a subordinate degree, is delegated to the Church of later times; for it is noteworthy that even the apostles have not definitely prescribed any specific form of Church polity, and this is therefore, in a great measure, left to the discretion of each body of Christians. Indeed, the settlement of the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, as a basis of Church-membership and ecclesiastical discipline, appears to be the only explicit element of the authority conferred in these passages, or peculiar to his apostles — and exclusively belonged to them, inasmuch as their office was not transmissible; so that the canon of Scripture, as well as the essential points of Church constitution, have been completed by them for all time. See Successors. As to Peter himself, it is a gratuitous assumption on the part of Romanists that the authority was conferred upon him personally above his fellow-disciples, since in the other passage the general "ye" is used in place of the individual "thou." It is true, however, that as Peter was here addressed as the foremost, so to speak, of the apostolic college, he was eventually honored as the instrument of the introduction of the first Gentile as well as Christian members into the Church (see Acts ii. x), a fact to which Peter himself alludes in a very unassuming way (Acts xv. 7). The association of this authority with the power of absolution is another unauthorized use of the Roman Catholic Church; for the passage in which this is conferred (John xx. 23, "Whoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whoever sins ye retain, they are retained") stands in a very different connection, and is evidently intended to be the exclusive apostolic right to pronounce upon the religious state of those to whom, by the imposition of hands, they imparted the peculiar miraculous gifts of the primitive age (see Acts vii. 14-17; xix. 6). In accordance with the above analogies, the "keys of knowledge" is the means of attaining to true knowledge in respect to the kingdom of God (Luke xi. 25; comp. Matt. xxiii. 13; Luke xxiv. 32). It is said that authority to explain the law and the prophets was given among the Jews by the delivery of a key. See Binds. The Habibs say that God gave Peter the key of all things, to spread abroad the seeds of faith, and in a word, to guide the people. Peter was the key of light, that is, of spiritual brightness; Peter was the key of rain, the key of the grave, the key of fruitfulness, and the key of barrenness. See Keys, Power of the.

KEYES, JOSIAH, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Canajoharie, N. Y., Dec. 8, 1799; converted at the age of twelve; entered the Genesee Conference in 1819; was presiding elder on Black River District, and in 1835 on Cayuga District, where he died April 22, 1836. Mr. Keyes possessed a grasping intellect and great application. Without regular instruction, he acquired "a respectable knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and as a general scholar, a theologian, and a preacher of the Gospel." — Minutes of Conferences, ii, 412; Geo. Peck, D.D., Early Methodist (N. Y. 1860, 12mo), p. 74. (G. L. T.)

KEYS, JOHN, a Presbyterian minister of English descent, was born at Wilton, N. H., in 1807. At Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., in 1823, and afterwards taught school for several years. He studied theology at Morrisant, N. J., under James Richards, D.D.; was licensed in 1825, and in 1807 ordained by the New York Presbytery at Orangepledge, N. J., and in 1828 installed pastor of the Church at Sandy Ridge, New- Albany, N. Y. In 1814 he accepted a call from the Congregational Church of Wolcott, Conn.; in 1824 removed to Tallmadge, Ohio, as pastor of a Congregational Church, and afterwards preached successively at Dover, Newburg, Ohio; at Portia, Ill.; at St. Louis, Mo.; and at Cedar Rapids and Elkhart, Iowa. At last he returned to Dover, Ohio, where he died January 27, 1867. Mr. Keyes was an industrious student. As a preacher he took the greatest delight in his work; as a Christian he had great faith in the power of special prayer. See Wilson, Pref. Hist. Ohio, 1868, p. 216; Mr. J. L. S.

KEYS, POWER OF THE, a term which in a general sense denotes the extent of ecclesiastical power, or, in a narrower sense, the right to authorize or prohibit abolution; and it is upon the interpretation in the one sense or the other that the Protestant and Romish churches differ from each other. We base this article in Herzog's Real-Enzyklop. xiii, 579 sq.

I. New Testament Doctrine. The expression κλεῖδα τοῦ θεοῦ δια Λία (Lxx. xx. 22), denotes the power which was given to the king's officer over the royal household. In literal symbolism, λεγεῖ διά Λία (Rev. iii. 7) denotes the authority which Christ as King exercises over his realm with special regard to his right of admission or dismission. When Jesus (Matt. xvi. 19) solemnly intrusted to Peter, as a representative of the apostles, the keys of the heavenly kingdom, he invested him by that act simply with his apostolic station, which involves the founding of the Christian Church by the preaching of the forgiveness of sins (Luke xx. 38) and the establishment of the Gospel doctrine (Matt. xx. 19). In this sense the commission (John xx. 23) to the other eleven apostles must likewise be interpreted, for we have no reason to believe that the apostles ever exercised the authority, as Jesus did, of relieving the sinner of his guilt and restoring him to favor. It would be added to show that the apostles did exercise such authority, all evidence that such authority was transferred to the Church after the apostolic age is surely wanting. Besides, it is proper to make a distinction between the power of the keys claimed for Peter as an exclusive apostolic authority to bind and to loose which Jesus (Matt. xvi. 19) also conferred not only upon his other apostles, but upon the whole Church (Matt. xviii. 18). Both expressions, to bind and
to lose, which in New-Testament usage do not require a personal, but an impersonal object, mean, according to Balsillie's language, to permit and to forbid, to exercise the power to bind and to reveal (see Lightfoot, at loc. Matt., and comp. the art. Bind); and in the N.T. passages quoted they can refer only to the sphere of Christian social life. Against the opinion of the later Church, that Paul (1 Cor. v, 5-6) made use of the power of the keys to retain sins, Ritschl (Alte-Kathol. Kirche, 2d edit., p. 837 sq.) argues that in this passage only a disciplinary regulation is referred to; that Paul conceded to the Church the right of discipline, and only exercised authority when he supposed himself to act in harmony with the will of Christ. In the apostles' (2 Cor. vii, 6-10) held a contrary doctrine, he would be subject to the charge of_simulation. The apostolic writings, moreover, do not allude to any other agency in the Church for the remission of sins than that spoken of by Paul himself; 5 Cor. v, 18 seq., only conciliatory by Christ and the prayers of believers (1 John v, 16, 17, 16).

II. Doctrine of the Patristic Period.—The misconceptions of the meaning of the power to bind and to loose was early manifested in the Church. The Jewish-Christian Cenemoria Homicida, it is true, still evince a knowledge of the idea of the power to bind and to loose, inasmuch as they still supply—in the N.T. sense—an impersonal object; but, withal, they have so far enlarged upon the meaning of the expression as to find comprehended in the power to which it alludes all privileges of the episcopal office as a continuation of the apostolic office (iii, 72). Quite the opposite was held in the Gentile-Christian Church of the 2d century. It interpreted the power “to bind and to loose” as authority to retain and to forgive sin, and supplied the two verbs with personal objects; yet regarded—in the spirit of the early Church—as the authorities vested with the power to bind and to loose, the society (Church), and not the bishop. In so far as from a heathen-Christian stand-point the power of the “keys” was identified with the power “to bind and to loose,” the former was held to express in one conception both the latter acts, viz. excommunication and readmittance to the Church; but as the keys of Peter were taken also to comprehend all rights of Church government, and especially of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, we need not wonder that among the Church fathers of this age the two verbs were used somewhat mixed (comp. Tertullian, De Pudic. 21; Cyprian, De unit. eccles.; cap. 4). It was in the period of scholasticism—a period which really strict distinction was aimed at, and yet to this day Roman Catholics have failed to recognize generally this discrimination. The Church first regarded as bearers of the keys, i.e. of the power to bind and to loose, evidently because Christ works and has his abode there. (For this reason, also, the martyrs were accorded the position of “praeclara ecclesiae membria,” in whom Christ is active for his own glorification. Comp. Eusebius, v, 5, 5; Tertullian, De Pudic., Iadem, Apolog. 39.)

The first decided change of view is found among the Montanists. Tertullian (in De Pudicitia) limits the promise of Matt. xxv, 18 sq. simply to the person of Peter as the apostolic founder of the Church; the power to forgive sin he regards as the right of the Church in so far as she is identical with the Holy Ghost. The bearer of this right he holds to be the spiritual man (spiritualis homo), but that the latter, in the interests of the Church, abstains from exercising this prerogative. His opponent, the Roman bishop, however, interpreted it in favor of all the bishops (bishops are numerus episcoporum, chap. xxii). This thought Cyprian enlarged upon with a free use of the Montanistic thesis, holding that the episcopate is the inheritor (heir) of the apostolic power, the seat and the organ of the Holy Ghost, and therefore possessing of power to bind or to loose of its own accord. Of course, from such a stand-point, Cyprian was forced to reject as presumptuous the claim of the martyrs to the power of the keys; he only conceded to them the right of intercession for the fallen. To prove the ideal unity of the Church, Cyprian defined the argument that the power of the keys was first intrusted by Christ to Peter, and only afterwards to the other apostles (De uni. eccles. cap. iv). In the writings of Optatus Milerius this thought takes the form that the Church intrusted to Peter to bind and to loose the key to retain sins; Ritschl (Alte-Kathol. Kirche, 2d edit., p. 837 sq.) argues that in this passage only a disciplinary regulation is referred to; that Paul conceded to the Church the right of discipline, and only exercised authority when he supposed himself to act in harmony with the will of Christ; in the apostles' (2 Cor. iv, 6-10) held a contrary doctrine, he would be subject to the charge of simulation. The apostolic writings, moreover, do not allude to any other agency in the Church for the remission of sins than that spoken of by Peter himself; 5 Cor. v, 18 seq., only conciliatory by Christ and the prayers of believers (1 John v, 16, 17, 16).

At the Council of Chalcedon (451) the orthodox dogma of the grace of baptism (e.g. Epist. 73, c. 7) was further defined. Later, however, they are used in a narrower sense, and refer to great sins committed after baptism; in short, they denote the right of exercising penance-discipline, a power in principle conceded to the bishop, but which practically was limited to murder or treason, which actually was permitted to exercise only in union with all holy councils. All sins committed after baptism were subject to the power of the keys, only the greater ones, as Augustine has it, “committed against the Decalogue” (Serm. 851, 1 “De penit. c. 4). This declaration, however, is to be understood in the sense of the exemption of the sinner who passes against the ninth and tenth commandments; moreover, in the older practice, only the different species of idolatry, murder, and unchastity were punished by ecclesiastical courts. It is incorrect to argue, as has been done on the part of Protestants, that only the public sins — those which caused trouble to the Church were taken account of by the Church. As to the sins alluded to above, whether committed in secret or publicly, it was supposed that they did injury to the gifts of regeneration, and entangled the soul in the meshes of spiritual death; they were therefore held to be mortal defects or criminal (criminala mortaria, also cripulatio; the others were regarded as simply daily experiences of the remains of weakness cleaving to the believer, of which it seems almost impossible to be rid in this life. For the former only the power of the keys and the exercise of penance were regarded as in force; the latter, on the other hand, were supposed to be stoned for by the daily penance of a believing heart, by the fifth request in the Lord's Prayer, by oblation and the eucharist, etc. They were called pecunia reminiscit. Actually the power of the keys was exercised by the whole clerical body, under the presidency of the bishop. In formal inquisitions proceedings, the fact of the commission of a mortal sin was determined either by the voluntary confession of the perpetrator or by indiction and hearing of witnesses, followed, in case of established guilt, by the excommunication of the excommunicated. The excommunicated retained the privilege of praying for admission to the exercise of penance in the Church. This last, in early days, was in all cases public, especially after the time of Augustine, at least in cases of public crime; but after the beginning of the 13th century it was regulated by steps corresponding to catablematical grades. Upon the expiration of the term of penance, the length of which, in the early Church, was discretionary with the bishop, but in later times was determined by ecclesiastical laws, the excommunicated was again received into Church membership. This act, which was consummated by imposition of hands, prayer, and the kiss of peace by the bishop, with the assistance of the clergy before the altar (ante aspimen), in presence of the membership of the Church, was called reconciliation, or the bestowal of peace (paxem dare). Penitent souls, however, in danger of immediate death, could be reconciled even before the expiration of their period of pence, in presence of the bishop, by any presbyter, or, if such a one was not accessible, even by a deacon (Cyprian, Epist. xviii, 1; Conc. Eliberti, can. 92); a practice which we do not find as last as its Montanistic doctrine, which clearly proves that in the early Church reconciliation was more an act of jurisdiction than of order.
The earliest days of the Church, the exercise of its prerogative of the power to 'loose,' in reconciliation, coincided completely with abandonment, except that to this term there was not given the meaning which it received in the Middle Ages. Above all, it must not be forgotten that the Church fathers did not place the emphasis upon the act of repentance as they do now, but in the activity of the penitent himself; from the Church the penitent received only instruction how to heal the wound he had created by sin; hence they frequently designated penance as the medicine, and the sinner imposing it as the physician (the penitent). Vasilius (f. 40) states: "The Church does not undertake to repair himself from his crime by his good works, and merit the divine forgiveness. Thus must be understood Cyprian's frequent demand of 'justa penitentia,' which consists in the congruity of the guilt with the penance offered as reparation. That God alone absolved from sin was the accepted axiom of the early Church. Yet the Church hesitated not to consider itself one of the means of grace, competent to assist in the work of salvation, acting upon the theory laid down by Cyprian: 'Extra ecclesias nulla salus.' So long as the mortally sinning one seeks himself inwardly and outwardly, from the Church, the immediate way to salvation, divine forgiveness, seemed to him inaccessible; there was no need of judgment by the courts, he was already judged. If the Church again admitted him to membership among the purified, he was not necessary. He was the only object of the salvation, and he had at least the prospect of salvation; he now belonged to the number of those over whom the Lord on the final day would sit in judgment, from whom he would select his own. Upon this point Cyprian (Ep. lv. 15, 24) and Pacian (Epistol. ad Sympos. in fine) are very clear. As the absolving judgment of the Church thus becomes rather uncertain, depending upon approval or rejection in the final judgment, there was need of further elucidation. Reconciliation was therefore joined with prayer by a petition that God would forgive the penitent his sins, accept as sufficient his repentance, which of course could only afford a limited satisfaction for the committed offense, and restore to him the lost spiritual gifts. For this reason the act was accompanied by the imposition of hands; compare Augustine, De Baptismo, iii. c. 16, who says of this ceremony that it is "oratio super hominem," i.e. the symbolic pledge that the answer of prayer should benefit the penitent, and that with it was bestowed the gift of the Holy Ghost. In this sense Cyprian speaks of a "remissio facta per sacerdotes, ship Dominum gratia," for he knows only a forgiving only exists for him, who is absolved, with the Church. Thus these passages of Cyprian and Ambrose, this confiance in the Church, this assurance of divine absolution, were in the first ages of the Church, but we have every reason to suppose, upon the premises stated, that it could only have been deprecatory. Augustine even denounced the expression "I forgive thy sins," of the Donatists, as heretical (Serm. 99, c. 7-8). If, in our last allusion to the reconciliation of the sinner by means of prayerful intercession, the priest alone seemed to be entitled to be deprecator, we find a very different view was entertained by other Church fathers. In accordance with Lev. xiv, 2, Jerome says that the priests cannot make the leper clean, but the sinner; and between the clean and the unclean (Comm. in Matt. lib. iii). Not understanding, therefore, Matt. xvi, 19 to concede to the bishops and the elders any other power, it follows that he concede to the ecclesiastical office simply the authority of distinction, i.e. the judicial power of pronouncing those as les saints who had been inwardly loosed, and those as bound who have not yet been loosed by God's mercy—a judicial decision whose validity is essentially confined to the forum of the Church, and does not extend to the forum of God. Just so St. Augustine says (Comm. in Gen. 14, 19): "It must be determined what guilt has preceded and what repentance has followed guilt in order that the shepherd may loose those whom the Lord in his mercy visits with a sense of repentance. Only when the judg-
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Key of the inner judge is obeyed can the action of the
officer to loose be a correct and real one." Adding, as
he does Augustine, the narrative of the resurrection
of Lazarus, it is evident that Gregory did not consider
the bishop's action in mortal sins as anything more than
constituting a recognition of the inner condition of the
sinner. Just as God had breathed the spirit of life the
eascent judge is to pronounce as
loosed, those yet spiritually dead as bound.

As in the early Church great penitence was conceded
once only, so reconciliation by the Church was not re-
peatedly granted. In the writings of the 6th, 7th,
and 8th centuries, we first find a witness for the principle of ad-
mitting also backsliders to penance and reconciliation.
This change of practice was a necessary consequence of the
enactment of penitential laws which extended the use of the
term mortal sin also to such offences as had formerly been considered simply venial.

III. Doctrine of the Middle Ages and the Roman Catho-
ic Church.—The ancient Church classified her mem-
bers into three sections—the faithful, the catechumens,
and the penitent. The power of the keys was exercised
upon the former by the deacon; upon the latter by the bishop; and
among the newly-converted Germanic nations to en-
large the practice of penance into a general institution in the Church, and to make the power of the keys, which concerned the penitent alone, a general court of appeal and of mercy for all the faithful. This was done
first by subjecting also mental sins to the power of the keys, while in the earlier Church such a thing had nev-
er been dreamed of. The origin of this innovation has been demonstrated with full evidence by Wasserchle-
ben (Bussordnung d. oberrheinischen Kirche, p. 108 sq.).
Monasmic was the exercise of penance for all life. In the monas-
terity it was early considered an act of asceticism
to disclose to the brethren the most secret man-
ifestations of sin. In the old British and Irish Church education was directed especially to the order and in-
terests of practical Church life; morals and discipline were usually regulated by monastic also upon in the
prestressed society at large, and more widely in the
all civil legislation. As early as the 6th century,
Cyprian,
Viniffera, who flourished towards the end of the
scholasticise, the order is given that mental sins, even if
prevented from execution, should be amended for to
the satisfaction of the bishop, and were to be taken
over for the period of one year. The Anglo-Saxon Pemulentia, which bears the name of Theodore of Canterbury, prescribes for lus
t of seven years to forty days' atonement. The
rules of penance of the Irish monk Columbanus (died A.
D. 615) imported these regulations to the Continent, and,
and ordered that all sinful lusts of the mind should be
stated for by penance and bread and water from forty
days to six months (compare Wasserchleben, Bussord-
zung, p. 109, 1195, 835). In the 5th century the semi-
Feudal John Cassian, of Marseilles, established eight
principal sin (vita principal), from which grew the
actual sins, namely, intemperance, licentious-
ness, avariciousness, anger, sadness, bitterness, vanity, pride (Cod. S. S. Potamum vi-
tris). In the instructions of Columbanus (Biblioth.
Patris-
maries, xii, 23) they are mentioned under the name of
crimina capitalis," by which the early Church
designated simply those mortal actual sins that were subject
to public penitence, and under that name they were intro-
duced into several Anglo-Saxon and Frankish pen-
ance regulations. The Synod of Chalons, in the year
813, directed for private confession in the
atonement, to the principal sins of the confessor, a commendation
which Alcuin already made in his De divinis officiis, cap.
From these eight radical sins the seven death-sins
of scholasticism were developed. In these regulations of penance we find also already penance redemptions, so
important to the history of absolution, which originated simply by a transfer of the old Germanic composition
system to ecclesiastical life.

The extension of the power to bind and to loose over
all Christians was a necessary consequence of such in-
fluences as those just alluded to. In the instructions
for penance of the abbot Ottham, of St. Gall (died A.D.
761), we have the principle laid down that without con-
fession there is no forgiveness of sin. In Columbanus's
book, De confess. (can. 80), on the basis of a teaching in the
5th and 7th centuries, it is ordered that before every com-
munion there should be confession, especially of mental
excitements. According to Regino of Prum (died 915)
(De discipl. eccles. ii, 2), every person ought to confess
at least once a year. The first provincial synod which
makes confession a general obligation is that of Aachen,
A.D. 1109 (canon 20, in two very varying recensions). In-
ocent III is really the originator of the general pen-
ance law [see Penance], and thus likewise of the regu-
lar periodic exercise of the power of the keys over all Christians.
A regulation has no doubt the intention of staying, by ecclesiastical shackles on the spiritual freedom,
a spreading heresy, as seems evinced by the similarity of
canon 29 of the fourth Lateran synod with the twelfth
canon of the celebrated Synod of Toulouse in 1229.

Notwithstanding the opposition which manifested itself in the north of the empire, the laws of
books and those of its rules not corresponding to the
regulations of the older canons, its principles took effectu-
tional hold, and caused a decided revolution in the prac-
tice of penance and reconciliation. Even though, after
the 4th century, by the side of the public penance, pri-


Upon the theological importance of absolution, and the relation which the priest in the administering of it sustains to it, the same opposite opinions which we found in the /patrice period were entertained in the first half of the Middle Ages. According to the view of which Jerome in the Great Must be especially designated as representatives, the priest is judge in /foro ecclesiae, and may by his judgment simply determine and certify for the Church the manifestation of divine mercy in the penitent's heart. Thus, in the /Homile of Eginus of Noyon, which, in all probability, belong to the Carolingian period, we read that the priests, who are in Christ's stead, must by their office, in a visible manner (externally or ecclesiastically), absolve those whom Christ, by an invisible ( inwardly effected) absolution, declares worthy of his reconciliation (atonement). Thus says Haymo of Halberstadt (died 898), in a sermon (Hom. in Octaur, Ps. 118), after alluding to the practices of the O.-T. priests towards lepers: "Those whom he recognizes by repentance and worthy improvement as inwardly loosed, the shepherd of souls may absolve by his declaration." According to this view, divine forgiveness not only precedes priestly absolution, but also confession; it is the portion of the sinner from the moment when he repents in his heart and turns to God. Absolution of the Church in this instance is simply the confirmation of what God has already done. A proof that God has done it in his strength (cfr. also the condemnation of Gratian's treatment of the Decretals (can. xxxiii, qu. iii). He there proposes the question whether anybody can give satisfaction to God by simple repentance without confession (and consequently, also, without absolution). He first adduces the reasonableness of authorities that must compel an affirmative answer to this question, then those that would answer it in the negative; at the close he leaves it to the reader to decide for himself in favor of the one or the other, as both opinions have the favor and disapproval of wise and pious men. Thus, for example, Lombard, Gratian's contemporary, says (Sent. lib. iv, dist. 17) that the sense of forgiveness is felt before the confession of the lips, indeed, from the moment when the holy desire fills the heart. The priest has therefore the power to bind and to loose only in the sense that he declares men bound or loosed, just as the disciples declared Lazarus free from his bonds only after Christ had restored him to life. The declaration of the priest has therefore simply the effect of releasing before the Church the person already loosed by God. According to cardinal Robert Pulley (died 1158), a man of great divine feeling, a sinner as soon as he repents; absolution is a sacrament, i.e. the symbol of a sacred cause, for it externally represents forgiveness already secured in the heart by repentance, not as if the priest actually forgave, but as the external symbol, for the purpose of the priest, the sinner doubly sure of forgiveness, although it has already become manifested (Sentent. lib. vii., 12). If, at the same time, the anxiety still remaining in the heart is lessened or relieved, this is the effect of absolution, not depending so much upon the activity of the priest as upon God, from whom it springs. By the exercise of divine forgiveness the sinner is simply relieved of the ultimate consequences of his guilt, i.e. eternal damnation; yet earlier or more immediate punishment can only be prevented by his future efforts to atone for the act. Hence the priest imposes a certain measure of satisfaction, a compliance with which, alone from the passage of punishment corresponding to the greatness of his guilt; if the satisfaction is too moderate, the penitent must not fancy himself absolved before God; he will have to atone to the fulness of the measure either in this world or in the next. The prospect hereby becomes complete absolution before God we evidently do not find here conceived to be the prerogative of the Church; her judgment is competent only to free the sinner after compliance with her imposition of punishment; on divine punishments she has no judgment. Nearest in view to Robert Pulley comes Peter of Poictiers, chancellor of the University of Paris (he died about 1204), who (in his /Libri Sententiarum) lays down the doctrine that forgiveness of sin proceeds confession; and that it is solely by repentance that God freely condescends that the priest cannot relieve the confessing one of his guilt or of eternal punishment; both he asserts to be the prerogative of God alone. The priest has simply the authority to indicate or to declare that God has forgiven the penitent his sin. God, however, relieves of eternal punishment only on condition of definite satisfactions, which the priest has to determine as to measure, and to impose according to the greatness of the crime; and on this account the priest must possess not simply the power to loose, but also the power of discretion (claris discretionis), which is not granted to everybody. The penitent is therefore advised in all cases to go, if possible, beyond the measure of satisfaction imposed by the priest, lest in purgatory the offender may be obliged to make satisfaction for his neglect here. It is quite characteristic that this scholastic regards conscience as a sacrament, a new teaching of St. T., for the whole process of penance he bases upon the personal activity of the penitent (Sent. iii, cap. 18 and 16). Alongside of this view, according to which the possessor of the power of the keys officiates essentially as judge in /foro ecclesiae, another is entertained, which finds its strongest supporters in the Gemonian school; to whom the priest is intercessor and mediator for the penitent before God. This particular view, in its successive developments, has exerted the greatest influence in expanding the priestly power of the keys. This position is assigned to the priest in all late pontifical books. Its nature is clearly defined by Alcuin, who, from the analogy of Leviticus (v, 12), in which the sinner is advised to seek the priest with his sacrifice, draws the conclusion that Christian penitents also must bring their sacrifice of confession to God by way of the priest, in order that the latter may intercede for him and secure the forgiveness of the Lord (Adfratr. in provinc. Gatharonum, ep. 96). For this very reason he calls (in his De officia divina) the priest "sequester ac mediarius inter Deum et peccatores hominem ordinatus, pro peccatorum intercessor." This sacerdotal intercession received a higher emphasis in the 11th or 12th century by the De cuta et jilere penitentiarum, a work attributed, though incorrectly, to Augustine. It develops the following doctrines: 1. That the priest in confession stands in God's stead—his forgiveness is God's forgiveness; for does not Christ say, "Whom ye hold to be innocent, I also hold to be innocent. Whom ye condemn to be guilty, I also condemn to be guilty"? (cap. xxv.) 2. Gregory the Great had already laid down the dogma that by penance (but not by absolution), sin, which in itself was irremovable, became removable, i.e. became an expiable guilt by the perspicacity of the sinner, of which thought was modified in the work just alluded to, so that in confession, it is true, the sinner is not cleared before God, but the committed offence is changed from a mortal to a venial sin (cap. xxv). 3. Such sins no longer incur eternal, but simply temporal punishment, and may be atoned for, either in this world by works of confession, or after death in purgatory, where the pain to be endured for them shall far exceed any tortures which the martyrs ever suffered in this life. This thought was taken up by the Victorians, and from it was developed a complete system. Hugo of St. Victor regarded the penitent's prayer in the Litany as the most appropriate adoration, the most perfect intercession, the most pure mouth of God's mercy (Adfratr. in provinc. Gatharonum, ep. 96). And why should he not? Had not pope John VIII., in the year 878 (Epist. 60), already assumed for himself the power, in virtue of his authority from Peter, to bind and to loose, to absolve from all sins, those who had fallen in battle for the Church? and had not bishop
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Jerusalem, of Limoges, in 1081, at the council held in that city, developed the principle that Christ had intrusted to his Church such a power, that she may loose after death those who were living in it. Bond (Marais, xvi, 589; Grimme, Ch. Hist., i, 1, 38, note 8) says that this principle was quickly spread among his contemporaries. Cardinal Pulley says that confession made to the priest means virtually (quasi) confession to God; and Alexander III declares that what the priest learns in confession he does not learn as a judge, but as God ("ut Deus," cap. 2, ap. Greg. De offic.; jurid. ordin. i, 81). Now if we behold in the priest an intermediate being between God and man, surrounded by a splendor before which the layman's eye is blinded, it is no more than reasonable to expect that his acts must gain in importance, and his position approach near that of the God under whom he represents him-

tative. Hugo beholds the sinner bound by a twofold bondage—by an internal and external, by hardness and by incurable damnation; the former God loses by con-

nition, the latter by the assistance of the priest, as the instrument by which he works. Here also the resurrection of Lazarus serves both as example and as proof (ibid., pt. xiv, cap. 8).

His pupil, Richard of St. Victor, goes a step further in his tract De potestate lignandi et solvens. Loosening from guilt, the effects of which are basically imprison (impotency) and servitude (as has been said), is a thing only accomplished by the justly justified, or by the justly justified only, by men, who need not necessarily be priests; it is done even before confession, by contrition. The loosening from eternal punishment God performs by the priest, to whom, for this purpose, the power of the keys has been intrusted; he changes it (i.e., the punishment) into a transitory one, to be absolved either upon earth or in purgatory. The loosening from transitory punishment is effected by the priest himself by changing it into an ex-

ce of penance, which is done by the imposition of a corresponding satisfaction.

If he is considered, side by side, two opinio, namely, that the administrator of the power of the keys either judges in foro ecclesiae or as an interceding mediator, we need not wonder that the advance of doctrinal development soon effected a dialectical union of the two. Richard of St. Victor evidently aimed at such a fusion; the great scholastics of the 13th century accomplished it; and Thomas Aquinas is to be especially regarded as the author of the doctrine defined by the Council of Trent. Alexander of Hales, in his Summa Theologiae (pt. iv, qu. 20, membro iii, art. 2), opens with the proposition: "Aeternum judicat Deus, sanumque resurrecit, sed non omne sacerdos, sed unus eligitur, qui semper dicitur in foro ecclesiae. Unum est, igitur, quem in foro, quem in se, et di verum in foro,

nition, that all parts of the sacrament of penance se-

ure their unity in it. Thomas himself argues that God alone relieves of guilt and eternal punishment on condi-
tion of mere contrition; but this contrition can only as-

re the heart, and affect the forms of primary corruption, followed by the fulness of love (as an attendant of fides formatio), and furthermore must be accompanied with a desire for sacramental confession and absolution. To him who thus repents, guilt and eternal punishment are already remitted before confession, because in the con-

mitante desire, while repenting, to subject himself to the power of the keys, the latter at once exerts its influence (in actu exerit), although not in actu se exercet. If such a person comes into the penance-chair, the grace showered upon him is greatly increased (augeret gru-

ia) by the exercise (in actu) of the power of the keys. But if contrition does not sufficiently fill the sinner's heart (for want of love, as is frequently the case in the simple attrito, and therefore his disposition does not admit the actual exercise of the power of the keys, then the latter supplements his disposition by removing any still existing impediment to the enjoyment of the remission of sin-

grace, provided he does not himself bar all access to his heart. In all these relations the priest has that place in the sacrament of penance which water holds in the sacrament of baptism; the former is instrumentum ministrum, as the latter is instrumentum sacram. His power, whether simply in foro ascribed to actu
exerted, makes way for the overflowing stream of mercy, and secures the necessary disposition for its reception (chap. 18, art. 1 and 2). The power of the keys is consequently the red thread which is threaded at discretion, drawn through penance, and becomes visible to the outward eye also in absolution. It gives the real form, the frame that secures to all acts of penance (which by its structure forms the sacred altar), and receives a sacramental character their inner connection, and supplies to all what is still needed for their completion (comp. qu. 10, art. 1). This is manifest in the effects of absolution by the power of the keys; for example (according to qu. 18, art. 2), temporal punishment is remitted, and the confession is ratified (Richard of St. Victor). Yet this is not completely done as in baptism, but only in part; the portion still remaining must be atoned for by the personal satisfactions of the penitent, by his prayer, by almsgiving, by fasting to the fullness of the measure meted out by the priest (qu. 18, art. 5). The imposition of satisfactions Thomas calls binding, i.e., obliging to atone for punishments still in reserve. The satisfactions have the twofold object of appeasing divine justice and of counteracting any tendency in the soul to sin. Punishment still in reserve (peccata satisfactiores) again are imposed in virtue of the power of the jurisdic- tion (by means of indulgence (qu. 25, art. 1), which in the forum of God has the same value as in that of the Church; and this, according to the idea of substituting satisfaction on which it rests, may be of benefit even to souls in purgatory.

By this further development of the doctrine of the power of the keys the form of absolution also was nec- essarily considerably altered. Alexander of Hales says that in his day the deprecatory formula preceded and was followed by the indults; and this he justifies from his position by the sentence, "Est deprecatio gra- tiam impetrat et absolutioni gratiam supponit" (comp. pt. iv, qu. 21, membr. 1). The indicative form of absolution, however, must have been an innovation, for the unnamed opponent of Thomas alluded to in his opusculum xxiii (others xxii) actually asserts that to within thirty years the absolution formula used by all priests was Absolutionem et remissionem iibi tribuat Deus. Thomas de- fends with special emphasis the formula Ego te absolvo, etc., because it has in its favor the analogy of other sac- raments, and because it precisely expresses the effect of the act. He places rather, in the first place, the effect of the absolution, namely, the forgiveness of sins, as an exercise of the power of the keys. He interprets its content in the following words: "Ego impenso iibi sacra- mentum absolutionis." But he also advises that the indicative form be preceded by the deprecatory, lest on the part of the penitent the sacramental effects may be put in question. (Cod. Litra. 10, Mem. 1). The doctrine of Thomas had in its essentials already been dogmatically defined by Eugenius IV in 1439 at the Council of Florence (ManSI, xxxii, 1057), and in its different rules more minutely at the Council of Trent, at its fourteenth session, Nov. 25, 1551. The Council of Trent, in its decree and the canons appended, had sim- ply pronounced authoritatively the exclusive right of the priest to absolve, and it explained the spirit of the latter to be not merely an announcement of forgiveness, but a judicial and sacramental act. The Roman cate- chism enters far more into detail on this particular point: as the priest in all sacraments performs Christ's office, the penitent has to honor in him the person of Christ. Absolution announced by him does not simply mean, but actually procures forgiveness of sin (pt. ii, cap. v, qu. 17 and 11), for it causes the blood of Christ to flow unto us, and washes away sins committed after baptism (qu. 10). If, in contrition, confession, and satisfaction, the personal activity of the penitent (the opus operans) is pre-eminent, on the other hand, in absolution (by which, as the forma sacramentalis, those acts of penance first really as- sume the character of a perfect act), the absolution by the priest (the forma operativa), he must become perfectly passive (for it operates altogether as opere operato). From this stand-point the objection frequently raised on the Roman Catholic side against Protestant polemics seems in some sort reasonable, namely, that absolution is neither hypothetical nor absolute, and that it is a sacramental act to which this distinction cannot actually be applied; and it must be conceded on our part that, with the conditions under- stood to be concurrent, it furnishes such a degree of cer- tainty, such a finality of disposition, to each individual in every one who does not intentionally frustrate it.

This, however, is only one side, in which the priest stands as intercessor between God and the penitent, no longer (as formerly regarded) as a deprecant simply, but as dispenser of mercies. The Roman Catholic concep- tion of absolution furnishes a condition for the personal absolu- tion side, according to which the priest is essentially judge, not simply in foro ecclesiae, but also, at the same time, in foro Dei, i.e., judge in God's stead. As such, he inves- tigates sin to determine a corresponding punishment, and examines the spiritual condition of the penitent in order to know whether to bind or to loose. He is there- fore not simply executor of the opus operans, but also judge of the opus operans. Now, as such, he gives a judgment, and this must be either hypothetical or absolute. If we look at the form of the sacramental prac- tices, at the sacrificial act, at the dispensation of grace, the more the acts and the faith of the Roman Catholic in the absolving priest is to be looked upon as if he heard the words of Christ to the leper, "Thy sins be forgiven thee" (L. c. qu. 10), we cannot do otherwise than regard the priestly deed as both absolute, both by its form and in view of the infallible division. If, on the other hand, we consider that the priest—and this is con- ceded on the part of the Roman Catholics—may also be fallible; that the confessor is, after all, a very imperfect surrogate on account of his want of omnipotence; yes, that but very seldom any certain knowledge of the spiritual condition of the confidant, his judgment must necessarily become conditioned; the whole sacrament becomes equally hypothetical, as upon this rests its basis. Thus the Roman Catholic doctrine fluctuates between two opposite poles of assurance and contingency. This, indeed, is the necessary consequence of its development as we have followed it in history, in which two separate originally distinct views as to the position of the priest in absolution had been combined, without, however, really agreeing with each other.

Thus was the power of the keys developed. A very new development was given to the doctrine of the power of the keys by the Reformers. Especially noteworthy is,

1. Luther's Attitude.—He retained private confession and private absolution, although he knew them to be unnecessary (see Munock's Aries; he also abolished the sacramental character of absolution. Yet, notwithstanding this apparent adherence to Romish practices, it will be found that he changed, so to speak, regenerated the whole institution in a reformatory spirit. With Luther also the power of the keys is identical with the power to bind and to loose. The keys he re- gards as nothing else than the authority or office by which the Word is practiced and propagated. As the Word of God, from the nature of its contents, is both law and gospel, so the sermon has the twofold task of alarming the secure sinner by threats of the law, and of giving peace to the troubled conscience by the consola- tions of the Gospel, i.e., by the forgiveness of sins. The former is denoted by the binding key, the latter by the loosing key, which are both equally essential to keep Christ in the narrow path of spiritual life. Even the sermon Luther therefore considers as an act (the essential act) of the power of the keys, and the consola- tion afforded by it as a perfectly effectual absolution. From the latter, however, is to be particularly distin- guished common absolution, accorded at the close of the sermon, in which the priest dismisses all hearers for obtaining themselves forgiveness of sin; also private absolution, to be received only at the
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confessional, and which is nothing more nor less than a sermon confined to one auditor. The existence of these two distinct modes of exercising the keys he ascribes partly to God's riches, who did not wish to manifest any listlessness in the matter, and partly to the wants of an abashed conscience and a timid heart, which greatly need this strength and stimulus against the devil. The value of private absolution he places in its quasi sacramental character, for, like the sacrament, it also affords a real advantage in confining the Word to a particular person, and thus more securely strikes home than in the sermon. It is true, for this reason, private absolution cannot be regarded as an absolute necessity to forgiveness, for the views it is unquestionably here taken from an official and advisable (St.ites, Privatabtesliche u. Privatab solUTION, p. 7-14). As Luther, moreover, did not look upon the confessional as a judicial authority, but simply as a mercy-seat, so he looked upon absolution, which he recognized as the most important feature of confession, not as a judicial decision, but as the simple announcement of the Gospel: "They sins are forgiven thee"—the apportionment of the forgiveness of sin to a particular person, the confinement of its consolation to the most individual needs of a single heart. The power and effect do not depend upon the person upon whom it rests or the manner in which it is exercised; it may be ascribed either to God, or to the office of Christ, which is announced by it, and upon the command of Christ, which is executed by it. For this very reason, all distinction of human and divine activity disappears from it; neither is the sentence of the person absolving anything but the word of God, nor does the absolver announce upon earth the judgment of heaven, but in the forgiveness at absolution God's forgiveness is directly afforded. The only condition upon which the effect of absolution depends is that upon which rests the efficacy of the word of God, i.e., the faith of the person, namely, faith; by faith it is received. Repentance is efficacious only so far as it is the indispensable preparation for the reception, but in itself cannot insure forgiveness, as without faith it remains simply sin come to life and experienced in the heart, a Judas-pain of despair (St.ites, ut supra, ib. 15-18). Notwithstanding this irremissible necessity of faith, Luther is far from basing it upon his power of absolution; a weak faith may receive strength also; yes, even to the unbeliever it is truly offered, and affords him forgiveness on account of the inwardness of the Word of God, who demands it, and on this account the power to loose in private absolution is not accompanied by the power to bind. Upon this rests the importance of the distinction between private absolution and private confession; for to confess does not mean anything else than inwardly to declare absolution for our own guilt. Confession can therefore not be offered to anyone for God himself does not offer it; it must be an inward want. For this reason, again, no remuneration can be demanded of the person confessing. Luther makes no distinction between the absolution of the layman and that of the priest. It is also his opinion that man cannot too frequently enjoy absolution and the consolation of forgiveness, hence God, in the riches of his mercy, has so ordered it that this consolation may be experienced wherever the Church of the faithful exerts her influence. In this connection, it was not infrequently said, "Our confession all one's different sins, it is most important to confess those that particularly oppress the heart. The key to bind, for which Luther found no place in private confession, he assigned particularly to jurisdiction; it forms absolution for the Church, which is exercised in all the different and varied forms of public sin and reproach, and for notorious distinction to reparation; it is the public declaration of the Church that the sinner has bound himself, i.e., has deprived himself of all association of love, and surrendered himself to the devil. It excludes simply from the public association with the Church and her sacraments, not from the inner membership of the Church, from which the sinner himself only can cut loose. It is merely a public punishment of the Church, and has no other object than to improve the sinner. For this reason he is simply excluded from the sacrament, not from the sermon, nor even from the intercession of the Church on his behalf. The loosing from the ban is the public declaration of forgiveness by the Church, and the sinner himself must be reconciled to and is again accepted by the Church. This loosing is to be granted to any one who seeks it in repentance and faith; and this absolution of the Church, in virtue of the power of the keys, is God's absolution. A ban unjustly imposed can do the person so punished no harm, and should be borne patiently; nor must it be forgotten that external membership in the Church may be coexistent with exclusion from inner membership.

2. Melanchthon coincided generally with Luther on the doctrine of the power of the keys, but with this difference that he regarded the keys as possessing a more exalted status in the office of the episcopal or ministerial office. Yet we find in ecclesiastical regulations made under his supervision, as early as 1548, some decided deviations from Luther's doctrines. It is there directed to admit no one to communion "unless he has previously received private absolution from his pastor or some other competent person" (Richter, Kirchenordnung, ii. 45). Furthermore, the right is conceded to the absolving minister, under certain conditions, to deny absolution to the confessing. The ban itself, however, in consequence of its abuse, was early taken out of the hands of the clergy, and its imposition left to the Consistory. Absolution was bestowed in the church at Sunday vesper service by imposition of hands. The formulas of absolution are partly expository; not unfrequently both stand side by side for reception.

Cheninitz is the first who disputes that absolution can be regarded as a sacrament in the same manner as baptism and communion, and assigns for his reason that it rests simply upon the Word of God, and has received no additional external sign. He also regards the exercise of absolution as a right of the church's community, not as a right of the individual, though he adds that the person who demands it, and on this account the power to loose in private absolution is not accompanied by the power to bind. Upon this rests the importance of the distinction between private absolution and private confession; for to confess does not mean anything else than inwardly to declare absolution for our own guilt. Confession can therefore not be offered to anyone for God himself does not offer it; it must be an inward want. For this reason, again, no remuneration can be demanded of the person confessing. Luther makes no distinction between the absolution of the layman and that of the priest. It is also his opinion that man cannot too frequently enjoy absolution and the consolation of forgiveness, hence God, in the riches of his mercy, has so ordered it that this consolation may be experienced wherever the Church of the faithful exerts her influence. In this connection, it was not infrequently said, "Our confession all one's different sins, it is most important to confess those that particularly oppress the heart. The key to bind, for which Luther found no place in private confession, he assigned particularly to jurisdiction; it forms absolution for the Church, which is exercised in all the different and varied forms of public sin and reproach, and for notorious distinction to reparation; it is the public declaration of the Church that the sinner has bound himself, i.e., has deprived himself of all association of love, and surrendered himself to the devil. It excludes simply from the public association with the Church and her sacraments, not from the inner membership of the Church, from which the sinner himself only can cut loose. It is merely a public punishment of the Church, and has no other object than to improve the sinner. For this reason he is simply excluded from the sacrament, not from the sermon, nor even from the intercession of the Church on his behalf. The loosing from the ban is the public declaration of forgiveness by the Church, and the sinner himself must be reconciled to and is again accepted by the Church. This loosing is to be granted to any one who seeks it in repentance and faith; and this absolution of the Church, in virtue of the power of the keys, is God's absolution. A ban unjustly imposed can do the person so punished no harm, and should be borne patiently; nor must it be forgotten that external membership in the Church may be coexistent with exclusion from inner membership.

As a misinterpretation of the original Protestant view on this doctrine we must certainly regard Bähr's position that abjuration is a juridical act; and he, in consequence, distinguishes the potestas ordinis and the potestas clavium or jurisdictionis, and determines the former to be a potestas publice docendi et sacramentis administrandi, and the latter a potestas revocandi et revocandis pecatoribus (Bähr, loc. cit., §§ 59, note 9).

8. The Swiss reformers, from the very commencement, interpreted the power of the keys to refer especially to the exercise of ecclesiastical government, and more particularly to Church discipline, and in this sense they have been adhered to by the Genevan church. Little light is shed by the Swiss writers pertaining to this subject. On the other hand, Calvin referred the power of the keys altogether to the preaching
of the Gospel and the exercise of Church discipline, disregarding the sacramental idea. He taught: 1. Absolution is twofold: one part paper faith, the other belongs to Church discipline. 2. Absolution is nothing else than the witness of the forgiveness of sin based upon the forms of the Gospel (Matt. liii. cap. iv., § 29). 3. Absolution is conditioned by faith, that is, by a faith that is not merely a paper faith. As to the existence of these conditions men must necessarily be uncertain, so that the certainty of binding and loosing does not depend upon the judicial decision of a human court. The servants of the divine Word can therefore absolve only conditionally (§ 26), in virtue of the divine Word. They can only promise forgiveness to all who believe on Christ, and threaten damnation to those who do not lay hold of Christ (§ 21). 5. In this exercise of their functions they can, for this reason, not fall into error, for they do not promise more than the Word of God commands them; while the sinner can secure for himself certain and complete absolution with perfect assurance whenever he will lay hold upon the mercy of Christ in accordance with the spirit of the Bible promises, "According to thy faith be it unto thee" (§ 22). 6. The other absolution, which forms a constituent of Church discipline, is directed to the individual sins; it exterminates only any offence which may have been given to the Church (§ 23). In this also the Church follows the infallible rule of the divine Word: in virtue of this word she announces that all adulterers, thieves, murderers, and the unjust shall not have part or lot in the kingdom of God; and in this binding she cannot err. With this same word she looses the repeating ones, to whom she brings consolation (§ 21). According to these principles, which, with utter disregard of the sacramental idea, designate absolution simply as a species of sermon, and with it reproduce the doctrine of German Protestantism in an improved form, Calvin could not cast aside private absolution; yet he declined to recognise in it a general institution of the Church, and made its administration dependent upon the individual need of those who should demand it. Its value to the end in view he speaks of very much in the strain of the Lutheran Church: "It happens sometimes that some one hears the promises given to all the faithful, and nevertheless remains in doubt whether to him also his sins are forgiven. When such a one uncovers his secret wound to his pastor, and hears that voice of the Gospel, 'Be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee' (Matt. ix. 2), addressed to himself, his heart is quieted and freed from all fear. Nevertheless we must take care lest we should dream of a power of the keys not in accord with the doctrine of the Church (§ 14). The truth is, this does not look exactly like Lutheran private absolution, but it is certainly the only evangelical sense; and of this alone the Scriptures, the apostolic Church, and the following centuries down to the Middle Ages, know anything.

4. Private absolution, as a whole, could be a blessing only so long as that specific religious interest which the Reformation awakened in all circles remained fresh and full of life; with a latitude of the latter, the former also, together with confession, its offspring, necessarily deteriorates to a formal, thoughtless form, and, instead of encouraging faith, favored a false sense of security. The bewailing of the Lutheran churches its exercise was ignored, and finally resulted in a complete change of the manner of confession and absolution (Steits, p. 169 sq.). The fresh and living spirit of the Reformation had fled, private confession and private absolution had sunk to a mere thoughtless form, Church ban had become a punishment, public reconciliation a public restitution; this ecclesiastical punishment was pronounced only by the consistory, and simply in cases of offences of the flesh.

5. Suddenly Pietism came forward with a loud protest, and demanded a decided reform in the exercise of the power of the keys. The forerunner in this direction was Theophilus Grotiusgebauer, professor at Rostock (Wiedertimmer aus dem verwüsteten Zion, 1661), who regard-
ed as essential for private sins only confession before God, but for public sins, to which alone he referred the power to bind and to loose, public confession and reconciliation in presence of the offended Church. Spener, although in favor of retaining private confession and private absolution, advocated a modified form, viz., an announcement of the fault, made public, to the elders or deacons of the church, and examination of the condition of the confessor's soul; and he insisted that the confessor, whose choice he left to personal confidence, should absolve only those truly repenting, but should impress the sinner with his guilt, and summon him to appear before a college of elders for them to judge and to exercise the authority of the ban. With special emphasis he declared the power of the keys to be a right of the whole Church or of the brotherhood, which, by way of abuse, had fallen exclusively into the hands of the ecclesiastics. With far greater decision his adherents opposed the institution of private confession: the attacks of pastor Johann Kaspar Schade, of Berlin, on the confessional, which he called an institution of Satan, and his absolution of private absolution of his own accord, resulted first in an investigation of the merits of the question (Nov. 16, 1659), and finally in the condemnation of the doctrine (May 17, 1660). This was followed by a like regulation on the part of other states, which ordered confession and absolution of all confidants in common, but, on the other hand, left private confession and private absolution to be determined by the needs of the individual. Pietism and Lutheran orthodoxy led the latter to declare private confession and private absolution a divine institution, and thus only brought some credit to the old Lutheran institutions, while it greatly increased the fervor of their opponents.

4. In the sphere of dogmatism Schleiermacher was the first among German Protestant divines to reintroduce the idea of the power of the keys, but he confines its application, after special exclusion of the sermon, to the law-giving and judicial (administrative) power of the Church, which he regards as the essential outgrowth of the ecclesiastical office of Christ, and whose existence he ascribes to the association of the Church with the world (§ 144, 145). When we consider, however, how vague and contradictory are the confessional books of the evangelical churches on this point (we need in viti.e only a comparison of the passages collected by Schleiermacher in § 145), how things altogether distinct are there joined, and how difficult it is in an exegetical way to define the subject with any degree of certainty, it seems the most proper course to ignore the attempt altogether of introducing into dogmatism the significations of the term "keys," and to leave, in the hope of being kindred to, "to bind and loose." What has thus far been written upon these phrases would have been much more in place in defining "forgiveness of sin" and "justification" when alluding in practical theology to preparation for communion (as has been done, with a good deal of tact, by Nitschke in his Prakt. Theol. ii, 2, 420), and in ecclesiastical law under discipline without any cause for fear of complication.

As regards the idea of absolution so prominent in the exercise of the power of the keys, it has, during the last twenty years, again become (in Germany) matter of general discussion. The eminent court preacher, Dr. Ackermann (as the Church diet in Bremen in 1852), on private confession. Although he did not lay particular stress upon absolution, but simply justified confession on its own account and as a psychological need, it naturally led to a discussion by the Church diet, followed by a lively discussion between the Lutheran and Reformed ministers. On this part of the Lutherans every possible effort was made to reinvest private absolution with its former rights, and to prove the way at least for its early reintroduction. They went so far as to claim it as an institution, argued for general absolution as a duty, and, well knowing its origin in the Middle Ages, appealed to it as an institution sanctified by tradition of the Church.
even the assertion was not wanting that absoluteness, under all circumstances, possesses divine power, as actually to free the sinner from his guilt, quite in contradiction to the new Lutheran doctrine. See Lutheranism, New.

V. Doctrine of the Greek Church.—The Greek Church entertains views on the doctrine of the power of the keys and on dissolution very similar to those entertained by the Latin Church in the Middle Ages. The subject is treated in full in Govel, Account of the Greek Church (Cambridge, 1722, fol.), p. 229 sq.; Neale, Eastern Church, Intro., i. See Greek Church.

VI. Doctrine of the Church of England and of the Protestant Episcopal Church.—On the question of absolution, as involved in the so-called “power of the keys,” there is a division of opinion similar to that noticed above in the Lutheran Church of Germany. This difference is but a part of a wide divergence of views on the whole question of ministerial functions, and is generally denied by the opposite terms the High-Church and the Low-Church party. See Ritualism.

VII. Literature.—J. Morinus, De disciplina in administration esteramentum pontificium (Paris, 1651, Antwerp, 1662); Daillée, De penna und satisfactionis humanis (Amst., 1649); De abbatiali una curatulis Lutetiarum confessionis (Gen., 1661); Hottinger, Summae exercit.
tat de pontificiis antiquiora Romanae ecclesiae (Tigurini, 1761); Wernsdorf, De absolutione non mere declaratricia (Vill., 1761); Albicht, De confessione privata (Gedan., 1785); Fix, Greek, d. Reiche (Chemnitz, 1802); Denz, Thesaurus, tom. vi.; De Sacrament. Pont., No. 14, tom. ii, No. 91, De Primato Petri; Mohrike, Das Sechste Hauptstück im Katechismus (Strals., 1800); Barron, On the Supremacy (in Works, vii, 184 sq., Oxf., 1850); Chas. Elliott, Description of Roman Catholicism (3d ed., by Dr. Hannah, Lond., 1851); p. 195 sq., 618 sq.; Mühler, Synopsis (transl. by Robertson, 3d ed., N. Y. Cathol. Publ. House, 1870), p. 217 sq.; H. C. Lea, Studies in Ch. Hist. (Phil., 1869), p. 158, 225 sq.; Haag (Romish), Histoire des Dogmes Chrétiens, vol. ii, p. 20; London Review, 1864 (July), p. 96 sq.; Expositor, Quart. Rev. 1869 (April), p. 69, 292; (July) p. 69, 341; Martin, Dictionnaire des dogmes de l'Église, p. 55. Among the early monographs on the keys we may mention those of Wigand, De clave ligante (Francof., 1661); Schmid, De clavis ecclesiae (Argent., 1667); Boscace, De clavis Petri (Haf., 1707); Luther, Vom d. Schlüssel (ed. Wiesing, Frankf., and Lips, 1790); Of late (chiefly German) treatises specially on the subject we may name Rothe, Am. d. Schlüssel (Görl., 1801); Brezina, Am. d. Schlüssel (Breslau, 1820); Steitz, Das Beurtheilung und Priesterabsolution (Frankf., 1861); Kliefoth, Reiche

and Absolution (Schwer, 1858); Pfisterer, Luther's Lehre von der Beichte (Stuttg., 1867). See also Absolution; Lay Representation; Rock.

Kesvi, Leonhard, a Baptist martyr, originally a Roman Catholic priest, flourished in the first half of the 16th century. He joined the Baptists in 1525, and immediately began preaching the Reformation doctrine, undimmed by all the tyranny exerted against the faithful by water, fire, and sword. In the second year of his ministry (1527) he was apprehended at Scherdin, on the River Inn, and condemned to the flames. “The chief heads of accusation against him were, that faith alone justifies, without good works; that there are only two sacraments; that the Gospel was not preached by the papists in Germany; that confession is not God's command; that Christ is the only satisfaction for sin; that there is no purgatory; that Christ is the only Mediator; and that all days (alluding to feast or saint's days) are alike with God.”—Baptist Martyrs, p. 60.

Keszi (Heb. Keszai), כזא, καζία, as in Ps. xliv, 9; Septuag. Kasseis v. v. Kaeaei, the name of Job's second daughter, born to him after the return of his prosperity (Job xlii, 14). B.C. cir. 2220.

Kedzi (Hebrew Ketsis), כ'ץ, e'zek, valley, prefixed; Septuag. both Α'μεζάζις, Vulg. Vallis Cosiae, or rather Enék-Kézis (Yale of Kezis), a city of the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned between Beth-hoglah and Beth-arabah (Jos. xviii. 21), and therefore probably situated in a steep ravine of the same name leading to the valley of the Jordan. See Bernab., M. De Saulcy found a small valley by the name of Kestis about an hour and a half distant from Bethany, in the direction of Jericho (Narrative, ii, 17), which he conjectures (p. 26) was the ancient Valley of Kestis. So also Van de Velde (Memoirs, p. 229) calls it Wydy el-Kezi.

Khadîjah is the name of the first wife of the Islamic prophet. See Mohammed.

Khan is the more common Arabic name for the public establishments which, under the less imposing title of menzal, or the more stately one of currucumserori (q. v.), correspond to our Occidental ideas of an inn (q. v.). These afford lodging, but not usually food, for man and beast. They are generally found near towns, but sometimes in the open country on a frequented route. They are mentioned in the N. Test. (παναλεόν, Luke x, 84) and Talmud (בָּנָא, Lightfoot, pp. 799), and something of the kind seems to occur in the later books of the O. T. (בָּנָא, Jer. xii, 17; the סְרְבָּאָה of Luke ii, 7 is, however, thought by some to have been of a more
private character). The earlier Hebrews knew of no such provision for travellers (Gen. xlii, 27; Exod. iv, 24); 2 Kings xix, 29; the גְּדֹלָה being merely the stopping-place over night; the גְּדֹלָה of Josh. ii, 1 indicating rather a brothel, and the גְּדֹלָה of 1 Sam. xix, 18 the home of the prophet-scholars. Entertainment was generally furnished by individual hospitality (q. v.).

Khachadur, an Armenian theologian, flourished in the opening of the 17th century. He was bishop of Dehougha, and in 1690 was sent by the Armenian patriarch Michael III to Constantinople on ecclesiastical missions to Galicia, and later to Poland. He is particularly celebrated, however, as a poet.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Génr., xxvi, 675.

Khachapli I, elected patriarch of Armenia in 972, is noted in the annals of the ecclesiastical history of Armenia for the interest he manifested toward literature and the fine arts, and for the establishment of a number of monasteries. He died at his residence in Arinca in 992.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Génr., xxvii, 676.

Khachapli II was patriarch of Armenia in 1008, but was oppressed by the Byzantine emperor Constantine Ducas, who imprisoned him for some three years, and then banished him to Cappadocia. He died in 1014.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Génr., xxvii, 675.

Khazar or Khassar is the name of a Finnish people, a rude but powerful nation, north of the Caucasus, related to the Bulgarians and Hungarians, which in the 8th century embraced Judaism. After the disolution of the empire of the Huns they settled on the borders of Europe and Asia, and at one time possessed a realm near the Caspian Sea. (By their called Ilir or Atel), on the Caspian Sea (after them sometimes called Khazar Sea), where the Kalamaacs (q. v.) now live. They gave much uneasiness to the Persians, especially during the reign of Khosrow I (q. v.), and in the 7th century, after the downfall of the Sassanians, the Khazars went across the Caucasus, invaded Armenia, and conquered the Cherniss, hence called at one time Khosar or Chosar. The Byzantine emperors trembled before the warlike skill of the Khazars, and paid large tributes to keep them at a respectable distance from Constantinople; the Bulgarians and other peoples were their vassals; the Russians (Kievians) appeased their desire for conquest by an annual tribute, and with the Arabs they were waging constant warfare. But by degrees, as they abandoned their nomadic habits, and the territory decreased by the decay of its population, they fostered commercial intercourse with the outer world. They exchanged dried fish, the furs of the north, and slaves for the gold and silver and the luxuries of southern climates. Merchants of all religions—Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans—were freely admitted, and their superior intelligence and his more barbarous subjects induced one of their kings, Balan, to forsake their coarse, idolatrous worship, greatly mixed with sensuousness and licentiousness, and to embrace (A.D. 740) the Jewish religion. By one account, says Milman (ii, 27), he was admonished by an angel; by another, he decided in this singular manner between the claims of Christianity, Moslemism, and Judaism. He examined the different teachers apart, and asked the Christians if Judaism were not better than Mohammedanism; the Mohammedan, whether it was not better than Christianity. Both replied in the affirmative; on which the monarch decided in favor of Judaism. According to one statement secretly, to another openly, he embraced the faith of Moses, and induced learned teachers of the law to settle in his dominions. Of course, at first, the change of religious belief was confined to the royal family and the chief nobility of the land, who, with Balan, embraced Judaism; but soon the new religion spread, and ere long the majority of the nation bowed in adoration to the one and ever-living

God. Judaism actually became a necessary condition to the succession to the throne, but there was the most liberal toleration to all other forms of faith. See OBDIAL. Rabbi Hasdai, a learned Jew, who was in the highest confidence with Abderrahman, the caliph of Cordova, first received intelligence of this sovereignty possessed by the Khazars, and sent his son through the embassies of Khazar to the Byzantine emperor. After considerable difficulty, Hasdai succeeded in establishing a correspondence with Joseph, the reigning king. The letter of Hasdai is extant, and an answer of the king, which does not possess equal certainty, but authenticity. The whole history has been wrought out into a religious romance, entitled Cosro (see JOSHUA HALEVI), which has involved the question in great obscurity. Basinger rejected the whole as a fiction of the Rabbins, anxious to prove that "the seer was not entirely departed from Israel." Just inclines to the belief that "there is a groundwork of truth under the veil of poetic embellishment." The latest writers upon the subject admit without hesitation, and Jewish writers almost boast of the kingdom of Khazar. Comp. Frith's "Commentary on Ibn-Fadlan": "De Chemie des Peuples de la Mer Caspienne," (Memoires de l'Acad. des Sciences de St Petersburg, 1829, vol. viii); D'Houssois, "Peuples du Caucase" (see J. H. W.)

Khedr, Ail, is the name which figures in the Koran (chap. xviii, Sale's edition, p. 244) as that of a person whom the Mohammedans assert the Lord pointed out to Moses as superior in wisdom to any other living person, Moses included. The story the Mohammedans tell is thus given by Sale: "Moses once preaching to the people, they admired his knowledge and eloquence so much that they asked him whether he knew any man in the world who was wiser than himself, to which he answered in the negative; whereupon God, in a revelation, having reprehended him for his vanity (though some pretend that Moses asked God the question of his own accord), acquainted him that his servant Al Khedr was more knowing than he. Moses then asked him whether he knew that person at a certain rock where the two seas met, directing him to take a fish with him in a basket, and that where he missed the fish that was the place. Accordingly Moses set out, with his servant Joshua, in search of Al Khedr." See Sale's Koran, p. 244.

Khlesl, Melchthon, a German theologian, born at Vienna in 1553 of Protestant parents, was induced to enter the Roman Catholic Church, and joined the Jesuits. After studying five years under the Jesuits he returned to his former order, then continued two years at Innsbruck, and was ordained priest in 1579. He became successively provost of the cathedral at Vienna, administrator of the bishopric of Neustadt in 1588, and bishop of Vienna in 1598. The loose conduct of the Roman Catholic clergy having greatly contributed to the rapid spreading of Protestantism, Khlesl showed himself a zealous partisan of reform in this respect, while, on the other hand, he did his utmost to bring Protestants back into the fold of Romanism. Yet he was still more inclined to mingle in politics than in Church affairs. He attached himself to the grandson and successor of the emperor Rudolph II, whom the latter particularly disliked on account of a prediction, according to which this brother was to depose him. The emperor contemplated exiling Khlesl,
but the latter succeeded in organizing a conspiracy, and
Matthews was made emperor in Rudolph’s place. The
Protestant princes had a part in this revolution, but
Klose took good care that they should not derive any
benefit from it to further their religion. Under emper-
or Matthew he became president of the privy coun-
cil in 1611, and cardinal in 1616. Notwithstanding his
opposition to Protestantism, which he rigorously perse-
cutus in 1587, he remained at the head of the Ger-
man party, and opposed the adoption of the grand duch
e Ferdinand as heir to the throne. Ferdinand revenged
himself by arresting Klose at Vienna, July 20, 1618,
and confining him first at the castle of Ambras, and
then at the convent of Georgenberg, in Tyrol. In 1622
a reprieve from the pope caused him to be transferred
to Rome, where he was imprisoned for seven months in
the castle of St. Angelo. After his liberation he return-
ed to Vienna in 1627, and was restored to the possession
of his property and his offices. He gave up politics to
attend exclusively to the management of ecclesiastical
affairs, and died Sept. 15, 1630. His fortune, amount-
ing to over half a million, he left to the bisporphic of Vi-
enna; 100,000 florins to Neustadt and Vienna for a yearly
mass for his soul; 100,000 florins to the convent of Hmi-
lesfort, 20,000 to the Jesuits, and 46,000 to his rela-
tives. He is buried in St. Stephen’s, near the high altar, in
action, mild in manner; the latter was somewhat
difficult for him to submit to, as he was naturally hasty.
He had received no classical education, but was well
versed in the Bible, in philasterics, and in homiletics. See
Hanserys, Utter, Leon. Klose (Vienna, 1847-51, 4 vol., 8vo); piercer, uttr. Lexi.
sv., Wetzer and Wetze, Kirch.-Lexi, vi, 225.

Klostevschicki.

See Skotzki.

Khlistie (Lutherans), also called Danielites, is
the same of a powerful Russian sect. They call themselves
"people of God," "tribe of Israel," "worshippers of the
ture God," or "Brothers and Sisters." They originated
in the first year of the reign of the emperor Alexis (A.D.
1645). According to their tradition, they descended, in
the days of Alexis, upon Mt. Gorodon, in the district of
Wladimir, in great part on a signal of fire surrounded
by a cloud, "God the Father," accompanied by the hosts
of heaven. The latter returned again to the other world,
but the Lord himself remains on the earth, and mani-
fested himself in the flesh in the person of Daniel Philip-
an, in whose person, according to them, the second mani-
festation of God the Father in the flesh, and in his first manifestation Jerusalem was enlight-
ened, so at this time Russia was blessed with special di-
vine favor; and, corresponding to Jerusalem, they point
out as their Zion, or, as they call it, "the higher region," the
mountainous districts of the South, where Daniel prophesied,
the doctrine of the inerrancy of the Bible and the
baptism. The historical facts in the case, as related by
Dixon (Free Russia, p. 139), however, are, that Daniel
was a peasant in the province of Kostroma, and, after
serving for a time in the Russian army, ran away from
his flag in battle, declared himself the Almighty, and
wandered about the empire, teaching those who would
listen to his voice his doctrine, inundated in the follow-
ing twelve commandments:
1. I am the God of whom the prophets spoke. I came
for the second time into the world to redeem the souls of
men. I am a God and need not be waited for.
2. There is no other doctrine, and no other is to be
kept.
3. In what you are taught, therein also remain.
4. Keep the commandments of your God, and become
masters of men in general.
5. Drink no strong drinks, and do not fulfill the last of
the saints.
6. Do not get married, and whoever is married let him
be with his wife as with his sister. This is the sense of the
second Testament Scripture. This shall not marry, and
those who are married should separate.
7. No abusive word (disoil) is to be used.
8. Those who attend weddings or baptism festivities, or drink at
parties, are to be expelled.
9. To steal; and if any one takes of another the smallest
coin, it will have to melt on his head at the judg-
ment day from the beat of punishment before he can
be pardoned.
10. These commandments are to be kept secret, not to be
revealed even to father or mother. The suffering from fire
and the like may be many, but the suffering for it in the
kingdom of heaven and bliss on earth are obtained.
11. Friends and relations are to give up all superflu-
ity, to exercise love, to keep these commandments, and pray
to God.
12. To believe in the Holy Spirit.

Their own tradition asserts that Daniel himself did not
issue these commandments, but that a son was born to
him fifteen years before his appearance in this world, in
the person of Ivan Timofejen, in the village Makasakon,
of a woman one hundred years old. That this Ivan,
when thirty-three years old, was summoned by Daniel
to the village Strelia, the pope caused him to be recicled
and that thereupon father and son ascended into heav-
en, and, after a short tarry, from the same place de-
scended Jesus the Christ, in the person of Ivan, who at
once commenced to preach, assisted by twelve disciples,
the doctrines embodied in the twelve commandments
above cited, and entered into the state of holy matri-
mony with a young female, whom they call "the daugh-
ter of God." To add to the romance of the story, the
persecutions to which these fanatical religious leaders
subject has given rise to an imitation of the resurrection
After Ivan, the apostles of the "true sect" of the liberti-
une under various forms and of divers kinds, Ivan
was partly burned and then crucified; but, after remo-
val from the cross, his body and fat at a Frayday, he rose
again, and on the Sunday after appeared in the midst of
his followers, with a red stone in his breast, his hair
wet, his face red, and his eyes bright and shining.
Ivan tried and crucified a second time, and his skin taken
off; one of his female followers standing by then wrapped
the body in a sheet, out of which a new skin formed it-
self, and after burial he again rose and commenced
the preaching of his doctrines, and made many followers.
Thereafter Ivan took up his residence at
Moscow, and openly taught his new religion. The house
which he occupied was called the "New Jerusalem." He
died on the day of St. Tichon, after living some forty-
five years at Moscow, and ascended to heaven in pres-
ence of his disciples, to join his father and the saints.
Notwithstanding the fabric of this fabulous narrative,
the sect is numerous, and has among its members many
of the nobles of the land.

Like the Skotzki, the sect of the Khlistie also observe
some of the practices of the regular Church, to ward off
suspicion and to conceal their meetings. However, the
from their usages it is known that before they go to
communion in the church they first partake of it accord-
ing to their own form. They also have a separate form of
baptism. They have pictures of their god Daniel Philip-
en, their Jesus Christ, their mother of God, saints,
prophets, and teachers whom they adore. The orthodox
church edifices they call "ant-nests," and their priests
"isolaters and adulterers." Marriage is considered an
impurity, and all entering this state are lost, yet they
permit one of the nearest relatives of Daniel Philippen
and Ivan Timofejen to enter the state to prevent the
interuption of the lineage. The water from a well in
the village Staraja, near Kostroma, is in the winter sent
about in the shape of ice, and used by them to take
their communion bread. In the same village lived in
1847 a girl, Ulana Visiljewa by name, who was adored
as the last of the Nemes by many from all parts, among
them nobles and merchants of Moscow, and though for
this reason the government passed unnoticed her sacri-
Legious acts, she was at last arrested and sent to a
monastery.

Their mode of worship is very much like that of the
Skotzki, except that after service they partake of an
ordinary meal in common, which is prolonged till late
in the evening, and often becomes the occasion of licen-
sious sins. This sect is known in various localities by
different names; in some parts they are called Liudy
(useless), in others Chynki (heretics), Kyjedew (Cupido, the god of love). Great num-
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numbers of these heretics have been sent into the Caucasus and Siberia, where many of them have been forced to enter the armies and the mines. See Dixon, Free Russia, chap. xxiv.

Kholbah (Arabic), a peculiar form of prayer used in the Moslem countries at the commencement of public worship in the great mosques on Friday at noon. It was originally performed by the Prophet himself, and by his successors up to A.D. 936, since which time special ministers are appointed for the purpose. The Kholbah is chiefly "a confession of faith," and a general petition for the success of the Mohammedan religion. It is divided into two distinct parts, between which a considerable pause is observed, which the Mussulman regards as the most solemn and important part of his worship. The insertion of the sultan's name in this prayer has always been considered one of his chief prerogatives. See Brande and Cox, Dict. of Science, Literature, and Art, ii, 282.

Khonds. There are throughout India manifest traces of a rude primitive stock of people who occupied the country anterior to the Aryo-Scythian races, and there are still great divisions of the people bearing national characteristics which distinguish them from the Hindus. The earliest knowledge we have of these people is through the great epic poems of the Hindus, the Mahabharata and the Ramayana, which describe the wars of the invading Aryan races and the invasion of the aboriginal or primitive inhabitants of these impenetrable forests. Successive waves of invaders, however, subdued, to a greater or less extent, some of these, and modified their views and usages; but these, in turn, affected the religion and manners of their conquerors.

Divisions. Some of these races have attached themselves to Hindu society, and serve in a condition of degradation as Chandals or Mekchas, i.e. outcasts or pariahs. They often hold offices of trust and responsibility in village communities, but, according to Hindu law, are not included in the caste of the Hindu, though they own property but do not hold it in their own right. Their customs and institutions are, however, everywhere different from those of the Hindus.

There are others of these aboriginal tribes who have not mingled with Hinduism at all, or only very partially. Among these are the Kora of Bengal and Eastern Nagpoor, the Khonds of Central India, the Belus of the Vindhy Mountains, the Khaudes Malwah, etc., of Central India, and others in the south amid the forests of the Neelgherry Hills, in Gourjara, and other places (see Edwards, 1857, p. 42, note). These tribes have their own habits, even where Hinduism most presses them. They have no castes, their widows are allowed to remarry, they have no objection to any kind of flesh, and otherwise differ greatly from the Aryan peoples.

The least raised above their primitive condition are the Khonds of Orissa, who "occupy a district about two hundred miles long by one hundred and seventy broad, in Rampur, in the district of Gunjum" (Brace, p. 142), a tract of land back from the coast of the Bay of Bengal, where it trends eastward to Calcutta and southward to Mysore, and embracing the plateaux of the Vindhyas and other mountains.

Names. They term themselves Koe, Ki, Koniga, Koniga, but are known to Europeans by their Hindu name of Khond or Kond. Their language is affiliated with the Oriya (Oriya), but the dialects are many, and often a Khond of one district has been found unable to hold communication with one of a neighboring tribe. The speech has "a peculiar peculitar enunciation." Ethnologically, all these tribes are Turanian or Mongolian.

Domestic Relations. Marriage may only take place without the tribe, but never with the tribe. Boys of ten or twelve years of age are married to girls of fifteen or sixteen, the arrangements being always made by the parents. The father of the bridegroom generally pays twenty or thirty "livers" of cattle to the bride's father. The marriage rite itself is very simple. The father of the bridegroom, with his family and friends, bears a quantity of rice and liquor in procession to the house of the parents of the girl. The priest takes it, and dashes the bowl down, and pours it out to the gods. The parents of the parties join hands to show the marriage is completed. An entertainment follows, with dancing and song. Late at night the married pair are carried out on the shoulders of their respective uncles, when, the burdens being suddenly exchanged, the boy's uncle disappears, and the company assembled divides into two parties, who go through the streets singing and thus the semblance of forcible abduction, remains or indications of which are found so frequently in widely separated quarters, are preserved among the Khonds of Orissa (see McLennan's Primitive Marriage). The marriage contract is, however, loosely held. If childless, the wife may return to her father at any time, or, in any event, within six months of the marriage if the money given at her marriage be restored to her father. She cannot be forcibly retained, however, even if the money be not returned. If her withdrawal be voluntary she cannot contract another matrimonial alliance. A man may ally himself with another woman than his wife, with the wife's consent. Concubinage is not disgraceful, fathers of respectable families allowing their daughters to contract such marriages. An unmarried woman may become a hater or patriarch and marry a brother.

Births. Births are celebrated on the seventh day by a feast given to the priests and villagers. The name is determined by a peculiar rite, in which grains of rice are dropped into a cup of water.

Death. After the death of a private person his body is burned, without any ceremony other than a drining feast. If, however, a chief dies, the "heads of society" are assembled from every quarter by the beating of gongs and drums; the body is placed on the funeral pile; a bag of grain is laid on the ground, a staff being planted in it, and the relatives of the dead person and all the clothes, arms, and eating and drinking vessels, being first placed by the flag, are afterwards distributed, when the pile is fired, and the company dance round the flag-staff.

Social Organisation and Government. The family is the unit of organization and the government patriarchal, all the members of the family living in subordination to the head, the eldest son succeeding to his authority. All property belongs to the father, the married sons having separate houses assigned them, except the younger, who remains with the father. This father, or patriarch, is called Abogho.

A number of families constitute a village, which generally numbers forty or fifty houses, over whom there is a village abbaya or patriarch. A number of villages are organized into a district, superintended by a district abbaya, who, however, must be lineally descended from the head of the colony. A number of districts constitute a tribe, with a tribal abbaya, and a number of tribes constitute a federal group, with a federal abbaya or chief. This chiefship is immemorially hereditary in particular families, but is elective to persons. The head, however, is only the first among equals, and his rule is without external pomp, or castle, or fort. The chief receives no tribute, but he takes part in all important discussions, whether social or religious, and leads his people in war. His influence is very great. Originally and theoretically, the abbaya is the priest. This is not so now in all cases, yet he is religiously venerated. The family and the religious principles are thus combined. The theory of government, as above sketched, is not, however, often completely realized, there being very many additional castes free from it, and the tribe being much intermingled. These tribes have a name resembling those adopted by the North American Indians, e.g. "Spotted Deer," "Bear," "Owl," etc.

Personal and Social Characteristics. These people, like almost all known rude races, are "given to hospiti-
For the safety of a guest life and honor are pledged. He is "before a child." A murderer even may not be hurt in the house of his enemy; it is doubtful if he may kill it. The preservation of innocence is clearly Turanian. The color varies from that of light bamboo to a deep copper; the forehead is full, the cheek-bones high, the nose broad at the point, the lips full, but not thick, and the mouth large. The Khonds are of great bodily strength and symmetry, well endowed on common subjects, of quick comprehension, and otherwise show considerable intellectual capability. Their mode of salutation is with the hand raised over the head. Their natural moral qualities are of mixed character. They are personally courageous and resolute. They have so great a love of personal liberty that it is affirmed they have been known to tear out their hearts by the roots that they might perish rather than endure confinement. They are not very intensely attached to their tribal institutions, but have great devotion to the persons of their patriarchal chiefs. They have, however, a great spirit of revenge, and are given to seasons of periodical intoxication. They drink a liquor made of the More flower, this tree being found near every hut and in the jungles. They are a "nation of drunkards," and will drink any intoxicating beverage, the stronger the better. They have no code by which they are governed, but follow custom and usage. The right of property is recognized. Murder is left to private revenge or retaliation. In case of matrimonial unfaithfulness, the seducer may be put to death if the husband choose, or he may accept the entire property of the criminal in lieu of his right to put him to death. Property stolen must be returned, or its equivalent given. There are seven judicial tests; common oaths are administered on the skin of a tiger or a lizard. Ordeal of boiling oil and water are likewise resorted to.

Arms and Agriculture.—They use the sling, bow and arrows, and a broad battle-axe, and adorn themselves for battle as for a feast. They raise rice, oils, millet, pulses, fruits, tobacco, turmeric, mustard, etc. No money other than "cowries" (shells) was until recently known, all property being estimated in "lives," as of bullocks, buffaloes, horses, men, women, etc. Women share in the work of harvest and sowing.

Diseases and Remedies.—For external wounds they resort to a poultice of warm mud, made of the earth of the ant-hills. They also co matière with a hot stick over the spot when bitten with any medicines. They consider all diseases to be supernatural, and the priest, being the physician, must discover the deity that is displeased. He divides rice into small heaps, which he dedicates to the gods; then he balances a sickle with a thread, puts a few grains upon each end of it, and calls upon the names of the gods, who answer by agitating the sickle, whereupon the grains are counted, and if the number of them be odd he is offended. The priest becomes "full of the god," makes his head frantically, utters wild and incoherent sentences, etc. Deceased ancestors are invoked in the same way, when offerings of fowls, rice, and liquor are made, which subsequently become the priest's portion.

Magical and Superstitions Usages.—Spells, charms, incantations, etc., are used for substitute medicines; wizards, witches, ghosts, sorcerers, augurs, astrologers, conjurers, all like magic powers in common use. Death is not a necessity, not the appointed lot of man; it is a special penalty of the gods, who destroy through war, or assume the shapes of wild beasts to destroy mankind. Magicians may take away life.

Mythology.—(1) The image of gods worshipped among the Khonds is extensive. (2) At the head of the pantheon is the Earth-Goddess, who, with the sun, receives the principal worship. The Earth-Goddess is the superior power, and presides over the productive energies of nature. She is all motherhood, and is invoked in war. She is depicted in the season's, and the periodical rains. To her human sacrifices were offered. There are, besides her, (2) a God of Limits, who fixes boundaries, and whose altar is on the highways. (3) The sun and moon; ceremonially worshipped. (4) The God of Arms, to whom a grove is devoted. (5) The God of Hunting, worshipped by parties who hunt in companies of thirty or forty, and surround their game. (6) The God of Births, worshipped in case of barrenness. (7) The God of Small-fox, who "sows" that disease as men do the earth with seeds. (8) The Hill-god, without form or worship. (9) The Forest-god, to whom birds, hogs, and sheep are offered. (10) The God of Rain. (11) Of Fountains. (12) Of Rivers. (13) Of Tanks; and (14) the village gods, who are the guardians of localities, and of domestic and familiar worship.

The great conservative principle is worshipped.

Priesthood.—The abbayas are the priests, but this office may be assumed by others. Priests eat only with priests; take part in marriage, elections, elections, etc. They are of about the same level of culture as those of other tribes among Turanian races.

Religious Rites and Sacrifices.—Nothing was definitely known of the tribes of Gúmar until the British army was brought into collision with them in 1866, subsequently to which the custom of human sacrifices was discovered to exist among them. The British government, after a long series of efforts, succeeded in abolishing it. Major Campbell says, "The Khonds generally propitiated their deity (the Earth-Goddess) with human offerings (p. 69). This had been done through successive generations, and was regarded as a national duty. In Gúmar it is offered under the effigy of a bird, in other localities as an elephant (p. 51). The victim, called Meriah, must be purchased, may be of any age, sex, or caste, adults being best, and the more costly the more acceptable. These are purchased from relations in time of famine or poverty, or are stolen from other regions by profession kidnappers of the Panoo caste (p. 62). In some cases Meriah women were allowed to live until they had borne children to Khond fathers, the women then being required for sacrifice, to be efficacious, must be public (p. 53). In Gúmar it was offered annually. The priest officiates. For a month previous there is much feasting, dancing, intoxication, etc. One day before the victim is stupefied with too much bond spirit, and then cut open as near the post bearing an effigy. The crowd dance, and say, "O god, we offer this sacrifice to you; give us good crops, seasons, and health." To the victim they say, "We bought you with a price, and did not seize you; now we sacrifice you according to our custom, and no sin rests with us" (p. 56). Various other ceremonies are performed, after which they return to the post near the village idol, always represented by three stones, a hog is sacrificed, the blood flows into a pit, the human victim, having been intoxicated, is thrown in and suffocated in the bloody mire. The priest cuts a piece of the flesh and burns it; others do likewise, carrying the flesh to their own villages. In some cases the flesh is cut while the victim is yet alive, and buried as a sacred and supernatural manner."

Cognate Tribes.—These and other aboriginal races which have received so much attention from ethnographers, philologists, and other scientific men that further details are not needed here. The prominence given to these aboriginal races of late years might justify full articles on the kindred tribes, but, as they are of subserviency of the same class, it is more convenient to have chosen a very full sketch of the Khonds as typical of the aboriginal
KID (property of, seek), so called from cropping the herbage; more fully, גיד, gidh, "kid of the goats." fm. גיד, gidh, a skittish, Cant. 5, 8; also לַבֶּה, labh, son of a goat, 2 Chron. xxiv, 7, orig.; sometimes for תָּרָא, tarah, goat, itself, Num. xv, 11; 1 Kings xx, 27; likewise מִלְּחָה, melchah, i.e. a goat, Gen. xxxv, 81; Lev. iv, 23; ix, 3; xvi, 5; xxii, 19, etc.; לַבֶּה, labh, Lev. iv, 28; v, 6; Greek μουσός, Luke xv, 29; "goat," Matt. xxxv, 32, ver. 33 (μουσός), diminutive, the young of the goat, reckoned a great delicacy among the ancients; and it appears to have been served for food in preference to the lamb (Exod. xxii, 29; xxxix, 19; Lev. vi, 19; xvi, 6; 1 Sam. xvi, 20). It still continues to be a choice dish among the Arabs. By the Mosaic law, the Hebrews were forbidden to dress a kid in the milk of its dam; and this remarkable prohibition is repeated several times (Exod. xxiii, 19; xxix, 26; Deut. xix, 11). This law has been variously understood. However, it is generally supposed that it was intended to guard the Hebrews against some idolatrous or superstitious practice of the neighboring heathen nations. The practice is quite common with modern Orientals (Thomson, Land and Book, i, 155). Kids were slain for the sacrificial offerings (Exod. xii, 8, margin; Lev. iv, 23-26; Num. vii, 16-87). See Goat.

Kidd, Benjamin, a noted Quaker minister, was born in Yorkshire, England, about 1692; entered the ministry at the age of twenty-one, emigrated to this country about 1722, and labored here successfully for some time. He afterwards returned, however, to England, and settled at Banbury, Oxfordshire, "where his exemplary conduct gained him the esteem of all ranks and persuasions." He died March 21, 1751. KIdd served his generation in "turning many from darkness to light, and from the power of darkness to the kingdom of the Lord, and of the glory of Jesus the Christ."—Janney, Hist. of the Friends, iii, 287.

Kiddah. See CASTA.

Kidders, Richard, D.D., an eminent English prelate and learned Orientalist, was born at Brighthelmstone, in Sussex. He studied at Emanuel College, Cambridge, of which he was elected fellow in 1655. He afterwards became vicar of Stanground, Huntingdonshire, but emigrated in 1662 for nonconformity. He, however, conformed some time after, and became rector of Raine, Essex, in 1664, and successively rector of St. Martin's Outwich, London, in 1674; prebendary of Norwich in 1681; dean of Peterborough in 1689; and finally bishop of Bath and Wells in 1691. He died in 1708. He was considered one of the best divines of his time, and a clear and elegant writer. His principal works are Demonstration of the Messiah, etc. (London, 1684, 1690, 1700), 3 vols.; another edit. 1725, fol., and often since:—The Judgment of private Discretion in Matters of Religion defended—a sermon in Three, v. 21 (London, 1877, 4to):—A Sermon preached before the King and Queen at Whitehall, Nov. 5, 1692 [on 2 Sam. xxiv, 14] (London, 1693, 4to):—Sermon, Zech. vii, 5, of Fasting (London, 1694, 4to):—A Commentary on the Five Books of Moses, etc. (London, 1709). His works are contained in Gibson's Preservative, iv, 55;—On Repentance (Tracts of Angl. Fathers, ii, 800).—Darling, Encyclop. Bibliograph. vol. ii, s. v.: Birch, Life of Tillotson; Hook, Eccles. Biogr. s. v.

Kidderminster. See KYDERMINSTER.

Kiddushin. See TALMUD.

Kidney (only in plur. גִּבֹּת, geboth, prob. from the idea of its being the seat of longing), the leaf-fat around which was specially to be a burn-offering, significant of its being the richest and most choice part of the animal (Exod. xxii, 22; Lev. iii, 4, 10; iv, 7; vii, 4; vii, 16, 25; ix, 10; 19; Isai. xxxiv, 8). Spoken also of the "rims" of a human being, i.e. the innermost soul, which the ancients supposed to be seated in the viscus (compare the Homeric ἱερόν, midsize, hence mind), both in a physical sense (Job xv, 13, hence 27; Psa. cxviii, 13; 13, 18), and figuratively (Psa. vii, 9, 10; 7, 23, 26; xxii, 21; Prov. xxiii, 16; Jer. xi, 10; xxxi, 2; zel, 7; xxvii, 10, xx, 12). Sometimes applied to kernels of grain, from their kidney-like shape and richness (Deut. xvi, 13).

Kidron (Heb. Kidron), a torrent, compare Job vi, 16; Sept. Κιδρόν, Κ. Κ. Κ. Ἰοβονί, where some copies erroneously have Ἰοβονί, Gen. vii, 11 in the Latin Version "Cedron;" Josephus Κεδρών, Gen. -ωρος), the brook or winter torrent which flows through the valley of Jehoshaphat (as it is now called), on the east side of Jerusalem (see I Macc. xxii, 37). "The brook Kidron" is the only name by which the valley of Jehoshaphat is mentioned in Scripture, for it is by no means certain that the name "Valley of Jehoshaphat" in Joel (iii, 12) was intended to apply to this valley. The word rendered "brook" (2 Sam. xv, 23; 1 Kings ii, 21; xv, 13; 2 Kings xxii, 8, 16; 2 Chron. xxvii, 9, xxix, 16, xxx, 14; Jer. xxxi, 40; compare Neh. xi, 15; Amos vi, 14) in the LXX, mekáll, which may be taken as equivalent to the Arabic stream, meaning a stream and its bed or valley, or properly the valley of a stream, even when the stream is dry. The Septuagint and evangelist (in the above passages), as well as Josephus (Ant. xvii, 1, 5; but paráyter in i, 7, 5; War, v, 1, 6), denominated χρυμπός, krympós, a torrent, brook, or winter torrent. But it was not so seem as if it were formerly applied also to the ravines surrounding other portions of Jerusalem, the south or west, since Solomon's prohibition to Shimei to "pass over the torrent Kidron" (1 Kings ii, 37; Josephus, Ant. xiii, 5, 9) is said to have been broken by the latter when he went in the direction of Gath to seek his fugitive slaves (ver. 41, 42). Now a person going to Gath would certainly not go by the way of the Mount of Olives, or approach the eastern side of the city at all. The route—whether Gath were at Beit-Jaizo or at Talm-Safeleh—would be by the Bethlehem gate, and then nearly due west. Perhaps the prohibition may have been a more general one than is implied in ver. 37 (comp. the king's reiteration of it in ver. 42), the Kidron being in that case specially mentioned because it was on the road to Babylon, Shimei's home, and the scene of his crime. At no time would the passage in question, there is no evidence of the name Kidron having been applied to the southern or western ravines of the city.

The Kidron is mentioned several times in the Scripture history, being the memorable brook which David crossed before he went up and removed when first the Ark came to Jerusalem (2 Sam. xv, 23, 40); and Jesus must often have crossed it on his way to the Mount of Olives and Bethany (see John xviii, 1). According to the Talmud, the blood of the animals slaughtered in the Temple, and the other refuse (probably the impurities from the city, נזיר, lvii, 4), were carried through a sewer into the lower Kidron, and thence sold as manure to gardeners (Joma, lvii, 2). For early notices of the Kidron, see William of Tyre, viii, 2; Brocardus, p. 8; Reland, p. 294 sq. The distinguishing peculiarity of the Kidron—that in respect to which it is most frequently mentioned—is the 2, —is the impurity which appears to have been ascribed to it. Excepting the two casual notices already quoted, we first meet with it as the place in which king Azaz demolished and burnt the obscene phallic idol (see ASHERAH) of his mother (1 Kings xv, 18; 2 Chron. xvii, 16). Next we find that Athaliah hurried thither to execute Joseph (Ant. ix, i, 7, 8; 2 Kings xii, 16). It then becomes the regular receptacle for the impurities and abominations of the idol-worship, when removed from the Temple and destroyed by the adherents of Jehovah (2 Chron. xxviii, 18; xxxii, 14; 2 Kings xxiii, 13, 18).
KIDRON

xxvi, 25, "graves of the common people"), perhaps the valley of dead bodies" mentioned by Jeremiah (xxxvi, 40) in close connection with the "fields" of Kidoron, and the restoration of which to sanctity was to be one of the miracles of future times (ibid.). It was doubtless the Kidron valley which the Lord told to Ezekiel when he described the vision of the healing waters flowing from the Temple through the desert into the sea (xviii, 8); and this very contrast with its customary uses serves to add emphasis to his prophecy (comp. William L. Baedeker, i, 522; Stanley, "Jerusalem," p. 268). How long this valley continued to be used for a burying-place it is very hard to as-
certain. After the capture of Jerusalem in 1099 the bodies of the slain were buried outside the Golden Gateway (Maslin, ii, 487; Tobler, "Umgangbomen," p. 219); but what had been the practice in the interval the writer has not succeeded in tracing. To the date of the monu-
ments at the foot of Olives we have at present no clew; but, even if they are of pre-Christian times, there is no proof that they are tombs. From the date just men-
tioned, however, the burials appear to have been con-
stant, and at present it is the favorite resting-place of Muslems and Jews, the former on the west, the latter on the east of the valley. The Muslems are mostly confined to the narrow level spot between the foot of the wall and the commencement of the precipitous slope, which gives them a peculiar advantage for part of the slopes of Olives, where their scanty tombs are crowded so thick together as literally to cover the sur-
face like a pavement.

The Kidron is a mountain ravine, in most places narrow, with precipitous banks of naked limestone; but here and there its banks have an easy slope, along its bottom are strips of land capable of cultivation. It contains the bed of a streamlet, but during the whole summer, and most of the winter, it is perfectly dry; in fact, no water runs in it except when heavy rains arefalling. The Jerusalemites made Shaddai, the principal missionarie assured Dr. Robinson that they had not during several years seen a stream running through the valley (see Bibl. Researches, i, 396-402). On the broad summit of the mountain ridge of Judaea, a mile and a quarter north-west of Jerusalem, is a slight depression; this is the head of the Kidron. The sides of the re-
oppression, and the elevated ground around it, are whitened by the broad, jagged tops of limestone rocks, and almost every rock is excavated, partly as a quarry, and partly to form the façade of a tomb. The valley or de-
pression extends for a mile to the west of the city; it is shallown and broad, dotted with corn-fields, and sprinkled with a few old oaks. It then bends eastward, and in another half mile is crossed by the great northern road coming down from the hill Scopus. On the east side of the road, and south bank of the Kidron, are the celebrated Tombs of the Kings. The bed of the valley is here about half a mile due north of the city gate. It continues in the same course about a quarter of a mile farther, and then, turning south, opens into a wide basin containing cultivated fields and olive groves. Here it is crossed diagonally by the road to Jerusalem, and Nahaloth. As it advances southward, the right bank, forming the side of the hill Bezaetha, becomes higher and steeper, with occasional precipices of rock, on which may be seen a few fragments of the ancient city wall; while on the left the base of Olives projects, greatly narrowing the valley. Opposite St. Stephen's gate, the city gate is fully 100 feet, and the breadth not more than 400 feet. The olive-trees in the bottom are so thickly clustered as to form a shady grove; and their massive trunks and gnarled boughs give evidence of great age. This spot is shut out from the city, from the view of public roads, and from the notice and interruption of wayfarers. See GETHSEMANE. A zigzag path descends the steep bank from St. Stephen's gate, crosses the bed of the valley by an old bridge, and then branches. One branch leads directly over the top of Olives. This path has a deep his-
torical interest; it was by it that David went when he fled from Absalom: "The king passed over the brook Kidron, and all the people passed over, towards the way of the wilderness" (2 Sam. xv, 23). See OLIVET. Another branch runs round the southern shoulder of the hill to Bethel with which it has an intimate connection; it is the road of Christ's triumphal entry (Matt. xxv. 1 sqq.; Luke xix, 37). Below the bridge the Kidron becomes still narrower, and here traces of a torrent bed first begin to appear. Three hundred yards farther down, the hills on each side—Mount of Olives on the right and Olives on the left—are precipitously from the summit, and the valley is spanned by a single arch. On the left bank is a sin-
gular group of tombs, comprising those of Absalom, Je-
oshaphat, and St. James (now so called); while on the right, 150 feet overhead, towers the south-eastern angle of the Temple wall, most probably the "pinnacle" on which our Lord was placed (Matt. iv, 5). The ravine runs on, narrow and rocky, for 500 yards more; there, on its right bank, in a cave, is the fountain of the Vir-
gin; and higher up on the left, perched on the side of naked cliffs, the ancient palace of Siloam. A short dis-
tance farther down, the valley of the Tyropoion falls in from the right, descending in terraced slopes, fresh and green, from the waters of the Pool of Siloam. The Kid-
ron here expands, affording a level tract for cultivation, and now covered with beds of cucumbers, melons, and other vegetables. Here the ancient city wall of Asa ( Neh. iii, 15). The level tract extends down to the mouth of Hinnom, and is about 200 yards wide. A short distance below the junction of Hinnom and the Kidron is the fountain of En-Rogel, now called Br Ayuh, "the Well of the Grenade." The length of the valley from its head to En-Rogel is 24 miles, and here the his-
toric Kidron may be said to terminate. Every refer-
ce to the Kidron in the Bible is made to this section. David crossed it at a point opposite the city (1 Sam. xv, 29); it was the boundary beyond which Solomon for-
bade the people of Judah to go (2 Kings xxii, 4). Therafter a king of Israel made this border; it was here, probably, near the mouth of Hinnom, that Asa destroyed the idol which Maachah his mother set up (xv, 18); and it seems to have been at the same spot, "in the fields of Kidron," that king Jehoshaphat ordered the vessels of Baal to be burned (2 Kings xxiii, 4). It would seem, from 2 Kings xxiii, 4, that a portion of the Kid-
ron, apparently near the mouth of Hinnom, was used as a burying-ground. The sides of the surrounding cliffs are filled with ancient rock tombs, and the greatest boon the dying Jew now asks is that his bones be laid in that spot. To the south of the Kidron, opposite the temple area, far up the side of the valley, is paved with the white tombs of Jews. This singular longing is doubtless to be ascribed to the opinion which the Jews entertain that the Kidron is the Valley of Jehoshaphat that mentioned by Joel (iii, 2). See JERUSALEM, VALLEY OF. Below En-Rogel, the Kidron has little of historical or sacred interest. It runs in a winding course east by south, through the Wilder-
ness of Judaea, to the Dead Sea. For about a mile be-
low En-Rogel the bottom of the valley is cultivated and thinly covered with olive-trees. Farther up, the fields of corn are met with at intervals, but these soon disapper, and the ravine assumes the bleak and deso-
late aspect of the surrounding hills. About seven miles from Jerusalem the features of the valley assume a much wilder and grander form. Hitherto the banks have been steep and narrow; here and there a high precipice and jutting cliff, giving variety to the scene. Now they suddenly contract to precipices of naked rock nearly 800 feet in height, which look as if the mountain had been torn asunder by an earthquake. About a mile farther, on the south side, the right bank is fully 200 feet, and the conical dome of St. Sabas, one of the most remarkable buildings in Pal-
estina, founded by the saint whose name it bears, in the year A.D. 489. The sides of the chasm both above and below the convent are filled with caves and grottoes, even the abode of monks and hermits, and from these double-
less this section of the valley has got its modern name, Wady cr-Rakeb, "Monk's Valley" (Woolcott, Researches is Pal., in Biblical Cabinet, xiii, 38). Below Mar Salo the head of the Kidron is just on the verge of the water-shed of the mountain-chain of Judah, about 2000 feet above the sea. Its length, as the crow flies, is only twenty miles, and yet in this short space it has a descent of no less than 8912 feet—the Dead Sea having a depth of 14042 feet (Van de Velde, p. 179, 182).—Kitto; Smith. In 1848 the levelling party of the Dead Sea Expedition, under command ofLieut. Lynch, worked up the wady en-Nar, the bed of the Kidron, from the Dead Sea to Jerusalem. They encountered several precipices from ten to twelve feet high, down which cataracts plunge in winter. They found the ravine shut in on each side by high, barren cliffs of chalky limestone, and the dry torrent-beds interrupted by boulders, and covered with fragments of stone (Narrative, p. 384, 386). The place where it empties into the Jordan is a great natural deep, deep, narrow, which at this place is filled with confused fragments of rock, much worn, but perfectly dry (ib.). For further notices, see Ritter's Erdkunde, xvi, 600; Robinson, Biblical Researches, ut sup.

Kieeff or Kieff, the name of the chief town of the government of that name, on the west bank of the Dnieper, one of the oldest of the Russian towns, and formerly the capital (containing 60,000 inhabitants, with a university and a theological school), was in 864 taken from the Khazars by two Norman chiefs, companions of Ruric, and conquered from them by Oleg, Ruric's successor, who made it his capital. In 1240, when it ceased to be the capital it was expressly destroyed by Batiu, khan of Kiptschak. Christianity was first proclaimed in Russia at Kieff in 888. In the 14th century it was seized by Gedimin, grand duke of Lithuania, and annexed to Poland in 1569, but in 1686 was restored to Russia.

Kieff is the oldest Russian metropolis's residence, the cradle of Russian Christianity. It is also noted on account of two Church (Greek) councils that have been held there. See Landon, Manual of Church Councils.

(a) The first of these convened about 1147, and is noted for the manner in which the bishops elected a metropolitan, and placed him in the place of Michael. It is the exception of Niphont of Novgorod, they all agreed to take the election into their own hands, without allowing to the patriarch of Constantinople the exercise of his right either to nominate or confirm. Niphont strongly pressed against the act, but with the excommunication of the synod fell upon Clement, a monk of Smolensk. As a substitute for the patriarchal consecration, Onuphrius proposed that the hand of St. Clement of Rome, whose relics had been brought from Cherson, should be placed upon his head. This election led to great disorder, and subsequently the patriarch Luke Chyserges consecrated Constantine metropolitan, who condemned the acts of this synod, and suspended for a time all the clergy ordained by Clement.—Mauravieff’s Hist. Russ. Church (by Blackmore), p. 55.

(b) Another council was convened here in 1622. Meletias, archbishop of Polotsk, at one time a most zealous defender of the orthodox Church in Russia, had been obliged to flee into Greece upon a groundless suspicion of having been concerned in the murder of Jeshophat, Uniate archbishop of Polotsk, and, urged by fear, had given himself up to the Uniate party, and written an apology in censure of the orthodox Church; in this council he was called to account, made to perform open penance, and to bear his book. Soon after he entirely apostatised; and, going to Rome, had the title of archbishop of Hieropolis conferred on him.—Mauravieff, p. 173.

In the neighborhood of Kieff is the convent of Kievo-Petchersk, a celebrated Russian sanctuary, which annually attracts thousands of pilgrims from the most remote parts of Russia. The name descriptive of its aspect, for so bare and scorched it is that it seems as if it had participated in the doomed of Sodom. It runs on, a deep, narrow, wild chasm, until it breaks through the lofty line of cliffs at Ras el-Feshkha, on the shore of the Dead Sea. It will thus be seen that the head of the Kidron is just on the verge of the water-shed of the mountain-chain of Judah, about 2000 feet above the sea. Its length, as the crow flies, is only twenty miles, and yet in this short space it has a descent of no less than 8912 feet—"the Dead Sea having a depth of 14042 feet (Van de Velde, p. 179, 182).—Kitto; Smith. In 1848 the levelling party of the Dead Sea Expedition, under command of Lieut. Lynch, worked up the wady en-Nar, the bed of the Kidron, from the Dead Sea to Jerusalem. They encountered several precipices from ten to twelve feet high, down which cataracts plunge in winter. They found the ravine shut in on each side by high, barren cliffs of chalky limestone, and the dry torrent-beds interrupted by boulders, and covered with fragments of stone (Narrative, p. 384, 386). The place where it empties into the Jordan is a great natural deep, deep, narrow, which at this place is filled with confused fragments of rock, much worn, but perfectly dry (ib.). For further notices, see Ritter’s Erdkunde, xvi, 600; Robinson, Biblical Researches, ut sup.

Kieff or Kieff, the name of the chief town of the government of that name, on the west bank of the Dnieper, one of the oldest of the Russian towns, and formerly the capital (containing 60,000 inhabitants, with a university and a theological school), was in 864 taken from the Khazars by two Norman chiefs, companions of Ruric, and conquered from them by Oleg, Ruric’s successor, who made it his capital. In 1240, when it ceased to be the capital, it was expressly destroyed by Batiu, khan of Kiptschak. Christianity was first proclaimed in Russia at Kieff in 888. In the 14th century it was seized by Gedimin, grand duke of Lithuania, and annexed to Poland in 1569, but in 1686 was restored to Russia.

Kieff is the oldest Russian metropolis’s residence, the cradle of Russian Christianity. It is also noted on account of two Church (Greek) councils that have been held there. See Landon, Manual of Church Councils.

(a) The first of these convened about 1147, and is noted for the manner in which the bishops elected a metropolitan, and placed him in the place of Michael. It is the exception of Niphont of Novgorod, they all agreed to take the election into their own hands, without allowing to the patriarch of Constantinople the exercise of his right either to nominate or confirm. Niphont strongly pressed against the act, but with the excommunication of the synod fell upon Clement, a monk of Smolensk. As a substitute for the patriarchal consecration, Onuphrius proposed that the hand of St. Clement of Rome, whose relics had been brought from Cherson, should be placed upon his head. This election led to great disorder, and subsequently the patriarch Luke Chyserges consecrated Constantine metropolitan, who condemned the acts of this synod, and suspended for a time all the clergy ordained by Clement.—Mauravieff’s Hist. Russ. Church (by Blackmore), p. 55.

(b) Another council was convened here in 1622. Meletias, archbishop of Polotsk, at one time a most zealous defender of the orthodox Church in Russia, had been obliged to flee into Greece upon a groundless suspicion of having been concerned in the murder of Jeshophat, Uniate archbishop of Polotsk, and, urged by fear, had given himself up to the Uniate party, and written an apology in censure of the orthodox Church; in this council he was called to account, made to perform open penance, and to bear his book. Soon after he entirely apostatised; and, going to Rome, had the title of archbishop of Hieropolis conferred on him.—Mauravieff, p. 173.
work, and was handled with severity by Edwards in his *Carogamus*. He is regarded as the father of the "Particular Baptists." An estimate may be formed of the high position Kiffin must have occupied in his day if Macaulay (*History of England*, vol. ii) could say, "Great as was the authority of Bunyan with Baptists, that of William Kiffin was still greater," and quote a passage from the *Declaration of Dissenting Churches* (p. 430), "his portrait," says Skeats (*Hist. English Free Churches*, p. 154), "does not bear out the once current impression concerning the Baptists of that age. With skull-cap and flowing ringlets, with mustache and "imperial," with broad lance and round hat" (see his portrait at *Lives and Times of Distinguished Dissenters*, 1:430), he resembles a gentleman Cavalier rather than any popular ideal of a sour-visaged and discontented Anabaptist." See Crosby, *Hist. Eng. Baptists*; and Lives (London 1659, 4to, and one by Joseph Gurney, 1825, 2vo; also his Autobiography, edited by Orme, London 1829, 2vo). (J. H. W.)

KILHAM

Kilburn, David, a Methodist Episcopal bishop, born at Gilsland, N. H., October 24, 1784, was converted when seventeen years old, licensed to preach in 1805, and, after three years' labor as a local preacher, was received into the New England Conference, and obtained his first pastorate in a vacant charge, at Union, Me. His subsequent stations were Reading, Me.; Stanstead, Canada; Danville, Barnard and White River, Needham, Boston, Portland, Me.; Wethersfield and Barre, Vt.; Providence, R. I.; Lowell, Lynn-Cummington, Bridgewater, North-west Bridgewater, Waltham, Barre, Ashburnham, South Boylston, Enfield, and South Hampton. He traveled also the following districts as presiding elder: Portland District, Maine Conference; New Hampshire, Boston, Springfield, and Providence Districts, in the New England Conference. In 1816 he became superannuated, in 1833-35 offensive, in 1834 supernumerary, in 1836 effective, in 1838 again supernumerary, and in 1859 he again became superannuated, in which relation he remained till the time of his death, July 18, 1865. Kilburn was a man of great endurance, and constitutionally qualified for the immense labor he performed; of sound judgment, clear understanding, strong will; earnest and conscientious in the performance of duty. During his laborious ministry he sustained a high reputation and exerted a powerful influence. . . . His prudent foresight, his comprehensive views, his knowledge of men, his perception of character, his urbanity, his high moral and Christian virtues, entitled him to an honorable social and official position in the Church which he so faithfully served."—*Conf. Minutes*, 1865, p. 56.

Kilby, Richard, an English theologian, was born at Ratcliffe in the second half of the 16th century, and was educated at Oxford University, with which he was identified throughout life; he was its rector in 1590, and held a professorship of the Hebrew language. He died Nov. 7, 1620. Richard Kilby was one of the translators of King James's version of the Bible. He also published several sermons (1613, etc.) and a *Commentary on Titus*. Another English divine of the same name flourished about the same time in Warwickshire. He died in 1617, and is the author of a work entitled *Burthen of a loud Conscience* (1616, 8vo; often reprinted).—Hoefcr, *Dictionary of National Biography*, xxvi, 729; Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, vol. ii. a. v.

Kildare, an ancient church in central Ireland, founded A.D. 490, derived its name from the Irish *cele*, church, and *dair*, the oak, and was first established by St. Bridget as a Christian school, and afterwards called a nunnery, for the purpose of teaching pagan women, until the death of St. Patrick, who administered a bishop's ordination to the Church. Soon a town or city grew up around it, and in later times it formed an extensive diocese. In the early period of Ireland's history it is nothing remarkable to find woman assuming the position of public instructor; Druidism, the former religion of Ireland, assigned offices to females. In the early history of the Irish Church we have several intimations that Christian women were employed in its services. St. Patrick, in his *Confession*, sect. xviii, writes about a woman of noble birth, of the august name of Sael, that she was apprehended in the act of administering the sacrament. St. Bridget, the founder of this church and female seminary, tradition says, died about A.D. 515, at an advanced age, loved in life and lamented in death. In honor of her memory, through an extent of fourteen centuries, in different countries and in different languages, there have been called by her name; more children, perhaps, than after any other Christian woman whose name is not in the inspired records. Her memory was cherished by the Picts and the British Scots, but in no place except Kildare was it more honored than in the Heb- ridies, where it left, as St. Columba said, a chief eremite and less pure than the patrones of their churches. Several lives of her have been written by foreigners and in different languages, but the best and the fullest is said to be that by St. Ulian, the materials for which he obtained from a manuscript of the monastery of Rathibo, Germany, of 1231. See Moore, *Hist. of Ireland*: Ware's *Irish Antiquities*; Todd, *Irish Church*, p. 28. (D. D.)

KILHAM, Alexander, one of the most celebrated characters in the history of Methodism, the founder of the "New Connection of Wesleyan Methodists," frequently called simply "Kilhampites," and really the first man in the Methodist connection who advocated the representation of the lay element in the government of the Church, was born at Epworth, England, July 10, 1762. His parents were Methodists, and he enjoyed a training strictly in accordance with their own religious convictions. Vacillating in character and impatient in temper in his youthful days, he struggled hard against all religious impressions, but was finally converted at the age of eighteen, and shortly after began preaching. Brackenbury, one of Wesley's right-hand men, met young Kilham one day at Epworth while himself on a preaching excursum, and engaged him at once as his travelling companion. In Brackenbury's missionary visit to the Channel Islands, Kilham proved himself an able assistant. In 1788, shortly after their return from the islands, Wesley received Kilham into the regular itineraries of his Church. He was always one of the most zealous Methodists, his ministrations frequently met with opposition, and an encounter with a mob was almost a daily experience. At Bolton his chapel was stoned; at Alford market-place he was attacked by a clergyman and a constable; at Spilsby he was assailed with dirt and eggs. In another place gunpowder was laid under the spot where he expected to preach, with a train extending some distance, but without effect, for he took his stand elsewhere and escaped the danger. It was amid such difficulties and trials that he labored for the cause of his Master. In 1791 the founder of Methodist expired. During the life of Wesley there had been no actual separation of the Wesleyans from the Established Church. He had been careful to avoid religious meetings during the hours for public worship in the Establishment. He had thus preserved the connection; nor did Wesley, to record the wish, "Let us have the liberty of Englishmen, and give the Lord's Supper to our societies." About the time of Wesley's death he wrote, "I
The storm, however, soon blew over. I hope God will open the eyes of the Methodists to see their sin and folly in their inconsistent connection with the Church. The opposition against ecclesiastical subserviency to the laws of the Church of England became more determined after W. Taylor's death, July 28, 1791, the first after Mr. Wesley's death, to "take the plan as Mr. Wesley had left it." "The controversy could not," says Stevens (History of Methodism, iii, 88), "be resumed, and more definite results must be reached. Vehemence and anarchy would be the consequences." The body of the national Church regarded the pledge as binding the Methodists to the Establishment; the advocates of progress disdained, and, in the language of Pownall, declared, "Not so; our old plan has been to follow the openings of Providence, and to alter or amend the plan as we saw it needful, in order to be more useful in the hand of God." Hanby, whom Wesley had authorized to administer the sacraments, still claimed the right to do so wherever the societies wished him. Pownall wrote the same year that if the people were denied the sacraments, they would leave the connection in many places.

Taylor was determined as far as Liverpool; and Atmore wrote that, having 'solemnly promised upon his knees before God and his people that he would give all diligence not only to preach the word, but to administer the sacraments in the Church of God,' he would "never, unless overruled by Divine Providence, be induced to withdraw from any connection. We were as much divided," he later wrote, "in our views and practice as before; and numerous disputes occurred during the year respecting the administration of the sacraments and a total separation from the Church of England. Circular letters in great abundance were sent into different parts of the kingdom, and the minds of the people were much diverted from the pursuit of more sublime objects by others which tended but little to the profit of the soul. The diversified opinions of the connection were, in fine, resolving themselves into three classes, and giving rise to as many parties, composed respectively of men who, from their attachment to the Establishment, wished no change, unless it might be a greater subordination to the national Church by the abandonment of the sacraments in those cases where Wesley had admitted them; of such as wished to maintain the plan of connection as settled by the Methodists; and of those who thought it might be requisite to administer it; and such as desired revolutionary changes, with a more equal distribution of powers among laymen and preachers." Kilham belonged to the third party, and used all the means at his disposal to prevent the Revolution, or, "as he termed it, the connection." At the next Conference, however, he was severely criticized for his assertion of the popular rights, and for the publication of a pamphlet on the Progress of Liberty, in which he urged a distribution of the power of government between the clerical and the lay elements. In the course of the controversy severe remarks had been thrown out by Kilham, which were construed by the preachers into defamations of the society, and at the London Conference of 1796 he was formally arraigned, and expelled from the connection. This summary process precipitated the division of sentiment, and resulted in the establishment of an independent body (now known as the New Connection Methodists) in 1797 at Ebenezer Chapel. See Methodists, New Connection. A writer in the Wesleyan Times of May 12, 1862, furnishes documents which go to prove that Kilham's course, both in 1763-4, and even as late as 1796, had the approval of the most celebrated leaders of Methodism. At this time Dr. Adam Clarke, Pownall, Browne, and Cowles, all earnestly indorsed the movement. Kilham himself did not long survive the ecclesiastical censure of his brethren. He died July 20, 1798. It is but just to his memory to say that he is acknowledged by all to have been a man of fervent piety, and that he was animated by great zeal for the success of the Wesleyan cause.
KILLIGREW, 80

KIMCHI


Kilgrew, Hickety, D.D., an English divine, was born in 1615, and educated at Christ Church, Oxford, where he was ordained in 1638. He was made chaplain to James, duke of York, and prebend of Westminster, in 1642, and died about 1685. His Sermons were published (1666, 4to; 1685, 4to; 1689, 4to; and 1695, 4to): the last edition was by bishop Patrick, who highly eulogized the abilities of Killigrew as a pulpit orator. — Allibone, Dict. of Engl. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.

Kilvert, Francis, an English theologian and teacher, was born in Bath in 1739. His early education was under the instruction of Dr. Rowlandson, at Hungerford; afterwards he was at the Bath Grammar School, where, because of his superior acquirements, he was engaged as one of the assistant masters prior to his entering Oxford. He went to Worcester College in 1811, was ordained deacon in 1816, and priest in 1817. His first curacy was that of Claverton, near Bath. In 1837 he became rector of Claverton Lodge, in which he continued to teach privately until his death, Sept. 15, 1863. Kilvert was a man of uncommon purity of life, and as an instructor of the youth his precepts and holy example were invaluable. He published a volume of Sermons (preached at St. Mary's Church, Bathwick, 1827): — Collection of original Latin inscriptions: and Memoirs of Bishop Hard (1860). See Appleton, American Annual Cyclopaedia, 1868, p. 571. (J. L. S.)

Kilwardbye, Robert, a noted English prelate, flourished in the second half of the 13th century. He was educated at the universities of Oxford and Paris. In 1272 he became archbishop of Canterbury, and in 1277 was made cardinal. He died in 1279. Cardinal Kilwardbye is said to have written as many as 80 different works, but none of these were ever printed. See Hoefer, Neue Biog. Gér. xxvii, 720.

Kimball. See Thorn.

Kimmer, Isaac, an English dissenting minister, born at Wantage, Berkshire, in 1639, was educated at Gresham College, London, and the Dissenters' Academy, and was admitted at Wadham College, Oxford; but resigned in 1672 on account of some difficulties with his congregation, and returned to London, where he published a periodical which lived some four years. He was also employed by book-sellers in various literary undertakings, compiling a number of historical works, among which we remark the Life of Oliver Cromwell (London, 1714, 8vo). He wrote also the Life of bishop Beveridge prefixed to the folio edition of that prelate's works, of which he was editor:—Sermons, etc., to which is prefixed Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Author (London, 1756, 8vo). He died in 1758. See Chalmers, General Biographical Dictionary; Allibone, Dictionary of English and American Authors, vol. ii, s. v. (J. N. P.)

Kimchi, David, ben-Joseph (by the Jews frequently called Redak, from the initial letters דק רדניק רד וק), one of the most distinguished Jewish writers of the Middle Ages, the great exponent of Hebrew grammar, was born at Narbonne in the south of France, in 1160. Very little is known of his private life. He must certainly have enjoyed, even among his contemporaries, considerable influence, gained perhaps, in a measure, by his masterly defence of Moses Maimonides; for in 1292 we find him acting as the arbiter of the dispute then existing between the Spanish and French rabbis respecting the opinions advanced in the More Nebihek of Maimonides. He died about 1240. His works are:—(1) Commentary on the Pentateuch, only Genesis has been published by A. Ginsburg (Presburg, 1842), exp. 1–10 being supplied by Kirchheim; (2) Commentary on the Psalms, first printed in 1477, reprinted several times, and also given in the Rabbinical Bibles of Jacob ben-Chajim, but not in those edited by Buxtorf and Frankforter. (5) Commentary on Ruth, published for the first time by Mercier (Paris, 1568) and in the Rabbinical Bibles:—(7) Commentary on Job (translations by John, which has not yet been published:—(8) The celebrated work called Mikkol, or Perfection, which consists of two parts—a. A Hebrew Grammar (אכיפתי אכיפţi אכיפţi אכיפティング וקנס בימא וקנס בימא וקנס ביםא וקenso

Kimchi, as he himself frankly says in his introduction to the Mittkol, did not so much furnish new and startling criticism as an exhibit of the results of the manifold and extensive labors of his numerous predecessors. His lexicon is, to a great extent, a translation of Ibn-Ganach's Book of Roots [see Ibn-Ganach], and he freely quotes the great Jewish-Arabic commentators, grammarians, and lexicographers, Saadia, Ibn-Korieish, Chajuj, Ibn-Ganach, Ibn-Gebirol, Ibn-Gaith, Ibn-Balaam, Gikattisa, and many other celebrities. "But, though," says Ginsburgh, "the Book of Roots (Cytoph. Bibl. Lit. vol. ii, s. v.)," yet his merits are great. He was the first who discovered the distinction between the long and the short vowels, whereby the understanding of the changing of vowels has been greatly facilitated. He moreover defended a simple, natural, and grammatical exegesis, at a time when most of his Jewish brethren were enamored of Hagadic, Cabalistical, and astrological interpretations. It is therefore not to be wondered at that he became so eminent among his brethren that they applied to him, by a play of words, the saying in the Mishna (Aboth, iii, 17), רבי יוסי אפיה גיא אמרolk, No Kimchi, no understanding of the Scriptures. Among Christians Kimchi also enjoyed great celebrity, more especially, however, among the precursors of the Reformation and the Reformers themselves, "notwithstanding his hostility to Christianity, which is displayed throughout his commentaries, and which arose from the doctrines of the Jesuitical party, and from the Roman-Catholic establishment of the Crusaders. Many passages obnoxious to adherents of the Christian faith were struck out by the Inquisition, and are omitted in later editions of Kimchi's Commentaries. Pococke collected all the passages which had been omitted from the Prophets in Not. et Portus Moesiae, in his theological works (ed. Lond., 1740, 1, 341 sq. The first efforts of Christian scholars in compiling Heb.
lexicons, or glossaries, and grammars, were based on the labors of Kimchi, and the notes accompanying the Latin Bibles of Munster and Stephen are derived from him. Excerpts of his Commentary on Isaiah were translated into Latin by Munster, and a Latin version of the whole of it was published by Malalas (Florence, 1744). Later in the 18th century, the Psalms were translated by Utrecht, 1657 and 1658, and the Psalms into English (London, 1837). A Latin translation of the Commentary on the Psalms was made by Janvier (Constantin, 1544). His grammatical labors embraced in the Midrash was translated into Latin by Guidacior (Paris, 1540), and a Latin version of the Roots was published in 1546. See Steinschneider, Catalogus Lib. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 668-675; Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaeica, ii, 183 sq.; and his Introdc. to Hebrew Dictionary; the masterly biography of Kimchi by Geiger in Osar Nezach Maimonides ( Vienna, 1857), p. 157 sq.; Dukas, Die Familie Kimchi (Literaturblatt des Orientes, 1860); Gritz, Gesch. der Juden, vi, 296 sq.; Kittel, Bibl. Cyclopedia, a.v.

Kimchi, Joseph, Ben-Isaac, a distinguished Jewish Rabbi, father of the preceding (David), was born in Spain in the latter half of the 11th century, but was obliged to quit Spain during the terrible persecutions by the Mohammedans, and settled at Narbonne, France. Just as little is known of his personal history as of his son's. He was very learned in the science of the Hebrew language and Biblical exegesis, and by the introduction into Southern France of that thorough scholarship for which the Spanish Jews in his day are so celebrated, gave a new impetus to the study of the O.-Test. Scripture in the original. As has been pllyhly said, he became the father of the O.-Test. Bible in Southern France. He died about 1182. He wrote a number of valuable contributions to exegetical theology, but it is as a theologian, especially as a polemic, that Joseph Kimchi excelled. His most important works are: הָבֵית הָבֵית (Book of the Covenant), a treatise against Christianity, in his most outstanding from a dialogue between a Jew (Maammon or believer) and a Christian (Min or heretic), and which was published in the Makhem ha-Shem (Constantinople, 1710, 8vo), הָבֵית הָבֵית, and against a Jew named Peter Alphonse, who had become a Christian. This work was never published. He also wrote in Hebrew verse the maxims of Solomon ben-Gabriol (of these fragments appeared in the Zion [Franchise, 1842, 8vo], ii, 97-100); some Hebrew books, which were inserted into the midrash of Shokcar (published by Mars,Jare [Manresa, 1612, 8vo]); a Hebrew translation of Bachi ben-Joseph's moral, printed in the works of the latter (Leipzig, 1846, 12mo); besides commentaries on most of the books of the O. T. The last are as follows: (1) Commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled rod הָבֵית הָבֵית (The Book of the Law), fragments are extant in MS, de Rossi 166, and in the quotations of his son D. Kimchi;—(2) Commentary on the earlier Prophets, called rod הָבֵית הָבֵית (The Bill of Purchase), in allusion to Jer. xxxii, 11;—(3) Commentary on the later Prophets, called rod הָבֵית הָבֵית (The Unfolded Book), in allusion to Jer. xxxiii, 14). These works, too, have not as yet come to light, and we only know them through the numerous quotations from them dispersed through David Kimchi's Commentaries on the Prophets. His didactic Commentary on Job, of which defective MSS. are preserved in the Bodleian Library and at Munich, 366;—(5) Commentary on Proverbs, a perfect MS. of which exists in the Munich Library, No. 242;—(6) Hebrew Grammar, called rod הָבֵית הָבֵית (The Book of Remembrance), which is the first written by a Jew in a Christian country, and is quoted by D. Kimchi in the Midrash, רַבּ, d, b, c. Another grammatical work, entitled הָבֵית הָבֵית, also quoted in the Midrash, יִבְּרָה; also quoted in the Midrash, יִבְּרָה, a. "Both as a commentator and a grammarian," says Ginsburg (in Kittel, Bibl. Cyclopedia, vol. ii, s, v.), "Joseph Kimchi deserves the highest praise; and, though his works thus far unpublished, his contributions to Biblical literature produced the most beneficial results, inasmuch as they prepared the way in Christian countries for a literal and sound exegesis. His son, David Kimchi, who constantly quotes him, both in his commentaries and under almost every root of his Hebrew Lexicon, has thus far maintained him under the full influence of the grammatical and exegetical principles of this deservedly esteemed Hebraist." See, besides the works cited under David Kimchi, Biesenthal and Lebrecht's edition of D. Kimchi's Radicum Liber (Berlin, 1847), col. xxiv sq.; and Geiger's excellent treatise in Osar Nezach (Vienna, 1866), i, p. 97-115, ii, 827; Literaturblatt des Orientes, 1850; Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaeica, ii, 186 sq. (J. H. W.)

Kimchi, Moses, Ben-Joseph (also called Remah), from the initial letters יִבְּרָה יֵשְׁכָּם, eldest son of the preceding (Joseph), flourished about 1160-1176. Though far inferior in ability to his father and brother, he earned an honorable place as a commentator and grammarian. His works are as follows: (1) Commentary on Proverbs (or Journey on the Paths of Knowledge), which became a manual for both Jews and Christians, and which is still studied by Hebrew grammar. It was highly commended by Elias Levita, who annotated and edited it in 1608. It was afterwards published, with a Latin translation, by Seb. Munster (Basel, 1681), and since frequently, with diverse additions and modifications. The chief merit of this little volume consists in the fact that M. Kimchi was the first to employ therein the word וָסָפִית as a paradigm of the regular verbs, instead of the less appropriate verb meaning gutturals וָסָפִית, which had been used by his predecessors, in imitation of Arabic grammarians;—(2) A grammatical treatise on the anomalous expressions, entitled יִבְּרָה יֵשְׁכָּם, quoted by D. Kimchi in the Midrash, see Biesenthal and Lebrecht's edition of D. Kimchi's Radicum Liber (Berlin, 1847), col. xxxviii sq.; Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaeica, ii, 187 sq.; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, 1888-1884; I, the same author, Bibliographisches Handbuch (Leipzig, 1859), p. 74 sq.; Geiger's Osar Nezach, ii, 17 sq.; Ginsburg, in Kittel, Bibl. Cyclopedia, ii, s. v.

Kimmoah, Kimmoah. See NETTLE.

Kim'yah (Heb. Kim'ya, בִּקְרִית, an exeg., as in Jer. ix, 9, etc.; Septuag. כְּרִית v. l. 'Levij'), a city in the extreme south of Judah (hence prob. included within the territory of Simeon), mentioned between Jugur and Dimnah (Josh. xv, 22). "Stanley (Sinai and Pal. p. 160) ingeniously connects Kimnah with the Kenites (בִּקְרִית), who settled in this district (Josh. i. 16). But it should not be overlooked that the list in Josh. xv, 22 reports to record the towns as they were at the conquest, while the settlement of the Kenites probably (though not certainly) did not take place till after it. It is mentioned in the Omonacions of Eusebius and Jerome (s. v. כְּרִית, כרּית), but not as to imply that they had any actual knowledge of it. With the sole exception of Schwartz (Polest. p. 99), it appears to be unmentioned by any trav-
eller, and the 'town Cusab, situated near the wilderness of Zuin,' with which he would identify it, is not to be found in his own or any other map' (Smith). The true position of Cusab can only be conjecturally located as not far from the Dead Sea, possibly in wady Fikeh.

KINANAH. See Marahah.

Kindervater, Christian Victor, a German preacher and philosopher of the Kantine school, was born at Neuenhellen, Thuringen, in 1758, and was educated at the University of Leipzig. He became pastor at Peltelwitz, near Leipzig, in 1790; in 1804, general superintendent at Eisenach, and died May 9, 1806. His most important work is "De homine qui omnium necat esse immortalis, animae postea esse tranquillo" ( Lipsa, 1785, 4to):—

"Gibt es unerschütterliche Beruhigung in Leiden ohne den auf Moralität gegründeten Glauben an die Unsterblichkeit?" (1797):—"Gespräche über das Wesen der Götter" (1787):—"Adnoramius questionis, quae Fyrocka doctrina omnem tollatur virtus (1789, 4to):—"Skeptische Dialogen über die Vortheile der Leiden, und Widerrichtungen dieses Lebens (1788, 8vo):—"Geschichte der Wirkungen der verschiedenen Religionen auf die Sittlichkeit und Glückseligkeit des Menschengeschlechts in Altern und neuer Zeiten" (1798, 4to).—"Gratia et Deo tribua tua (1794, 8vo):—"Darstellung der Lehren des Jesus" (1797, 8vo):—"De indecete atque forma regni Messiae e mente Johannise Baptista Dissertatio (1803, 4to).—Krug, Encyklop. Lex. vol. ii. s. v.; Döring, Deutsche Konsolredner d. 18. u. 19. Jahrh. p. 155 sq.

KIND. I. The following are the Hebrew terms thus rendered in the English Bible:

1. בֵּית נוֹעַד, mishpachoth, usually rendered "family," answering to the Latin genus, except that it more distinctly includes the idea of original affinity or derivation from a common stock; it corresponds exactly with our word clan. It is used of the different tribes of the Canaanites (Gen. x. 9); of the subdivisions of the Hebrew people (Exod. vii. 14; Num. i. 20, etc.); sometimes for one of the tribes (Josh. vii. 17; Judg. xiii. 2, etc.), and in the later books tropically for a people or nation (Jer. viii. 3; xxv. 9; Ezek. xxvii. 32; Micah ii. 5). It is translated kindred in the A. V. at Gen. xxiv. 41; Josh. vi. 29; Ruth ii. 8; Job xxxii. 2— in all of which it refers to relationship by consanguinity, more or less remote.

2. בֵּית נוֹעַד, mole'edah, conveys primarily the idea of birth, nativity; hence a person born, a child (Gen. xxviii. 9; Lev. xvii. 9, 11), and persons of the same family or lineage (Gen. xii. 1; xxiv. 4; xxviii. 3; xxix. 7; Num. xx. 30; Esth. ii. 10; vii. 6— all which passages it is translated kindred in the A. V.). The family in these instances, however, the kinship is only the remote one of common nationality arising out of common descent. But מְלֹדֶד, molas'dah, literally knowledge, is used to express blood-relationship in Ruth iii. 2; compare בֵּית נוֹעַד (Ruth ii. 1; Prov. vii. 4).

4. בֵּית נוֹעַד, geülah, redemption, a word which properly designated such near relationship by blood as would confer the rights and obligations of a בֵּית נוֹעַד, kinsman, avenger, and redeemer, on the party. See Geûl. As commonly used, however, it denotes either the thing redeemed (Ruth iv. 6), or the right of redeeming (Lev. xxv. 29, etc.), or the redemption price (Lev. xxv. 26, etc.). The only passage in which it is translated kindred in the A. V. is Ezek. xi. 16. Hengstenberg (Christol. iii. 9, E. T.) and Hitzig (Comment. ad loc.) contend that פֵּנוּר is to be taken here not in the sense of relationship, but in that ofSureness or substitutionary action, and they would translate the passage, "Thy brethren are the men of thy suretyship," or "redemption," i. e. the men whom it lies on them to redeem or act for. The Sept. seems to have read פֵּנוּר, for they give עֲכָלָה in Isaiah.

5. בֵּית נוֹעַד, which properly means brother, occurs only once with the rendering kindred in the A. V., in 1 Chron. xiii. 29. It is frequently used elsewhere in a wide sense, and may be understood of nearly all collateral relationships whatever, whether by consanguinity, affinity, or simple association. From this comes בֵּית נוֹעַד, brotherhood (Zech. xi. 14).

Besides these terms, the Hebrews expressed consanguinity by such words and phrases as בֵּית נוֹעַד, flesh (Gen. xxxvii. 27; Isa. xi. 7); בֵּית נוֹעַד, my bone and my flesh (Gen. xxix. 14; Judg. ix. 2; 2 Sam. v. 1, etc.); בֵּית נוֹעַד, flesh (Lev. xviii. 12, 13, etc.; Num. xxvii. 41), with בֵּית נוֹעַד, coll. kinnsmen (Lev. xviii. 17); and בֵּית נוֹעַד, flesh of his flesh (A. V. near of kin, Lev. xviii. 6; near of blood, xv. 49).

II. With the Test. We have the following Greek words thus rendered: πατρίς, the most general and frequent term, our kinsman, i.e. birth relationship, with its derivative αὐγγελία, co-relationship: πατρίς (Acts iii. 25), descent in a direct line ("lineage," Luke ii. 4; "family," Eph. iii. 15); and ἐθνός (Rev. v. 9, vii. 5; xi. 3; xii. 7, xiv. 6), a tribe (as elsewhere rendered).

In addition to these Hebrew and Greek words, various others of cognate derivation or similar significance are frequently rendered "kin," "kinship." III. The terms expressive of immediate relationship are PATER, MOTHÉR, BROTHER, SISTER, CHILD; these expressing collateral relationship are UNCLE, AUNT, NEPHEW (niece does not occur in the A. V., but brother's or sister's daughter), COUSIN; those expressive of affinity are FATHER-IN-LAW, MOTHER-IN-LAW, SISTER-IN-LAW, MOTHER-IN-LAW, DAUGHTER-IN-LAW, BROTHER-IN-LAW, SISTER-IN-LAW.

See each of these in their place.

IV. The relations of kindred, expressed by few words, and imperfectly defined in the earliest ages, acquired in course of time greater significance and wider influence. The full list of relatives either by consanguinity, i. e. as arising from a common ancestor, or by affinity, i. e. as created by marriage, may be seen detailed in the Corpus Iuris Civ. Digest. lib. xxxviii. tit. 10, de Gradibus; see also Corp. Jur. Canum. Decr. ii. c. xxxv. 5, 9. See Family.

The domestic and economical questions arising out of kindred may be classed under the three heads of Marriage, Inheritance, and Blood-Revenger; and the reader is referred to the articles on those subjects for information thereon. It is clear that the tendency of the Mosaic law was to increase the restrictions on marriage, by defining more precisely the relations created by it, as is shown by the cases of Abraham and Moses. For information on the general subject of kindred and its obligations, see Selden, De Jure Naturali, lib. v.; Michaelis, Laws of Moses, ed. Smith, ii. 86; Knobel on Lev. xviii; Philo, De Spec. Leg. iii. 3, 4, 5, vol. ii. p. 301-304, ed. Mangely; Barthelemy, Traité I, 150; Reit, Dider. Arcas. ii. 106, 107. See Kindman.

Kine (קֵיתֶן, porah; i.e. fruitful, a heifer, Gen. xxxii. 15; xii. 2-7; and so rendered in Numb. xix. 2-9; also a young mish-cov, 1 Sam. vi. 14-14; "cow," Job xxi. 10; Isa. xi. 7; a "heifer" just broken to the yoke, Hose iv. 16; put as a symbol of a voluptuous female, Amos iv. 1; sometimes in the Auth. Vers. for בֵּית נוֹעַד, e' leph, usually an oz, as rendered in Psal. viii. 8; Prov. xiv. 4; xxxii. 24; but fem. in Deut. vii. 13; xxxii. 4, 18, 51; also for בֵּית נוֹעַד, bukar, Deut. xxxiii. 14; 2 Sam. xvii. 29; a beece or one of a herd of cattle, elsewhere without distinction of sex, and rendered "oz," "bulllock," "herd," etc.). See Cow.

KING (Heb. and Chald. קֵינָן, mel'et, ruler; בֵּלֶקָן, the most general term for an absolute, independent, and life-long sovereign. 1. Scriptural Applications of the Title.—In the Bible the name does not always imply the same degree of power or importance, neither does it indicate the magnitude of the dominion or territory of the national ruler thus designated (Gen. xxxvi. 81). Many persons are
called "kings" in Scripture whom we should rather denominate chiefs or leaders; and many single towns, or towns with their adjacent villages, are said to have kings. Hence we need not be surprised at seeing that so small a country as Canaan contained thirty-one kings which we were conquered (Josh. xii, 9, 24), besides many who no doubt escaped the arms of Joshua. Adonibezek himself, so very powerful king, mentions seventy kings whom he had subdued and mutilated (Judg. i, 7; 1 Kings iv, 21: xx, 1, 16). Even at the present day the heads of Arab tribes are often called "kings," which in this case also means no more than sheik or chief. In like manner, in the New Test., owing to the peculiar political relations of the Jews, the title "king" has very different significations. (1.) The "king" was the head of the state (1 Pet. ii, 19, 17); and so the "seven kings" (Rev. xv, 10) are perhaps the first seven Cæsars (comp. Thilo, Apocr. 579). (2.) Herod Antipas (Matt. xiv, 9; Mark vi, 22), although only tetrarch (compare Luke iii, 19). (3.) So also the ten provincial representatives of the Roman governors (Rev. xii, 12), as being supreme within their respective jurisdictions. See GOVERNOR, etc.

"Kings," in symbolical language, signifies the possessors of supreme power, whether lodged in one or more persons (Prov. viii, 15, 16). It is applied in the Scriptures to the various reagents of the universe (1 Tim. i, 17), and to Christ, the Son of God, the sole Head and Governor of his Church (1 Tim. vi, 15, 16; Matt. xxvii, 11; Luke xix, 38; John i, 49; xviii, 83, 84); also to men, as invested with regal authority by their fellow-men (Psalms ii, 1; 2 cryst.; 1 Peter ii, 13-17); and so also the people of God are called kings and priests (Psa. xlix, 14; Dan. vii, 22, 27; Matt. xix, 28; Luke xxii, 30; 1 Cor. vi, 2, 3; 2 Tim. ii, 12; Rev. i, 6; ii, 26; 21; xx, 10; xxii, 5). In Job xviii, 14 is applied to Death, who is there called the "king of terror." In Job xxv, 15, Leviathan, or the crocodile, is thus designated: "he is a king over all the children of pride." (See WENHAM'S Symbol. Dict.)

The application, however, of the term "king," with which we are here particularly concerned, is that of the name of the national ruler of the Hebrews during a period of about 350 years previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, B.C. 588. It was borne first by the ruler of the Twelve Tribes united, and then by the rulers of Judah and Israel separately. See KINGS, BOOK OF.

2. Origin of the Hebrew Monarchy.—Regal authority was one of the institutions that characterized the original and unadulterated form. Their fundamental idea was that Jehovah was the sole king of the nation (1 Sam. viii, 7); to use the emphatic words in Isa. xxxviii, 22, "the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king." Although Moses ventured, with his bar at Cades, to set up a national experiment, of founding a society without a king, and in doing so evinced a rare patriotism and self-denial, for without doubt the man who rescued the Jews from bondage and conducted them to the land of Canaan, might have chosen, have kept the dominion in his own hands, and transmitted a crown to his posterity, yet he well knew what were the elements with which he had to deal in framing institutions for the rescued Israelites. Slaves they had been, and the spirit of slavery was not yet wholly eradicated from their souls. They had witnessed to their elevation of the poor and the more than ordinary pomp and splendor which environ a throne. Not improbable the prosperity and abundance which they had seen in Egypt, and in which they had been, in a manner, allowed to partake, might have been sacrifices by them to the regal form of government. It was the closest possible consideration that they have apprehended a not very remote departure from the fundamental type of his institutions. Accordingly he makes a special provision for this contingency (Deut. xvii, 14), and labors, by anticipation, to guard against the abuses of royal power. Should a king be demanded by his people, let it be to perform the duties of his office; he was not to be drawn away by the love of show, especial-ly by a desire for that regal display in which horses have always borne so large a part, to send down to Egypt, still less to cause the people to return to that land; he was to avoid to amassing silver and gold; he was to have a copy of the law made expressly for his own study—a study which he was never to intermit till the end of his days. He might not be lifted up above his brethren, that he might not be turned aside from the living God, but observing the divine statutes, and thus acknowledging himself to be no more than the vicegerent of heaven, might enjoy happiness, and transmit his authority to his descendants.

The remnant of Israel, therefore, at length soon left the people to the natural results of their own condition and character. Anarchy ensued. Noble minds, indeed, and stout hearts appeared in those who were termed judges; but the state of the country was not so satisfactory to prevent an unenlightened people, having low and gross affections, from preferring to a crown the apparent protection of a sceptre to the invisible and, therefore, mostly unrecognised arm of Omnipotence. A king accordingly is requested (1 Sam. viii). "The misconduct of Samuel's sons, who had been made judges, and who had made themselves too much like their father, led the people to propose a king. The request was at first acceded to; but, having sought in prayer to learn the will of God, he was instructed to yield to the demand; and yet at the same time he was directed to "protest solemnly unto them, and show them the manner of the king that shall reign over them." Faithfully did the prophet depict the evils which a monarchy would inflict on the people. In vain, they said, "Nay, but we will have a king over us." Accordingly, Saul, the son of Kish, of the tribe of Benjamin, was, by divine direction, selected, and privately anointed by Samuel "to be captain over God's inheritance;" thus he was to hold only a delegated and subordinate authority (1 Sam. i, 3, 1-16). Under the guidance of Samuel, Saul was subsequently chosen by lot from among the assembled tribes; and though his personal appearance had no influence in the choice, yet, when he was plainly pointed out to be the individual designed for the sceptre, Samuel called the annual summons of the people, and announced his announcement. "The uncivilized nations have a preponderating influence, and are never without effect, at least, in supporting the physical dignity of a reign (1 Sam. x, 17-27)." (For a fuller discussion of this change in the Hebrew constitution, see Kitt's Daily Bible Illustrations under the portion of history in question.)

The special occasion of the substitution of a regal form of government for that of the judges seems to have been the siege of Jebesh-Gilead by Naahah, king of the Ammonites (1 Sam. xi, 1; xii, 12), and the refusal to allow the inhabitants of the city to remove except on humiliating and cruel conditions (1 Sam. xi, 2, 4-6). The conviction seems to have forced itself on the Israelites that they could not resist their formidable neighbor unless they placed themselves under the sway of a king; like surrounding nations. Concurrently with this conviction, disgust had been excited by the corrupt administration of justice under the sons of Samuel, and a radical change was desired by them in this respect also (1 Sam. viii, 8-5). Accordingly, the original idea of a Hebrew king was twofold: 1st, that he should lead the people in time of war; and, 2ndly, that he should execute judgment and justice in peace. See RULE; 20. In both respects the desired end was attained. The righteous wrath and military capacity of Saul were immediately triumphant over the Ammonites; and though ultimately he was defeated and slain in battle with the Philistines, he put even them to flight on more than one occasion (1 Sam. xiv, 28;
8. Functions and Prerogatives.—Emanating as the royal power did from the demand of the people and the permission of a prophet, it was not likely to be unilaterally authoritative or arbitrary. The government of God, indeed, remained, being rather concealed and complicated than divorced, much less superseded. The king ruled not in his own right nor in virtue of the choice of the people, but by concession from on high, and partly as the servant and partly as the representative of theocracy. Indeed, hence, was the tenure of the kingly power. How restricted it was in its authority, appears clear from the comparative facility with which the crown was transferred from Saul to David, and the part which the prophet Samuel took in effecting that transfer—points out the quarter where lay the power which limited, if it did not primarily, at least, control the royal authority. It must, however, be added that, if religion narrowed this authority, it also invested it with a sacredness which could emanate from no other source. Liable as the Israelitic kings were to interference on the part of priest and prophet, they were, by the same divine power, shielded from the unholy hands of the profane vulgar, and it was at once impious and rebellion to do injury to “the Lord’s anointed” (Psa. ii, 6, 7 sq.). Instances are not wanting to corroborate and extend these general observations. When Saul was in extremity before the Philistines (1 Sam. xxviii), he consulted the usual methods of obtaining counsel: “Saul inquired of the Lord; the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by the prophets.” So David, when in extremity before the Philistines (1 Sam. xxi, 1), inquired of the Lord, and thereupon the king was to take a certain course, which proved successful (see also 2 Sam. ii, 1). Sometimes, indeed, as appears from 1 Sam. xxviii, it was a prophet who acted the part of prime minister, or chief counsellor, to the king, and who, bearing that sacred character, must have possessed very weighty influence in the royal divan (1 Kings xxii, 7 sq.). We must not, however, expect to find any definite and permanent distribution of power, any legal determination of the royal prerogatives as they were established from the divine authority; circumstances, as they prompted certain deeds, restricted or enlarged the sphere of the monarch’s action. Thus, in 1 Sam. xi, 4 sq., we find Saul, in an emergency, assuming, without consultation or deliberation, the power of demanding something like a levy of the army and the vast preparations of a protracted war. With the king lay the administration of justice in the last resort (2 Sam. xv, 2; 1 Kings iii, 16 sq.). He also possessed the power of life and death (2 Sam. xiv). To provide for and superintend the public worship was at once a king’s highest and most important task (2 Kings v, viii, 2; 1 Kings xii, 4; xxiv, 4; xxiii, 1). One reason why a people requested a king was that they might have a recognised leader in war (1 Sam. viii, 20). The Mosaic law offered a powerful hindrance to royal despotism (1 Sam. x, 25). The people also, by means of their elders, formed an express compact, by which they stipulated for their rights (1 Kings vii, 4), and were from time to time appealed to, generally in cases of “great pith and exertion of the people” (1 Kings xvi, 15; 2 Kings v, 11, 12; 2 Chron. vii, 1). Nor did the people fail to interpose their will, where they thought it necessary, in opposition to that of the monarch (1 Sam. xiv, 45). The part which Nathan took against David shows how effective, as well as bold, was the check exerted by the prophets; indeed, most of the prominent historians believe that the Prophet’s chief opposition came in fact from the Prophet, and was the chief opposition ever made to the vices alike of royalty, priesthood, and people. If needful, the prophet hesitated not to demand an audience with the king, nor was he dazzled or deterred by royal power and pomp (1 Kings xxi, 22, 25; 2 Kings i, 13). As, however, the monarch held the sword, the instrument of death was sometimes made to prevail over every restraining influence (1 Sam. xxi, 17). See PROPHET.

To form a correct idea of a Hebrew king, we must abstract ourselves from the notions of modern Europe, and reduce the conception of Oriental monarchy. It would be a mistake to regard the Hebrew government as a limited monarchy, in the English sense of the expression. It is stated in 1 Sam. x, 25, that Samuel “told the people the manner of the kingdom,” and wrote it in a book (2 Sam. viii, 1), and it stands there, and it is barely possible that this may refer to some statement respecting the boundaries of the kingly power. (The word כַּהֲנָה, literally judgment, translated “manner” in the A. V., is translated in the Sept. Βιβλιακα, i.e. statute or ordinance [comp. Ecclus. iv, 17; Bar. ii, 12; iv, 18].) But Josephus seems to have regarded the document as a prophetic statement, respecting the king, of the calamities which were to arise from the kingly power, as a kind of protest recorded for succeeding ages (Ant. vi, 4, 6). But no such document has come down to us; and if it ever existed, and contained restrictions of any moment on the kingly power, it was probably disregarded in practice. The following passage of a letter by John Malcolm respecting the shah of Persia may, with some slight modifications, be regarded as fairly applicable to the Hebrew monarchy under David and Solomon: “The monarch of Persia has been pronounced to be one of the most absolute of the world; in the next moment he would make a decree; he has been deemed a law, and he has probably never had any further restraint upon the free exercise of his vast authority than has arisen from his regard for religion, his respect for established usages, his desire for reputation, and his fear of exciting an opposition that might be dangerous to his power. He has resided for 30 years (comp. Eliph. Stone’s India, bk. viii, ch. 3). It must not, however, be supposed to have been either the understanding or the practice that the sovereign might seize at his discretion the private property of individuals. Ahab did not venture to seize the vineyard of Naboth, both trials, through the testimony of false witnesses. Naboth had been convicted of blasphemy; and possibly his vineyard may have been seized as a confiscation, without flagrantly outraging public sentiment in those who did not know the truth (1 Kings xi, 6). But no monarch could arrogate to himself the right of discriminating between friend and foe, of granting or withholding the protection of the law to those who might be regarded as an outrage that the monarch should from covetousness seize the private property of an innocent subject in no ways dangerous to the state. And generally, when Sir John Malcolm proceeds as follows in reference to one of the most absolute monarchs of the world, it will be understood that the Hebrew king, whose power might be described in the same way, is not, on account of certain restraints which exist in the nature of things, to be regarded as “a limited monarch” in the European use of the words. ‘We may assume that the power of the king in Persia was over the property and lives of his conquered enemies, his rebellious subjects, his own family, his ministers, over...’
public officers civil and military, and all the numerous train of domestics, and that he may punish any person of these classes without examination or formal procedure of any kind; in all other cases that are capital, the forms prescribed by law and custom are observed; the monarch or his authorized officer, who has heard the evidence and examined the evidence and the law declared, that the sentence shall be put in execution or that the condemned culprit shall be pardoned” (ii, 306). In accordance with such usages, David ordered Uriah to be treacherously exposed to death in the forefront of the hottest battle (2 Sam. xi, 15); he caused Bechah and Baanah to be slain instantaneous, when they brought him the head of Ishboseth (2 Sam. iv, 12); and he is represented as having on his death-bed recommended Solomon to put Joab and Shimei to death (1 Kings ii, 5-9). In like manner, Solomon caused to be killed, without trial, not only his elder brother Adonijah and Joab, whose execution might be regarded as the exceptional acts of a dismal state-policy in the beginning of his reign, but likewise Shimei, after having been seated on the throne three years. And King Saul, in resentment at their conivance with David's escape, put to death 85 priests, and caused a massacre of the inhabitants of Nob, including women, children, and sucklings (1 Sam. xxiii, 18, 19).

Besides being commander-in-chief of the army, supreme judge, and absolute master, as it were, of the lives of his subjects, the king exercised the power of imposing taxes, exacting tribute, and ordering national service and labor. Both these points seem clear from the account given (1 Sam. viii, 11-17) of the evils which would arise from the kingly power, and are confirmed in various ways. Whatever mention may be made of conciliating "old men, or "elders of Israel," we never read of their deciding such points as these. When Pulp, the king of Assyria, imposed a tribute on the kingdom of Israel, "Menahem," the king," exacted the money of all the mighty men of wealth, of each man 50 shekels of silver (2 Kings xv, 19). When Jehoiakin, king of Judah, gave his tribute of silver and gold to Pharaoh, he taxed the land to give the money; he exacted the silver and gold of the people, of every one according to his taxation (2 Kings xxii, 35). The degree to which the taxation of national labor might be carried on a special occasion is illustrated by king Solomon's requirements for building the Temple. He raised a levy of 80,000 men, and sent them to Lebanon by courses of 10,000 a month; and he had 70,000 that bare burdens, and 80,000 hewers in the mountains (1 Kings v, 13-15). Judged by the Oriental standard, there is nothing improbable in the statement in 1 Kings iv, 26, that Solomon expended on constructing the Mahommedyeh Canal in Egypt, Menahel Ali, by orders given to the various sheiks of the provinces of Sakarah, Gihizeh, Mensouh, Sharkieh, Masih, Bahryeh, and some others, caused 500,000 men, women, and children to be assembled along the site of the intended canal (see Mrs. Poonie's Englishwoman in Egypt, ii, 219). This was 120,000 more than the levy of Solomon.

In addition to these earthy powers, the king of Israel had a more awful claim to respect and obedience. He was "the king's son, and of his own blood" (1 Kings xi, 1; xvi, 13); and, as it were, His son, if just and holy (2 Sam. vii, 14; Psa. lxxiii, 26, 27; ii, 6, 7). He had been set apart as a consecrated ruler. Upon his head had been poured the holy anointing oil, composed of olive-oil, myrrh, cinnamon, saffron, sweet calamus, and cassia, which had hitherto been reserved exclusively for the priests of Jehovah, especially the high-priest, or had been solely used to anoint the Tabernacle of the Congregation, the Ark of the Testimony, and the vessels of the Tabernacle (Exod. xxx, 35-38; xii, 8; Lev. xxvii, 10; 1 Kings i, 39). He had become, in fact, the new anointed Jehovah. At the coronation of sovereigns in modern Europe, holy oil has frequently been used as a symbol of divine right; but this has been mainly regarded as a mere form, and the use of it was undoubtedly introduced in imitation of the Hebrew custom. But, from the beginning to the end of the Hebrew monarchy, a living real significance was attached to consecration by this holy anointing oil. From well-known anecdotes related of David—and, perhaps, from words in his lamentation over Saul and Jonathan—it results that the custom of handing over the deceased monarch's body to the next of kin had been invested the person of Saul, the first king, as the Lord's anointed; and that, on this account, it was deemed sacrilegious to kill him, even at his own request (1 Sam. xxiv, 6, 10; xxxvi, 9; 12; 2 Sam. ii, 1). After the destruction of the first Temple, in the Book of Lamentations over the calamities of the Hebrew people, it is by the name of "the Lord's Anointed" that Zeidekah, the last king of Judah, is bewailed (Lam. iv, 20). Again, more than 600 years after the capture of Zeidekah, the name of the Anointed, though never so used in the Old Testament—yet suggested, probably, by Ps. ii, 2; Dan. ix, 26—had become appropriate to the expected king, who was to restore the kingdom of David, and inaugurate a period when Edom, Moab, the Ammonites, and the Philistines would again be incorporated with the Hebrew monarchy, which would extend from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean Sea and to the ends of the earth (Acts i, 6; John i, 41; iv, 25; Isa. xi, 12-14; Psa. lxxiii, 8). Thus the identical Hebrew word which signifies anointed, through its Aramaic form adopted into Greek and Latin, is still preserved to us in the English word Messiah. (See Gesenius's Thesaurus, p. 826.) See 1, 2 below.

4. Appointment and Inauguration.—The law of succession to the throne is somewhat obscure, but it seems most probable that the king during his lifetime named his successor. This was certainly the case with David, who passed over his elder son Adonijah, the son of Hag- gith, in favor of Solomon, the son of Bathsheba (1 Kings i, 80; ii, 22), and with Rehoboam, of whom it is said that he loved Maachah, the daughter of Abalom, above all his wives and concubines, and that he made Abijah her son to be ruler among his brethren, to make him king (2 Chron. xi, 21). The succession of the first-born has been inferred from a passage in 2 Chron. xxii, 3, 4, in which Jehoshaphat is said to have given the kingdom to Jehoram "because he was the first-born." But this very passage tends to show that Jehoshaphat had the power of naming his successor; and it is worthy of note that Jehoram, on his coming to the throne, put to death all his brothers, which he would scarcely, perhaps, have done if the succession of the first-born had been the law of the land. From the conciseness of the narratives in the books of Kings no inference either way can be drawn concerning the ordinary mode of appointing the death of the father and succession of his son is recorded (1 Kings xv, 8). At the same time, if no partiality for a favorite wife or son intervened, there would always be a natural bias of affection in favor of the eldest son. There appears to have been some prominence given to the mother of the king (2 Kings xii, 12, 15; 1 Kings ii, 19), and it is possible that the mother may have been regent during the minority of a son. Indeed, some such custom best explains the possibility of the audacious usurpation of Athaliah on the death of her son Ahaziah: "She came, and she sat down on the throne of the kings" (2 Kings ii, 11). She was not the only woman of the seed-royal except the young Jehoash (2 Kings xi, 1-3). The people, too, and even foreign powers, at a later period interrupted the regular transmission of royal authority (2 Kings xxiii, 24; xxiv, 23, 24, 30; xxiv, 17). See Hasm.

It is supposed both by Jahn (Bib. Archzol. § 222) and Bauer (in his Heb. Allerkämmerer, § 20) that a king was only anointed when a new family came to the throne, or when the right to the crown was disputed. It is usually on such occasions only that the anointing is specified. As, in 1 Sam. x, 13; 1 Sam. xi, 14; 1 Kings ii, 19, 21; 2 Kings ii, 10, 11; 2 Kings ix, 3, 12; but this is not necessarily the case (see 2 Kings xxiii, 30), and there does not appear sufficient reason to doubt that each individual king was anointed. There can be little doubt, likewise, that the
Kings of Israel were anointed, though the text is not specified.

Kings were anointed with oil (2 Sam. 4, 17: 1 Kings 19, 14: 1 Sam. 2, 11; 2 Sam. 2, 4; 1 Kings 1, 18; xxxix, 5), and in the banquet to which the prophet and high priest who performed the anointing acted as the representative of the theocracy and the expounder of the will of heaven, must have given to the spiritual power very considerable influence; and both in the parable of the devoted and of the observation direct to Egypt, where the same custom prevailed, and where the power of the priestly caste was immense (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt*, 1, 379).

Indeed, the ceremony seems to have been essential to consecration, for kings have been taken from private individuals, but never as the punishment of rebellion, or on any other plausible pretext, is not specified (1 Sam. viii, 14; 1 Chron. xxviii, 26-28).

The produce of the royal flocks (1 Sam. xxvi, 7; 2 Sam. xxi, 28; 2 Chron. xxi, 10; 1 Chron. xxvii, 25). A nominal tenth of the produce of corn, land, vineyards, and of sheep (1 Sam. viii, 15, 17).

4. A tribute from merchants who passed through the Hebrew territory (1 Kings xi, 14). Presents made by his subjects (1 Sam. xx, 27; xvi, 20; 1 Kings x, 9; Psa. lxxxii, 10). There is, perhaps, no greater distinction in the story of Solomon with Western nations than in what relates to the giving and receiving of presents. When made regularly, they do, in fact, amount to a regular tax. Thus, in the passage last referred to in the book of Kings, it is stated that they brought to Solomon “every man his present, vessels of silver and vessels of gold, and garments, and armor, and horses, and mules, a rate year by year.”

5. Court and Ceremonies. — The following is a list of some of the officers of the king: 1. The recorder or chronicler, who was perhaps analogous to the historiographer whose duties John Malcolm mentions as an officer of the Persian court, whose duty it is to write the annals of the king’s reign (*Hist. of Persia*, c. 23). Certain it is that there is no regular series of minute dates in Hebrew history until we read of this recorder, or remembrancer, as the word sopher is translated in a marginal note of the English version. It signifies one who keeps the memory of events alive, in accordance with a motive assigned by Herodotus for writing his history, viz. that the acts of men might not become extinct by time (Herod. i, 1; 2 Sam. vii, 16; 1 Kings iv, 8; 2 Kings xxvii, 9; Isaa. xxxix, 2, 20).

The scribe of the annals of the state (1 Kings iv, 3, 8). His duty was to the king, or what he could legally require. See Solomon.

6. Usages. — A ruler in whom so much authority, human and divine, was embodied, was naturally distinguished by outward honors and luxuries. He had a court of Oriental magnificence. When the power of the kingdom was at its height, he sat on a throne of ivory, covered with pure gold, at the feet of which were two figures of lions, with others on the steps approaching the throne. The king was dressed in royal robes (1 Kings xxi, 10; 2 Chron. xxiv, 20); his insignia were a crown or diadem of pure gold, or as in the case of Solomon, radiant with precious stones (2 Sam. i, 10; xii, 30; 2 Kings xi, 12; Psa. lxxvii, 3), and a royal sceptre (Ezek. xxi, 11; Isaa. xiv, 6; Psa. lxxxiv, 4; Amos i, 5, 8). Those who approached him did him obeisance, bowing down and touching the ground with their foreheads (1 Sam. xxiv, 8; 2 Sam. xix, 24); and this was done even by a king’s wife, the mother of Solomon (1 Kings i, 16).

His officers and subjects called themselves his servants or slaves, though they do not seem habitually to have given way to such extravagant salutation as in the speeches of theMitanni and Persian courts (1 Sam. xvii, 32, 34, 36; xx, 8; 2 Sam. vi, 20; Dan. xi, 10, 11). As in the East at present, a kiss was a sign of respect and homage (1 Sam. x, 1; perhaps Psa. i, 2). He lived in a splendid palace, with porches and columns (1 Kings vii, 2-7). All his drinking-vessels were of gold (1 Kings iv, 21).
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At his accession, in addition to the anointing mentioned above, jubilant music formed a part of the popular character (1 Kings i, 25); the new sovereign rode in solemn procession on the royal mule of his predecessor (1 Kings i, 38), and took possession of the royal harp—an act which seems to have been scarcely less essential than other observances with which it was accompanied (1 Sam. ii, 9). The law (Deut. xvii, 17), foreseeing evils as sure than that by which Solomon, in his later years, was turned away from his fidelity to God, had strictly forbidden many wives; but Eastern passions and usages were too strong for a mere written prohibition, and a corrupted religion became a pandemon to royal lust, interpreting the divine command as sanctioning eighteen as the minimum of wives and concubines.

Deriving their power originally from the wishes of the people, and being one of the same race, the Hebrew kings were not generally less despotic than other oriental sovereigns, mingled more with their subjects, and were by no means difficult of access (2 Sam. xix, 8; 1 Kings xx, 39; Jer. xxxix, 7; 1 Kings iii, 16; 2 Kings vi, 26; vii, 9). After death the monarchs were interred in the royal cemetery in Jerusalem: "So David slept with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David" (1 Kings ii, 10; x, 43; xiv, 81). But bad kings were excluded from "the sepulchres of the kings of Israel" (2 Chron. xxviii, 27).


KING is the name of the five canonical works of the followers of Confucius. See the art. Confucius in vol. ii, p. 470 sqq., especially p. 472.

KING, Alonso, a Baptist minister, was born in Wilkesbarre, Pennsylvania, in 1780. His early success, advantages were few; but in 1818 he went to prosecute his studies in the family of the Rev. Leland Howard, then pastor of the Baptist church in Windsor, Vt., where he was converted to Christ. He afterwards entered Watervliet College, Maine, and graduated in 1825. He was ordained pastor of the Baptist church in North Tarrytown, N.Y., in 1826, subsequently of a small church in Northborough, Mass., and finally settled at Westborough, Mass., where he died in 1855. King was a man of great humility, self-consecration, and self-abandonment. His preaching was never bold or startling, but always quiet, tender, persuasive. He had a talent for lyric poetry, and many of his productions are abroad without his name. His style as a writer was pure, with a decided cast of the imaginative or poetic, which was always apparent in his sermons and his printed productions. He compiled the Memoir of the distinguished missionary, Rev. George D. Boardman. See Sprague, Anecdotes of the American Pulpit, vi, 747. (J. L. S.)

KING, Barnabas, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Marlborough, Mass., June 2, 1780. While yet in his 14th year, his great proficiency in study attracted the attention of Dr. Catline, who afterwards became his pastor, who conducted him to Harvard College, Mass., which he entered in 1802. In 1804 he graduated, and then for a year taught school and studied theology with Dr. Catline. In 1805 he was licensed by the Berkshire Congregational Association, Mass., and in 1808 was ordained by the Presbytery, and installed as pastor of the Rockaway Church, N.J., where he continued to preach till 1848; his congregation then called a colleague pastor, which relation continued until the death of Dr. King, April 10, 1862. King was a man of admirable attainments; his cogent powers of reasoning, his unceasing devotion, and his sympathetic heart made him a model pastor. As a preacher, his style was very simple, but scriptural, and usually very earnest. See Wilson, Presbyterian Hist. Almanac, 1865. (J. L. S.)

KING, Charles, the noted president of Columbia College, was born in New York, March 16, 1789. In company with his father, Rufus King, he went to England, and, during his residence at the court of St. James as the representative of the American government, young Charles attended Harrow School, and later went to Paris to further prepare himself for admission to college. He, however, afterwards abandoned this intention and entered the mercantile profession. In 1828 he became co-editor of the New York American. In 1849 he was chosen president of Columbia College. He died at Frascati, near Rome, in Italy, Sept. 27, 1867. A list of his works, which are not of special interest to theological students, is given by Allibone, Dict. of English and American Authors, ii, a. v.; New Americans Cyclopaedia, 1867, p. 425.

KING, Edward, a noteworthy English antiquary and lawyer, was born in 1745 in Norfolk, and was a graduate of Cambridge University. He was elected F.R.S. in 1767 and F.S.A. in 1770. He died in 1807. King wrote a number of works connected with theology, politics, political economy, and antiquities. We have room here only to note his Monas of Criticisms, tending to Illustrate some Few Passages in Holy Scripture upon Philosophical Principles and an enlarged View of Things (Lond. 1788, 4to, and since). The contents of this work are: On the word "here" in the Lord's Prayer; Septuagint Translation of Genesis; John the Baptist being Elias; Future coming of Christ: Day of Judgment; Series of Events in Revelation; Daniel's Prophecy; Deaths of Animas and Sapphira; Dissertations on Ligh; The Heavens: Stars; Fluid of Heat: Miracles; Jacob and Esau; Soul, Body, Spirit, etc. King's learning was profound and extensive, but he was so inclined to the speculative and hypothetical that he perpetually fell into difficulty by advancing statements which he was unqualified to establish. The want of discrimination between theory and truth, supposition and reality, together with the tenacity with which he clung to his premature conclusions when assailed, proved quite detrimental. In a work of his treating on the signs of the times, he was very desirous of tracing the history of the French Revolution to the records of sacred antiquity; he also ventured to assert the genuineness of the second book of Esdras in the Apocrypha. He was replyed to by Gough and bishop Horsey. See Chalmers's Dict. vol. xix (Lond. 1815); Watkins's Aesop. Dict. (Lond. 1820); Blake's Dict. of Eng. and Am. Authors, ii, a. v.; Allibone, Dict. of English and American Authors, ii, a. v., 1840. (J. L. S.)

KING, Henry, D.D., bishop of Chichester, an eldest son of John King (q. v.), was born at Wornall, Buckinghamshire, in Jan. 1591. He studied at Westminster School, from whence he was elected to Christ Church, Oxford, in 1608. Having entered the Church, he became chaplain to king James I, archdeacon of Colchester, and resided for many years in the parish of Ashford-dean of Rochester in 1658, and finally bishop of Chichester in 1641. Although he was generally considered a Puritan, and his nomination had been a measure to conciliate that party, he remained a faithful adherent of the king during the civil war, and at the Restoration he was reinstated in his bishopric, though he had retired to France. He was considered a very successful preacher and a learned divine. His principal works are, An Exposition...
upon the Lord's Prayer (London, 1684, 4to):—A Sermon of Deliverance, Pm. xec, 3 ( Lond, 1626, 4to):—Two Sermons upon the Act Sunday, July 10, 1625 (Oxford, 1625, 4to):—The Psalms of David turned into Metre (1621, 12mo); new edition, with biographical notices, notes, etc., by Dr. John Hammond, 1643, 12mo); etc. See Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, vol. ii.; Dodd, Church History, vol. ii.; Hooper, New Biog. Generale, xxvi., 739; Allibone, Dict. of English and American Authors, ii, s. v. (J. H. P.)

King, James B., a Presbyterian minister, was born at Albany, N. Y., Aug. 20, 1802. He graduated from the College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J. He studied theology at the Princeton Theological Seminary. He was licensed by the New York Presbytery, and in 1858 ordained and installed pastor of the Rockland Lake Church, New York, where he was quite successful and greatly beloved by his people. Failing health, however, compelled him to withdraw from the active duties of the pastor. During the period of his necessitated rest he did some effective work. He died at Woodlawn, near Sing Sing, New York, Sept. 15, 1864. Mr. King was an estimable minister, of good talents, and thoroughly consecrated to his work. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 126; American Church, 1866, p. 408.

King, John (1), D.D., bishop of London, an English theologian and a descendant of Robert King, first bishop of Oxford, was born at Wornall, Buckinghamshire, about 1589. He studied at Christ Church, Oxford. Having entered the Church, he became successively chaplain to queen Elizabeth, archdeacon of Nottingham in 1600, D.D. in 1601, dean of Christ Church in 1605, and, finally, bishop of London in 1611. He died in 1621. James I called him the "king of preachers." He wrote Lectures upon Joshua, delivered at York, 1594 (Lond. 1611, 4to), and some Sermons. See Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, vol. i.; Dodd, Church History, vol. i.; Hooper, New Biog. Generale, xxvi., 739; Allibone, Dict. of English and American Authors.

King, John (2), D.D., an English theologian, was born in Cornwall in 1632. He studied at Oxford and Cambridge, and became successively rector of Chelsea and (in 1781) prebendary of the Cathedral of York. He died May 30, 1782. King wrote A vindication (2d ed. 1702, 4to):—The Case of John Atherton, Bishop of Waterford (1716, 8vo); and a number of Sermons.—Hooper, New Biog. Generale, xxvi., 742.

King, John (3), a Methodist minister, of whose early history nothing is definitely known, was one of the "first seven" who founded the Methodist movement in this country. He came from London to America in the latter part of 1759, and his enthusiastic sympathy with the pioneer Methodists led him to throw himself immediately into their ranks. The Church hesitated when he presented himself for license, but, persistent in his determination to preach, he made an appointment "in the Potter's Field," where he proclaimed his first message over the graves of the poor, and began a career of eminent usefulness. Afterwards he was licensed, and stationed in Wilmington, Del. Thence he went into Maryland, and was the first to introduce Methodism to the people of Baltimore. In this latter place he preached from tables in the public streets, and suffered much opposition from frequent mobs. King was afterwards received into the regular itinerancy. He was a member of the New Jersey conference of 1778, and was appointed to New Jersey. He soon after entered Virginia, and, till later he was again in New Jersey. He located during the Revolution, but in 1801 reappeared in the itinerant ranks in Virginia, and finally located in 1808. King was a pious, zealous, and useful man. He died at an advanced age, the last of the early ministers of the church. He was probably the only survivor, at the time of his decease, of all the preachers of ante-revolutionary date.—Stevens, Hist. of the M. E. Church, i. 87. (J. L. S.)

King, John Glen, D.D., F.R.S., F.A.S., a distinguished English theologian and antiquarian, was born in Norfolk about 1781. He studied at Caius College, Cambridge, entered the Church, and in 1764 was appointed chaplain to the English factory at Petersburg. He afterwards became successively rector of Wormley, Hertfordshire (in 1785), and minister of the chapel in Broad Court, Drury Lane, London (1786). He died Nov. 3, 1877. King wrote The Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia, containing an Account of its Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline (London, 1772, 4to):—A Letter to the Bishop of Durham, containing some Observations on the State of Greece, etc. (Lond. 1775, 4to); etc. See Gen. Magazine, ivii and iviii; Biog. Dictionary; Allibone, Dict. of English and American Authors, i. 1081.

King, John L., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Indiana Feb. 1, 1835; was educated at Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., and studied divinity in Lane Theological Seminary, Ohio; was licensed and ordained at Cincinnati in 1861, and then assumed the pastoral at Williamsport, Indiana; afterwards labored as a missionary among the sailors at Detroit, Michigan, and finally went to Idaho and Colorado Territories. He died near Denver, Nov. 10, 1886. Mr. King was a man of ripe scholarly attainments, and of fine abilities, especially to the work of elementary religious teaching.—Wilson, Presb. Historical Almanac, 1867.

King, Peter, lord chancellor of England, was born at Exeter, Devonshire, in 1669; went to Holland, and studied at the university at Leyden, and upon his return to England studied law at Lincoln's Inn, and became member of Parliament in 1699. In 1708 he was appointed recorder of London, and knighted. At the accession of George I he was made lord chief justice of the Court of Common Pleas, and soon after promoted to the peerage as lord King, baron of Ockham. He was made lord chancellor in 1726, but does not seem to have been as efficient in that position as was his predecessor, who died in 1733. He was well versed in both ecclesiastical history and the law. His principal works are, An Enquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church, etc. [Anon.] (Lond. 1713, 8vo) in this, his first publication, he advocated, with much ability and learning, the right of Protestant dissenters from episcopacy to be comprehended in the scheme of the national establishment. The work excited much attention, and provoked much discussion, especially when the second edition was issued (1715). Prominent among the opponents of the pamphlet was John St. John, who wrote an Answer to it. King himself has been said to have afterwards altered his opinion on the subject:—The History of the Apostolical Creed, with critical Observations on six several Articles [Anon.] (London, 1702, 8vo)—a work displaying extraordinary learning and judgment, and highly commended by the ablest critics, among others by Moore. See Gentleman's Magazine, vol. lixi and lxii; Chalmers, General Biog. Dictionary; Lord Campbell, Lives of Lords Chancellors; Allibone, Dict. of English and American Authors, s. v. (J. H. W.)

King, Richard, an English theologian, was born at Bristol in 1749; studied at the University of Oxford, and became successively rector of Steeple, Morden, and of Worthing. He died in 1810. King wrote Letters from Abraham Pymble to his Brother Peter on the Catholic Question (Lond. 1805, 8vo), which created some sensation.—On the Inspiration of the Scriptures (1805, 8vo):—On the Alliance between Church and State (1806, 8vo). His wife, Frances Elizabeth Bernard, wrote Female Scripture Biography (12th edit. London, 1840, 12mo):—The Benefits of the Christian Temper; etc. See Gen. Magazine (1810); Rose, New Biographical Dictionary, s. v.

King, Thomas Starr, a Unitarian minister, was born in New York Dec. 16, 1824. His father, Rev. T. F. King, was a Universalist clergyman of very decided ability, but died in the prime of life, and Thomas, at
the age of twelve years, while fitting to enter Harvard
College found himself the principal support of a large
family. He managed, however, successfully to complete
his studies, and in September, 1845, preached his first
sermon in Woburn, Mass. The next year he was set
tled over his father's former charge in Charlestown,
whence he was called in 1846 to the Hollis Street Unit
arian Church in Boston, where he met with great
acceptance and a constantly increasing reputation till
1860, when he accepted the call of the Unitarian Church
in San Francisco to become their pastor. He entered
upon his new duties with a zeal and energy which won
the heart of the people, and forward movements in be
half of the sick and wounded soldiers. His labors in
this cause, added to his pastoral duties, were too severe
for his strength, and he died March 4, 1866, after a very
brief illness. Mr. King published several discourses
and addresses, etc.—Appleton, *New American Cyclopaedia*
1868, 196, 458.

King, William, (1), archbishop of Dublin, a learned
divine and metaphysician, was born at Antrim, provin
ce of Ulster, Ireland, May 1, 1650. He studied at
Trinity College, Dublin, entered the Church in 1674, and
became chaplain to Parker, archbishop of Tuam. The
latter being translated, the archbishopship was given to
the same chaplain of St. Patrick and St. Marburgh, Dublin.
Ireland was then a prey to violent religious controversies, which served also as a cloak for political dissensions.
King wrote several pamphlets against Peter Manby, dean of Londonerry, who had embraced Romanism as a politician. In 1690 he was made dean of St. Patrick. The Revolution breaking out soon after, and James II having taken refuge in Ireland, King
was twice sent to the Tower of Dublin as a partisan of
the insurgents. He defended his opinions in a work
titled *The State of the Protestants of Ireland under the
Jacobite Government* (London, 1692, 8vo), which gave rise to a controversy between him and Charles Leslie, a partisan of the fallen mon
arch. In 1691 King was made bishop of Derry, and
applied himself with much zeal to the task of bringing
back the people to the proper path, and in 1700 he
finally became archbishop of Dublin in 1709, was ap
tonated one of the lords justices of Ireland in 1717, and
again in 1721 and 1723, and died at Dublin May 8, 1729.

He was through life held in high esteem as a man, and
also as his character of a prelate and writer on theo
logy. His principal work in that line is the *De Originali
Male* (Dublin, 1702, 4to; London, 1702, 8vo). "The object
of this work is to show how all the several kinds of evil
with which the world abounds are consistent with the
goodness of God, and may be accounted for without the
supposition of an evil principle." It was attacked by
Bayle and also by Leibnitz: by the former for the
charges of Manicheism made against him, and by the
latter because King had taken him to task for his optim
ism. King, however, during his life made no reply,
but he left among his papers notes of answers to their
announcements; and these were given to the world after his
death by Dr. Edmund Law, bishop of Carlisle, together
with a translation of the treatise itself (Camb. 1758, 8vo).

In 1709 he published a sermon on *Divine Predestina
tion and Foreknowledge consistent with the Freedom of Man's Will* (Dublin, 1709, 8vo), in which he endeavored to
be advanced a doctrine concerning the moral attributes of
God as being different from the moral qualities of the
same name in man. This valuable and most important
work was often reprinted (Exeter, 1815, 8vo; London,
1821, 8vo; and in the *Tracts of Anglican Fathers*, ii, 225).

He wrote also *A Discourse concerning the Intentions
of Men in the Worship of God* (London, 1697, 8vo)—"An
Admonition to the Dissenters* (London, 1706, 8vo)—
*An Account of James I. and the Ad
diant Subjects of Ireland*, etc. (London, 1746, 8vo)—*A Vio
duction of the Rev. Dr. Henry Sacheverell*, etc. [Anon.]
(London, 1710, 8vo); etc. See *Bibliographia Britannica*
Chalmers, *General Biographical Dictionary*; *Cyclopaedia
Bibliographica*, i, 1790; *Hook, Ecclesiastical Biography*.

King, William, (2), a Scotch Presbyterian minis
ter, was born in Tyrone, Ireland. He emigrated to America in 1830, and became pastor of a church at Nel
son, Canada West. After laboring there faithfully and
earnestly for many years he removed to Caradou, C.W.,
where he died, March 18, 1859.

Kingdom of God or of Heaven (βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢ τῶν ἀνθρώπων). In the New Testament the phrases "kingdom of God" (Matt. vi, 35; Mark i,
14, 15; Luke iv, 43; vi, 20; John iii, 3, 5), "kingdom of Christ" (Matt. xvi, 19; Mark xvi, 21; Rev. xix, 3), and "kingdom of God and of Christ and of God" (Eph. v, 5), "kingdom of David," i.e. as the ancestor and type of the Messiah (Matt. xi, 10), "the kingdom" (Matt. viii, 12; xii, 33; ix, 58), and "kingdom of heaven" (Matt. iii, 2; iv, 17; xii, 31, 33, 44, 47; 2 Tim. iv, 18), are all synonymous, and sig
ify the divine supremacy, the glorious reign of the Mes
siah. The idea of this kingdom has its basis in the prophecies of the Old Testament, where the coming of the Messiah and his triumphs are foretold (Psa. ii, 6—
12; ci, 1—7; Isa. ii, 1—4; Mic. iv, 1; Isa. xi, 1—10; Jer.
xxii, 5, 6; xxxi, 4—5; xlvii, 24—28; Dan. ii, 34; iv, 14, 27; ix, 25, 27). In those passages the reign of the Mes
siah is figuratively described as a golden age, when the true religion, and with it the Jewish theocracy, should
be re-established in more than pristine purity, and uni
versal peace and happiness prevailed. All this was doubt
less to be understood in a spiritual sense; and so the
devout Jews of our Saviour's time appear to have un
derstood it, as Zacharias, Simeon, Anna, and Joseph
(Luke i, 67—79; ii, 23—50; xxiii, 50—51). But the Jews
at large gave to these prophecies a temporal meaning,
and expected the Messiah who should reign as king of
heaven, and, as king of the Jewish nation, restore the
ancient religion and worship, reform the corrupt morals
of the people, make expiation for their sins, free them
from the yoke of foreign dominion, and at length reign
over the whole earth in peace and justice (Isa. xi, 1—
20; xli, 12; xvii, 1; xx, 1; Luke xvii, 20; xix, 11; Acts
i, 6). This Jewish temporal sense appears to have been
also held by the apostles before the day of Penteceot.

It has been well observed by Knobel, in his work On the Prophecies, that "Jesus did not acknowledge himself called upon to fulfill those theocratic announcements which had an earthly political character, in the sense in which they were uttered; for his plan was spiritual and universal, neither including worldly interests, nor
contracted within national and political limits. He gave,
accordingly, to all such announcements a higher and
more general meaning, so as to realize them in accord
ance with such a scheme. Thus, 1. The prophecies had
announced that Jehovah would deliver his people from
the political calamities into which, through the con
quering might of his foes, they had been brought.
This Jesus could do by putting an end to his work.
He healed the Jewish and heathen world under the thraldom of error and of sin, in circumstances of moral calamity,
and he regarded himself as sent to effect its deliverance. In
this sense he announced himself as the Redeemer, who
had come to destroy the works of the wicked, to cast out
the devil, to annihilate the powers of evil, and to bring men
from the kingdom of darkness to the kingdom of light.
2. The prophets had predicted that Jehovah would again be united to his restored people, would dwell among them, and no more give up the theocratic relation. This also Jesus fulfilled in a higher sense. He found mankind in a state of estrangement from God, arising from the sin of Adam, and he visited the earth as a savior to bring them back to God. He reconciled men to God—gave them access to God—united them to him as needful children, and made his people one with God as he himself is one.

3. The prophets had declared that Jehovah would make his people, thus redeemed and reunited to him, in a manner that would exceed all earthly pleasures. To communicate such blessings in the literal acceptance of the words was no part of the work of Jesus; on the contrary, he often tells his followers that they must lay their account with much suffering.

4. The kingdom of God, and all the glories of the spirit, which are two aspects of the same thing, are in the Bible, and in the teachings of Jesus, confused in general, and the re-establishment of their people into a mighty state, which should endure upon the earth in imperishable splendor as an outward community. This prophet Jesus, however, in his own meditational sense, would establish a religious invisible community, internally united by oneness of faith in God and of pure desire, which ever grows and reaches its perfection only in another life. The rise and progress of this man cannot observe, for its existence is in the invisible life of the spirit (Luke xvi, 20), yet the opposition of the wicked has an evidence of its approach (Matt. xii, 28).

5. It has no political designs, for it 'is not of this world;' and there are found in it no such gradations of rank as in earthly political communities (Matt. xx, 25). What is external is not essential to it; its prime element is mind, pious, devoted to God. This apocalyptic kingdom of Jesus is composed of those who turn to God and his ambassadors, and in faith and life abide true to them. From this it is clear how sometimes this kingdom may be spoken of as present, and sometimes as future. Religious and moral truth works forever, and draws under its influence one after another, until at length it shall reign over all. In designating this community, Jesus made use of terms having a relation to the ancient theocracy; it is the kingdom of God or of heaven, though, at the same time, it is represented rather as the family that is called out of all nations (Luke xii, 23). This apocalyptic kingdom is called Lord and King; that of the new is called Father; the members of the former were servants, i.e. subjects of Jehovah; those of the latter are sons of God; the feeling of the former towards God is described as the fear of Jehovah; that of the latter is believing confidence or love; the chief duty of the former was righteousness; the first duty of the latter is love. All these expressions are adapted to the constitution of the sacred community, either as a divine state or as a divine family. It need not, however, be mentioned that God extended the fulfillment of these ancient prophecies in this spiritual sense to all men.

4. Referring to the Old Testament idea, we may therefore regard the 'kingdom of heaven,' etc., in the New Testament, as designating, in its Christian sense, the Church, the kingdom of God, or the community, or the organization of those who receive Jesus as the Messiah, and who, united by his Spirit under him as their Head, rejoice in the truth, and live a holy life in love and in communion with him (Matt. iii, 2; iv, 17, 28; ix, 35; x, 7; Mark i, 14, 15; Luke x, 9, 11; xxii, 51; Acts xxvii, 81). This spiritual kingdom has, in fact, been invested with a kind of intern and spiritual, it already exists and rules in the hearts of all Christians, and is therefore present (Rom. xiv, 17; Matt. vi, 38; Mark x, 15; Luke xvii, 21; xiii, 17; John iii, 5; 1 Cor. iv, 20). It 'suffers violence,' implying the eagerness with which the Gospel was received in the agitated state of men's minds (Matt. xi, 12; Luke xvi, 6). As external, it is either embodied in the visible Church of Christ, and in so far is present and progressive (Matt. xvi, 18, 19; 2 Pet. i, 21; 3 John, 10; Acts xiii, 17; Heb. xii, 28), or it is perfected in the coming of the Messiah to judgment and his subsequent spiritual reign in bliss and glory, in which view it is future (Matt. xiii, 41; xvii, 26; Mark xiv, 25; Luke xxii, 29, 30; 2 Thess. i, 9, 10). The latter view it denotes especially the bliss of heaven, eternal life, which is to be enjoyed in the Redeemer's kingdom (Matt. viii, 11; xxi, 34; Mark ix, 47; Luke xiii, 18, 29; Acts xiv, 22; 2 Cor. vi, 9, 20; xvi, 50; Gal. v, 21; Eph. v, 5; 2 Thess. iv, 16; James i, 2). But these different aspects are not always distinguished, the expression often embracing both the internal and external sense, and referring both to its commencement in this world and its completion in the world to come (Matt. v, 10, 20; vii, 21; xi, 11, 12; xvii, 8, 4; Col. i, 18; 1 Thess. li, 12). In Luke i, 38, it is said of the kingdom of Christ 'there shall be no end;' whereas in 1 Cor. x, 24-25, it is said 'he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father.' The contradiction is only in appearance. The latter passage refers to the mediatorial work of the Saviour; and when the mediatorial work of the Saviour is accomplished, and the final judgment, he will resign forever his mediatorial office, while the reign of Christ as God supreme will never cease. 'His throne,' in the empire of the universe, 'is forever and ever' (Heb. x, 8).

5. There is reason to believe not only that the expression 'kingdom of heaven,' as used in the New Testament, was employed as synonymous with 'kingdom of God, as referred to in the Old Testament, but that the former expression had become common among the Jews of our Lord's time for denoting the state of things expected to be brought in by the Messiah. The more the use of the expression as it first occurs in Matthew, uttered apparently by John Baptist, and our Lord himself, without a note of explanation, as if all perfectly understood what was meant by it, seems alone conclusive evidence of this. The Old Testament is, however, full of the language, and the idea, of the kingdom of heaven. What the Hebrew writings belonging to it, had familiarized the Jews with the application of the terms 'king' and 'kingdom' to God, not merely with reference to his universal sovereignty, but also to his special connection with the people he had chosen for himself (1 Sam. xii, 12; Psa. i, 6; v, 2; xx, 9; 1 Chron. ii, 42, 44; Jer. ii, 1; 9). The Messiah, however, where pointed expression required to be given to the difference in this respect between what is of earth and what is of heaven, we find matters ordered on a certain occasion with a view to bring out the special lesson that 'the heavens do rule' (iv, 20); and in the interpretation given to the vision, which had been granted to Nebuchadnezzar, it was said, with more special reference to New Testament times, that 'in the days of those (earthly) kings the God of heaven (lit. of the heavens) should set up a kingdom that should never be destroyed,' i.e. that the kingdom of God himself, this divine kingdom was represented under the image of 'one like a Son of man coming with the clouds of heaven, and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him' (viii, 13, 14). It appears to have been in consequence of the phraseology thus introduced and sanctioned by Daniel that the expression 'kingdom of heaven' (ם この鞋子 רפוכש, mylkut hashemayim) passed into common usage among the Jews, and was but another name with them for a state of fellowship with God and devotedness to his service. Many examples of the use of the term in the New Testament, and of many given over from Jewish writings: thus, 'He who confesses God to be one, and repeats Deut. vi, 4, takes up the kingdom of heaven;' "Jacob called his sons and commanded them
KINGDOM OF ISRAEL

concerning the ways of God, and they took upon them the kingdom of heaven; 'The sons of Achadzias did not take upon them the yoke of the kingdom of heaven; the land was not delivered to him, and he did not accept it as the Lord had given. There is not a kingdom of heaven,' etc. The expression, indeed, does not seem to have been used specifically with reference to the Messiah's coming, or the state to be introduced by him (for the examples produced by Schöttgen [in Mosaic, ch. ii.] are scarcely in point); but when the Lord directly represented all things spiritual as being spiritual, and everything, and visibly take the government, as it were, on his shoulder, it would be understood of itself that here the kingdom of heaven should be found concentrating itself, and that to join one's self to Messiah would be as necessary as to the Messiah of that kingdom.

See KINGLY OFFICE OF CHRIST.

The scriptural and popular usages of the term "kingdom of God," "kingdom of heaven," etc., serve as a clew to the otherwise rather abrupt proclamation of the Baptist and Jesus at the very beginning of their public ministrations. It is true that in the Old Testament the kingdom or reign of God usually signifies his infinite power, or, more properly, his sovereign authority over all creatures, kingdoms, and hearts. See KING. Thus Wisdom says (x, 10), God showed his kingdom to Jacob, i.e., he showed the kingdom of heaven, by showing him the mysterious ladder by which the angels ascended and descended; and Ecclesiasticus (xlvi, 18) says, God gave to David the covenant assurance, or promise of the kingdom, for himself and his successors. Still the transition from this to the conception of a spiritual sphere was so natural that it was silently and continually made, especially as Jehovah was perpetually represented as the supreme and sole legitimate sovereign of his people. Indeed, the theocracy was the central idea of the Jewish state (see JUDGES), and hence the first announcements of the kingdom sound with thrilling effect upon the ears of the people, proverbially impatient of foreign rule, and yet, at the time, apparently bound in a hopeless vassalage to Rome. It was to the populace like a trumpet-call to a war for independence, or rather like one of the old prelures of deliverance sung by Miriam and Deborah. See THEOCRACY.

Copious lists of monographs on this subject may be seen in Dürren, Wirttenbach, a. v. Himmel-Reich, Messiahs-Reich; Volbing, Index Programmatum, p. 37; Hase, Lehre Jesu, p. 12, 77. See MESSIAH.

KINGDOM OF ISRAEL. See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

KINGDOM OF JUDAH. See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

Kingly Office of Christ, one of the three great relations which Jesus sustains to his people, namely, as prophet, priest, and king, and to which he was solemnly instituted as his baptism by John. See THRONE.

It is by virtue of this that he became head of the Church, which is the sphere of his reign. See KINGDOM OF GOD. This is that spiritual, evangelical, and eternal empire to which he himself referred when interrogated before Pontius Pilate, and in which he referred to which he said, "My kingdom is not of this world" (John xviii, 36, 37). His empire, indeed, extends to every creature, for "all authority is committed into his hands, both in heaven and on earth," and he is "head over all things to the Church:" but his kingdom primarily imports the Gospel Church, which is the object of his laws, the seat of his government, and the object of his care, and, being surrounded with powerful opponents, he is represented as waging in the midst of his enemies. This kingdom is set of a worldly origin or nature, nor has it this world for its end and object (Rom. xiv, 17; 1 Cor. iv, 20). It can neither be promoted nor defended by worldly power, influence, or carnal weapons, but by bearing witness unto the truth, or by the preaching of the Gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven (2 Cor. x, 4, 5). Its establishment among men is progressive, but it is already present in this world (Eph. iii, 16; Rev. xvi, 15).

In its real subjects are only those who are of the truth, and hear Christ's voice; for none can enter it but such as are born from above (John iii, 8-36; Matt. xvi, 13; xix, 14; Mark x, 18), nor can any be visibly subjects of it but those recognized by a credible profession of faith and obedience (Luke xvi, 16; Matt. xx, 28-44). Its privileges and immunities are not of this world, but such as are spiritual and heavenly; they are all spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ Jesus (Eph. i, 8). Over this glorious kingdom death has no power; it extends as well to the future as to the present world; and though entered here by renewing grace (Col. i, 13), it is inherited in its perfection in the world of glory (Matt. xxv, 34; 1 Cor. xv, 50; 2 Pet. i, 11). Hypocrisies and false brethren may indeed insinuate themselves into it here, but they will have no possible place in it hereafter (Matt. xiii, 41, 47-50; xxii, 11-14; Luke xiv, 22, 29; 1 Cor. vi, 9, 10; Gal. v. 21; Rev. xvi, 27). It is a fundamental truth (Tholuck, Sermon on the Mount, i, 163). See CHRIST, OFFICE OF.

KINGS, First and Second Books of, the second of the series of Hebrew royal annals, the books of Samuel forming the introductory series, and the books of Chronicles being a parallel series. In the Hebrew Bible the first two series alone form part of "the Former Prophets," like Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. See BIBLE. In the Authorized English Version it is added to their titles: "commonwealths and the kingdom of the fourth (or) Book of the Kings." See SAMUEL, BOOKS OF.

I. Number and Title.—The two books of Kings formed anciently but one book in the Jewish Scriptures, as is affirmed by Origen (apud Euseb. Prop. Evang, vi, 23, Βασιλεύων τριών, τετράβιον, ἐν ἑνὶ Θεομάθει διὰ πτώσεως), Jerome (Prolog, Gal.), Josephus (Cont. Apion, i, 8), and others. The present division of the two books into one (Second Kings) in the Greek and Latin versions, has been common in the Hebrew Bibles since the Venetian editions of Bomberg.

The old Jewish name was borrowed, as usual, from the commencing words of the book (" μεγάλοι βασιλεῖς"); Græcized as in the above quotation from Eusebius. The Septuagint and Vulgate now number them as the third and fourth books of Kings, reckoning the two books of Samuel the first and second. Their present title, μεγάλοι Βασιλείων, Regum, in the opinion of Havernick, has respect more to the formal than essential character of the composition (Eisleitungen, § 168); yet under such forms of government as those of Judah and Israel the royal person and name are intimately associated with all national acts and moments, legal decisions, popular surgeries, domestic legislation, and foreign policy. The reign of an Oriental prince is identified with the history of his nation during the period of his sovereignty. More especially in the theocratic constitution of the Jewish realm the character of the monarch was an important element of national history, and, of necessity, it had considerable influence on the fate and fortunes of the people.

II. Independent Form.—The question has been raised and minutely discussed whether the books of Kings (1 and 2) constitute an entire work of themselves, or whether they originally formed part of a larger historical work embracing the historical parts of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, out of which several books, as we now have them, have been formed. Ewald regards the books of Judges (with Ruth), 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings, as forming parts of one whole work, which had been reduced to the present great book of the Kings. The grounds on which this supposition has been built are partly the following:

(1) These books together contain one unbroken narrative, in form and matter, each portion being connected with the preceding by the conjunctive ἢ or the continuative οὖν. The book of Judges shows itself to be a separate work from Joshua by opening with a narrative of events in which that book ends (Josh. xix, 1 ff.), which proceeds through the times of the Judges, and goes on to give, in Ruth, the family history and genealogy
of David, and in Samuel and Kings the events which transpired down to the captivity.

(2.) The recurrence in Judges of the phrases, "And in those days there was no king in Israel" (xvii, 6; xviii, 1; xxi, 25); "It came to pass in those days when there was no king" (xix, 1); and in Ruth (i, 1), "Now it came to pass in the days when the judges judged," shows that this portion of the work was written in the times when there were kings in Israel. The writer therefore was in a position to pass under review the whole period of the times of the judges, and we find that he estimates the conduct of the people according to the degree of their conformity to the law of the Lord, after the manner of the writer of the Kings (Judg. ii, 11-19; 2 Kings xvii, 7-23).

Again, in Judg. i, 21, it is said that the Jebusites dwell with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem unto this day; and in 2 Sam. xxiv, 16, mention is made of Azurannah the Jebusite as an inhabitant of Jerusalem, from which it is inferred that the writer intended these facts to explain each other. (But see Josh. xv, 68.) So there is a reference in Judges xx, 27 to the removal of the ark of the covenant from Shiloh to Jerusalem; and there is another reference in those days" points as in xvi, 6, etc., to remote times. There is thought to be a reference in Judges xviii, 30 to the captivity of Israel in the days of Hoshea, in which case that book must have been written subsequently to that time, as well as the books of Kings.

(3.) The books of Kings take up the narrative where 2 Samuel breaks off, and proceed to narrate the history of the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah; and so it is natural that these books should be written after the former, in order to build up a continuous and comprehensive account of the events of the Hebrews since the time of Joshua. The authors of these books were also the contemporaries of the events they describe, which makes it more likely that the events were written down at the time of their occurrence. The books of Kings are the only books of the Bible that are not anonymous, and the names of the authors are known to be Samuel and Kings.

(4.) The books of Kings exist as the works of the writers, and are as such together forming an entire and independent work, such as the variety of style and language, both vocabulary and grammar, which pervades the two books, but distinguishes them from others—the uniform system of quotation observed in them, but not in the books which precede them—the same careful attention to chronology of certain phrases and forms of speech peculiar to them. A great variety of events occur in Kings, which are found in them only; such are chiefly names of materials and utensils, and architectural terms. Words, and unusual forms of words, occur, which are only found here and in writers of the same period, as Isaiah and Jeremiah, but not in Samuel or Judges. See § v. below.

III. Contents, Character, and Design.—The books of Kings contain the brief annals of a long period, from the accession of Solomon till the dissolution of the commonwealth. The first chapters describe the reign of Solomon over the united kingdom, and the revolt under Rehoboam. The history of the rival states is next narrated in parallel sections till the period of Israel's downfall on the invasion of Shalman. Then the remaining years of the principality of Judah are recorded till the fall of Jehoiachin, and the establishment of the Babylonian captivity. See Israel; Je,

For an adjustment of the years of the respective reigns in each line, see Chronology.

There are some peculiarities in this succinct history worthy of attention. It is summary, but very suggestive, narrative, and at times, especially in the chronological part, more record of political occurrences, nor yet an ecclesiastical register. King, Church, and State are all comprised in their sacred relations. It is a theocratic history, a retrospective survey of the kingdom as existing under a theocratic government. The character of the sovereign is tested by his fidelity to the religious obligations of his office, and this decision in reference to his conduct is generally added to the notice of his accession. The new king's religious character is generally portrayed by its similarity or opposition to the way of David, his father, or of Jehoahaz, son of Nebat, "who made Israel to sin." Ecclesiastical affairs are noticed with a similar purpose, and in contrast with past or prevalent apostasy, especially as manifested in the popular superstitions, whose shrines were on the "high places." Political or national incidents are introduced in general for the sake of illustrating the influence of religion on civic prosperity; of showing how the theocracy maintained a vigilant and vengeful guardianship over its rights and privileges—adherence to its principles securing peace and plenty, disobedience to them bringing along with it its awful wrath. Thus from the moral and religious standpoints, a verification of the Mosaic warnings, and the author of them has kept this steadily in view. He has given a brief history of his people, arranged under the various political chiefs in such a manner as to show that the government was essentially theocratic that its spirit, as developed in the Mosaic writings, was never extinct, however modified or inactive it might sometimes appear. Thus the books of Kings appear in a religious costume, quite different from the form they would have assumed either as a political or ecclesiastical narrative. In the one case legislative enactments, royal edicts, popular movements, would have occupied a prominent place; in the other, sacerdotal arrangements, Levitical service, music, and pageantry, would have filled the leading sections of the treatise. In either view the points added would have had a distinctive reference to the palace or the temple, the sovereign or the pontiff, the church or a priesthood, the throne or the altar, the tribute or tithes, the nation on its farms, or the tribes in the courts of the sacred edifice. But the theocracy confined both the political and religious elements, and the inspired annal-ist united them as essential to his design. The agency of divinity is constantly recognized, the hand of Jeho-

vah is continually acknowledged. The chief organ of theocratic influence enjoys peculiar prominence. We
position and succession of kings (1 Kings xxii, 33; iv, 5, 29, 80: 2 Kings xi, 17, etc.). Compare, on the whole of this view, Havernick, Einleitung, § 165; Jahn, Introduct., § 46; Gesenius, and Dr. Gesenius, loc. cit., It is thus apparent that the object of the author of the Books of Kings was to describe the history of the kingdoms, especially in connection with the theocratic element. This design accounts for what De Wette (Einleitung, § 185) terms the mythical character of these books.

As to what has been said of the anti-Israelitic spirit of the work (Bertholdt, Einleitung, p. 949), we do not perceive it. Truth required that the kingdom of Israel should be described in its real character. Idol-worship was connected with it; monachism was a state practice; fidelity obliged the annals to state that all its kings patronized the institution of the Temple and the Tabernacle. It was the same with all the kingdoms of antiquity, and the best historians have described them.

IV. Relation of Kings to Chronicles.—The more obvious differences between the Books of Kings and of Chronicles are (1) in the respect of language, by which the former are shown to be of earlier date than the latter.

(2) Of periods embraced in each work. The Chronicles are much more comprehensive than Kings, containing genealogical lists from Adam downwards, and a full account of the reign of David. The portions of the Chronicles synchronistic with Kings are 1 Chron. xxviii—2 Chron. xxxiv.

(3) In the Kings, greater prominence is given to the prophetical office; in Chronicles, to the priestly or Levitical. In the Books of the Kings we have the active influence of Nathan in regard to the succession to the throne; and the remarkable lives of Elijah and Elisha, of whom numerous extraordinary miracles are related, of which scarcely the slightest mention is made in Chronicles, although in Kings about fourteen chapters are taken up with them. Besides these, other prophets are mentioned, and their acts and sayings are recorded; as, 1 Kings xiii, the prophet who came to Bethel from Judah in the reign of Jeroboam, and his predictions; and in 2 Kings xxii, the fulfilment of them in the days of Josiah; 1 Kings xiii, the old prophet who lived at Bethel with his son. Ahijah the prophet, also, in the days of Jeroboam, 1 Kings xiv; Jehu, the son of Hanani, 1 Kings xv; Jehu, in the time of Jeroboam, 2 Kings xiv; and Isaiah, in relation to the sickness of Hezekiah, 2 Kings xx. Of these there is either no mention, or much slighter in Chronicles, where the priestly or Levitical element is more observable; as, for example, the full account, in 2 Chron. xxix—xxxi, of the purification of the Temple by Hezekiah; of the sacrifices and feasts, and of the names of the Levites, who took part in it, and the restoration of the courses and orders of the priesthood, and the supplies for the daily, weekly, and yearly sacrifices; also, the circumstantial account of the Passover observed by command of Josiah, 2 Chron. xxx, 1—11. In this way we may account not only for the omission of much that relates to the prophets, but also for the less remarkable prominence given to the history of Israel, and the greater to Judah and Jerusalem; and for the frequent omission of details respecting the idolatrous practices of some of the kings, as, for example, the worship of Bethel and the shrine of Bethel, and the destruction of idolatry by Josiah, showing that the books of Chronicles were written in times in which the people less needed to be warned against idolatry; to which, after the captivity, they had ceased to be so prone as before.

For further information on the relation between Kings and Chronicles, see CHRONICLES, BOOKS OF.

V. Peculiarities of Diction.—1. The words noticed by De Wette (Einleitung, § 185) as indicating their modern date are the following: מַעַבֵּר for מֵאֵבוּר, 1 Kings xiv, 2. (But...

only in Kings, Chronicles, Jeremiah, and Ezra. To these may be added the architectural terms in 1 Kings vi, vii, and the names of foreign idols in 2 Kings xvii. The general character of the language is most distinctly that of the time before the Babylonian captivity.

VI. Variations in the Septuagint.—These are very remarkable, and consist of transpositions, omissions, and some considerable additions, of all which Thesiuss gives some useful notices in his Introduction to the book of Kings.

1. The most important transpositions are the history of Shime's death, 1 Kings ii, 86-46, which in the Sept. (Cod. Vat.) comes after iii, 1, and divers scraps from ch. iv, v, and ix, accompanied by one or two remarks of the translator. In 1 Kings iv, 4i, 23, and v, 1, are strangely added and precede 1 Kings iii, 2-26, but many of them are repeated again in their proper places. The sections 1 Kings iii, 1, ix, 16, 17, are strangely together, and placed between iv, 3 and v, 1. The section 1 Kings vii, 1-12, is placed after viii, 21. Section viii, 12, 18, is placed after 55. Section ix, 15-22 is placed after x, 22. Section xi, 43, xii, 2, 3, is much transposed and confused in Sept. xi, 43, 44, xii, 1-3. Section xiv, 1-21, is placed in the midst of the long addition to Chron. xii mentioned below. Section xxii, 42-50, is placed after xli, 22. Chapter xx and xxxvi are transposed. Section 2 Kings iii, 1-3, is placed after 2 Kings xix, 18.

2. The omissions are few. Section 1 Kings vi, 11-14, is entirely omitted, and 87, 88 are only slightly added at the opening of chap. iii. The erroneous clause 1 Kings iv, 6, is omitted; and so are the dates of Ass. in reigns in xvi, 8 and 16; and there are a few verbal omissions of no consequence.

3. The chief interest lies in the additions, of which the principal are the following. The supposed mention of a fountain as among Solomon's works in the Temple in the passage after 1 Kings ii, 85; of a paved causeway on 1 Kings iii, 44; of the dedication of the sun at the dedication of the Temple, before he uttered the prayer, "The Lord said he would dwell in the thick darkness," etc., viii, 12, 13 (after 53, Sept.), with a reference to the βίβλος τῆς φύσεως, a passage on which Thesiuss relies as proving that the Alexandrian had access to original documents now lost; the information that "the Lord's brother" passed with Tilibi, xvi, 22, an additional date in the twenty-fourth year of Jeroboam, xv, 8; numerous verbal additions, as xi, 29, xvii, 1, etc.; and, lastly, the long passage concerning Jeroboam, which is inserted between 1 Kings xi, 25 and 16. There are also many glosses of the translator, explanatory, or necessary in consequence of transpositions, as 1 Kings iii, 35, viii, 1, xii, 43, xvii, 20, xix, 2, etc. Of the above, from the recapitulatory character of the passage after 1 Kings xi, 46, containing in brief the sum of the things detailed in vii, 21-23, it seems far more probable that ΚΡΙΤΗΝ ΤΗΣ ΑΥΤΗΣ is only a corruption of ΚΡΙΤΗΝ ΤΟΥ ΑΑΛΑΜ, there mentioned. The obscure passage about Lebanon after iii, 46 seems no less certainly to represent what in the Heb. is ix, 18, 19, as appears by the triple concurrence of Tadmor, Lebanon, and ἐρεωτυρα, representing לְמָעָרָים. The strange mention of the son seems to be introduced by the translator to give significance to Solomon's mention of the house which he had built for God, who had said he would dwell in the thick darkness: not therefore under the unclouded light of the sun; and the reference to "the book of nature," to show that he could point out that the passage to which Solomon referred was Ps. xxvii, 2. Of the other additions, the mention of Tilibi's brother Joram is the one which has most the semblance of an historical fact, or makes the existence of any character of history probable. See, too, 1 Kings xx, 19; 2 Kings xv, 26.

There remains only the long passage about Jeroboam. That this account is only an apocryphal version, made up of the existing materials in the Hebrew Scriptures, after the manner of 1 Esdras, Bel and the Dragon, the apocryphal Esther, the Targums, etc., may be inferred on the following grounds. The framework of the story is given in the very words of the Hebrew narrative, and the fidelity of the new narratives is such that very careful students have noticed in here and there. Demonstrably, therefore, the Hebrew account existed when the Greek one was framed, and was the original one. The principal new facts introduced, the marriage of Jeroboam to the sister of Shishak's wife, and his request to be permitted to return, is a manifest imitation of the story of Hadad, 2 Kings x, 1-10, and the new narratives are simply an expansion of this. The story of the prophecy of Shimei (2 Kings ii, 2 of his having told Jeroboam he should be king), and the king's anxiety about the recovery of his son and heir. The embellishments of the story, Jeroboam's chariots, the amplification of Athiaah's address to Aro, the request asked of Pharaoh, the new garment not worked in water, are precisely such as an embellisher would add, as we may see by the apocryphal books above cited. Then the fusing down the three Hebrew names, פִּינְפִּין, פִּינְפִּין, and פִּינְפִּין, into one, שָׁם, thus giving the same name to the mother of Jeroboam, and to the city where she dwelt, shows how comparatively modern the story is, and how constantly it has grown. A parallel indication is its surrounding the Shemaiah of 1 Kings xii, 22 with Shemaiah the Nehelamite of Jer. xxix, 24, 25, and putting Athiaah's prophecy into his mouth; for, beyond all question, Βαλαμί (1 Kings xii) is only another form of Βαλαμί (Jer. xxvii, 2), against, again, the story is only working contradiction; for, if Jeroboam's child Athiaah was not born till a year or so after Solomon's death, how could "any good thing toward the Lord God of Israel" have been found in him before Jeroboam became king? The one thing in the story that is more like truth than the Hebrew narrative is the age given to Rechabom, sixteen years, which may have been preserved in the MS. which the writer of this romance had before him. The calling Jeroboam's mother γυνή τοῦ Ραμιαδα instead of γυνή χίρα was probably accidental.

On the whole, then, it appears that the great variations in the Sept. contribute little or nothing to the elucidation of the history contained in these books, nor much even to the text. The Hebrew text and arrangement is not in the least shaken in its main points, nor is there the slightest cloud cast on the accuracy of the history, or the truthfulness of the prophetic elements in it. But these variations illustrate a characteristic tendency of the Jewish mind to make interesting portions of the Scriptures the groundwork of separate religious tales, which they altered or added to according to their fancy, without any regard to history or chronology, and in which they exercised a peculiar kind of ingenuity in working up the Scripture materials, or in inventing circumstances calculated, as they thought, to make the main history more probable. The story of Zerubbabel's answer in 1 Esdras about truth, to prepare the way for his mission by Darius; of the discovery of the imposture of Bel's priests by Daniel, in Bel and the Dragon; of Mordecai's dream in the apocryphal Esther, and the paragraph in the Talmud inserted to connect 1 Kings xvi, 54 with xvii, 1 (Smith's Suer. Amm. ii, 421), are instances of this. The reign of Solomon, and the remarkable prosperity which he enjoyed, were not unlike to explain this propensity of the Hellenistic Jews. It is to the existence of such works that the variations in the Sept. account of Solomon and Jeroboam may most probably be attributed.
unto this day" (1 Kings viii, 8) does not accord with the account of the destruction of the Temple (2 Kings xxi, 12). The prophecies of the Lord left (1 Kings xviii, 22; xix, 10) has an appearance of disagreement with xx, 18, 35, etc., though xviii, 4, xix, 18 supply, it is true, a ready answer. In 1 Kings xxi, 13 only Nabinoth is mentioned, while in 2 Kings ix, 40, the terms are added. The prediction in 1 Kings xvi, 15-17 has no perfect fulfillment in the following chapters. 1 Kings xxii, 8 does not seem to be a fulfillment of xvi, 19. The declaration in 1 Kings ix, 22 does not seem in harmony with xi, 25. There are also some singular repetitions, as 1 Kings xiv, 21 compared with xxvi, 3, 19; xv, 1 compared with xii, 1, 19, with xiii, 12, 13. But it is enough just to have pointed these out, as no real difficulty can be found in them.

As regards the sources of information, it may truly be said that in the books of Kings we have the narrative of contemporary writers throughout. It has already been observed (see Chronicles) that there was a regular series of state annals both for the kingdom of Judah and for that of Israel, which embraced the whole time comprehended in the books of Kings, or at least to the end of the reign of Jehoiakim (2 Kings xxiv, 5). The annals are clearly cited by the Chronicler, as in the Book of the Acts of Solomon (1 Kings xi, 41); and, after Solomon, "the Book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah, or Israel" (e.g. 1 Kings xiv, 29; xv, 7; xvi, 5, 14, 20; 2 Kings x, 34; xxiv, 5, etc.) and it is manifest that the latter had been both before him while he drew up his history, in which the reigns of the two kingdoms are harmonized, and these annals constantly appealed to. (Similar phraseology is used in Esther x, 2, vi, 1, to denote the official annals of the Persian empire. Public documents are spoken of in the same way in Neh, xii, 25). But, in addition to these national annals, there were also extant, at the time that the books of Kings were compiled, separate works of the several prophets who had lived in Judah and Israel, and which probably bore the same relation to the annals as the historical parts of Isaiah and Jeremiah bear to those portions of the annals preserved in the books of Kings, i.e. were, in some instances at least, fuller and more copious accounts of the current events, by the same hands which drew up the more concise narrative of the annals, though in others perhaps mere duplicates. Thus the acts of Uzziah, written very likely by his son, are of great value for substance with the history of his reign in the national chronicles; and part of the history of Hezekiah we know was identical in the chronicles and in the prophet. The chapter in Jeremiah relating to the destruction of the Temple (ch. lii) is identical with that in 2 Kings xxvii, xxviii, where it is said there were some that cast it to the ground, but that a chapter in the prophecies of Daniel was used for the national chronicles, and appears as Ezri i. (Comp. also 2 Kings xvii, 1; Isa. vii, 2; 2 Kings xvii, 18, 8, xxiv, 28-32). As an instance of verbal agreement, coupled with greater fulness in the prophetical account, see 2 Kings xx compared with Isa. xxxvii, vii, in which latter alone is Hezekiah's writing given.

These other works, then, as far as the memory of has been preserved to us, were as follows (see Keil's Apology, 1st c.): For the time of David, the book of Samuel, the book of Nathan the prophet, the book of Gad the seer (2 Sam. xxvi-xxvii with 1 Kings i, being probably extracted from Nathan's book), which seem to have been collected—at least that portion of them relating to David—into one work called "the Acts of David the king" (1 Chron. xxi, 29). For the time of Solomon, "the Book of the Books of Solomon" (1 Kings xi, 41), consisting probably of parts of the "Book of Nathan the prophet, the prophecy of Ahijah the Shiloite, and the visions of Iddo the seer" (2 Chron. xix, 29). For the time of Rehoboam, "the words of Shemaiah the prophet, and of Iddo the seer, who conveyed concerning the genealogies" (2 Chron. xii, 15). For the time of Abijah, "the story (ፋኔ) of the prophet Iddo" (2 Chron. xiii, 22). For the time of Jehoshaphat, "the words of Jehu, the son of Hanani" (2 Chron. xx, 9-16). For the time of Uzziah, "the writings of Isaiah the prophet, and of the time of Hezekiah, "the vision of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amos" (2 Chron. xxxiii, 23). For the time of Manasseh, a book called "the sayings of the seers," as the A.V., following the Sept.-Vulg., Kimchi, etc., rightly renders it, may be added; in another passage (26) (2 Chron. xxxiii, 19), though others, following these last servilely, make Chozar a proper name, because of the absence of the article. For the time of Jeroboam II, a prophecy of "Jehovah, the son of Amittai the prophet, of the tribe of Issachar," is cited (2 Kings xiv, 25); and it seems less likely that we should read there xvi, 1-16 (2 Chron. xxxiii, 19), though others, following these last servilely, make Chozar a proper name, because of the absence of the article. Of the latter Gehazi might well have been the author, to judge from 2 Kings vii, 4, and as itself might have been of the kingdom. In one, too, the prophecies of Azariah, the son of Oded, in Ahab's reign (2 Chron. xiv, 1), and of Hanami (2 Chron. xvi, 7) (unless this latter is the same as Jeph, son of Hanani, as Oded is put for Azariah in xv, 8), and Micah the son of Imlai, in Ahab's reign, and Eliezer, the son of Dodavah, in Jehoshaphat's reign (e.g. 2 Kings xiv, 23, xxii, 20), 2 Kings xvi, 11, 15, 16, with xiii, 12, 13. But it is enough just to have pointed these out, as no real difficulty can be found in them.

With regard to the work so often cited in the Chronicles as "the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah" (1 Chron. i, 1; 2 Chron. xvi, 11, xxvi, 7; xxvii, 26; xxxii, 32; xxxvi, 27; xxxvi, 8), it has been thought by some that it was a separate collection containing the joint histories of the two kingdoms; by others, that it is our book, the Kings, which answer to this description; but by Eichhorn, that it is the same as the Chronicles of the kings of Judah so constantly cited in the books of Kings; and this last opinion seems to be the best founded. For in 2 Chron. xvi, 11, the same book is called "the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel," which in the parallel passage, 1 Kings xx, 22, is called "the Book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah." So again, 2 Chron. xxvii, 7, comp with 2 Kings xx, 86; 2 Chron. xxxviii, 26, comp with 2 Kings xvi, 19; 2 Chron. xxxii, 82, comp with 2 Kings xx, 20; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 27, with 2 Kings xxv, 29; 2 Chron. xxxv, 1; 2 Kings xxiv, 5. Moreover, the book so quoted refers exclusively to the affairs of Judah; and even in the one passage where reference is made to it as "the Book of the Kings of Israel" (2 Chron. xx, 94), it is for the reign of Jehoshaphat that it is cited. Obviously, therefore, it is the same book as the Chronicles of Israel and Judah, and of Judah and Israel. Nor is this an unreasonable title to give to these chronicles. Saul, David, Solomon, and in some sense Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxx, 1, 5, 6), and all his successors, were kings of Israel as well as of Judah; and therefore it is very conceivable that in Ezra's time the chronicles of
Judah should have acquired the name of the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah. Even with regard to a portion of Israel in the days of Rehoboam, the chronicler remarks, apparently as a matter of gratulation, that "Rehoboam reigned over them" (2 Chron. x, 17); he notices Abijah's authority in Judah (2 Chron. ii, 1), but makes mention of the whole of Israel (2 Chron. xx, 18, 19; xv, 8, 9); he does not frequently speak of Israel, when the kingdom of Judah is the matter in hand (2 Chron. xii, 11, xxii, 1, 4; xiii, 2, etc.), and even calls Jehovah's "king of Israel" (2 Chron. xxi, 2), and distinguishes "Israel and Judah" from "Judah and Manasseh" (xix, 11); he notices Hezekiah's authority from Dan to Beer-sheba (2 Chron. xxx, 5), and Josiah's destruction of idols throughout all the land of Israel (xxxiv, 6-9), and his Passover for all Israel (xxxv, 17, 18), and seems to parade the title "king of Israel" in connection with David and Solomon (xxxv, 4, 4), and the relation of the Levites to "all Israel" (ver. 5); and therefore it is only in accordance with the feeling displayed in such passages that the expression, "the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah," should be given to the chronicles of the Jewish kingdom. The use of this term in speaking of the "kings of Israel and Judah who were carried away to Babylon for their transgression" (1 Chron. ix, 1) would be conclusive if the construction of the sentence were certain. But though it is absurd to separate the words "Israel" and "Judah" from Israel, as Bertheau does (Kurzgez. Exeg. Handb.), following the Masoretic punctuation, he interprets "the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah" cited in at least six other places in Chronicles, still it is possible that Israel and Judah might be the antecedent to the pronoun understood before בִּלְבָּבָה. It seems, however, much more likely that the antecedent to יָדִי אֶל is יָדִי אֶל בָּבָל. The whole, therefore, there is no evidence of the existence in the time of the chronicler of a history, since lost, of the two kingdoms, as distinguished from the books of Kings; the words as used by the chronicler, seeing he often refers to it for "the rest of the acts" of Kings, when he has already given all that is contained in our books of Kings. He refers, therefore, to the chronicles of Judah. From the above authentic sources, then, was compiled the history in the books under consideration. Judging from the facts that we have in 2 Kings xvii, xix, xx, the history of Hezekiah in the very words of Isaiah, xxxvi-xxxix; that, as stated above, we have several passages from Jeremiah in duplicate in 2 Kings, and the whole of Jer. ii in 2 Kings xxv, 18, etc., xxvii; that so large a case of the books of Kings is repeated in the books of Chronicles, though the writer of Chronicles had the original Chronicles also before him, as well as from the whole internal character of the narrative, and even some of the blemishes referred to under the second head—we may conclude with certainty that we have in the books of Kings, not only in the main the history faithfully preserved to us from the ancient chroniclers, but most frequently whole passages transferred verbatim into them. Occasionally, no doubt, we have the compiler's own comments, or reflections thrown in, as at 2 Kings xiv, 4; xvi, 18, 19; xxiv, 7-41, etc. We connect the insertion of the prophecy in 1 Kings xiii with the fact that the compiler himself was an eye-witness of the fulfilment of it, and can even see how the words ascribed to the prophet are of the age of the compiler. We can perhaps see his hand in the frequent repetition, on the review of each reign, of the remark, "The high places were not taken away; the people still sacrificed and burned incense on the high places" (1 Kings xxii, 43; 2 Kings xiii, 3; xiv, 4; xv, 4, 5; comp. 1 Kings iii, 3), and in the repeated observations that such and such things, which the ark was borne, the revolt of the ten tribes, the rebellion of Edom, etc., continue "unto this day," though it may be perhaps doubted in some cases whether these words were not in the old chronicle (2 Chron. v, 9). See 1 Kings vii, 8; ix, 18; xii, 1, 21; xii, 18; xvi, 20; 2 Kings ii, 22; viii, 22; x, 27; xii, 28; xiv, 7; xvi, 6; xvii, 34, 41; xxiii, 25. It is remarkable, however, that in no instance does the use of this phrase lead us to suppose that it was penned after the destruction of the Temple; in several of the above instances the phrase necessarily supposes that the temple and the kingdom of Judah were still standing. If the phrase, then, is the compiler's, it proves him to have written before the Babylonian captivity; if it was a part of the chronicle he was quoting, it shows how exactly he transferred its contents to his own pages.

IX. Author and Date.

The authorship and age of this historical treatise may admit of several suppositions. Whatever were the original sources, the books are evidently the composition of one writer. The style is generally uniform throughout (Dr. Davidson, in Horne's Introd., new edit., ii, 668 sq.). The same forms of expression are used (to denote the same, e.g., the male sex (1 Kings xiv, 10, etc.); the death of a king (1 Kings xi, 45, etc.); modes of allusion to the law (1 Kings xi, 18); fidelity to Jehovah (1 Kings viii, 68, etc.; see De Wette, Einl. § 184, a; Hävernick, Einl. § 171). Similar idioms are ever recurring, so as to produce a uniformity of style (Dr. Hävernick, Einl. § 171). See § ii, above.

1. With regard to the time when the author lived and wrote there are the following arguments:

(1) The style and diction indicate the later age of the Hebrew language, but not the latest. Attempts to prove a more modern date than the middle of the captivity have completely failed. Nearly all the words which De Wette and others have selected (see § v, above) are shown to have been in use, either by the prophets who flourished before the captivity and at its commencement, or by still earlier writers; but words and phrases abound which were in common use by the writers of the conclusion of the fourth century B.C., who would not go into captivity, especially by Isaiah and Jeremiah. In this respect there is a manifest difference between Kings and Chronicles. Though neither work is free from Chaldee forms, they are rare in Kings, but numerous in Chronicles. Their occurrence at all in Kings is sufficiently accounted for from the contiguity of Judah to Syria, and from the frequent intercourse with Assyria which commerce and war involved.

(2) With the evidence which the language affords, the internal evidence of the contents agrees. The history is carried down to the captivity in detail; and, by way of supplement, to the reign of Evil-merodach, king of Babylon. The closing verse implies that the writer survived Jehoachin, but gives no hint whatever of the termination of the captivity, which he surely would have done had he written after the return from Babylon. We may therefore safely conclude that the work was composed before the end of the captivity, but after the twenty-sixth year of its continuance.

2. Calmet ascribes the authorship to Ezra; but there are no decided indications of his authorship, and the names Zid and Bul (1 Kings vi, 1, 87, 88) were not in use after the captivity. The general opinion, however, that Jeremiah was the author is adopted by Grotius, Carpzov, and others, and is lately reindicated by Hävernick, as well as by Graf (De libror, Sam. et Regum compositione, p. 61 sq.), but is opposed by Keil, Davidson, and others. In favor of it are the following strong arguments:

(1) The work is attributed to Jeremiah by ancient tradition. There is a reference to Jeremiah as the author in the Talmud (Baba Bathra, fol. 15, 1), and with this comment the common opinion of the Jews.

(2) The style and language of Kings resemble those of the acknowledged writings of Jeremiah. In both works there is an unusual number of וָאַלֶּבֶנ לַמָּוֶשׁ; and also of words peculiar to each work, though used more than once. What is still more to the purpose, there are words and forms of words used in both works, but in them only; as, פַּלּוֹפָּה, a "cruse" (1 Kings xiv, vii, 4-5).
captive who followed Nebuzar-adan as far as Ramah, and was very kindly treated by him. The careful enumeration of the pillars and of the sacred vessels of the Temple which were plundered by the Chaldeans tallies exactly with the prediction of Jeremiah concerning them. (SeeJer.xvii. 12.) The paragraph begins with the point of Gedaliah, as governor of the remnant, and his murder by Ishmael, and the flight of the Jews into Egypt, is merely an abridged account of what Jeremiah tells us more fully (xl-xiii., 7), and are events in which personally he was deeply concerned. The writer in Kings has nothing more to tell than concerning the Jews or Chaldees in the land of Judah, which exactly agrees with the hypothesis that he is Jeremiah, who we know was carried down to Egypt with the fugitives. In fact, the date of the writing and the position of the writer seem actually marked by the time and event that were active at v. 26, as in the case of the Acts of the Apostles. It may be added, though the argument is less weighty, that the annexation of this chapter to the writings of Jeremiah so as to form Jer. iii (with the additional clause contained in vs. 26-30) is an evidence of a very ancient, if not a contemporary belief, that Jeremiah was the author of it. Again, the special mention of Seraijah the high-priest, and Zephaniah the second priest, as slain by Nebuzar-adan (v. 18), together with three other priests, is very significant when taken in connection with Jer. xxi. 1, xxii. 25-29, passing on to Lev. xxvi. 31; that Zedekiah was longed to the faction which opposed the prophet, a faction which was headed by priests and false prophets (Jer. xxvi. 7, 8, 11, 16). Going back to the xxivth chapter, we find in verse 14 an enumeration of the captives taken with Jehoiachin identical with that in Jer. xxvi., 1, in verse 18 a reference to the vessels of the Temple precisely similar to that in Jer. xxvii., 18-20, xxviii., 8, 6, and in verse 8, 4, a reference to the idolatries and bloodshed of Manasseh very similar to those in Jer. ii., 34, xiv., 4-8, etc., a reference which also connects chap. xxvii. with xxvi., 6, 18-10. In verse 2 the enumeration of the hostile nations, and the reference to the prophets of God, point directly to Jer. xxv., 9, 20, 21, and the reference to Pharaoh-necho in verse 7 points to verse 19, and to xiv., 1-12. Brief as the narrative is, it brings out all the chief points in the political events of the time which we know were much in Jeremiah's mind; and yet, which is exceedingly remarkable, Jeremiah is never once named (as he is in 2 Chron. xxxvi., 12, 21), although the manner of the writer is frequently to connect the sufferings of Judah with their sins and their neglect of the Word of God (2 Kings xxvi., 18 sq. ; xxiv., 15-19; xxv., 1 sq.). This leads to an inconclusive evidence between that portion of the history which belongs to Jeremiah's times and the writings of Jeremiah himself. De Wette speaks of the superficial character of the history of Jeremiah's times as hostile to the theory of Jeremiah's authorship. Now, considering the nature of these annals, and their consciousness, this critic seems very unfounded as regards the reigns of Josiah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah. It must, however, be acknowledged that, as regards Jehoiakim's reign, and especially the latter part of it, and the way in which it was closed by his death, the more meagre than one would have expected from a contemporary writer living on the spot. But exactly the same paucity of information is found in those otherwise copious notices of contemporary events with which Jeremiah's prophecies are interspersed, e. g. Townsend's Arrangement or Geneste's Parallel Histories, and he will see at a glance how remarkably little light Jeremiah's narrative or prophecies throw upon the latter part of Jehoiakim's reign. The cause of this silence may be difficult to assign; but, more than once it was, whether the absence from Jerusalem mostly on the mission described in Jer. xiii., or imprisonment, or any other impediment, it operated equally on Jeremiah and on the writer of 2 Kings xxiv. When it is borne in mind that the writer of 2 Kings was a contemporary
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writer, and, if not Jeremiah, must have had independent means of information, this coincidence will have great weight.

It has been argued on the other side—

(2) That the concluding portion of the book of Kings could hardly have been written by Jeremiah, unless we suppose him to have written it when he was between eighty and ninety years old. To this it may be replied that the last four verses, relative to Jehoiachin, are equally a supplement, whether added by the author or by some later hand. There is nothing impossible in the supposition of Jeremiah having survived till the thirty-seventh year of Jehoiachin's captivity, though he would have been between eighty and ninety. There is something touching in the idea of this gleam of joy having reached the Prophet in his old age, and of his having added these few words to his long-finished history of his nation (see Hävernick, Uebcr Daniel, p. 14).

(2) That the resemblance of style and diction may be accounted for on the supposition of Jeremiah's familiarity with the autobiography of the writer of Kings, how long before his death he had access, while the similarity of 2 Kings xxiv, 1-18, etc., and Jer. xxxix, might arise from the writer of Kings using that portion of Jeremiah's work. The identity of Jer. lii with the same portion of Kings is probably owing to its being an altered extract from Kings, as it is not to be found in Jeremiah, except by a second hand. Neither of the suppositions, however, seriously militates against the general authorship of Jeremiah as to the book of Kings. See JEREMIAH.

X. Place of these Books in the Canon, and References to them.

1. The author of the books of Kings has never been disputed; it is needless to bring forward the testimonials to their authenticity which may be found in Josephus, Eusebius, Jerome, Augustine, etc., or in Bp. Cosin, or any other modern work on the Canon of Scripture. See CANON. They are reckoned, as has already been noticed, among the Prophets, in the threefold division of the Holy Scriptures; a position in accordance with the supposition that they were compiled by Jeremiah, and contain the narratives of the different prophets in succession. They are frequently cited by our Lord and by the Apostles. Thus the allusion to Solomon's glory is made (Matt. vi, 29); to the queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon to hear his wisdom (xii, 42); to the Temple (Acts vii, 47, 48); to the great drought in the days of Elijah, and the widow of Sarepta (Luke iv, 25, 26); to the cleansing of Naaman the Syrian (ver. 27); to the story of the Elisha to Gehazi (vers. iv, 29, come with Luke x, 4); to the dress of Elijah (Mark i, 6, comp. with 2 Kings i, 8); to the complaint of Elijah, and God's answer to him (Rom. xi, 3, 4); to the raising of the Shunammite's son from the dead (Heb. xi, 38); to the giving and withholding of the rain in answer to Elijah's prayer (James v, 17, 18; Rev. xi, 6); to Jezebel (Rev. ii, 26) are all derived from the books of Kings, and, with the statement of Elijah's presence at the Transfiguration, are a striking testimony to their value for the purpose of religious teaching, and to their authenticity as a portion of the Word of God.

On the whole, then, in this portion of the history of the Israelitish people to which the name of the Books of Kings has been given, we have (if we except those errors in numbers which are either later additions to the original work, or accidental corruptions of the text) a most important and accurate account of that people during upwards of four hundred years of their national existence, delivered for the most part by contemporary writers, and guaranteed by the authority of one of the most eminent of the Jewish prophets. Considering the conditions of the time, and the narrowness of the style, the amount of knowledge which these books convey of the characters, conduct, and manners of kings and people during so long a period is truly wonderful. The insight they give us into the aspect of Judah and Jerusalem, both natural and artificial, into the religious, military, and civil institutions of the people, their arts and manufactures, the state of education and learning among them, their resources, commerce, exports, alliances, the causes of their decadence, and, finally, of their ruin, is most clear, interesting, and instructive. In a few brief sentences we can only mention a few of the important passages which deal with the affairs of Egypt, Tyre, Syria, Assyria, Babylon, and other neighboring nations, that have been preserved to us in all the other remains of antiquity up to the recent discoveries in hieroglyphical and cuneiform monuments. The synchronisms with these, if there are not some difficulties, yet furnish the only real basis for dates of these contemporaneous powers; and if we are content to read accurate and truthful history, substantially with an exact though intricate net-work of chronology, then we shall assuredly find it will abundantly repay the most laborious studies of all the ages.

But it is for their deep religious teaching, and for the insight which they give us into God's providential and moral government of the world, that these books are above all valuable. Books which describe the wisdom and the glory of Solomon, and are replete with his fall; which make us acquainted with the painful ministry of Elijah, and his translation into heaven; and which tell us how the most magnificent temple ever built for God's glory, and of which he vouchsafed to take possession by a visible symbol of his presence, was consigned to the flames and to the destruction of the nation of his worship and subjection in it, read us such lessons concerning both God and man as are the best evidence of their divine origin, and make them the richest treasure to every Christian man.

XI. Commentaries.—The following are the exegetical works which help specially on the two books of Kings, to the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Ephraem, Syrus, Explanatio (in Syriac, in his Opp. iv, 489); Theodore, Questions (in Greek, in his Opp. i, edit. Halle, 1769); Procopius of Gaza, Scholia [including Chron.] (from Theodore, edit. Meursius, Lugd. Bat., 1628, 4to); Zaccariah the Eucherius (falsely attributed to [Acheirius]) (in the Max. Hebr. Vet. Pers., vi, 965 sq.); Raabî (i. e. Rab. Sol. Jacri), Commentarius [Joshua—Kings] (trans. by Breithaupt, Goth., 1714, 4to); Baholos, ᾑγατον [Joshua—Kings] (with Kimchi's Commentary, Seira, 1494, folio, and in the Rabbinical Bibles); Alschheim, ᾑγατον, etc., [Joshua—Kings] (Venice, 1601, fol., and later); Bugenhagen, Adnotationes (Basil. 1825, 8vo); Weller, Commentarius (Francofurti, 1567, North. 1569, fol.), Commentarius ii [Joshua—Kings] (Basil. 1567, fol.); Sarcer, Commentarius (Lipa. 1559, 8vo); Martyr, Commentarius (Tigrur. 1666, 1681, Heidel. 1599, fol.); Sirigel, Commentarius [Samuel—Chron.] (Lipa. 1588, 1591, fol.); Sanarius, Commentarius [Joshua—Chron.] (Moutug. 1605, 1617, 2 vols. fol.); L. de Batis, Hypomnemata (Basil. 1629, 8vo); Erffurt, 1698, 1614, 8vo; Lipa. 1610, 4to); De Mendoza, Commentarius [including Sam.] (Lugd. 1622—1631, 8 vols. fol.); Sanctius, Commentarius [Sam.—Chron.] (Antwerp, 1624, Lugd. 1625, fol.); Cronimus, Illustrationes [Ruth—Chron.] (Lovan, 1631, 4to); De Vera, Commentarius [including Sam.] (Lipa. 1635, fol.); Bonfrette, Commentaria [Sam.—Chron.] (Tornaci, 1648, 2 vols. fol.), also with his other commentaries, Lugd. 1737; Causinus, Dissertationes [including Sam.] (Par. 1650, fol.; Colon, 1652, 4to); Schmidt, Adnotationes (Argent. 1657, 4to); Calmet, Commentaire (Par. 1711, 4to); A. Lapiccioli, Commentarius [Joshua—Kings] (Antw. 1718, fol.); Bentano and Desreuer, Erklärung (V. a. M. 1827, 8vo); Tanchur—Jerusalam, Commentarius [incl. Sam.] (from the Arabic, by Haarbrucker, Lipa. 1844, 8vo); Keil, Commentarius [Moskau, 1846, 8vo; tr. Edinb. 1857, 8vo, different from that in Keil and Delitzsch's Commentary] (the Thessalius, Erklärung (in the Kurzgez. Erleg. Hdb. Lpz. 1849, 8vo); Schlatter, Einleitung in die Bücher der Könige (Halle, 1861, 8vo). For monographs on particular passages, see Danz, Wörterbuch, p. 555. See Commentary.

King's Book is the name of a book published A.D. 1648, under the sanction of Henry VIII. A Lutheran necessity Doctrine and Eradication for any Christian Man.
The people called it the King's Book in contradistinction from the work which furnished the basis for the King's Book, and was called the Bishop's Book. This latter was an exposition of the Apostles' Creed, the Seven Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, the Pater Noster, and the Ave Maria: to these, in the King's Book, was subjoined a different matter touching free will, good works, justification, predestination, and purgatory. A comparison, however, of the two shows that in the King's Book there is a falling away from the principles of the Reformation. See Institution of a Christian Man.

King's Dale (קִנְיָה דָּלָה, K'inek ham-Me'lah, Valley of the King; سِمَّى الْبَرْدَةُ وَبَلَدُ الْبَرْدَةِ, سَمْيَةُ الْبَرْدَةُ وَبَلَدُ الْبَرْدَةِ, a place incidentally mentioned in two passages of Scripture only. When Abraham was returning with the spoil of Sodom, the king of Sodom went out to meet him at the valley of Shaveh, which is the king's dale" (Gen. xv. 17); and in the narrative of the death of Absalom the incidental remark is inserted by the historian, "Now Absalom in his lifetime had reared up for himself a pillar which is in the king's dale" (2 Sam. xviii. 18). The locality has usually been supposed to be in the Valley of Jehoshaphat or Kidron, and that this unknown monument, now named the tomb of Absalom, is the pillar raised by that prince (Benajmin of Tudela, in Early Trau. in Pal. p. 84; Raumer, Palaest. p. 308; Barclay, City of the Great King, p. 92). The style of the monument, which is of the later Homan age, indicates against this theory, which we suppose that this great man's hand was in at least equal repute for scrofula and wens, doubtless for a like reason. If Jesus had laid his hands on many sick persons, and some of them had recovered within a week, how different would have been the state of the case! (See Paley on tenatious miracles and gradual cures.) As the same thing will not happen by the touch of a royal hand, it cannot be believed without the utmost degree of superstition, it is probable that the service was used as a petition for the cure, and that the touching the part affected was a superstitious act, followed by a cure in those cases in which the action of the mind was favorable to such an effect. Thus the cure itself would be explicable from natural causes.

King's Garden. See Garden.

King's House. See Palace.

King's Mother. See Queen.

King's Mowing. See Mowing.

King's Pool. See Pool.

King's Primer. See Primer.

King's Sepulchre. See Tomb.

Kingsbury, Cyrus, a noted American missionary to the Indians, was born about 1789. He commenced his missionary labors about 1816, and for more than fifty years faithfully, quietly, and meekly served his Master in making known to those committed to his care the unseen workings of Christ. Kingsbury died August 29th, 1870. His influence among the savages was great, and few men in any service could be more missed. Among the missionaries of this age, no purer name, no lovelier character, has appeared than that which belongs to Cyrus Kingsbury.

Kingsbury, William, a Congressional minister, was born in London July 12, 1744, and educated first at Christ's Hospital, London, and for the ministry at the educational institution for Congregational ministers at Milc End, where he graduated in 1764. He was ordained in 1765, and became pastor of the Independent Church at Southampton, a position which he most successfully filled for forty-five years. In 1772, in addition to his pastoral duties, he established an academy for the education of young men. In 1767 he declined a position in Homerston College. In 1758 he was one of the prime movers in founding the London Missionary Society, and was the first preside over its deliberations. He died at Caverness Feb. 18, 1818. He published in 1798 An Apology for Village Preachers, in answer to an attack made upon them. Mr. Kingsbury was "one of the brightest ornaments of the ministerial character that has graced the church in modern times—a man of rare and exalted worth, possessed of vigor of intellect, sound critical knowledge, as well as depth of piety."—Morison, Missionary Fathers. (H.C.W.)

Kingsley, Calvin, D.D., LL.D., a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born of Presbyterian

Answer. Which put their trust in thee, Minister. Send unto them help from above. Answer. And evermore mightily defend them. Minister. O Lord, grant us grace. Answer. And for the glory of thy name sake deliver us: we comfort all thy sinners, for thy name's sake. Minister. O Lord, hear our prayer. Answer. And let our cry come unto thee. Answer. Almighty God, the eternal health of all such as put their trust in thee, hear us, we beseech thee, on the behalf of these, for whose care we call for thy merciful help; that they, receiving health, may give thanks unto thee in thy holy Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The peace of God, etc.

"The evidence which has sometimes been offered for supposed miraculous cures of the king's evil is none at all for the miracles, but goes to prove that patients were touched, and afterwards recovered. Symptoms of many diseases abate spontaneously; and especially in the case of scrofula, a strong excitement of mind is supposed by medical men to exert often a reaction in the abscesses. The touch of a hanged man's hand has been held in at least equal repute for scrofula and wens, doubtless for a like reason. If Jesus had laid his hands on many sick persons, and some of them had recovered within a week, how different would have been the state of the case! (See Paley on tenatious miracles and gradual cures.) As the same thing will not happen by the touch of a royal hand, it cannot be believed without the utmost degree of superstition, it is probable that the service was used as a petition for the cure, and that the touching the part affected was a superstitious act, followed by a cure in those cases in which the action of the mind was favorable to such an effect. Thus the cure itself would be explicable from natural causes."
parentage, at Amesville, Oneida County, N. Y., Sept. 8, 1812. His early advantages were rather moderate, but his thirst for knowledge made him superior to circumstances. He was determined to succeed, and in 1834 entered Allegheny College, whence he graduated with honor in the year 1841, having held already, in his sophomore year, the appointment of tutor of mathematics. Immediately after graduation he was elected professor of mathematics in the college, and distinguished himself in that capacity for several years, taking upon himself also the work of preaching; he had been licensed to preach in 1836. In the year 1843, when Allegheny College was deprived of its assistance from Pennsylvania by an enactment withdrawing all appropriation from the high schools of the state, Kingsley, then an ordained deacon in the Church, was appointed agent "for the peculiarly arduous and thankless task of raising funds for the endowment of his college." About this time, also, the future bishop first came prominently before the general public. He had early entertained strong anti-slavery prejudices, and in 1844 he led to open public discussion with the distinguished preachers Luther Lee (q. v.) and Elias Smith (q. v.), who had formed the "Wesleyan" organization through disaffection at the position assumed by the Methodist Episcopal Church on the subject of the institution of slavery. In these discussions Kingsley proved himself in every respect the equal, if not the superior, of his antagonist—"men by nature able, and by practice trained to the highest point of effectiveness by their zeal for truth, and laborious study of the whole ground of the controversy." From 1844 to 1845 he was also regular pastor in the city of Erie, and during this period he resigned his scholarship and his teaching duties in the College. While here he had a public discussion with a Universalist minister, and also prepared his lectures on Prof. Bush's work on the Resurrection, which were published afterwards under the title "Kingsley on the Resurrection" (1845, and often). Preferring to remain in the pulpit to that in the rostrum, he resigned his place at Allegheny College in 1846, but the trustees refused to accept the resignation, and, at the most earnest entreaty of many of his friends, he was induced to continue his college relations, even at a considerable sacrifice of salary. Continuing the duties of his chair, he continued to labor faithfully as a preacher upon the adjacent circuits and stations. In 1852 he was elected a delegate from his Conference to the General Conference, and not only was he elected a member of that body, but he was also elected a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and in attendance, though a comparative stranger, received, in the election of bishops, some forty votes for this distinguished office. By the next General Conference (1866) he was elected editor of the Western Christian Advocate, successor of the celebrated late Dr. Elliott. In this place he displayed much editorial ability, and his paper became a powerful influence in the West. In 1860 he was recognised by the General Conference as the leader of the anti-slavery movement, and was chosen chairman of the Slavery Committee, and managed the discussion on that subject with great success. He was at that time re-elected editor of The Advocate, and at the breaking out of the war brought its whole support to the aid of the government. In 1864, the General Conference, then in session at Philadelphia, promoted him to the high distinction for which he had been a candidate in 1852, and he performed the duties of the position the summer of 1869, when he took an episcopal tour around the world, but died on his way homeward at Beirut, Syria, April 6, 1870. "As a bishop, he met the highest expectations of the Church. In the chair his decisions were clear and exact. In making the appointments he manifested great sympathy for the preachers and devotion to the interests of the Church. His ministrations were able and successful, and during the six years of his episcopal labors he gave himself wholly to the work of his great office. In his mien, his voice, his bearing, in his manner, genial and social in his spirit. His intellect was strong, keen, and logical. He used a ready pen, and his descriptions were clear, concise, and graphic. His sermons were rich in doctrinal truth, and by their clear and earnest delivery held the attention of large congregations. His entire power was of a superior order, and each successive year his talents were unfolding" (Conference Minutes, 1870, p. 294). The Rev. Dr. Robert Allyn, in his Personal Recollections of Bishop Kingsley (Central Christian Advocate, June 1, 1870), speaks of him as a man genial, charitable, honest, earnest, shrewd and far-seeing, patient, careful, and bold in defense and in attack. His square form, solid lips, and broad shoulders were an indication of the wrestler, and his keen, quick eye was that of a master of fence. While he was one of the most diligent of workers, he had just enough of the philosophic about his temperament to make him the pluckiest of fighters. He always looked at a point, and not at half of the horizon, as many do when they preach or write. His eagle eye would see the mark, no matter how far away, and his steady hand could point to where he hit it exactly. In his sermonizing there was no attempt at profundity of sentiment or rhetorical ornamentation, or even logical force; yet it had all these so far as they are of any account. It was emphatically as the rain that cometh down from heaven—falling because the clouds are too full to hold it longer, and never carking on what place it may descend, or what it shall refresh. His thoughts were always clear, and his words exact and often picturesque. He was entirely indifferent to the applause of those to whom he spoke, and was so natural—commonly not graceful in all his manner, that a careless observer would be sure to be deceived into regarding him of less importance than he had. Every word he chose was a word to help convey his meaning, and he never added another for show; hence a few, who looked for sound rather than sense, might undervalue his preaching; but let a congregation hear him often, and become accustomed to the flash of his eye and the movement of his face as his thoughts came leaping from his heart, and as he attempted to clothe them in words, and they could not fail to be fascinated. He had a magnetic power to keep people awake and to instruct them, and to attach men to him which no mere mental assent could ever do. Those who sat on the wings of fancy, I can only instruct and convince."

"In a word," says Dr. Wiley, "his whole character was well rounded and symmetrical as his mind was rigorously logical, and his frame robust, compact, and well knit in all things, withabil," Bishop Kingsley left in MS. form a series of lectures he delivered while professor at Meadville, in defense of the Orthodox doctrine. It is to be hoped that they will soon be brought out in book form. They certainly would prove a great addition to our literature on those subjects. Since his decease his letters of travel have been published under the title of Round the World (Cincinnati, 1870, 2 vols. 12mo), prefixed by a memoir of the bishop. (J. H. W.)

Kingsley, James Luce, LL.D., an eminent and one of the most successful American educators, born in Scotland, Conn., Aug. 28, 1778, was a lineal descendant of John Kingsley, one of the seven men who in 1686 constituted the first Church in Dorchester, Mass. He entered Williams College at the age of seventeen, and at the end of the freshman year, sure that he would graduate in Yale, where he graduated in 1799. After teaching in Windham and Wethersfield for two years Mr. Kingsley was appointed tutor in Yale College in 1801, and in 1805 was promoted to the professorship of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin languages and of ecclesiastical history, a position which he retained till his death in 1852. His studies
were chiefly in language and history, but he was well versed in mathematics, theology, metaphysics, political science, and general literature. The study of the classics had disciplined his judgment and refined his taste, so that his writings were clear, finished, and forcible to the highest degree. As a writer of English, Dr. Dwight calles him an Addison; in Latin, Prof. Thacher says that "Cicerio was his model, and he was certainly a successful imitator of his style—surprisingly successful, when we consider how he was dependent on himself for instruction." Prof. Kingsley was at the same time remarkably modest and retiring, the usual accompaniments of great talent. He very rarely made a public address, although so eminently qualified for the task; and the editions of classical authors which he published as text-books, together with the numerous articles which he contributed to quarterly and monthly periodicals, were commonly anonymous. His Latin compositions were numerous, but rarely published. The congratulatory address which he gave at the inauguration of President Day in 1817, and a similar address at the inauguration of President Woolsey in 1864, have not even been found among his papers. The memorial of one of his least of the six or eight monumental tributes, viz. president Dwight, 1817; colonel David Humphreys, 1818; professor Alexander M. Fisher, 1822; professor M. R. Dutton, 1825; tutor Amos Pettigill, 1825; and Osgood Johnson, 1837. The most elaborate of all was the one delivered on the two hundredth anniversary of the settlement of New Haven in 1838. It remains a model of thorough investigation and judicious combination. The letters of Prof. Kingsley have been very much admired. With president Sparks, Edward Everett, Dr. Drollery, Mr. Savage, and other literary gentlemen, he was in constant correspondence, but more particularly with Dr. J. E. Worcester. In the American Quarterly Register for April, 1835, and August, 1836, will be found his sketch of the History of Yale College, which was also printed as a separate pamphlet (46 pages 8vo). This is regarded as a chief authority in relation to the early history of this celebrated college. The productions of Prof. Kingsley found a large place in the leading American periodicals; he ranked especially prominent among the contributors to the New Englander, the Christian Spectator, the Biblical Repository, and the North American Review. For a complete list of his works, see Allibone, Dict. Eng. and Am. Auth. vol. ii. a. v. See also Thacher (Thomas A.), Commemorative Discourse on Prof. Kingsley (Oct., 1852).

Kingsley, Phineas, a Presbyterian minister, born in Rutland, Vt., March 12, 1788, educated in the classics by his uncle, a graduate of Harvard College, was licensed to preach about 1815, and ordained at Highgate, Vt., Oct. 12, 1819, where he remained two years. He was next settled for seven years at Underhill, Vt., and for five years following at Sheldon, Vt. In 1847 he removed to Brooklyn, Ohio, and continued preaching to the day of his death, July 6, 1862. "He was highly esteemed by his minister brethren, not for showy talents, but for substantial worth and fidelity."—Wilson, Prep. Hist. Almanac, 1887.

Kingsmill, Andrew, an English divine, born at Sidmouth, in Hampshire, in 1588, was educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and removed thence to a fellowship of All Souls in 1588. In the year 1603 there were only three preachers in the university, of whom Kingsmill was one; but after some time, when conformity was pressed, he withdrew from the kingdom and went to Geneva, but at the end of three years moved to Lausanne, where he died in the year 1570, in the prime of life, "leaving behind him," says Neale (Hist. of the Puritans, i. 116 sq.), "an excellent pattern of industry, devotion, and all manner of virtue." He was an admired preacher, and a scholar of superior attainments. His memory was most remarkable, for it is said that he could readily rehearse, in the Greek language, all St. Paul's epistles to the Romans and Galatians, and other portions of holy Scripture, memorized. His works are: 1. View of Man's Estate (1574-80); 2. Godly Advice touching Marriage (1580, 8vo); 3. Treatise for such as are troubled in Mind or Afflicted in Body; 4. godly Exhortation to bear patiently all Afflictions for the Gospel; 5. Confession of a Converted Christian and an afflicted Convert. (E. de P.)

Kinkaid, Samuel Porterfield, a Presbyterian minister, was born May 24, 1827, in Donegal, Butler County, Pa.; was educated at Washington College, Pa., where he graduated with honor in 1857; studied theology at the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany, Pa.; was licensed in the spring of 1859, and during his senior year he preached at the Academy and Rockland, Pa. There his labors were so abundantly successful that immediately upon his graduation he was ordained and installed over the united churches of Academia, Rockland, and Richland. In addition to his pastoral duties, he taught the academy at Friends Meeting House, Alleghany County, Pa. He died March 24, 1866. Kinkaid was marked for his great earnestness and diligence, as well as for his ardent piety and ability to present truth with directness and searching power.—Wilson, Prep. Hist. Almanac, 1867.

Kinkead, James, a Presbyterian minister, was born in St. Louis, Mo., July 6, 1807, and was licensed to preach in 1833, and ordained in 1840. His ministerial life was passed entirely in St. Francois and Washington counties, Mo. During the civil war he took every opportunity to favor the Union cause, and thus became obnoxious to the rebels, by whom he was taken from his bed and cruelly murdered on the night of Sept. 26, 1863. Destitute of thorough educational training, he yet excelled in quickness of perception, power of reasoning, and good judgment. Not sectarian in views of doctrine and Church government, he was always tenaciously firm in the sost of truth, and watchful against sophistry.—Prep. Hist. Almanac, 1865. (H. C. W.)

Kinnerdale, Ernszer, a Baptist minister, and an eminent scientist, was born in Gloucester, England, in 1711. In 1748 he was brought to America. His early life was spent in Lower Dublin, near Philadelphia, where he pursued his studies under the supervision of his father. He was ordained for the ministry in 1748. In 1748 his attention was directed to scientific pursuits and discoveries. Afterwards he became associated with Dr. Franklin in some of his most splendid discoveries, and delivered scientific lectures in Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and Newport. In 1758 he was chosen chief master of an English school in connection with the academy at Philadelphia, and in 1766 he was unanimously elected professor of the English language and of oratory in the college. Successful in this department, he was honored, in 1757, by the trustees with the degree of master of arts, and in 1768 was chosen a member of the American Philosophical Society, which was then composed of the most learned and scientific men in the city. In 1772 he resigned the professorship, and visited the island of Barbadoes on account of his failing health. He afterwards returned to America, and died July 4, 1778. Mr. Kinnerdale was of dignified personal appearance, and eminent as a teacher of public speaking. He acquired his chief renown not in the ministry, but in his scientific pursuits and experiments.—See Sprague, Memoirs Amer. Pulpit, vi. 45. (J. L. S.)

Kinnin. See LICK; TALMUD.

Kinsman. Of the four Hebrew words thus translated in the A. V., three, נְקָם (Num. xxxv. 11; "kinsman," Lev. xxviii, 12,13) elsewhere "kin," etc.; and so קָנָם, "kinswomen," Lev. xviii. 17, קָנָא (literally acquiescence, Ruth ii. 1), and קָנָא (Ps. xxxvii. 12 [11]; Job xix. 14, A. V. "kinsfolk," literally near, as often, indicate simple relationship. The remaining one, מָאָר, along
with that, implies certain obligations arising out of that relationship. The term קין, kin', is derived by the lexicographers from the verb קינ, to redeem. That the two are closely connected is certain, but whether the meaning of the verb is derived from that of the noun, or the converse, may be made matter of question. The comparison of the cognate dialects leads to the conclusion that the primary idea lying at the basis of both is that of coming to the help or rescue of one, hence giving protection, redeeming, redeeming. In this case the קין of the O.T. would, in fundamental concept, answer pretty nearly to the παράκλησις or παραδόντα of the N.T. The goel among the Hebrews was the nearest male blood relation alive. To him, as such, three rights specially belonged, and on him corresponding duties devolved toward his next kinsman. See KINSHIP.

1. When an Israelite through poverty sold his inheritance and was unable to redeem it, it devolved upon one of his kin to purchase it (Lev. xxv, 25-28; Ruth iii, iv). So also, when an Israelite had through poverty sold himself into slavery, it devolved upon the next of kin, as his goel, to ransom him in the jubilee year (Lev. xxv, 47 sq.). See JUBILEE. Year of. In allusion to this, God is frequently represented as the goel of his people, both as he redeems them from temporal bondage (Exod. vi, 6; Isa. lxxxiii, 1; xxxviii, 20; Jer. i, 54, etc.) and from the slavery of sin and evil (Isa. xxi, 14; xlv, 22; xxix, 7; Ps. xci, 4; Job xxxix, 25, etc.). In many of these passages there is an obvious Messianic reference, to show the fact that our redemption from sin has been effected by one who has become near of kin to us by assuming our nature gives special force (comp. Heb. ii, 14). See REDEEMER.

2. When an Israelite who had wronged any one sought to make restitution, but found that the party he had wronged was dead without leaving a son, it fell to the next of kin of the injured party, as his goel, to represent him and receive the reparation (Num. v, 6 sq.). The law provided that, in case of his having no one sufficiently near of kin to act for him in this way, the property restored should go to the priest, as representing Jehovah, the King of Israel—a provision which the Jews say indicates that the law has reference to strangers, as "no Israelite could be without a redeemer, for if any one of his tribe was left he would be his heir." (Maimon. in Baba Kamma, ix, 11). See GOEL.

3. The most striking office of the goel was that of acting as the avenger of blood in case of the murder of his next of kin; hence the phrase בָּלָא בָּלָא, the blood-redeemer. In the heart of man there seems to be a deep-rooted feeling that the human family is united by violence the offence can be expiated only by the life of the murderer; hence, in all nations where the rights of individuals are not administered by a general executive acting under the guidance of law, the rule obtains that where murder has been committed the right and duty of retaliation devolves on the kindred of the murdered person. Among the Semitic tribes this took the form of a personal obligation resting on the nearest of kin—a custom which still prevails among the Arabs (Niebuhr, Des. d'Arabie, ch. 7). This deep-rooted feeling and established usage the Moses legislation sought to place under such regulations as would tend to prevent the excesses and disorders to which personal retaliation is apt to lead, without attempting to preclude the innocence of it. (Mohammed also sought to bring the practice under restraint without forbidding it; see Koran, it 4:199.) Certain cities of refuge were provided, to which the manambi might endeavor to escape. If the goel overtook him before he reached any of these cities, he might put him to death; but if the fugitive succeeded in gaining the asylum, he was safe until at least one investigation had been instituted as to the circumstances of the murder. If on inquiry it was found that the party had been guilty of deliberate murder, the law delivered him up to the goel, to be put to death by him in any way he pleased; but if the murder was accidental, the manambi was entitled to the property of the asylum he had reached. See CITY or REFUGE. He was safe, however, only within its precincts, for if the goel found him beyond these he was at liberty to kill him. Among some of the Oriental nations the right of blood-revenge might be sustained by the payment of a sum of money; in this practice, while it gave effective to the rich an undue advantage over the poor in matters of this sort, the law of Moses absolutely prohibits (Num. xxxv, 8). See BLOOD-REVENGE.

From the narrative in Ruth iii and iv it has been concluded that by the duty of the goel was that of marrying the widow of a deceased kinsman, so as to raise up seed to the deceased, thus identifying the office of the goel with that of the levir, as provided for in Deut. xxv, 5-10. See MARRIAGE. But the levirate law expressly imposes the obligation to a brother, and, according to the Jewish commentators, to a full brother by the father's side (Maimonides, quoted by Otho, Lex. Robin., p. 572), and in this relation neither Boaz nor the other kinsman stood to Elimelech or his sons. It is further evident that the question was one of right rather than one of duty, for a kinsman who was about to inherit incurred no disgrace thereby, such as one who declined to fulfil the levirate law incurred. The nearest kinsman had the right to redeem the land, and the redemption of the land probably involved the marrying of the widow of the deceased owner, according to usage and custom; but the law does not authorize this, nor did the goel who declined to avail himself of his right come under any penalty or ban. The case of the goel and that of the levir would thus be the converse of each other: the goel had a right to purchase the land, but in so doing came under an obligation from custom to marry the widow of the deceased owner; the levir was bound to marry the widow of his deceased brother, which involved, as a matter of course, the redemption of his property if he had sold it (see Selden, De Successo, in bon. defunct. c. 10; Benary, De Hebraeum Lecturis, p. 19 sq.; Bertheau, Exeg. Bibl. sum. A. T. pt. vi, p. 249; Michaels, On the Laws of Moses, ii, 129 sq.). See LEVIRATE LAW.

**Kipling, Charles, an English divine, born in Yorkshire about the middle of the 18th century, was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated as B.A. in 1766, and became D.D. in 1784. His first prominent position was that of deputy regius professor of divinity under Bishop Waterland, and in 1768 he was promoted to the deanship of Peterborough. In 1792 Kipling preached the Boyle Lectures, which were not published. In 1788 he brought out at the university press a very handsome edition of the famous "Codex Benez" of the N.T., with fac-simile type (Codex Benez, Quadratibus litteris, Graeco-Latinis, 2 vols. folio), which was immediately assailed with a virulence amounting to personal hostility by the party which had espoused the cause of the once notorious Freund, who was banished the university for Unitarianism, and in whose cause Kipling had come forward as promoter, or public prosecutor. Dr. Edwards, the leader of the party, charged him with ignorance and want of fidelity. But, though his proteges did not manifest much accurate scholarship, and he commits the serious error of printing the corrections instead of the original reading of the text, which he relegated to the notes at the end, Tregelles (Intro to Text. Crit. of N. Test.) allows that he "appears to have used scrupulous exactitude in performing his task efficiently according to the plan which he had proposed to himself. Kipling also published The Articles of the Church of England which I support the Credal Articles (1802, 8vo.), written in answer to Orton's True Churchman accursed. He died in 1822. See Kitto, Cyclop. Bib. Lit. a. v.; Allibone, Dict. Eng. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, a. v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Bibl. Gen. xxvi, 766.**
Kippis, Andrew, D.D., F.R.S., F.A.S., an eminent English Unitarian divine, was born at Nottingham in 1725. He studied under Dr. Doddridge at Northampton, and in 1746 became minister of a congregation at Boston, Lincolnshire. In 1750 he removed to Dor- kirk, and in 1765 he became one of the leading Unitarian preachers in London, and a prominent member in the academy for the education of dissenting ministers in London, on a plan similar to that on which the academy at Northampton had been conducted. He was also one of the principal contributors to the Monthly Review and the Gentleman's Magazine as a reviewer, and became one of the leading periodicals of England. There are several pamphlets of his on the claims of the dissenters, and on other topics of temporary interest; but the work with which his name is most honorably connected is the republication of the Bispographia Britannica, with a large addition of new lives, and a more extended account of many persons whose lives are in the former edition of that work.

The design was too vast to be accomplished by any one person, however well assisted. Five large folio volumes were printed of the work (1778), and yet it had proceeded no further. A sixth volume, in which it was understood, was printed, but it has not been given to the world. Many of the new lives were written by Dr. Kippis himself, and particularly that of captain Cook, which was printed in a separate form also. Dr. Kippis's was a literary life of great industry. He was the editor of the collected edition of the works of Dr. Nathaniel Lardner (q.v.), with a life of that eminent theological scholar. He published also the ethical and theological lectures of his tutor, Dr. Doddridge, with a large collection of references to authors on the various topics to which they relate. His other works of interest are, Sermons on Luke i, 25 (London, 1780, 8vo); — Sermons on Psalm exix, 5 (London, 1788, 8vo); — A Vindication of Protestant Dissenting Ministers (1778). See Rees, Funeral Sermon; — Gent. Mag. vols. lxv. lxvi. lxxi. — Darling, Encyclopaedia Britannica, s. v.; English Cyclopedia, s. v.

Kippis. See BITTEN.

Kip. [Heb. id., הֵע, a wall or fortress, as often; Sept. always as an appellative, γέρος, πόλις, βσρος, etc., but v. חֵדָּה, קֶרֶם, etc.], a people and country subject to the Assyrian empire, mentioned in connection with Elam (Isa. xxii. 6), to which the conquered Damascus were transplanted (2 Kings xix. 9; Amos i. 6), and whence the Arameans in the east of Syria, who are at some time or other migrated (Amos iv. 7). This is supposed by major Rennel to be the same country which still bears the name of Kurdistan or Koordistan (Geogr. of Herodot, p. 891). There are, however, objections to this view which do not apply so strongly to the notion of Rosenmüller and others, that it was a tract on the river Cyra (Pliny, Hist. Nat. vi. 10; Ptolemy, v. 12) (Κερος and Κίππος, in Zend Koros), which rises in the mountains between the Euxine and Caspian Seas, and runs into the latter after being joined by the Araxes (Buch- ing, Mag. x. 430; compare Michaelis, Specul. ii. 121; Suppl. 2191; Gesenius, Theaurus, p. 1210); still called Kur (Bononi, Nieverg., p. 47, 71). Gurjistan, or Grusia (Gruziana), commonly called Georgia, seems also to have derived its name from this river Kur, which flows through their country. Some companies, Durna or Curina, or Ptolomey (Kipisos or Kipisis in Ptol. vii. 1, 10; Chaldee, יפי), a city in the south of Media, on the river Marus (Bochart, Phalag, iv. 92; Vitringa the Carina, also in Media (Kapivos, Ptol., vi. 2, 15), now called Krend (Ritter, Erdk. ix. 891). Some region in Media is perhaps most suitable from the fact that Armenia, whose northern boundaries are washed by the river Cyra, was probably not a part of Assyria at the time referred to (see Knob. Prophe, ii. 106), Keil (Comment. on Kings, ad loc.) thinks the Medes must be meant, erroneously imagining that the inhabitants of Kip are spoken of in Isaiah as their brethren. See also (Yez. viii. 4, 2 Kings and Amos), and Symmachus (at Amos ix), render Cyrus.

For Kur of Mofib (Is. xvi. 1), see Kir-MAAR.

Kiratarjunyia, one of the most celebrated poets of Sanscrit literature, the production of Bhavari, depicts the life of the god Siva in his disguise of a kirta, or mountaineer.

Kirchentag. See CHURCH DIET.

Kircher, Athanasius, an eminent German Jesuit, and quite prominent as a philosopher, was born near Fulda, Germany, in 1601. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1618, and taught mathematics and metaphysics in the college at Wurzburg. During the invasions of the Swedes he fled before the Protestant powers, and, after a short stay in France, went to Rome, and became a professor at the Propaganda. He died in 1680. His writings, which extend over the different departments of the natural sciences, philosophy, philology, history, and archaeology, evince great talent, but are often fanciful in their theories. His principal works of interest are to us, are, Sapiens, Cujus, etc. (Rome, 1602, etc., 4 vols. fol.;) Mundus subterraneus, in 4 vol libros digestus, etc. (Amsterdam, 1665, fol.;) Arca Not, in tres libros digesta, etc. (Amst. 1675, fol.;) Liber philosophico de sive artificiose, sive marion. etc. (in Ugolino's Theaurus, xxxii. 838); — Liber decreticvs de Monstris, antimo- modernis (Ugolino, xxxii. 417; Ch. monumcnta, qua sacris, qua profanis, illustrata (Amst. 1667, fol.;) — Turris Bibel, sive Archetologico, etc. (Amst. 1675, fol.;) etc. See his autobiography and Letters (Aug. 1684; Wetter et Weite, Kirchentag. vol. vi, a. v.; Darling, Encyclopedia, s. v. (J. H. W.).

Kircher, Konrad, a learned German philologist of Augsburg, of the 16th century, was a Lutheran pastor first at Donauwuer and later at Jaxdorf, and died about 1622. He wrote Concilium veteris et Novi Testamenti Graecae et Romanae subscripsit (Francoforte 1607, 2 vols. 4to; greatly enlarged by Abraham Tronmius, 1619); De usu conciliorum Graecorum in Theologia, See Simon, Hist. Crit. du Vieux Testament, i. 5, ch. ii. Altp. Hist. Lexicon, iii, 33.

Kirchhofer, Melchior, a celebrated Swiss ecclesiastical writer, was born Jan. 3, 1775, at Schaffhausen, and was educated at Marburg. In 1797 he returned to Switzerland, and was ordained for the holy ministry. His first great opposition he secured in 1808 at Stein, and this he filled up to his death, Feb. 13, 1858. He is quite celebrated for his able efforts in the department of Church History, which procured for him in 1840 the doctorate of theology from the University of Marburg. Among the especially valuable writings of Kirchhofer are his monographs on Hofmeister (1810), Oswald Myconius (1813), Werner Steiner (1818), Berthold Halter (1828), Wilhelm Farel (1831), and his continuation of Hottingers Ecclesiastical History of Switzerland.—Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, vii, 708.

Kirchmayr, Thomas, a German theologian, was born at Straubing, Bavaria, in the early part of the 16th century; became pastor first at Stadtinzig, in Thuringia, and later (in 1541) at Kahla. He died at Wiesbach in 1563. Kirchmayr is noted as the author of a commentary on 1 John, in which he advocates the pre-dominance of the saving in a somewhat peculiar manner. He teaches that the chosen ones never lose the influence of the holy Spirit, however great their transgression. He was criticised and obliged to quit the pulpit.—Pfeifer, Universal Lexicon, ix, 584.

Kirchmeier, Johann Christoph, a noted German theologian, was born at Orphenode, Hesse, Sept. 4,
Kirchheimer, Johann Bisegmard, a German theologian of note, was born at Allendorf Jan. 4, 1764, and was educated at Marburg and Leyden. In 1798 he became pastor at Schwedden. In 1784 he accepted the professorship of logic and metaphysics at Marburg University, and at the same time became pastor of a Reformed church at Marburg. He died April 30, 1794. His writings, mainly dissertations, are enumerated by Dölger, Größte Theologen Deutschlands d. 18th u. 19th Jhdt. ii, 99 sq.

Kirghis, or Kirghis-Kaisaki (Cosmonauts of the Steppe), is the name of a people spread over the immense territory bounded by the Volga, desert of Obecktsch in 55° N. lat., the Iriltz, Chinese Turkestan, Altaic Uplands, the Gobi Desert, the Zara Sea—a vast tract of land, not unfrequently described as the "Eastern Steppe," and containing 850,000 English square miles; sterile, stony, and streamless, and covered with rank herbage five feet high. The Kirghis are of Turkish origin, and speak the Uzbek idiom of their race. They are of a people from time immemorial been divided into three branches, called the Great, Middle, and Little Horde. The first of these wanderers in the south-west portion of the Eastern Steppe; the Middle Horde roams over the territory between the Ishim, Iriltz, Lake Balkhash, and the territory of the Little Horde. The Little Horde (now more numerous than the other two tribes) ranges over the country bounded by the Ural, Tobol, Siberian Kirghis, and Turkesthan. (A small offshoot of them has, since 1801, wandered between the Volga and the Urals river, and is under rule of the governor of Astrakhan.) South of Lake Issakul is a wild mountain tribe called the Duko-Kasazonja, the only tribe which calls itself Kirghis. They are called by their neighbors Kara or Black Kirghis, and are of Mandshur stock. Their collective numbers are estimated at upwards of 11 millions of souls, more than half of whom belong to the Little Horde. The Kirghis have an economic system above mentioned, nomadic, and organized by chieftains or shamans. They are restless and predatory, and have well earned for themselves the title of the "Slave-hunters of the Steppes," by seizing upon caravans, appropriating the goods, and selling their captives at the great slave-markets of Khiva, Bokhara, etc. Their wealth consists of cattle, sheep, horses, and camels. They are of the Moslem faith, in somewhat a corrupt form, and, like the followers of Mohammed, are the sworn enemies of the Mongols. "Fired by hereditary hate," says Dixon (Russ. A. p. 339 sq.). "These Kirghis banditti took upon every man of Mongolian birth and Buddhistic faith as lawful spoil. They follow him to his pastures, plunder his tent, drive off his herds, and sell him as a slave. But when this lawful prey escapes their hands they raid and rob on more friendly soil, and manage toINGTON 105
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KIRKHARETH (2 Kings iii, 25), Kir-har'seth (Isa. xvi, 7), Kir-her'eth (Isa. xxvi, 11), Kir-ha'res (Jer. xlvi, 31, 86). See Kir-MAOL.

Kiriathiaim (Jer. xvili, 23; Ezek. xxxv, 9). See KIRJATHAIM.

Kiriathiaim (Heb. Kirya'tha'im, two cutes, i.e. double-town; Sept. Kapuadai, but Kapuadai in Numb.; f gath in Gen. v. r. Kapuadai or Kapa'ath in Jer. and Ezek.; walled with strongholds) [apparently mistaking the directive termination כותא for כותא in Ezek.; Auth. Vers. "Kiriathaim" in Jer. and Ezek.], the name of two places.

1. One of the most ancient towns in the country west of the Jordan (see Ewald, Gesch. Isr. i, 808), as it was possessed by the gigantes Ennim (Gen. xiv, 6), who were expelled by the Amorites (Deut. x, 2); and these, in their turn, were dispossessed by the Amorites, from whom it was taken by the Israelites. Kiriathiaim was then assigned to Reuben (Numb. xxxii, 37; Josh. xiii, 19); but during the Assyrian exile the Mosrites and one of the other cities (compare Jer. xlvi, 1, 23; Ezek. xxxv, 9). Barkhardt (Tyrrell, p. 267) found ruins, called El-Teim, which he conjectures to have been Kiriaithaim, the last syllable of the name being retained. This is somewhat doubtful, as the Christian village Kariaitha or Koreitha (Kapa'da, Kapadia) of Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. a. v.) is placed ten miles west of Medeba, whereas El-Teim is but two miles (Seetzen places it at half an hour, Reise, i, 408). Michaelis (Orient, u. exeg. Bibl. iii, 120; Suppl. 2208 sq.) compares the modern city Kirjahaim, one day's journey from Palmu (Wood, Reisen in Palmyra, p. 54); and Bisching (Erdb. xi, 568) adduces Kariaitha (in Flitn., v, 29, Carviate), a place in the desert of Arabia; but both these identifications are inadmissible (Hamesveld, iii, 169). Ritter (Erde, xi, 1815, 1186) supposes that the Onomasticon confounds two places of the same name, one being the ancient city corresponding to El-Teim, north of the wady Zarka, and the other the Christian town, represented by the modern Kereqat, south of the same wady; but we see no occasion for this, as the latter place, the name of which fully agrees, lies at the required distance (eleven miles, Seetzen, Reise, ii, 442) south-west of Al-Taiba (Porter, Heb., p. 800), upon the southern slope of Jebel Atturas (perhaps referred to by Eusebius in the expression annexed to his description, ει ρη νασ ουρον, on the Baris, using the term in the sense of a fortress on a hill-top rather than alluding to a position beyond the valley Zarka-Main, which Ritter, p. 678, fancifully conceives to be thus indicated from the abundance of mandrakes, βασαρας). See KIRJITHIOTH.

2. A city of refuge in the tribe of Naphtali (1 Chron. vi, 76); elsewhere (Josh. xxii, 32) called KARTAN (q. v.).

KIRJATH-ARBA (Hebrew Kirjath-Arba, γιρυμ Aρβα, city of Arba; Sept. πόλις Αρβακ, Gen. xxiii, 2; Judg. xiv, 15; xv, 13, 54; xxx, 7; Kepa'Sabro, Josh. xxii, 11; Judg. i, 10; πόλις του χρόνου, Gen. xxxv, 27; once with the art. τον χρόνον, "Kirjath-'Arba", Septuag. Kapodnepsev v. r. Kapodnepsev, Neb. xiv, 9; Auth. Vers. "city of Arba," in Gen. xxxv, 27; Josh. xv, 13; xxii, 11), the original name of Hebron, in the mountains of Judah, so called from its founder, one of the Anakim, and inhabited under the same name after the exile. Hengstenberg, however, thinks that Hebron was the earlier name of Kirjath-Arba, only altered by the Canaanites (Beit. iii, 187). Sir John Mandeville (cir. 1322) found it still "called by the Saracens Kari'carba" and by the Jews "Arb'atba" (Early Travels, p. 161).
It is a Jewish gloss (first mentioned by Jerome) which interprets the latter part of the name (אֶזְרַיִם, Ezra, Heb. "four") as referring to the four great men buried there (the saints Adam, Isaac, Jacob, and Jacob; so the Talmud, see Kel., ad loc.; or the giants Anak, Ahiman, Shobai, and Tolmai, according to Bochart, Com., 1:1). 

**Khirjath-arim** (Ezra ii, 20). See KIRJATH-JEARIM.

*Khirjath-ba'âl* (Heb. חֵרְצָת-בָּעָל, city of Baal; Sept. Καραθαδιλ, another name (Josh. xv, 60; xviii, 14) for KIRJATH-JEARIM (q. v.). See also Balaah.

*Khirjath-hu'soth* (Heb. חֵרְצָת-חָצוֹת, city of streets; Sept. πόλεις ἰδανωδού), a city of Moab to which Balaam took on his arrival to offer a preparatory sacrifice (Num. xxiii, 39). The Vulgate understands an extreme city of the territory of Moab, as that on the border of Arnon, where the king met his prophetic guest (verse 80); but the two appear to have different cities. The city in question was probably the capital of the Moabish king, usually called Kir-Moah, and here distinguished from other places of a similar name (Khirjath meaning simply "city") by an epithet, "the city of the king's power," as, in the presence of the court and "high places of Baal," as well as the conspicuous situation of the city (verse 41), corresponding to that of Kerak. Porter, however (Murray's Hand-Book for Pil. p. 299 sq.), inclines to identify the place with the Kirjath on Jebel Attarus, and so with Kirjathaim (q. v.).

**Khirjath-je'irim** (Heb. חֵרְצָת-יֵהֵרִים, city of forests; Sept. Καραθαπαπιφ, Josh. xviii, 14; Judg. xviii, 12; 1 Chron. ii, 50, 52; 2 Chron. i, 4; Neh. vii, 29; Jer. xxvi, 20; Kophera'ipim, 1 Sam. vi, 21; vii, 1, 2; v. r. Chron. i, 50; 2 Chron. ii, 4; Neh. vii, 29; Jer. xxvi, 20; Πόλις Ιακωβ, Josh. xv, 3, 60; 1 Chron. xxvi, 20; Kophera'apim, v. r. τῶν ἱλατρῶν, 1 Chron. ii, 53; Kophera'apim, Josh. xiii, 15; omitted in 1 Chron. xiii, 6; or, rather, paraphrases the words "Balaah, which is Kirjath-je'irim," by Πόλις Δαωίδ; Josephus οἱ τῶν Καραθαπαπιφ μετωπιτῶν, Ant. vi, 2, 1; with the art. Πόλις τῆς Καραθαπαπιφ, Jer. xxxvi, 20), in the contracted form KIRJATH-AHIM (Heb. חֵרְצָת-אֲהִימִ', city of forests, Ezra ii, 20; Sept. Καραθαπαπιφ, v. r. Καραθαπιαπιφ, and simply Kirjath (Heb. חֵרְצָת, Josh. xvii, 99, 19; Kophera'apim, ix, 16; Kophera'apim, v. r. πόλεις ἱλατρῶν, Josh. xiv, 3, 60; 1 Chron. xvi, 50, 51); one of the towns of the Gibeonites (Josh. ix, 17). It belonged to the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv, 60; Judg. xviii, 12), and lay on the border of Benjamin (Josh. xviii, 15; 1 Chron. ii, 50), to which it was finally assigned (Josh. xviii, 28). It was to this place the ark was brought from Beth-shemesh, after it had been brought from the land of the Philistines, and where it remained till removed to Jerusalem by David (1 Sam. vii; 1 Chron. xiii). This was one of the ancient sites which were again inhabited after the exile (Ezra ii, 25; Neh. vii, 29). It was also called Kirjath-baal (Josh. xv, 60; xviii, 14), and Balaah (Josh. xv, 9). It appears to have lain not far from Beeroth (Ezra ii, 25). "it is included in the genealogies of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 50, 52) as founded by or descended from Shobai, the son of Caleb ben-Hur, and as having in its turn sent out the colonies of the Ithrites, Puthites, Shimeathites, and Minimates, and those of Zerah and Eshtol. "Behind Kirjath-je'irim" the band of Danites pitched their camp before their expedition to Mount Ephraim and Laish, leaving their name attached to the spot for long after (Judg. xviii, 12). See MAHANAIM-DOAN.

Hitherto, beyond the early sanctity implied in the bearing the name of Baal, there is nothing of especial interest or remarkable in Kirjath-je'irim. It was no doubt this reputation for sanctity which made the people of Beth-shemesh appeal to its inhabitants to relieve them of the ark of Jehovah, which was bringing such calamities on their untutored inexperience. From their place in the valley they looked anxiously for some eminence, which, according to the belief of those days, should be the appropriate seat for so powerful a Deity [see Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 539] (1 Sam. vi, 20, 21). In this high place called Kirjath-je'irim the ark was concealed by David to the house of Obed-edom the sceptre (1 Chron. xiii, 5, 6; 2 Chron. i, 4; 2 Sam. vi, 2, etc.). It is very remarkable and suggestive that in the account of this transaction the ancient and heathen name Baal is retained. In fact, in 2 Sam. vi, 2—probably the original statement—the name Baal is used without any explanation, and to the exclusion of that of Kirjath-je'irim. In the allusion to this transaction in Psa. xcxxxii, 6, the name is obliquely indicated as the 'wood'—yqar, the root of Kirjath-je'irim. We also hear of a prophet Urijah ben-Sheemaiah, a native of the place, who enforced the warnings of Jeremiah, and was cruelly murdered by Jehoiakim (Jer. xxvi, 20, etc.), but of the place we know nothing beyond what has already been said. A tradition is mentioned by Archichomus (Descr. T. S. Dan. § 17), though without stating his authority, that it was the home of Sacheriah, son of Zechah, who said "he who was slain was between the altar and the Temple" (Smith). Josephus says it was near Beth-schemesh (Ant. vi, 1, 4). Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v. Baal, Baal-cara-thiam) speak of it as being in their day a village nine or ten miles from Diospolis (Lydda), on the road to Jerusalem; consequently north-west (Hamerowd, iii, 256). With this description, and the former of these two distances, agrees Procopius (see ReLand, Palest. p. 565). On account of its presumed proximity to Beth-shemesh, Williams (Holy City) endeavors to identify Kirjath-je'irim with Bethshean, though sufficiently near the latter place, does not answer to the other conditions. Dr. Robinson thinks it possible that the ancient Kirjath-je'irim may be recognised in the present Kurjat el-Ebn. The first part of the name (Kirjath, Kureyt, signifying city) is the same in both, and is most probably ancient, being found in Arabic proper names only in Syria and Palestine, and not very frequently even there. The only change has been that the ancient "city of forests" has, in modern times, become the "city of grapes. The site is also about nine and a half Roman miles from the road to Jerusalem, and not very remote from Gibeon, from which Kirjath-je'irim could not well have been distant. So close a correspondence of name and position seems to warrant the conclusion in favor of Kurjat el-Ebn (see Ritter's Erdkunde, xvi, 108-110). This place is that which ecclesiastical tradition has identified with Je Anathoth of Jeremiah (1, 1; comp. Jerome, ad loc.; also Onomasticon, s. v.; Josephus, Ant. x, 7, 3), which, however, is at Ana. Kurjet el-Ebn is now a poor village, its principal buildings being an old convent of the Mini-aters, and a little ruined mosque. The site is about seven miles from the sea of Ab, who for the last half century have been the terror of travellers, but have lately been overtaken with punishment by the Turkish government. Dr. Robinson remarks that "a pretty direct route from Beth-shemesh would go through the plain of Lebub and through Ab- Ghurab; but no such road now exists, and probably never did, judging from the nature of the country. In all probability, the ark was brought up by way of Saria (Researches, new ed., iii, 187). Schwartz, who identifies Kirjath-je'irim with the same site, suggests that the hill
(which he calls Mount Midas) south-west of the village, and which the family of Kurty or Seach, may be the "Mount Jeirim" spoken of in Josh. xv, 10. But different from Mount Baalah of ver. 11; both places having taken the title Jeirim from the intervening tract of land, perhaps once covered with wood (Psal. p. 97). It is the testimony of a recent traveller (Tobler, Dritte Wanderung, p. 179, 180) that the mount, which really stands on the ridge, is really a natural occurrence, and probably answering to Mount Jeirim, there still are "real woods, so thick and so solitary, he had seen nothing like them since he left Germany."

Kirkpatrick, Hugh. See Kirkpatrick, James.

Kirkpatrick, Jacob, D.D., a Presbytery divine, was born near Baskingridge, N. J., August 7, 1785; pursued his classical studies under the direction of the Rev.
Robert Finley, D.D., and graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1804. After this he studied law three years, but in 1807 he decided definitely in favor of the ministry, and resumed his studies under John Woodhull, D.D., of Freehold, N.J. In August, 1808, he was licensed by the New Jersey Presbytery and was ordained and installed pastor of the United First Church of Amwell,Ringoes, N.J., June 20, 1810, where he continued to labor for fifty-six years. He was one of the founders of the Hunterdon County Bible Society (1816), and also among the earliest and most energetic promoters of the temperance reform in that section. He died at Ringoes, N.J., May 2, 1866. Dr. Kirkpatrick was a man of a large and generous heart; his preaching was full of tenderness, pathos, and earnestness; his Christian character unassuming, and adorned with meekness and pietety.—Wilson, Presb. Historical Almanac, 1867. (J. L. S.)

Kirkpatrick, James, a noted minister of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, was the son of Hugh Kirkpatrick, a minister in Larrenan, Scotland, from about 1866 to the Revolution, when he retired to Dalry, Ireland, where he preached until 1691, then removed to Old Cumnock, and in 1696 again returned to Scotland, and died at Dalton in 1719. James was educated at Glasgow, entered the ministry, and became one of the most promising Irish Presbyterians in the pulpit. In 1706 he was the preacher of the second Belfast congregation. During the opposition of the House of Parliament to the Revolution, James Kirkpatrick became one of the ablest champions of the Presbyterian cause. In 1718 he published An Historical Essay upon the Loyalty of Presbyterians in Great Britain and Ireland from the Reformation to the present Year (Belfast, 1718, 4to), to which neither he nor the printer dared to affix their names, but made the book pass in his name. He published about 1720: Reid and Killen, Hist. Presb. Ch. in Ireland, iii, 91 sq.

Kirk-Sessions is the name of a petty ecclesiastical judicature in Scotland. Each parish, according to its extent, is divided into several particular districts, every one of which has its own elder and deacons to govern it. A Consistory of the ministers, elders, and deacons of a parish form a kirk-session. These meet once a week, the minister being their moderator, but without a negative voice. It regulates matters relative to public worship, elections, catechizing, visitations, membership, etc. It judges in matters of less scandal; but at Ballymacilgery, are left to the Presbytery; and in all cases an appeal lies from it to the Presbytery. The functions of the kirk-session were in former times too often inquisitorially exercised; but this is now less frequently attempted, and the danger of it is continuously diminishing through the growth of an enlightened public spirit. A former form of the kirk-session in Scotland often imposed fines, chiefly for offences against the seventh commandment; but this practice had no recognition in civil nor even in ecclesiastical law, and is now wholly relinquished. The kirk-session of the Established Church in each parish is fully recognised in Scottish law as having certain rights and duties with respect to the poor; but recent legislation has very much deprived it of its former importance in this relation. — Buck, s. v.; Chambers, s. v.

Kirkton, James, a Scottish divine, who flourished in the second half of the 17th century, is noted as the author of The First and True History of Church of Scotland from the Restoration to 1678, etc. (edited by C. K. Sharpe, Edinb. 1817, 4to), a work which has been highly commended by Sir Walter Scott (London Quart. Revue, xvii, 502 sq.). Kirkton died in 1699. —Blackwood's Magazine, ii, 905 sq.

Kirkwood, Robert, a Presbyterian minister, born in Paisley, Scotland, May 25, 1793, was educated in Glasgow College, and studied divinity with Rev. John Dick, D.D., at Theological Hall, Glasgow. He was licensed in 1828. In response to a pressing call for ministerial workers in New York, he went thither and connected himself with the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, under the Missionary Society of which he labored until 1830, when he became pastor at Cortlandville, N.Y. He officiated there and at Auburn and Sandbach, N.Y., until 1839, and then served as a domestic missionary for seven years in Illinois. For the next eleven years he labored as agent for the Bible and Tract Societies. In 1857 he transferred his connection from the Reformed to the Presbyterian Church, and settled at Yonkers, N.Y., devoting the remainder of his life to literary labor. He died August 26, 1885. In addition to numerous contributions to the Christian Intelligencer, New York Observer, and The Presbyterian, he published Lectures on the Millennium (New York, 1855); —Universalism Explained (New York, 1856) —A Plea for the Bible (New York, 1860); a very popular work and extensively sold; —Illustrations of the Offices of Christ (New York, 1868); and practical treatise on divine influences; together with a selection of sermons. Mr. Kirkwood having enjoyed the superior advantages of instruction by the distinguished Dr. Dick, was thoroughly and systematically trained in the great evangelical doctrines. His preaching was characterized by a practical scriptural tone. His "only peculiarity of doctrine was his pre-millennial views, in which, however, as his work on this subject shows, he was moderate, cautious, and never went to the extreme of fixing the time and season, which the Father has left to his own power. —Wilson, Presb. Historical Almanac.

Kir-Moáb (Heb. Kir-Moab, כּיר-מּׁעַבָּא, fortress of Moab [see Kir]; Isa. xv, 1; Sept. τό ρίον τῆς Μωαβίδος, Vulg. murus Moab, Auth. Vera. "Kir of Moab"), usually KIR-HERES (Heb. Kir-cheres, כּיר-כּהֶרֶס, brick fortress, Jer. xlvii, 31, 86; Sept. πόλις τῆς Μωαβίδος, Vulg. murus fictilia; in pause πόλις τῆς Μωαβίδος, Isa. xvi, 11; Sept. πόλις τῆς Μωαβίδος, Vulg. murus fictilia; in pause πόλις τῆς Μωαβίδος, Jer. xlvii, 25; Sept. τό ρίον τῆς Μωαβίδος, Vulg. murus fictilia, Auth. Vera. "Kir-hereses"), or KIR-HARESITH (Heb. Kir-Chureseth, כּיר-כּוֹרֶסֶת, city, Isa. xvi, 7; Sept. τοίχος τῆς Μωαβίδος, 233, Vulg. murus fictilia; in pause πόλις τῆς Μωαβίδος, 2 Kings iii, 25; Sept. τό ρίον τῆς Μωαβίδος, Vulg. murus fictilia, Auth. Vera. "Kir-hareseth"), one of the two strongly fortified cities in the territory of Moab, the other being Ar of Moab. Jerom, king of Israel, took the city, and destroyed it, except the walls (2 Kings iii, 25); but it appears from the passages here cited that it must have been rebuilt before the time of Isaiah, and again destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar and the Babylonians. Num. (xxv, 1), the Chaldee paraphrast has put נַקַבָּא, nakava, karka ba-de-Moab, "the castle of Moab;" and the former of these words, pronounced in Arabic karka, kerak, or Krak, is the name it bears in 2 Macc. xii, 17 (Kapara, Charocho), in Sept. (Kaparaos, Characoma), in Psalm. lxx, 6, (Kapara, Characema), in Abulfeda (Tafs. spr. p. 89), and in the historians of the Crusades. Abulfeda (who places it twelve Arabic miles from Ar-Moab) describes Kerak as a small town, with a castle on a high hill, and remarks that it is so strong that one must deny himself even the wish to take it by force ( comp. 2 Kings iii, 25). In the time of the Crusades, and when in possession of the Franks, it was invaded by Saladin; but, after lying before it a month, he was compelled to raise the siege (Bohedenin, fūta Saladin, p. 55). The Crusaders had erected here a fortress still known as Kerak, which formed one of the centres of operations for the Latin Expedition of 1189. On the capture of these at length by Saladin after a long siege, in A.D. 1188, the dominion of the Franks over this territory ceased (Wilken, Kreuz i, 244-247). It was then the chief city of Arabia Secunda or Petraea, a name still used in the Belkadi, and is separated from 'Moab' or 'Rabbah, the ancient Ar-Moab, and from the Munā regula (Schultens, Index Geogr. s. v. Carra; see also the remarks of Gesenius, Jastrow, i, 517, and his notes to the German translation of Burchhardt). The Crusaders, in error, believed it to be Petra, and that
Khiroba is frequently attached to it in the writings of William of Tyre and Jacob de Vitry (see quotations in Robinson, Bib. Reb., ii, 167). This error is perpetuated in the Greek Church to the present day; and the bishop of Petra, whose office, as representative of the patriarchate, is to produce the bell for Easter in the Church of the Sepulchre at Jerusalem (Stanley, S. and P., p. 467), is in reality bishop of Kerak (Seetzen, Reisen, ii, 388; Berkhartd, p. 887) (Smith). The first person who rated the place in modern times was Seetzen, who says, "Near to Kerak are a number of large villages which extend from Rabbah, and is broken only by low and detached hills, and the country now becomes mountainous. Kerak, formerly a city and bishop's see, lies on the top of the hill near the end of a deep valley, and is surrounded on all sides with lofty mountains. The hill is very steep, and in many places the sides are quite perpendicular. The walls round the town are for the most part destroyed, and Kerak can at present boast of little more than being a small country town. The castle, which is uninhabited, and in a state of great decay, was formerly one of the strong places not often in these countries. The inhabitants of the town consist of Mohammedans and Greek Christians. The present bishop of Kerak resides at Jerusalem. From this place one enjoys, by looking down the wady Kerak, a fine view of part of the Dead Sea, and even Jerusalem may be distinctly seen. From the hill on which the town stands lies a composed of limestone and bristle marl, with many beds of blue, black, and grey flint. In the neighboring rocks there are a number of curious grotoes; in those which are under ground wheat is sometimes preserved for a period of years" (Zach's Monatliche Correspond., xviii, 454). A fuller account of the place is given by Berkhartd. (Travels in Syria, p. 379-385), by whom it was next visited; and another description is furnished by Irby and Mangles (Travels, p. 361-370). From their account it would seem that the cavers noticed by Seetzen, the most important in the southern part of the town, are the sepulchres of the ancient town. We also learn that the Christians of Kerak (which they and Berkhartd call Kerke) are nearly as numerous as the Mohammedans, and boast of being stronger and braver (see Robinson's Researches, ii, 566-571). On account of the notoriously savage character of its Mohammedan inhabitants, it is often invaded by travelers. Lieut. Lynch, of the United States expedition to the Dead Sea, penetrated this fastness of banditti, having boldly seized the sheik and detained him as a hostage for their safety. He describes the town as situate near the Dead Sea, and the houses are composed of stone huts, built without mortar. They are seven from eight feet high; the ground floors about six feet below, and the flat terrace mud-roofs mostly about two feet above the streets; but in many places there were short cuts from street to street across the roofs of the houses. The houses, or rather huts, without windows and without chimneys, were blackened inside by smoke, and the women and children were squalid and filthy. Kerak contains a population of about 593 families; these include about 1000 Christians, who are kept in subjection by the Mohammedans. Most of the houses are wild-looking savages, but the Christians have a mild and hospitable character. The males mostly wear sheep-skin coats, the women dark-colored gowns; the Christian females did not conceal their faces, which were tattooed like the South Sea islanders. The entrance to Kerak is by a steep and crooked ravine, which is completely concealed by the summit by the castle. This latter, partly cut out of and partly built upon the mountain top, presents the remains of a magnificent structure, its cistern cut off from the town by a deep ditch. It seems to be Samerotic, although in various parts it has both the pointed Gothic and the rounded Roman arch, the work doubtless of the various masters into whose hands it has fallen during its eventful history. Its walls are composed of heavy, well-cut stones, with a steep glacis-wall surrounding the whole. It is of immense extent, having five gates, seven wells and cisterns, with subterranean passages, and seven arched store-houses, one above another, for purposes of defence (see Lynch's Narratives, p. 365-369). Mr. De Saulky also entered this "den of robbers," as he termed it, he added some particulars to the above description (Narratives, i, 392-393, 390). His account illustrates the character of the inhabitants, who have for many years been the terror of the vicinity (Porter, Handbook, p. 60; Schwarz, Palest- time, p. 216). See also Ritchie, i, 216, 317. A map of the site and a view of part of the keep will be found in the Atlas to De Saulky (La Mer Morte, etc., feuilles 8, 20). See Moab.

Kiriwan. See Murray, Nicholas.

Kiran. Walter Blake, an eminent Irish divine, and one of the most celebrated and popular preachers of the last half of the 18th century, was born at Galway about 1730. He was educated at the college of the English Jesuits at St. Omer; was ordained priest, and was for a time professor of natural and moral philosophy at Louvain. Having embraced Protestantism in 1787, he became successively minister of St. Peter's Church, Dublin; prebendary of Howth, minister of St. Nicholas Without in 1790, and dean of Killala in 1800. He died in 1805. Few preachers of any age have enjoyed such popularity as Walter Blake Kirwan. So great was the throng to listen to his sermons that it was found necessary to defend the entrance of the church where he was to preach with great palisades. He was of a man of feelings, amiable and benevolent, and his irresistable powers of persuasion were chiefly devoted to the preaching of charity sermons. It is said that the collections taken up after his sermons seldom fell short of £1000. These addresses have been published under the title of Sermons, with a sketch of his life (London, 1814, 8vo). See Darlington, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, ii, 1735; Allibone, Dict. of English and Amer. Authors, ii, 1038; Lond. Quart. Rev. xi, 180; Lord Brougham, Contrib. to the Edinb. Rev. (Lond. and Glasgow, 1865), i, 104 sq. (J. H. W.)

Kish (Heb. id., עִשָׂ, a trop, otherwise a horn; Sept. Kηκ, or Kηγ, or Κηγ, Auth. Ver. "Cis," Acts xxiii, 21), the name of five men.

1. The second of the two sons of Mahli (grandson of Levi); his sons married his cousins, heiresses of his brother Eleazar (1 Chron. xxiii, 21, 22). One of these sons was named Jerahmeel (1 Chron. xxiv, 29). B.C. cir. 1658.

2. A Benjamite of Jerusalem (i.e. the northern neighborhood of Jebus), third named of the sons of Jehiel (of Gibon) by Maaschah (1 Chron. viii, 30; ix, 66). B.C. apparently cir. 1618.

3. A wealthy and powerful Benjamite, son of Ner (1 Chron. viii, 33; ix, 66), and father of Zakkai (1 Sam. ix, 3; x, 11, 21; xiv, 51; 1 Chron. ix, 28; xii, 1; xxvi, 28). He was thus the grandson (1 Sam. ix, 1, "son [q.v.] of Abiel (q.v.) seen. No incident is mentioned respecting him excepting his sending Saul in search of the strayed asses (1 Sam. ix, 8), and that he was buried in Zelah (2 Sam. xxii, 14). B.C. 1093. In Acts xxii, 13 he is called Cis. See Saul.

4. A Levite of the family of Merari, son of Abdi, and one of those who assisted Hezekiah in restoring the true religion (2 Chron. xxxii, 12). B.C. 726.

5. A Benjamite, the father of Shimel, and great-grandfather of Mordecai (Esth. ii, 6). B.C. considerably ante 598.

Kish'tôn (1 Chron. vi, 44). See Kishaiha.

Kish'un (Heb. Kishyon, עִשְׂנּ, so called from the hardness of the soil; Sept. Kηκwν, Auth. Ver. "Kish- on" in Josh. xxxi, 28), a city of the tribe of Issachar (Josh. xix, 20, where it is mentioned between Reuben and Gad), assigned to the Levites of the family of Gershom, and for a place of refuge (Josh. xxxi, 20; elsewhere (1
Chron. vi, 72) called Kesh-en (q. v.). De Saulcy found ruins called Keshkeb (or Keshkebeh), an hour and a half's walk from Tell es-Serábel, commanding the north side of Mt. Tabor, which he inclined to identify with the ancient Kishon (Naruart, ii, 325, 326). Schwart, citing from Assur, places it 21/2 miles south of Chelseloth (Isa); but he appears to be misled by the analogy of the name of this place with that of the brook Kishon (Psal. lxv, 16), which has no connection in origin (see Havelock, iii, 241).  

Kishon (Heb. Kishon, יִשְׂנֹן, Kishon; Sept. Κισσόν, Kisson), as in Ps. lxxxi, 6, or Kisson v. v. Kasôn, Auth. Vers. "Kison", a torrent or winter stream (נהר, A. V. "river") of central Palestine, the scene of two of the grandest achievements of Israelitish history—the defeat of Sisera (Judg. iv, 7, 18; v, 21), and the destruction of the prophets of Baal by Elijah (1 Kings xviii, 40). It formed the boundary between Manasseh and Zebulun (Judg. xxi, 11). Zeeck.) Some portion of it is also thought to be designated as the "waters of Megiddo" (Judg. v, 19). See Megiddo. The term coupled with the Kishon in Judg. v, 21, as a stream of the ancients יִשְׂנֹן, A. V. "that ancient river", has been very variously rendered by the old interpreters. 1. It is taken as a proper name, and thus apparently that of a distinct stream—in some MSS. of the Sept. Kasipon (see D'Arcy, Compendium, 286) by Jerome, Vulgate, torrens Cadumum; in the Peshito and Arabic versions, Karmin. This view is also taken by Benjamin of Tudela, who speaks of the river close to Acre (doubtless meaning thereby the Cedus) as the יִשְׂנֹן. It is possible that the term may refer to an ancient tribe of Kedumim—wanderers from the Eastern deserts—who had in remote antiquity settled on the Kishon or one of its tributary wadys. See Kedumim. 2. As an epithet of the Kishon itself: Sept. נִמְלְפֶה דָּרוֹשֶׁי; Aquila, καυνονως, perhaps intending to imply a scourching wind or sionoo as accompanying the rising of the waters; Symmachus, αιγων or αἰγῶν, perhaps alluding to the swift springing of the torrent (αἰγῶν is used for high waves by Artemidorus). The Targum, adhering to the signification "ancient," expands the sentence—"the torrent in which were shown sugars and wonders to Israel of old," and this miraculous torrent a later Jewish tradition (preserved in the Commentaries of Censorinus to which Brodor, ascribed to Jerome) would identify with the Red Sea, the scene of the greatest marvels in Israel's history. The rendering of the A. V. is supported by Mendelesohn, Gesenius, Ewald, and other modern scholars. The reference is to the vastness of the torrent. Scholars of its ancient Israelite Ca-naanite, as the plain adjoining the stream has always been the great battle-ground of Palestine. See Exa-Stron. For the Kishon of Josh. xxi, 28, see Kishon.  

By Josephus the Kishon is never named, neither does the name occur in the early Itineraries of Abundius Augustus, or the Bordeux Flurgin. Eusebius and Jerome dismiss it in a few words, and note only its origin in Tabor (Onomast. Cicon), or such part of it as can be seen thence (Ep. ad Eustochium, § 13), passing by entirely its connection with Carmel. Benjamin of Tudela visited Akka and Carmel. He mentions the river by name as "Kishon," but only in the most cursory manner. Brodor (cir. 1500) describes the western portion of the stream with a little more fulness, but enlarges most on its upper or eastern part, which, with the victory of Barak, he places on the east of Tabor and Hermon, as discharging the water of those mountains into the Sea of Galilee (Deser. Terra S. cap. 6, 7). This has been shown by Dr. Robinson (Joh. Res. ii, 364) to allude to the wady el-Birch, which runs down to the Jordan a few miles above Scythopolis.  

The Kishon is beyond all doubt the river now called Nahr el-Maskout (or el-Maskuto), which, after traversing the plain of Acre, enters the bay of the latter name at its south-east corner. It has been usual to trace the source of this river to Mount Tabor (as above by Jose- phus), but Dr. Robinson affirms that it is found by following along the south-eastern brow of Mount Carmel he had an opportunity of seeing the sources of the river Kishon, three or four of which lie within less than a furlong of each other, and are called Ras el-Kishon, or the head of the Kishon. These alone, without the lesser contributions near by, would, if the stream were continued for half as large as the sea. During the rainy season all the waters which fall upon the eastern side of Carmel, or upon the rising grounds to the southward, empty themselves into it in a number of torrents, at which time the Kishon, as it overflows its banks, acquires vast dimensions, upholds a strong current, and carries all before it. It was doubtless in such a season that the host of Sisera was swept away in attempting to ford it. But such inundations are only occasional, and of short duration, as is indeed implied in the destruction in its waters of the fugitives, who doubtless expected to pass it safely. The current of the stream, as estimated from the sources thus indicated, is not more than seven miles. It runs very briskly till within half a league of the sea; but when not augmented by rains, it never falls into the sea in a full stream, but insensibly percolates through a bed of sand, with which the winds have thrown up at its mouth. It was in this state that Shaw himself found it in the month of April, 1722, when it was crossed by him.  

Notwithstanding Shaw's contradiction, the assertion that the Kishon derives its source from Mount Tabor has been adopted by modern travellers from its proximity to that peak, as by their ancient predecessors (Summer Rambles, i, 281). Buckingham's statement, being made with reference to the view from Mount Tabor itself, deserves attention. He says that near the foot of the mountain on the south-west are "the springs of the Ain es-Sherar, which send a perceptible stream through the centre of the plain of Esraelon, and form the brook Kishon of antiquity." Further on, the same traveller, on reaching the hills which divide the plain of Esraelon from that of Acre, saw the pass through which the river makes its way from the one plain to the other (Traveler in Palestine, i, 168, 177). Shaw also states that the sources of the Kishon are at a village called Sheik Arab, south-west of Tabor (Palez. p. 166). On further inquiry, and more extensive comparison of observations made at different times of the year, it will probably be found that the river issues from Mount Tabor, but that the supply from this source is cut off in early summer, when it ceases to be maintained by rains or contributory torrents; whereas the copious supply from the nearer springs at Ras el-Kishon, with other springs lower down, keep it up from that point to the Jordan during the whole of the rainy season. (See Kitto's Pict. Hist. of Palestine, p. 62.) Maritsi (ii, 112) mentions the case of the English drago- man who was drowned, and his horse with him, in the attempt to cross this temporary stream from Mt. Tabor, in Feb. 1761. During the battle of Mount Tabor, between the French and Arabs, April 16, 1799, many of the latter were drowned in their attempt to cross a stream coming from Debureih, which then inundated the plain (Burckhardt, Syria, p. 389). Monro, who crossed the river early in April (in its lower or perennial part), in 1799, gives the order of the river as follows: "Mr. Robinson describes it as traversing the plain of Esraelon. The river, where he crossed it, in a boat, was then thirty yards wide. In the plain from Solam to Nazareth he crossed a considerable brook, and afterwards some others, which flow into a small lake on the northern side of the plain, and eventually contribute to swell the Kishon" (Rambles, i, 55, 281). Dr. Robinson says that this account corresponds with channels that he observed (Biblical Researches, iii, 280). Prokere also, in April, 1829, when travelling directly from Ramleh to Nazareth, entered the plain of Esraelon on which he could not find a single spring, but which was flowing in a deep bed through marshy ground; and after wandering about for some time to find his way
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though the morass, he was at last set right by an Arab, who pointed out the proper ford (Reise ins H. Land, p. 125). The scriptural account of the overthrow of Sisera
ens last manifestly shows that the stream crossed the plain, and must have been of considerable size. The above arguments, to show that it did so, and still does so, are confirmed by Dr. Robinson, who adds that "not improbably, in ancient times, when the country was perhaps more wooded, there may have been permanent streams throughout the whole plain." The transaction of the prophet Elijah, who, after his sacrifice on Carmel, commanded the priests of Baal to be slain at the river Kishon, requires no explanation, seeing that it took place at the perennial lower stream. This also explains, what has sometimes been asked, whence, in that time of drought, the water was obtained with which the prophet inducted his altar and sacrifice.

The Kishon is, in fact, the drain by which the waters of the plain of Esraelion, and of the mountains which inclose that plain, namely, Carmel and the Samaria ranges on the south, the mountain of Gailee on the north, and Gilboa, "Little Hermon" (so called), and Tabor on the east, find their way to the Mediterranean. Its course is in a direction nearly due north-west along the lower part of the plain nearest the foot of the Samaria hills, and close beneath the very cliffs of Carmel, breaking through the hills which separate the plain of Esraelion from the maritime plain of Acre, by a very narrow pass, beneath the eminence of Harothieh or Harb, which is believed by some still to retain a trace of the name of Harosheth of the Gentiles. It has two principal feeders: the first from Debether (Dalethatha), on Mount Tabor, the north-east angle of the plain; and, secondly, from Jebeln (Gilboa) on the south-east. It is also fed by the copious spring of Lejjoun, the stream from which is probably the "waters of Megiddo" (Porter, Handbook, p. 385). The highest sources of the Kishon on the south-east is the large fountain of Jenin, the ancient En-gannim, the water from which, increased by a number of the streamlets from the surrounding hills, flows westward across the plain through a deep channel during the winter months; but in summer this channel, like the northern one, is perfectly dry (Van de Velde, Travels, i, 362). The two channels unite at a point a few miles north of the site of Megiddo. The channel of the united stream is here deep and miry, the ground for some distance on each side is low and marshy, and the fords during winter are always difficult, and often, after heavy rain, impassable; yet in summer, even here, the whole plain and the river bed are dry and hard (Robinson, ii, 364). These facts strikingly illustrate the narrative of the defeat of Sisera. The battle was fought on the south bank of the Kishon, at Megiddo (Judg. iv. 14; v. 19). While the battle raged a violent storm of wind and rain came on (Judg. v. 4, 20; comp. Josephus, Ant. v. 5, 4). In a short time the hard plain was turned into a marsh, and the dry river-bed into a foaming torrent. The Canaanites were driven back on the river by the fiery attack of Barak and the fury of the storm; for "the earth trembled, the heavens dropped...the stars in their courses fought against Sisera." The war-horses and chariots dashing madly through the marshy ground made it much worse; and the soldiers, in trying to cross the swollen torrent, were swept away.

But, like most of the so-called "rivers" of Palestine, the perennial stream forms but a small part of the Kishon. During the greater part of the year (as above noted) its upper portion is dry, and the stream confined to a few miles next the sea. The sources of this perennial portion proceed from the roots of Carmel—the "vast fountains called Sa'diyeh, about three miles east of Chais" (Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 140), and those, apparently still more copious, described by Shaw (Robinson, ii, 365), as bursting forth from beneath the eastern brow of Carmel, and discharging of themselves "a river half as big as the Lea." It enters the sea at the lower part of the bay of Akka, about two miles east of Chais, "in a deep, tortuous bed, between banks of loamy soil some fifteen feet high, and fifteen to twenty yards apart" (Porter, Handbook, p. 388). Between the mouth and the town the shore is lined by an extensive grove of date-palms, one of the finest in Palestine (Van de Velde, i, 289). The part of the Kishon at which the prophets of Baal were slaughtered by Elijah was loutless close below the spot on Carmel where the sacrifice had taken place. This spot is now fixed with all but certainty at the extreme east end of the mountain, to which the name is still attached of Et-Mahraka, the "burning." See Canaan. Nowhere does the Kishon run so close to the mountain as just beneath this spot (Van de Velde, i, 924). It is about 1000 feet above the river, and a precipitous ravine leads directly down, by which the victims were perhaps hurried from the sacred precincts of the altar of Jehovah to their doom in the torrent bed below, at the foot of the mound, which from this circumstance may be called tell Kheda, the hill of the priests. Whether the Kishon contained any water at this time we are not told; that required for Elijah's sacrifice was in all probability obtained from the spring on the mountain side below the plateau of Et-Mahraka. At the mouth of the river are banks of fine sand, which any unusual swell in the river converts into dangerous quicksands (Van de Velde, i, 289).

The modern name Nahr el-Mukata some have thought means "the river of slaughter," in allusion to the slaughter of the prophets of Baal on its banks; but the name may also signify "river of the ford," from another meaning of the same root (compare Robinson, ii, 366); the latter is the interpretation given of the name by the people of the country.—Kitto; Smith. See further in Hamesveld, i, 622 sq.; Schwarz, Palestine, p. 49; Hackett, Illust., p. 321-328; Ritter, Erdw. xvi. 704; Maundrell, Early Travels, p. 430; Pococke, East, ii, 55; G. Robinson, Palest. i, 203 (Par. 1835); Thomson, Land and Book, i, 492; Stanley, Sinai and Pal., p. 347; Wilson, Lands of Bible, ii, 86; Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 56, 494.

Mouth of the Kishon.
KISHSHU. See CUMCUM.

Kiss, JOHANN JUSTUS, a German theologian, was born at Rödinghausen in 1600, and was educated at the universities of Rhenen and Giessen. He became professor of philosophy at Rinteln University, and the year following professor of theology. He died March 25, 1714. For a list of his writings, mainly dissertations, see Döring, Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands des 18. und 19. Jahrth. ii, 102.

KISS. (Psa. Ixxxiii. 9). See KISHON.

Kiss (קִשָּׁה, miskheh; Gr. φιλία, to love, and derivatives). Originally the act of kissing had a symbolical character. The "signs of language, expressive of tender affection and respect. It appears from the case of Laban and Jacob (Gen. xxix. 13) that this method of salutation was even then established and recognised as a matter of course. In Gen. xxvi. 26, 27, a kiss is a sign of affection between a parent and child; in Cant. viii. 1, between a lover and his bride. It was also, as with some modern nations, a token of friendship and regard bestowed when friends or relations met or separated (Tobit vii. 6; x. 12; Luke vii. 45; xv. 20; Acts xx. 57; Matt. xxvii. 46; 2 Sam. xx. 9); the same custom is still observed in the East, and to this day the people of Armenia, Barzai, the Egyptians (see Gen. xlvi. 255). The Church of Ephesus wept sore at Paul's departure, and fell on his neck and kissed him. When Orpheus quitted Naomi and Ruth (Ruth i. 14), after the three had lifted up their voice and wept, she "kissed her husband and her three sons, and her daughter-in-law, Elimelech's wife." (Ruth iv. 11) (KJV). The act of kissing the feet was in the Roman law a sign of subjection and obedience, which was sometimes carried so far that the print of the foot received the kiss, as, for example, in the case of a Roman citizen when he became sacred by the royal touch, or that the subject was not worthy to salute even the prince's feet, but was content to kiss the earth itself near or on which he trod (Isa. xl. 38; Micah vii. 17; Psa. Ixxxii. 9; comp. Gen. xxxi. 40; 1 Sam. xvi. 24, 25; 2 Sam. xiv. 8; 2 Kings xiii. 20; Luke xv. 20; Tobit vii. 6; x. 12; 2 (between brothers, or near male relatives or intimate friends (Gen. xxix. 18; xxxii. 4; xiv. 15; Exod. iv. 27; 1 Sam. xix. 41)); (iv) by using the act of kissing between persons not related, but of equal rank, whether friendly or deceitful, is mentioned (2 Sam. xx. 9; Psa. lxxv. 10; Prov. xxvii. 6; Luke vii. 45 [1st clause]; xxii. 48; Acts xx. 57); (v) as a mark of a real or affected convergence; not distant from the inferior (Luke vii. 38, 45, and perhaps vii. 44). In other cases the kiss is imprinted on the beard (see Arvieux, ii. 182); sometimes on the head (see D'Orville, Ad Chariton, viii. 4), which was then taken hold of by the hand (3 Sam. xix. 9). Among the Arabs the women and children kiss the beards of their husbands or fathers. The superior returns the salute by a kiss on the forehead. Kissing the hand of another appears to be a modern practice. In Egypt an inferior kisses the hand of a superior, generally on the back, but sometimes, as a special favor, on the palm also. To testify abjurate subscription, and in asking favors, the feet are often kissed instead of the hand (Luke vii. 38), "The son kisses the hand of his father, the wife that of her husband, the slave and the often free servant, that of the master. The slaves and servants of a grandee kiss their lord's sleeve, or the skirt of his clothing" (Lane, Mod. Eg. ii. 9; compare Arvieux, Trac. p. 151; Burckhardt, Trav. i. 369; Niebuhr, Voy. i. 329; ii. 83; Layard, Nine. i. 174; Wellsted, Arabia, i. 341; Malcolm, Sketches of Persia, p. 271). Friends saluting each other join the right hand of each kiss his own hand and puts it to his lips and forehead, or breast; after a long kiss, they embrace each other, kissing first on the right side of the face or neck, and then on the left, or on both sides of the beard (Lane, ii. 9, 10; comp. Irby and Mangles, p. 110; Charleyn, Voyage, iii. 421; Burckhardt, Notes, ii. 869; Russell, Isopo, i. 249). The passage of Isaiah ii. 27, "Or my mouth hath kissed my hand," is not in point (see Menken, Dissert. in p. 1, Lipsius, 1717; Doughtie, Anteclear, i. 211; Kissinger, in the Nov. Miscell. Lyp. i. 580; Böttiger, Kunstsgesch. i. 52); and refers to idolatrous modes of worship. (See Layard, Ninev. and Babylon, Regiom. 1698), namely, the adoration of the heavenly bodies (comp. Cicero, Ver. iv. 48; Gesenius, Comment. on Isa. xiil. 22). See Adoration. It was the custom to throw kisses towards the images of the gods, and towards the sun and moon (1 Kings xiii. 16; Hos. xii. 2, 5; comp. Isa. xvi. 20; Jer. x. 5; De Salt. c. 17; Pliny, Nat. Hist. xxvi. 5). The kising of princes was a token of homage (Psa. xi. 2; 1 Sam. xi. 1; Xenophon, Cyrop. viii. 5, 82). So probably in Gen. xii. 40, "Upon thy mouth shall all my people kiss," where the Auth. vera interprets, "According to thy word shall all my people be ruled" (see Gesenius, Thesaurus Heb. p. 922). We may compare the Mohammedan custom of kissing the Kaaba at Mecca (Burckhardt, Trav. i. 250, 256, 323; Crichton, Arabia, ii. 215). Xenophon says (Apoll. v. 4) that it was a national custom with the Persians, who were the "most divine people of the world." A curious passage to this effect may be found in the Cyropædis (i. 4, 27). Kissing the feet of princes was a token of subjectification, and sometimes carried so far that the print of the foot received the kiss, and as such was a mark of real "submission." The feet were some sacred by the royal touch, or that the subject was not worthy to salute even the prince's feet, but was content to kiss the earth itself near or on which he trod (Isa. xl. 38; Micah vii. 17; Psa. lxxxii. 9; comp. Gen. xxxi. 40; 1 Sam. xvi. 24, 25; Matt. xxviii. 9; see Dion Cass. lix. 27; Seneca, De Beneficiis, ii. 17). Similar usages prevail among the Orientals to the present day (see Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. ii. 208; Layard, Ninev. i. 274; Harmer, Obs. i. 336; Niebuhr, Travels, iv. 414; compare Assemani, Bibl. Ori., iii. 77; Othon, Lex. Rhod. p. 238; Darbeur. Chron. p. 148, 193, 503). The Rabbins, in the medievals, scrupulous, and falsely delicate spirit which animated much of what they wrote, did not permit more than three kinds of kisses—the kiss of reverence, of reception, and of dismissal (Schorah Raba on Gen. xxix. 11).

The peculiar tendency of the Christian religion to encourage a kindred spirit to this, and to men, as men, to substitute and develop the softer affections, and, in the trying condition of the early Church, to make its members intimately known to one another, and unite them in the closest bonds, led to the observance of kissing as an accompanying feature of the new order of things, and in the Church the kissing of the feet was the very cradle of our religion. (See Coteler, Ad constitut. Apost. i. 57; Fessel, Aedera. sacr. p. 283.) Hence the exhortation, "Salute each other with a holy kiss" (Rom. xvi. 16; see also 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 26; in 1 Pet. v. 14 it is termed "a kiss of charity"). It "might, perhaps, be understood among the members of the Church that the kiss was to be exchanged between persons of the same sex only, though no direction to this effect is found in the apostolic epistles, and it is known that in process of time the heathen took occasion from the practice to reproach the Christians for looseness of manners. On this account care was taken (as appears from the Apostolical Constitutions) to maintain in respect to it the distinction of sexes; but the practice itself was kept up for centuries, especially in connection with the celebration of the Supper. It was regarded as the special token of perfect reconciliation and accord among the members of the Church, and was called simply the peace (sinejyn), or the kiss of peace (osculum pacis). It was exchanged in the Eastern Church before, but in the Western after the consecration prayer. Ultimately, however, it in part took its place as a symbol of Christian fellowship, or a part of any Christian solemnity" (Fairbairn). (See Apost. Constit. ii. 67; vii. 11; Just. Mart. Apol. i. 65; Palmer, On Lit.)
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i, 102, and note from Du Cange; Bingham, Christ. An-apeut. b. xii, c. iv, § 5, vol. iv, 49; b. ii, c. xi, § 10, vol. i, 181; b. ii, c. xix, § 17, vol. i, 272; b. iv, c. vi, § 14, vol. i, 526; b. xxii, c. iii, § 6, vol. viii, 546; see also Cod. Just. V. Tit. iii, 16; de Dom. ante Nupt.; Brande, Pop. Antiq. ii, 87). The peculiar circumstances have now vanished which gave propriety and emphasis to such an expression of brotherly love and Christian friendship. (See Wemys, Christ. Symbolica, s. v.). The kiss of peace still forms part of the Rites of the Church. It is given immediately before the communion; the clergyman who celebrates mass kisses the altar, and embracing the deacon, saying, "Fæx tibi, frater, et eccliesia sancte Dei," the deacon does the same to the subdeacon, saying," Fæx tecum;" the latter then salutes the others.

Kissing the foot or toe has been required by the popes as a sign of respect from the secular power since the 8th century. The first who received this honor was pope Constantine I. It was paid him by the emperor Justinian II, on his entry into Constantinople in 710. Valentinian, about 827, required every one to kiss his foot, and from that time this mark of reverence appears to have been expected by all popes. When the ceremony takes place, the pope wears a slipper with a cross, which is kissed. In more recent times, Protestants have not been required to kiss the pope's foot, but merely to bend the knee slightly. SeeADORATION.

On the subject of this article generally, consult Emmerich, De Osculis ap. Vet. in div. sacris (Meining, 1788); Heckel, De Osculis (Lipsia, 1689); Pfannen, De Osculis Christianior. Vet... in his Obs. Sacra. ii, 181-201; Kempis, De Osculis (Francois, 1680); Jac. Herrenscmidtus, Oscologica (Viteb, 1630); Muller, De Osculo Sancto (Jena, 1746); Boverg, De Osculis Hebr.; Lomeier, Dias. gentil. p.289; also in Ugolini, Theesaur. vol.xx; Götz, De Osculo (Jena, 1670); Lange, Friedensbl. a. alm. Christen (Leips, 1747); compare Fabrics, Bibliogr. antiquar. p. 1016 sq.; and other monographs cited by Volbeding, Index, p. 55, 147. See SALUTATION.

Kissos. See IVY.

Kistemaker, Johann Hyacinthus, a celebrated Roman Catholic theologian, was born August 15, 1754, at Northorn, in Hanover, and was educated at the University of Münster. He was ordained priest Dec. 22, 1777, but filled the rostrum instead of the pulpit, and became quite celebrated for his attainments as a linguist. In 1786 he was elected professor of philology at his alma mater, and in 1795 was transferred to the chair of bibliology in the University of Leyden. He died March 2, 1884. Of his numerous works we have room here only for the titles of those most important in theology, which are, Commentatio de nova lexREG. praepium Veteris Testamenti ex collata scriptoribus Graecis et Romanis scriptis (Münster, 1806); — Exeg. A. Bland. über Matt. xvi, 18, 19, s. i, xix, 3-12, oder über den Prinzip Petr und das Ehrenb.- Exegesis critica in Psalmos Ivi. et cix, et excursum in Daniel iii de fornis ignis (1809) — Weingang Jesu vom Gericht über Judas und die Welt, etc. (1816) — Canonis conciliorum illustratum ex Hieroglogia Orientalis (1818) — Weingang vom Inmanuel (1824) — and especially Biblia sacra Vulgate editione juxta exemplar Vaticanum (1824, 3 vols.), dedicated to pope Leo XII; and his translation of the New Testament (1825), which is largely circulated among the Roman Catholics of Germany. See Hambrecht, Das gelehrte Deutschland, Appendix, vol. xvi and xxii; Watzer und Welte, KirchenLexikon, vol. vi, s. v.; xiii, 671 sq. (J. H. W.)

Kite (ΠΥΓ, ayyah), so called from its clamorous cry: Seph. levir v. r.tirpow, Vulg. vulter; but in Job, xxxvii, 7, yqf, Auth. Version "vulture," an unclean and keen- sighted bird of prey (Lev. xi, 14; Deut. xiv, 13). The version of Pseudo-Jonathan has the Black vulture; the Venetian Greek κακοδαμος, or κακοδαμος; Kimchi נשק, or מגש; Saadia and Abenabad the male horned owl—most of which are evidently more conjectures, with lit-
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many meaning of which, according to Schulten, is ‘to turn.’ If this derivation be the true one, it is not improbable that ‘kite’ is the correct rendering. The habit is which birds of this genus have of sailing in circles, with the rudder-like tail by its inclination governing the curve, as Yarrell says, accords with the Arabic derivation. Wood (in his Mammals, p. 386) inclines to adopt Tristram’s identification of the Red kite (Milvus regalis), which is scattered all over Palestine, feeding chiefly on the smaller birds, mice, reptiles, and fish. Its piercing sight and soaring habits peculiarly suit the passage in Job. See VULTURE.

Kithlish (Heb. Kithlish, קיתליש, prob. for בְּקִית לֶשׁ, a man’s seat; Sept. Ἀθάλος v. v. Καλάς and ἁρπακός, Vulg. Cerialis), a town in the valley or plain (Shebna-) of Judah, mentioned between Lachish and Gederoth (Josh. xv. 40); evidently situated in the south-western group, possibly at the mound and some foundations called Jesimeh (Robinson, Researches ii, 386), on wady el-Heroy, between Gaza and Lachish (Van de Velde, Map). A writer in Fairbairn’s Dictionary, however, gives the site el-Moses given by Smith (in Robinson’s Res. iii, Appendix, p. 119) in this vicinity; but this is not laid down on any map, if, indeed, it be not the same place as the above. The derivation proposed by the same writer for the name Kithlish, from יָקַטֵל, to crush, and לֶשׁ, a lion, as if it were the local emblem of the place, is fastened, and unwarranted by any allusion of the kind in the text; the form, the version, would then have been יָקִיתלֶשׁ.

Kitron (Heb. Kitron, קיתרון, khitron, otherwise curtained, or cistle; Sept. Κερύς v. v. Κιτρόν, and even Χιτρόν, a city of Zebulon from which the Israelites were long unable to expel the native Canaanites (Judg. i. 30). It is very possibly the same elsewhere called Kattath (Josh. xix. 10), notwithstanding the objection of Keil (Comment. on Josh. ad loc.) that this and all the other names are not distinct cities, in order to make up the number twelve there specified: for even thus the number will be incomplete, without either supposing the text corrupt or borrowing from those enumerated in the preceding verses (doubtless the true solution), in either of which cases these three names, so nearly identical (Kattath, Kartath, Kitron), may be assigned to one place. Schwarz (Palest., p. 178), on Tell-Mudjans grounds, apparently incorrectly, identifies it with Sephoris (q. v.).

Kittim (Gen. x. 4; 2 Chron. i. 7). See CHITTIM.

Kittle, Andrew N., a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Kinderhook, N.Y., in 1765, educated at Union College in 1804, studied theology under Dr. Froeligh and Livingston, and entered the ministry in 1806. Until 1846 he was successively pastor of the churches of Red Hook Landing and of St. John’s, Linnitho, Upper Red Hook, and Stayversant. Early consecrated to the Lord, he was an able, vigorous, and indefatigable minister of Jesus Christ. Though he was of the school of a theological scholar, possessed of strong common sense, and fond of reading, his retiring disposition kept him aloof from the agitating controversies and public excitement of the times. Aspiring only to be a preacher and pastor, he dwelt among his people until the infirmities of age constrained him to give up the active ministry. He died in 1864. Kittle was a man of fine features and noble form, a dignified Christian gentleman, and a true man of God.—Corwin, Manual of Ref. Church, p. 126. (W. J. R. T.)

Kitt, John, one of the most eminent Biblical scholars of this age, was born at Plymouth, England, Nov. 4, 1804. To humble birth was added, in his twelfth year, the loss of his paternal fortune; and neither poverty nor bodily defect were sufficient to extinguish the ambitious and energetic youth from the acquisition of knowledge. Every effort that could possibly be put forth to secure books was made; to pay for a few books from a circulating library, he grooped for old iron and ropes in Sutton Pool, and with the few pence obtained by this irksome task he supplied himself with the elements of an education. The destitution of his parents obliged them at last to place John in the "workhouse" at Plymouth, where he was admitted Nov. 18, 1819, and taught him the culture of the ground. In this way, however, he learned the rudiments of the art, and his knowledge of the Bible and the skillful Soon asserted his position against older and stronger boys, and here he began in 1820 a diary which is still preserved, and large excerpts from which have been printed in his Works. It contains many self-portraits, physical and mental, and shows the growth of a mind to literary tastes and ambition. In his trade, however, he was often so dull and dispirited that he called himself "John the Comfortless," and twice had thoughts of bringing his life to a premature end. In 1821 he was hired out to a shoemaker, but his awkwardness and tendency to books greatly irritated his master, and John was submitted to such harsh treatment that he was readmitted to the workhouse about six months later. In the year following he finally brought out some essays in Nettleton's Plymouth Journal. These efforts attracted attention, and the wise and self-controlled interposition of several gentlemen removed to Exeter to become a dentist. In 1825 he published a volume of Essays and Letters, which, though it afforded him but a small pecuniary remuneration, secured him many friends, made him known, and generally known, and secured him in a complete change of basis for life. Instead of perfecting himself in the art of dentistry, he accepted an offer to enter the Missionary College at Islington, where he was to be taught the art of printing with a view to service in some foreign missionary institution. In June, 1827, he was sent out to Malta; but, his health declining, he returned to England in 1829. Shortly after this he became connected with the Missionary Schools at Malta; but, his health declining, he returned to England in 1833. Through the influence of friends he gained attention by a series of papers in the Penny Magazine (one of these under the suggestive title "The Defaul Traveller"), and by other literary efforts.

In 1838 Kitti finally entered upon the preparation of that class of works which have so justly secured him a prominent place in the field of letters. In this year Mr. Charles Knight, then the editor of the Penny Magazine, suggested to Kitti the preparation of a "Theological Bible." All that Kitti needed was the suggestion. He not only eagerly embraced the proposal, but earnestly entreated to be allowed to undertake the responsibility of the entire work. The expiration of scarcely more than two years saw the Pictorial Bible finished (new ed. 1847, 4 vols. 8vo), and shortly after (in 1838) he embodied a great portion of his experience in Persia in two small volumes, Uncle Oliver's Travels. Next followed (1839-40) a Biblical History of Palestine and the Holy Land. From 1841 to 1843 he found employment in preparing the letter-press for the Gallery of Scripture Engravings, in 8 vols. In 1843 he wrote a History of Palestine (published by A. and C. Black, of Edinburgh), and Thoughts among Flowers (published by the Religious Tract Society). In 1845 he prepared The Pictorial Sunday Book, and commenced the work which, in its extant form (4th edition), still continues to be one of the best works of the kind in any language, the Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature. See DICTIONARIES, BIBLICAL. Though the work already accomplished (up to 1848)
the degree of D.D. at Würzburg by his able dissertation, De chilicismo primoriorum subseculorum. In 1827 he wrote a treatise on Acurial Conflation, and in 1829 a commentary on the Gospel of St. John. He acquired at the same time great popularity at Mayence as a preacher. So great, indeed, was his renown, that several high-sounding collegians endeavored to secure him, but he finally accepted a call to Heidelberg University. He met with great satisfaction to the strict Roman Catholic party, but had a long and severe controversy with Hermes (q.v.) and the Hermeses, who were then protected by the archbishop. Klee taught the popular doctrine that faith was the basis of all theology; Hermes, on the other hand, inclined more to accept philosophy as its basis. With Klee, who evidently endeavored to infuse into the theological system of Romanism a philosophical method-objective reason, revelation, Christianity, the Roman Catholic Church, all having the same origin, must naturally constitute part of an indivisible whole, which it remained only for subjective reason to prove by the testimony of history, and to arrange in obedience to faith. Thus, with him, the definition of religion was chiefly objective: "Religion is a union between God, as truth and love, and man, as reason and will." A similar definition is recognized by revelation on the part of God, and by faith on the part of man; "The Church is Christianity in its present state and activity; "The Church, in its nature, is such as Christ has made it;" "The inward and outward wards of the Church is established and preserved by the hierarchy;" "It is the most perfect Christian-human-polity;" "Christ established the primacy in order to preserve the unity of the hierarchy." He argued against Hermes that the Roman Catholic doctrine of faith has for the theologian and thinker the same authoritative evidence as the empirical laws of nature for the student of natural philosophy. This is lost sight of the fact that nature is the result of necessary laws, and a pure action of God, while Church tradition is but the result of historical freedom, which we find full of defects, and has therefore to be judged on the ground of its origin and of its continued validity. In his theory Klee was a Kantian, but in practice he was an ardent Roman Catholic apologist. It may even be questioned whether the strong traditionalistic faith of Klee and his school, which permits only a historical demonstration of the truth of revelation, has rendered any great and lasting service to Roman Catholic theology. Klee's system coincides with the final development of abstract Protestant supranaturalism, inasmuch as he makes the truth of the whole system of revelation to depend upon historical proofs. Nevertheless his system is much more dangerous than Hermes'. He placed the latter idea of theological certainty with confidence of faith, Klee identified philosophy with ecclesiastical Christianity itself. He gave permanent form to these doctrines in System der Kultur. Dogmatik (Bonn, 1881). When Clement August became archbishop, Klee's system prevailed; he was appointed examiner, and his lectures on dogmatics, which had always been well attended, were crowded. The exile of the archbishop, however, changed his position, and he accepted a call to Munich in 1839. He died there July 28, 1841. Besides the above mentioned works he wrote Commentary über d. Apost. Paulus Sententiarum c. d. Römer (Mentz, 1830); —Encycl. d. Theologie (ibid. 1832); —Auslegung d. Briefes a. d. Hebräer (ibid. 1833) —Die Eke (ibid. 1833) —D. Kalth. Dogmatik (ibid. 1834-45, 8 vols.; 3d ed. 1844) —Dogmengeschichte (ibid. 1835-37, 2 vols.). His Grundriss d. Kultur. Moral was published after his death (in 1843) by Himobien. See, besides the authorities cited in the article Hermes, Hermann, Real-Encyclopädie, vii, 711; Wetscher und Weite, Kirchen-Leh. vi, 213 sq.; Migne, Conclusions, p. 1239.

Kleefker, Bernhard, a German preacher of distinction, was born at Hamburg Jan. 12, 1790, and was educated at the university, where he entered in 1797, and where, under the instruction of that eminent German pulpit orator Zollkoffer, he laid the foundation for his future excellence as a preacher. In May, 1791, he was called as regular preacher to Osnabrück, and, after a stay of six years, removed there in 1797 to assist the city to assume the pastorate of St. James's Church. Here he labored with great acceptance and success until his death, June 10, 1825. Though Kleefker aimed to emulate successfully in the pulpit, his literary efforts were not so successful. He published, besides several works on practical religion and deism, also a homiletic magazine (Homiletisches Ideenmagazin, 1809-19, 8 vols. 8vo) — Praktische Vorlesungen u. d. N. Test. (1811-12, 3 vols. 8vo). See Göring, Deutscher Kunstges. p. 136 sq.

Klein, Friedrich August, a German theologian, was born at Friedrichshaide, near Ronsberg, Nov. 7, 1798; entered the University of Jena in 1811, and became a minister at Jena in 1819; but only two years later he was suddenly taken ill, and died Feb. 12, 1823, having a year before his death received the honorable appointment of professor of theology at the university. Klein published in 1817 Fortwarte Briefe an Christisches u. Protestantismus, and in 1817 began with Schröter the publication of the theological journal für Christentum und GottheitsGelehrtheit. Of his other publications the following deserve our notice: Belehrung der Geistlichen (1818, 2 vols. 8vo) — Der Glaube der Religionslehrer des 19. Jahrh. (1823, 2 vols. 8vo) — Dogmatik d. evang. prot. Kirche (1829, 2 vols.). See Göring, Deutche Theologen Deutschland, ii, 108 sq. (J. H. W.)

Klein, Georg Michael, a German Roman Catholic priest, was born at Alzilheim in 1777, and was educated at the high-school in Würzburg. He was ordained priest in 1798, but, securing the favor of a celebrated German philosopher Schelling, Klein thereafter devoted himself zealously to the study of metaphysics. He became professor at Würzburg in 1804, and in 1806 removed to Bamberg in the same capacity. In 1811 he became professor of philosophy at the University of Jena, but in 1818 he returned again to Würzburg. He died in 1819. His works are, Beiträge zum Studium der Philosophie des All (Würzb. 1803, 8vo) — Verstandeshilfe (1810) — Versuch d. Ethik als Wissenschaft zu begründen (Rudolstadt, 1811, 8vo) — Der Weg zur reinen Religion (Würzb. 1818, 8vo) — by far his ablest work. — Kalth. Real-Encycol. xi, 850.

Kleinhnecht, Conrad Daniel, a German theologian, was born at Leiplighe Aug. 22, 1791, and was educated at the University of Jena. By advice of the celebrated Orientalist and theologian Baddeus, in whom Kleinhnecht found a warm friend, he accepted a position as teacher in the Orphanage of Halle, which he held until 1719. In 1725 he became pastor at Pului, in 1731 at Leiplighe, and died July 11, 1753. He was especially active in behalf of missions, and sought to interest the state authorities for them. For a list of his writings, see Göring, Deutche Theologen Deutschland, ii, 115 sq.

Klemm, Johann Christian, a German theologian, born at Stuttgart Oct. 22, 1688, was the son of Johann Conrad Klemm, who, at the time of his death in 1717, was professor of theology at Tubingen. Young Klemm was educated at the universities of Stuttgart and Tubingen, and secured the degree of A.M. in 1707. Shortly after he began to lecture at the university, in 1717 he became professor extraordinary of philosophy, in 1725 of theology, and the year following of the Oriental languages. The degree of D.D. was bestowed upon him in 1730. He was promoted to a full regular professorship in 1736. He died Oct. 1, 1754. A list of his works is given by Göring, Deutche Theologen Deutschland, ii, 118 sq. See also Allgemeines Hnt. Lex. u. v.; Frier, Universal-Lexikon, u. v.

Kleptomania (κλεφτω, to steal, and μανία, madness), a form of partial mental derangement which is manifested by a propensity to steal and hoard articles.
that can be surreptitiously appropriated. The propensity to acquire becomes, in such cases, so irresistible, and the will so impotent, that the appropriation is generally regarded as involuntary, and the perpetrator, therefore, irresponsible; but, in order to constitute a case of moral irresponsibility, it should undoubtedly be shown on the face of the sworn statement that there would always be superadded those of intellectual disorder, the assumption being that so long as the intellect is unperverted the person will be found to possess a consciousness of the nature of the criminal act in relation to law. The plea of insanity in the legal sense must not be admitted unless it is evident that the subject is perfectly aware of the tendency of his or her actions; the simple moral inability to resist this temptation is only in the same predicament with that of every unquestioned candidate for the penitentiary or gallows. A state which may seem to deserve the name of moral insanity, as exhibiting a perversion of the moral sentiments, tendencies, and perceptions, with a loss, to a great extent, of self-control, is often prominent in the early stages of mental disease, and before the intellect is palpably affected. Up to this point the patient should undoubtedly be held personally responsible for his or her conduct in a criminal sense. When certain delusions, when delirium or incoherency supervene, the case then, without question, may be set down as that of insanity, which would absolve the patient from responsibility. The question here suggests itself: is not this a great and important fact to know—how nearly are they allied to insanity, and how far can they be urged as extenuating, or even excusing, misdemeanors or crimes? This strange thraldom to a morbid prompting not infrequently has its outlet in crimes of the deepest dye. When lord Byron was sail-
ing from Greece to Constantinople, he was observed to stand over the sleeping body of an Albanian with a pontiff in his hand, and after a while to turn away muttering, "I should like to know how a man feels who has committed a murder!" There can be no doubt that Lord Byron, urged by a morbid impulse, was on the very eve of knowing what he desired to know. But one of the most singular instances of morbid impulses in connection with material things is related in the case of a young man who, in visiting a large manufacturing establishment, stood opposite a large hammer, and watched with great interest its perfectly regular strokes. At first it was beating immense lumps of crimson metal into thin sheets, but the supply becoming exhausted, at last it only descended on the polished anvil. Still the young man gazed intently on its motion; then he kicked the loose head of the hammer, then he left his arm moved to the same tune; and, finally, he deliberately placed his fist on the anvil, and in a second it was crushed to a jelly. The only explanation he could afford was that he felt an impulse to do it; that he knew he should be disabled; that he saw all the consequences in a misty kind of manner, but that he still felt a power above within sense and reason—a morbid impulse, in fact, to which he succumbed, and by which he lost a good right hand. This incident suggests many things besides proving the peculiar nature and power of such cases. Thus, in each of cases, there is a law of sympathy on a scale hitherto unrestrained of, as well as a musical tone pervading all things. An illus-
tious physician has lately left on record the opinion that "one of the chief causes of the terrible scenes which ac-
compounded the final suppression of the Communist out-
break was a contagious mental alienation. The minds of the Parisians were gradually unhinged by the priva-
tions of the siege. The revolt of the 18th of March gave the last blow to brains which were already shaken, and as long as the greater part of the population went raving mad. Women were, under such circumstances, for some reason, more reckless than men. This is because their nervous system is more fully developed; their brain is weaker, and their sensibilities are more acute than those of the stronger sex; and they are consequently far more dan-
gerous in such paroxysms. None of them knew exactly what they were fighting for; they were possessed by one of the various forms of mania—that which impelled the French Jansenists of the latter half of the 18th century to execute themselves with a strange delight in pain of the most aggravated kind. The man who, under the command of a hallucination, found himself upon the lay-decks of the soldiers in a paroxysm of passion was a few moments afterwards utterly pro-
strate and begging for mercy. They were no more cow-
ards in the last state than they were heroes in the first—
they were simply madmen." In recurring to the "Reign of Terror" of the first French Revolution, we find in Lewis Case this profound reflection: "In surveying the French na-
tional character of the present day" (this was written in 1840), "it is difficult to recognize those traits of cruelty which were so shockingly developed during the Revolu-
tion. A more gross form of passion cannot be brought the nation into acts inconsistent with its general feeling; and marking that time of political effervescence as an ex-
traordinary period in human history." The general term monomania implies that the individual is deranged only on one subject, or in reference to one object, or in one particular train of thought or faculty of thinking; and that his intellect, judgment, and emotions are otherwise sound, at least when not exercised upon the subject of his derangement. This, however, is not strictly true. In almost all cases of so-called monomania there are other morbid indications besides the distinct, the salient, and the grossly morbid vanity or irritability. Monom-
mania seems to arise in the failure of the faculties around a given centre of thought, in a paralysis of power along a given line of mental direction, unaccompanied by any parallel paralysis of interest; so that the patient busies himself involuntarily on a subject on which he has lost the power of bringing his faculties properly to bear. It is the attempt of weakened faculties to work upon an overstrained nervous string, so that all mental power disappears just where the wish to apply it is greatest. Now these morbid centres of partial imbecility are, cer-
terus paribus, more likely to spring up in minds below the average in general power than in those above them, though the centre of the disease itself will often be on the noblest or most sensitive part of the mind. These peculiarities are nearly always distinctly marked in monomania, particularly in the form of it which is called kleptomania. It is usually exhibited by persons who have no motive to steal, and is frequently satisfied by purloining articles of no value. A baronet of large fortune stole, while on the continent, pieces of old iron and of broken crockery, and in such quantities that tons of these collecting pieces were presented in the lists of the officers. In the second volume of the Medical Critic the case of a female is detailed who could not resist the im-
pulse of appropriating everything within her reach. In searching this woman on one occasion there were found 15 bags upon her person, in which there were 1182 arti-
cles, mostly worthless, viz., 104 bits of paper, 82 sewing-
neddles, 18 old gloves, 12 moulds for wax leaves, 19 but-
tons, 60 feathers, 8 parcels of dried fish, 185 bits of rib-
obns, 9 bottles, 61 lozenges, and a variety of other arti-
cles, the refuse of the place, to which she had at various times taken refuge. Another case reported to have high medical authority is that of a rich but eccentric gentle-
man living in an old manor-house in Lincolnshire, Eng-
land. He was a good business man, and managed his estate with care and prudence, auditing his steward's
yearly accounts with the skill of an expert. To this sort of the bar-
obns were all kindly disposed towards him, and he was charitably disposed towards the poor. Even the serv-
ants who saw him every day, although they confessed that he was "certainly very peculiar at times," never once dreamed of impugning his intellect. He was in-
sane in one direction only; and one might have passed a lifetime with him without discovering it. He would be seized by a sudden determination to travel, and on such occasions he would travel in state, with a retinue of servants. After a fortnight's or perhaps a month's ab-
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sence, he would return home. Invariably, on the morning of the next day after his return, towels, which had been taken from an open portmanteau, were found scattered about the room. After breakfast, his custom was to go to the customary inn, and upon the arrival of all the hotel-keepers at whose houses he had slept during his absence on so many alips of writing-paper, with directions to his servants to inclose to each address the number of towels specified upon each piece of paper, with an assurance that they might find them, and send them in a letter, with the towels, to the hotel-keeper. This gentleman was one of the unhappy race of kleptomaniacs, whose particular mania impelled him to pilfer towels. He subsequently gave to a friend a history of his case, and said he was goaded to these journeys and thefts more by the impulse he insisted was the result of demoniacal possession. He was never impelled, however, a second time on the same journey; so that, while no hotel-keeper would be likely to suspect, during his visit, a gentleman of his rank and style as one who would steal his towels, it never transpired publicly, so far as is known, that he was a thief, although his own consciousness of the fact embittered his existence. Sometimes, in the case of this form of monomania, there exists, in the mind of the sufferer, the delusion that what he steals is his own property, or has been stolen from him by others; and it retains him. Sometimes he imagines that God orders him to steal. The case is recorded of a Scotch clergyman, distinguished for his learning, piety, and charity; he stole Bibles with a special view to the glory of God by the propagation of the Gospel. His name was a little "missionary society of stolen Bibles," and he was as much in earnest in the conversion of souls by the contraband process as the most enthusiastic foreign missionary could be in his calling. He was at last detected in wholesale Bible-stealing. It was farther discovered that he had organized a wide missionary district, and left a Bible or a Testament at every cottage where it was needed along the route. The most touching fact in the story is that he was arrested while on his knees by the bedside of a dying old man, with a stolen Bible lying open before him on the bed. "What made you steal the Bible, Mr. E. P.?" asked the sheriff, with pious horror on his face. "God made me steal them, good man," was the reply; "he was weary of seeing his poor people perish of Gospel-hunger because the rich Bible Society could not afford to feed them without the baubes, and so God set me to steal for him, and save them." He could not be persuaded that he had done wrong. The mental illness of the clergyman, who was a very poor man, naturally suggested insanity. But he was perfectly sane upon all other points, and it is doubtful whether he would have received the benefit of his malady—whether, indeed, it would have been admitted as a malady at all—if a learned and philosophical physician in a neighboring town had not positively sworn that he was the "victim of moral mania." There is this peculiarity sometimes in the case of kleptomaniacs, that their purloining is confined to single articles. Another case is reported of a lady who could not resist the temptation to steal silk stockings. Another lady would steal gloves whenever the opportunity was afforded. A boy was arrested some months since in Brooklyn for stealing slopers from the feet of ladies while walking in the street. His friends came forward and testified that he had been in the habit of stealing slopers, and was never known to have stolen anything else, all his life. A letter-carrier in Harlem, N.Y., was detected in abstracting letters and concealing them under a rock, which he had practiced for more than 20 years. It was most carefully hoarded in his place of concealment, and were found under the rock. It was proven in his case, we believe, that he had a mania for stealing letters without any apparent motive, as he never made any use of them except to hoard them. The cases quoted are sufficient to prove that the form of moral insanity to which the name of kleptomaniac has been given really exists. From these, as well as many other instances which will readily occur to the reader, it will be seen that there can be little difficulty for a skilful physician, after a short examination, in distinguishing between the true cases and an ordinary thief. And this, as well as every other true form of insanity, we presume, frees every one, whether previously bad or good, from moral responsibility in this particular regard. When the actual condition exists, no matter what the conduct may have been which preceded and conducted to this earthly account of the subject has already been closed, and the deeds that follow, we are sure, will be mercifully judged of by him who knows whereof his poor frail creatures are made, and remembers that they are but dust. (E. de P.)

1. The distinction is well made in the beginning of the article that some intellectual defect must be proven in order to constitute the crime of kleptomaniacal theft. It is not enough that a perversion of the moral faculties exists, for that is the quintessence of guilt; and on this ground he who should most effectually oblige his own conscience would thereby the most completely exonerate himself from the crime. In other words, he might thus render himself capable of committing the act. The mere expression that the persons laboring under kleptomaniacal frequency are not conscious of any wrong-doing on their own part is not of itself an adequate plea in their justification.

2. The actual presence of mental imbecility in these peculiar cases is proved by the fact of the abused individual in whom the subjects of the disease steal. In the first place, they do not commit theft for their own benefit; they do not appropriate the articles taken to their own use, nor do they have any occasion for them. The moral aspect, i.e. gain, is evidently absent, and their conduct is not understood, when the impulse to steal becomes known, as very different from ordinary cases of shop-lifting. In the second place, there is usually a pettiness, oftentimes absolute puerility in the acts committed, that marks the person as for the time "non compos mentis." The articles purloined are frequently worthless in themselves, and always relatively so. The conduct of the individual so strongly resembles that harmless and meaningless gathering of sticks and straws which is one of the most common signs of lunacy, that every one informed with the case spontaneously sets it down in the head of the person suffering from this impulse to these acts comes on in sudden fits, quite at variance with the usual course of the individual's conduct. A general good character is always held to be one of the strongest evidences against the probability of a particular offence; in the case of people suffering from the acts, their sporadic occurrence, the peculiar line in which they take place, all go to show the abnormal condition of the mind at the time. The mere violence of the impulse to commit them, it is true, is not a valid excuse; for it is hard even for the subject himself to be sure that this is really irresistible; but the frantic character of it, as he experiences it, and as it appears to others, is a legitimate proof of its insanity. In short, the utter and marked want of congruity between the behavior of the person under these circumstances and ordinary rational life stamps the act as that of a special mania, unaccountable to the individual himself in his lucid moments. The foregoing criterion, we may remark, will serve to distinguish genuine cases of irresponsible kleptomaniac from deliberate and culpable thievery, wherein no special occasion is known.

3. The question whether this may be a congenital tendency we cannot here digress to consider, except so far as to remark that this, if proved in the affirmative, would not really affect the main issue of moral responsibility; for human depravity is all confessedly inherited, but we do not, on that account, hold any one free from
the obligation to restrain its manifestation, and, by using the help within his reach, even ultimately eradicating it. In like manner we pass by the interesting cognate subject of the peculiar passion for intoxicating drinks experienced by the brute, the latter only being the controlling element, and its violent and seemingly overwhelming—tendency to return on the slightest stimulus, even after years of reform; merely observing that here, whether in instances of inherited or acquired appetite, the disease—for it undoubtedly is—such is a cowpained one, i.e. both of the body and the mind, the latter only being the controlling element—being the subject of moral consideration; and that the responsibility in these cases is at most simply shifted to total abstinence henceforth from the deadly seducer. This last thought, however, may easily apply to kindred sins, as to a propensity that brings back the drunkard's fatal appetite, so perhaps it was the indulgence in the first petty theft that developed the uncontrollable passion for purloining. In this light the subject has a grave lesson for all fallen humanity, inasmuch as each son of man bears within his bosom the germ of every hydra sin, which, perchance needs but one conducive act to cause it to spring forth to virulent life.

Kleschius, Daniel a German theologian, born at Iglau, in Moravia, in the early part of the 17th century, was educated at the universities of Strasbourg and Wittcnberg, and was prepared for a career for a number of years in Hungary and Croatia. In 1673 he was caught there for a time, and then removed to Weissenfels, where he became a professor at the gymnasium. Kleschius was a very peculiar character. He made many predictions, among others that the year 1700 would bring the final judgment day. He lived, however, beyond the time appointed. He died about 1701. See Spiegelmeir Hist. Lec. vol. iii, a v.

Kiesel. See Kielsel.

Klette, Johann Georg, a German Lutheran divine, was born at Radeberg, in Saxony, October 12, 1650, and studied theology at Leipzig and Wittenberg. He was made professor of theology and metaphysics at Jena in 1684. In 1696 he became pastor in that place, and died Dec. 28, 1697.

Kleuker, Johann Friedrich, one of the most eminent modern German theologians, was born at Osterode Oct. 24, 1749. He studied history, philosophy, and theology at the University of Göttingen. In 1778 he became a parish priest at Rüdernick, and there made the acquaintance of Herder, through whom he was appointed professor of the gymnasium of Lemgo, and, in 1778 rector of the gymnasium of Osnabruck. Herder also induced and encouraged him to write on the theological questions of the day. In acknowledgment of his literary activity and profound learning, he was made D.D. by the University of the Helmstedt in 1791. In 1796 he was appointed fourth ordinary professor of theology at Kiel, which position he filled with great success, lecturing on the exegesis of the O. and N. Test., Christian apologetics, Christian antiques, ancient Church history, the doctrine of Christ and of the apostles, symbolics, and Christian science, of which, in 1800, he published a Grundriss or Encyclopädie d. Theologie in 2 vols., for the use of his numerous pupils. The last few years of his life were spent in retirement after he had vainly tried to avoid the progress of scientific rationalism. Kleuker, says Hagenbach (see below), was one of the few men who, in doctrine and writings, stood in avowed opposition to the prevailing theological spirit of his times, of which he said 'that he had so poisoned the whole atmosphere that men hardly dared to speak of Christ as anything more than a passing shadow.' He was not even satisfied with Herder, who, as he held, made too many concessions to the new system of doctrine and thinking. Yet his simple, evangelical faith, his humble piety, and his active interest in all that was grand and good, secured him the intimate friendship of that class of men, while his profound learning, especially in Oriental and in classical antiquities, procured him the respect and consideration of all scholars. In judging a theologian, his influence on his associates and on the age in which he lived, is more important than any his writings: as much, if not more, can be determined of his character by the testimony of his life and death. With pleasure, then, do we point to the dying testimony of this celebrated German theologian. His biographer (see below) says of his last moments: 'I had the fortunes to be present when Kleuker died, for I must call it a good fortune to see a true Christian die as calmly as he did. As I came in, the approach of death was clearly indicated by his cold hands, almost motionless pulse, and difficult breathing. A kind of prophetic spirit appeared as if to guard, to prepare his soul for meeting it.'

Kley, Edward, a Jewish preacher and educator of note, born June 10, 1789, at Bernstadt, in Silesia, was prominently connected with the reformation of Judaism in the synagogue at the opening of the 19th century. He was a teacher and preacher at Berlin when, in 1818, the Progressive Jews of Hamburg called him to the superintendency of their schools, and later to the duties of a pastor. Kley was the first Jew who preached in a
temple (the name for the houses of worship of Reformed Jews), and who used a German liturgy and introduced an organ. May 9, 1840, he resigned his pastoral office, but the superintendence of the Jewish schools he held until 1862. The bulk of his school work was done in foreign languages and fell into the all active labors. His admirers presented him with a large fund for his support, but he declined to use it for himself, and founded the "Eduard Kley Stiftung" for the support and assistance of old teachers not sufficiently provided for by the state. He died Oct. 4, 1867. His works, which are generally acknowledged to be of superior order, were published at Hamburg in 1826-27, 1844, 8vo. He also published two volumes of hymnals: Predigt Skizzen, or Beiträge zu einer kirchlichen Homiletik (Leips, 1836, 2 vols, 8vo), and Die deutsche Synagoge oder Vaterland'sche Kirche (3 vols, 8vo, 1838; 2 vols, 8vo): — \[\text{Further information not transcribed.}\]

Kling, Christian Friedrich, a German theologian, was born at Aldolitz, in Württemberg, Nov. 4, 1800, and was educated at the University of Tübingen, where he became professor in 1824. Two years later he entered the ministry, and settled at Waiblingen until 1832, when he removed to Marburg as professor of theology. In 1840 he was appointed to and accepted a like position at Bonn University, which he held until 1847; then became professor at Erlangen, in Württemberg; later deceased at Marbach, in 1861. Kling was a ready writer, and contributed largely to the different German periodicals; he was one of the ablest assistants on the Theologische Studien und Kritiken. He edited J. F. von Flatt's Vorlesungen über die Pastoralische Physiognomy (1851), and contributed a Commentary to the Corinthisches and Lange's Bibelwerk (translated by Daniel W. Poor, D.D., Scribner's editor. New York, 1871, royal 8vo).

Klinge, Zacharias Laurentius, a Swedish theologian who flourished during the middle of the 17th century, was first professor of theology at Dorpat, then preacher at the Swedish court, and later pastor at Stockholm and Holmestrand in Norway. He died Sept. 8, 1671. His work, Teutonicoeremove, etc. See Allgemeines Histo. Lexicon, iii, 38.

Klingler, Antonius, a German Reformed theologian, was born at Zurich, Switzerland, Aug. 2, 1649; was educated at several of the most celebrated German universities, and theological professor at the gymnasium at Hanau in the same year. In 1680 he was offered a professorship at the University of Groningen, but he declined this honor in favor of a pastorate in his native place. He died there in August, 1718. Klingler published several theological works, of which the best is Bella Jadve. See Allgemeines Histo. Lexicon, iii, 38.

Klostock, Friedrich Gottlieb, an eminent German poet, one of the forerunners of the great German poetic romance of the 18th century—"the German Milton," as he is frequently styled—was born at Quedlinburg, Saxony, July 5, 1724. He received his early education at the school of his native place, and when sixteen years of age was admitted to the gymnasium at Naumburg, where he became acquainted with the style of the classical authors of his country. While his studies were highly honored and his position were elevated both in prose and verse, particularly to the writing of pastoral, which were in great vogue among the German, and it is said that even at that early period he had decided to write a poem of greater length than any that had hitherto been attempted by his countrymen, and one that should do honor to German literature, which was at this time rather at low ebb. France was in the avant-garde of political influence, and everything French was considered worthy of imitation; but French influence was most completely manifest in the social life of the people. The main feature of the litera

\[\text{Further information not transcribed.}\]
went to Hamburg, which was at this time a sort of litera-

city of Germany, and more particularly of its

northern half, as Weimar became some years later of the

southern half. Not only could Klostock claim it as his

residence, but it also contained for some time the great

Lesing, who, by the way, was no mean defendant of

Klostock in a lawsuit. The latter was under the

Governor of Hamburg's school; Herder occasionally visited

the Hanse city, and a number of lesser lights, such as

Voss, Claudius, Reimerius, the Stolberges, et. etc., gathered

there about the two chief luminaries. "Klostock,"

says Mrs. Winkworth (Christian Singers of Germany, p. 386),

speaking of the young poet, "with the respect at least,

or as it may be called reverence, not unlike that paid to Dr.

Johnson in England, but in some respects more flattering,

as he was a man of whom it was much easier to make a

popular, and especially a ladies' hero." Here the Messiah

was at last finished in 1775, having thus occupied twenty-

seven years in preparation. A complete edition of his

odes and lyrics was brought out, and here he devoted the

autumn of his long life to the study and purification of the

German language and its grammar. He had always been

a passionate lover of his country, but this did not prevent

him from sympathizing in the American War of Independenee,

and the opening of the French Revolution. He was among those who hailed the

earlier years of the latter with eager sympathy, and the

hope of a coming brighter era for humanity, and who

afterwards underwent the bitterness of profound disappoint-

ment. The hatred of his countrymen increased with the

recognition of his friendship for the French people by

accordign the rights of a French citizen, but when the

terrible massacres of 1793 took place he sent back to

them his diplogen. In Hamburg he married his "be-

loved" Margaretha, with whom, however, he enjoyed

only a short union; she died in childbirth in 1798.

In 1771 he was honored with the appointment of Danish

ambassador to Hamburg, and flourished at this place

the remainder of his days, dividing his time between

his public duties and the pursuits of literature. In 1792

Klostock married for the second time, choosing the

Fras von Winther, an old love of his, who had mean-

while become a widow, and who survived him. He died

in 1803, and was buried (March 22) by Hamburg with

royal honors, a distinction which in Germany is gener-

ally accorded only to royal personages.

His work of next importance to the Messiah is a

drama, above alluded to, entitled Hermann's Schlacht

(The Battle of Armimius), the subject of which is the

defeat of the Roman general Varus by the ancient Ger-

mans. It is scarcely so much a drama as a lyric poem in

twenty cantos of an irregular rhythm. His other dramas are of a similar character, and were

written evidently with intent to arouse German patriotism

from its lethargy, and to breathe into the German heart

the spirit of freedom. But the Messiah alone is of special interest to

our readers, and we therefore give a particular

description of it.

Klostock's Messiah is a poem in twenty cantos,

written in hexameters, except where certain choral

songs occur in unrhymed lyrical measure. "The action

opens after the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, when the

Messiah withdraws from the people, and, alone on the

Mount of Olives, renews his solemn vow to the

Almighty Father to undertake the work of redemption; it

closes when that work is completed, and he sits down at

the right hand of God. Around the central figure of the

God-man are grouped an infinite variety of specta-

cles; songs of joy are heard in the distant lands; John,

Gabriel are especially appointed to attend on the

divine sufferer; evil spirits who conspire against him,

but one of whom, Abbadon, repents and at last ob-

tains mercy; Adam and Eve, and the patriarchs, who

watch the occurrence with astonishment; the apostles

and the inhabitants of another world, like in nature to man, but unfallen, who are permitted

know what is taking place among their sinful kin-

dred. Even the Father himself is introduced as speak-

ing, and the scene is sometimes laid in the highest

heaven. The earthly actors are the mother and disci-

ples of Jesus, the Jews, and the Romans, who lead him
to death, and a number of those who have come in

contact with him in his ministrations, among whom the

most curiously drawn are two female figures, both named

Cidil: one, the daughter of Gederoan, is a remnant of

Genoa, and her death is an exact transcript of Meta's death-bed; the

other is the daughter of Jairus, between whom and

Semida, the youth of Naith, there exists a pure but ar-

dent attachment, which at last finds satisfaction in

heaven. The immense number of personages thus intro-

duced produces a confused impression; everything is

described by one or another of them, and talked over at

length; scarcely anything actually takes place before

the reader; there is an absence of local coloring and of

character, and very few of the actors have any distinct

individuality at all; while the effort to keep the whole

tone of the poem at the highest possible pitch of inten-

sity and awe gives rise to an overstrained inflation of

both thought and style, which becomes in the long run

inexpressibly fatiguing. Yet Klostock's poem has made

for itself and for the day in the German literature of his

country which does not depend on the number of read-

ers it now attracts. Its subject is linked by a thousand

invisible fibres to the whole Christian thought of centu-

ries past, while its spirit of mercy, forgiveness, and tol-

erance—in a word, of redemption—is essentially char-

acteristic of the sentimental development of Germany.

Here, too, Klostock most effectively treats such a theme worthily at all—to embody it in a

form which, however full of defects, yet possesses a cer-

tain dignity and real genius—marks its author as a

great poet, if not one of the greatest, and gives him a

place in the Pantheon of German literature, perhaps, than he has a

right to command as an artist." The poem certainly

abounds in passages of the most beautiful and splendid

poetry. An exuberant imagination everywhere scat-

ters its wealth, and Klostock has been said by one critic to be "as superior to Fidlar in richness and

deepest feeling as the spiritual world he paints transcends in in-

trinsic magnificence the scenes celebrated by the Gre-

cian bard." And by another critic, "now to rival the

tenderness of David, now to soar in the loftiest flights like

Isaiah. The purity and pathos of its religious sen-

timents are equal to the excellence of its poetry. But

all good and candid judges will allow that, though ex-

hibiting a sublimity and beauty of no common order, it

has failed to accomplish the confident expectations of the Germans, that it would eclipse the Paradise Lost of

Milton." For, notwithstanding its grandeur, it is ex-

cessively cold and coldly read. His other works and

Klostock's greatest popularity this seems to have been felt, for Leasing observes, in an epigram, that everybody praises Klostock, but few read him. His odes are val-

ued by his own countrymen more than his epic, and some are truly sublime, but contrasted with the language is so singular, and the connection of the thoughts so often non-apparent, that these odes are reckoned among the most difficult in the language. Both in his

Messiah and his odes he is dignified and sublime, but his rhapsodical manner contrasts strangely with the pedantry which is always apparent. Goethe, in his

conversations with Eckermann, expressed his opinion that German literature was greatly indebted to

Klostock, who was in advance of his times, but that the

times had since advanced beyond Klostock. The young

Hardenberg (who wrote under the name of "Novalis")

has happily said that Klostock's work always resemble translations from some unknown poet, done by a clever but unpoetical philologist. As for the theological as-

pect of his poem of the Messiah, Klostock fell into the almost inevitable fault, in treating this subject poetical-

ly, of dividing the kingdom of heaven between the Par-


ther and the Son (divine), and even opposing them to

each other, as when he makes Christ say to God, "I,

who am God as well as thou, swear to thee by myself
that I will redeem mankind." (Comp. Hurst's Hagenbach, Church History of the 18th and 19th Centuries, i. 249; ii. 277 sq.)

The Messiah was first published in fragments, and then as a whole (Altona, 1780; 7th ed. Lpz. 1817); it has been translated into Latin, English, French, Polish, Dutch, and other languages. There are also several shorter poems: Oden u. Elegien (Hamb. 1771, 2 vols.; 6th ed. Lpz. 1827; trans. into English by W. Nind, 1847) — Gefallene Lieder (Kopenhagen. 1738-39, 2 vols.); besides dramas under the following titles: Ad am'n Tod (Kopenhagen. 1757; 4th ed. 1773) — Schoone Liebe (Magdeburg. 1754) — Jürek (Hamburg. 1772); etc. His complete works have been published under the title Klopfstock's sämtliche Werke (Lpz. 1798-1817, 12 vols.; 1822-24, 12 vols. 1828-29, 18 vols.; 1839, 9 vols.; 1839, 1 vol.; Copenhagen. 1844, 10 vols., with 3 supplements. See Cramer, Klopfstock, u. a. über ihn (Dessau, 1798, 5 vols. 8vo); Mms. de Stahl, De Fallemmage; Klamer-Schmidt, Klopfstock u. a. Freunde (Halberstadt, 1810); H. Döring, Klopfstock's Leben (Weimar, 1825) — English Cyclop. s. v.; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. der Literatur, iii. 260 sq., 2884 sq., etc.; Löbell, Entwickelung d. deutschen Poesie v. Klopfstock bis Goethe ( Brunswick, 1856), vol. i: Gervinus. Gesch. d. deutschen Dichtung (Leipzig, 1844, 6 vols. 8vo, 2nd ed., iv. 155 sq.; British and Foreign Expositor, xxxv, 1843, 592 sq.)

Klopf, David, a German theologian, was born at Tithi, Prussia, April 14, 1618, and, upon the urgent request of his father, studied theology, although his own inclinations were in favor of medicine. In 1641 he began to lecture at the University of Rostock, where he had pursued his theological studies for several years, in addition to his course at Königsberg University. Later he travelled abroad, and visited the high-schools of Sweden and the Netherlands. He began to preach in 1644 at Marienwerder; removed in 1646 to Saalfeld, and in 1657 to Ellingen, in 1650 to Wismar, and in 1655 to Hamburg. He died there April 14, 1681. For a list of his works, see Jocher, Gekr. Lex. ii, 2118 sq.

Klopf, Johann Daniel, a German theologian, was born at Weissenfels June 6, 1760, and educated at the Universities of Leipzig and Wittenberg. He was a professor at the gymnasium in Dortmund in 1780; in 1795 he removed to Weissenfels as preacher and superintendent of the churches, and in 1796 accepted the same office at Zerbst, where he died July 5, 1808. Klopf was well acquainted with dogmatics and the exegesis of the N.T., as is evinced by his writings in those departments. He contributed largely to periodicals, and published in book form Concilium syntagmatis confessio Eccles. Luther (Hamburg 1792, 4to) — Commentatio de Mart. Clementii auriorum consensus in acta justificationis presentis falsa protesta (ibid. 1784, 4to) — Commentatio in locum (Timm. iii, 2) (Dortm. 1747, 4to) — Eclogae in pericopos epistolicae (ibid. 1748, 4to, etc.) See Döring, Gekr. Theol. Deutschlands, ii. 126 sq. (where, by mistake, he is treated as Klopf, Johann Andreas). (J. H. W.)

Knapp, Albert, a German theologian, and one of the ablest workers in the Wittenburg Church of the 19th century, peculiarly distinguished for his poetical gifts and influence in establishing a school of religious poetry, was born in Tübingen July 25, 1796. His childhood was passed in the village of Alpirsbach, under the old 11th-century Benedictine cloister, and he enjoyed the careful instruction of Handel, afterward pastor at Stammheim. Night and day he dreamed poetry. His university studies, upon which he entered in 1816, were rather poetical than literary, the authorship of a volume of his choice, and for that he always expressed his gratitude. In 1820 he was established vicar near Stuttgart, and here, through intercourse with the poets Wilhelm Hofacker (q. v.), he received that deep religious impression which ever after characterized his work. In 1881 he became professor at Königsberg, where, in 1835, on the occasion of a friend, he began the publication of the Christreden, an annual which contained religious selections from various eminent authors, was popular, and often sought as a Christmas gift in families, but ceased with the year 1837. In 1836 he was made pastor at Stuttgart, and labored there with great zeal for the cause of his Master, exercising a large influence until his death, June 18, 1864. The prayer expressed in one of his best hymns was answered: "Grant me one thing here below—thy
KNAPP

123

KNAPP

Spirit and thy peace, and the honor in my grave of hav- ing known thy love.

Albert Knapp is chiefly known by his religious poems, and as the best of these may be pointed out his Christ-
lische Gedichte (in 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1829; 8d ed. Bade, 1845), Herbstblüthen (1859), and Christoterpe, already referred to. To the hymnology of the Church Knapp rendered

penetrating, in the line of the Church hymn-book, many forgotten treasures. His Lie-

dachser, generally acknowledged to be one of the most

valuable collections of Christian hymns of all ages, was first published in 1857 (2d ed. 1860, 2 vols. 8vo), and the Evangelielle Gesangbuch in 1865. His avowed principle of

composition was a sharp and deliberate assault, and he himself restored at a later day some of the original expressions. As a preacher the manifold richness of his thought and delicacy of diction was his attraction. He did not suffer himself to appear in his sermons, never having once so used a poem of his own, nor even having appointed one of his own hymns to be sung, yet no one could listen to him without acknowledging a rare union of extensive learning with original genius. His singular merit as a hymn-

maker remains, notwithstanding a haste of composition and an apparent want of order, a truth of thought, a subjectivity of the author, according to the spirit of the times, often characterizes his weightier pieces, yet his individuality is one of simple faith.

In theology he was fully evangelical in his doctrine of salvation, which he defended not in mere polemic, but in heart and soul against all opposers. See also the Christoterpe of 1846 for a statement of his belief. He grounded all defence of doctrine upon the necessities and joyful faith of spiritual experience, and severely con- demned a merely external method and the zeal of argu-

mentation more often than not. He had no sympathy with sects as such. Knapp's biographical contributions in the Christoterpe are of great interest and beauty; we name that on his own "Childhood Days" in the issue of 1849, on Ludwig Hofacker (1848), Hedinger (1860), Steinhofen (1867), Jacob Balde (1864), Jeremias Flatt (1892). The writer's poetic humor and narrative power, invested with love for his theme, make these sketches perfect art-

works. Dr. Friedrich Wilhelm Krummacher, in his autobiography (translated by Easton, Edinb. 1869, 8vo, p. 203, 294), pays the following tribute to the high poet-
ic merit of our subject: "From the first Knapp chose the true poetic inborn genius no one will seriously deny, and yet he is not generally mentioned in our recent histories of literature as ranked among the 'Swabian poets,' although, without doubt, he would have been named among them, and in the very foremost rank, had he cultivated a talent more often recognized, and no more than his spirit's desire of seeking all his inspiration from the Spirit of God; but worldly fame, to which the way and the door stood wide open for him, he gladly cast at his feet, and recognized it as his calling, as it indeed was the impulse of his heart, to sing the praises of the heavenly Prince of Peace, through whom he knew himself redeemed and ordained 'to the inheritance of the saints in light.' Instead of worldly fame, there was destined for him, so long as a Church of Christ shall remain on earth, the glorious re-

ward of God, that his Eines wuchs ich mir vor allem Andenken, his As dein Blumen und Erkichen, his Abend ist es, Herr, die Stunde, and many others of his hymns, will never cease to be sung in it. We bless him in the name of many thousands to whom the melodies of his harp, breathing peace and joy, have lightened their steps on the way to the city of God, and we hope that the people of our Church will continue the "stream of living water", according to the word of the Lord, yet flow for them to this hour from the life and labors of their highly-gifted pastor." See Herzog, Real-Enzyklop. vii, 768; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, a. v.; Düng-

ing, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschland, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Knapp, Johann Georg, father of Georg Christi-

an, was himself a theologian of some note. He was born at Oehringen Decr. 27, 1705, of pious parents, and went to the University of Altdorf to study theology. He removed to Jena in 1726 to continue his preparatory studies for the ministerial office, and completed them at Halle, where, in 1728, he was appointed instructor at the royal pedagogium. In 1732 he became pastor to the Prussian military school at Berlin, but was restored to Halle only one year, and then returned to Halle to fill an ad-

junct professorship in theology at the university. He was made ordinary or regular professor in 1739. After the decease of the celebrated Knapp he was placed over the orphan asylum, and held this position until his death, July 30, 1771. Knapp took a particular interest in the cause of missions, and published Neues Gesch. d. evang.
that those of the ancient Hebrews were of the same description as those now in use appear from their being able to carry them, together with the dough, wrapped up in their cloaks, upon their shoulders without difficulty.

The Bedouin Arabs, indeed, use for this purpose a leather, which can be drawn up into a bag by a running cord, and which is then sometimes open and sometimes closed, and often carry their dough. This might equally, and in some respects better answer the described conditions; but, being especially adapted to the use of a nomad and tent-dwelling people, it is more likely that the Israelites, who were not such at the time of the Exode, then used the wooden bowls for their 'kneading-troughs' (Exod. viii. 3; xiii. 34; Deut. xxviii. 5, 7). It is clear, from the history of the departure from Egypt, that the flour had first been made into a dough by water only, in which state it had been kept some little time before it was leavened; for when the Israelites were unexpectedly (as to the moment) compelled in all haste to withdraw, it was found that, although the dough had been prepared in the kneading-trough, it was still unleavened (Exod. xii. 34; compare Hos. vii. 4); and it was in consequence of this circumstance that they and their descendants in all ages were enjoined to eat only unleavened bread at the feast of the Passover. See BREAD.

Knead (נוּשָׁה, lish), to prepare dough by working it with the hands; a task usually performed by women (Gen. xviii. 6; I Sam. xxiv. 24; 2 Sam. xiii. 8; Jer. vii. 18); once spoken of a male baker (Hos. viii. 4). See Dought.

KNEADING-TROUGH (טָנֹשׁ, mishkeit, so called from the fermentation of the dough), the vessel in which the materials of the bread, after being mixed and leavened, is left to swell (Exod. viii. 3, xii. 34, rendered "store" in Deut. xxviii. 5, 17); probably like the wooden bowl used by the modern Arabs for the same purpose. On the monuments of Egypt we find the various processes of making bread represented with great minuteness. Men were chiefly occupied in it, as with us at the present day. Their grain was ground in hand-mills, or pounded in mortars, and then kneaded into dough, which was afterwards kneaded by the hand, in a large circular bowl, or in a trough with the feet (Wilkinson, 4. c. Ep. i. 174–6). See BAKE. The process of making bread in Egypt is now generally performed in villages by women, among whom proficiency in that art is looked upon as a sort of accomplishment. Except in large towns, each family bakes its own bread, which is usually made into small cakes and eaten new, the climate not admitting of its being kept long without turning sour. When the dough is sufficiently kneaded, it is made up into a round flat cake, generally about a span in width, and a finger's breadth in height. Some of this straw and dung is then kindled on the floor or hearth, which, when sufficiently heated, is removed, and the dough being placed on it, and covered with hot embers, is thus soon baked. Sometimes a circle of small stones is placed upon the hearth after it has been heated, into which some paste is poured, and covered with hot embers: this produces a kind of biscuit. See OVEN. "The modern Oriental kneading-troughs, in which the dough is prepared, have no resemblance to ours in size or shape. As one person does not bake bread for many families, as is the case with us; as a family does not make bread sufficient for many days, as in our villages, but every family bakes for the day only the quantity of bread which it requires, but a comparatively small quantity of dough is prepared. This is done in small wooden bowls, and so the kneading is done" (Deut. xv. 17). For the peculiar term in Gen. xxi. 48 (see Reinecke, De nomine אֵשֶׁת, Weissenf. 1726), see ABRECH.
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a loud voice," praying for his murderer (Acts vii, 60); Peter likewise "kneeled down and prayed" (Acts ii, 46). Paul also (Acts xxx, 36; xxii, 5). That the posture was a customary one may be inferred from the conduct of the man beseeching Christ to heal his son (Matt. xvii, 14), and of the rich young man (Mark x, 17), as also of the scribes (Mark i, 46); yes, we have even the example of John the Baptist, who "kneeling down" (Luke viii, 40), "kneeled down when he prayed. That the practice was general among the early Christians is plain from the Shepherd of Hermas, from Eusebius' History (i, 38), and from numberless other authors, and especially from the procession made by the faithful in many places to the people in all the liturgies, "Flectamus genua" (Let us bend our knees), whereupon the people knelt till, at the close of the prayer, they received a corresponding summons, "Levate" (Arise), and from the fact that prayer itself was termed ενεκτοσων, bending the knees. In the days of Irenaeus, and for some time after, four postures were in use among Christians, namely, standing (for which see reason below), prostration (as a sign of deep and extraordinary humiliation), bowing, and kneeling. The posture of sitting during the time of public prayer, of modern days, seems to have been unknown in the first centuries. The kneeling posture in the practice of penance was the common practice during the six working days, and was understood by the early Church to denote humility of mind before God, and as a symbol of our fall by sin. A standing posture in worship (explained by St. Chrysostom) was from the Church's infancy to the dead, and the forgiveness of sins, and also as being a sign of the Christian's hope and expectation of heaven) was assumed by the early Christian worshippers (except penitents) on Sundays and during the fifty days between Easter and Whit Sunday, "as a symbol of the resurrection, whereby, through the grace of Christ, we rise again from our fall." Cassian says of the Egyptian churches that from Saturday night to Sunday night, and all the days of Pentecost, they neither knelt nor fasted. The Apostolical Constitutions order that Christians should pray three times on the Lord's day, standing, in honor of him who rose the third day from the dead, and in the writings of Chrysostom we meet with frequent allusions to the same practice, especially in the oft-repeated form by which the deacon called upon the people to pray, "Let us stand upright with reverence and devotion." St. Zosimus says, "We count it a sin to sit fast, or to worship kneeling, on the Lord's day, and we enjoy the same immunity from Easter to Pentecost." This practice was confirmed by the Council of Nice, for the sake of uniformity, and it is from this circumstance, probably, that the Ethiopic and Muscovitian churches adopted the attitude of standing generally, a custom which they continue to this day. From Cyril's writings it would appear that also at the celebration of the Eucharist a standing attitude was assumed by the early Christians. He says "it was with silence and downcast eyes, bowing themselves in the posture of worship and adoration." The exact period when kneeling at the Lord's Supper became general cannot be ascertained, but it has prevailed for many centuries, and it is now generally, though not altogether, practiced as the proper posture for communicants.

In ordination, also, a kneeling posture was early practiced. Dionysius says, "The person to be ordained kneeled before the bishop at the altar, and he, laying his hand upon his head, did consecrate him with a holy prayer, and then signed him with the sign of the cross, after which the bishop and the clergy present gave him the kiss of peace." It would appear, however, that bishops and deacons did not relish much the humilitating posture of kneeling at their ordination, for Theodoret informs us that "it was a customary rite to bring the person about to be ordained bishop to the holy table, and make him kneel before the bishop. But after he had touched the earth, the bishop made him kneel also, for a significant mode of showing with what reluctance men should undertake so important, so weighty a charge as that of bishop in the Church of Jesus Christ. Indeed, so solemn and onerous were its responsibilities esteemed, that we read of several who recoiled as soon as they understood that the popular voice had chosen them to fill this honorable post; and many of them, when captured, were brought by force to the holy altar, and there, against their will and inclination, were ordained by the bishop, who was held down on their knees by the officers of the church. See Election of Clergy.

In the Roman Catholic Church the act of kneeling belongs to the highest form of worship. It is especially practiced in the performance of monastic devotions and in the acts of penance. It is also frequently employed during the mass as well as the presence of the consecrated elements when reserved for subsequent communion. In acts of penance this Church has carried the practice to great excess, subjecting the penitent to sufferings which remind us of the legend told of St. James, that he contracted a hardness on his knees equal to that of camels because he was so generally on his knees. "Instances," says Edie, "are innumerable, and ever recurring in the Romish Church, of delicate women being obliged to walk on rough pavements, for hours in succession, on their bare knees, until at length nature, worn out by the long exposure to injurious and exhausting exercises, compels them to desist. To encourage the penitent and devout in acts of this nature, the most wonderful tales are related of the good resulting from self-mortification and entire submission to the stern discipline of the Church." See the article Oration.

In the Anglican Church the rubric prescribes the kneeling posture in many parts of the service, and this, as well as the practice of bowing the head at the name of Jesus, was the subject of much controversy with the Puritans. A like controversy was in 1688 provoked in Bavaria by a ministerial decree obliging Protestants to join the Romanists in this ceremony when required of them, and ended only with its repeal in 1844 (for details on this point, see the Roman Catholic version in Wetzler and Welte, Kirchen Lex. vi, 236; the Protestant side in Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, a. v. Baier). See Edie, Eccles. Dict. a. v.; Patriz, Eccles. Dict. a. v.; Hook, Church Hist. Dict. a. v.; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, 391 sq., 631 sq.,; Coleman, Christian Antiquities (see Index).

Kneph or Kaphphis, also known under the name of Nym or Nysr, in Egyptian mythology is the oldest designated deity of the waters, and signifies either spirit or water, perhaps in allusion to the Spirit of God, who in the beginning moved upon the face of the waters. Greatly distorted by the priests, the legend is in brief that from his mouth came the egg which gave existence to all things temporal; hence the egg is his symbol; likewise the snake, which assumes the shape of a ring, to indicate his eternal existence. His representation is frequently found on Egyptian monuments, sometimes with a snake holding an egg between its head and tail. The Egyptians of Thebes knew only this one god to be immortal; all others they supposed to be more or less subject to temporal changes.

In the late twelfth century, Kneph was the special god of Upper Egypt, where he was represented in human shape, with the head of a ram; still regarded as the creator of other gods, he was figured at Elephantine sitting at a potter's wheel fashioning the limbs of Osiris, while the god of the Nile is the wind. "The idea," says Trevor (Anc. Egypt, p. 131), "seems to be the same as in Job (x, 8, 9; Rom. ix, 22): 'Thine..."
hands have made me and fashioned me together round about. Remember, I beseech thee, that thou hast made me as the clay." (Comp. Herodotus, ii. 41.) See Voll- 
W.)

**Knibb, William**, a Baptist missionary to Jamaica, 
was born at Kettering, in Northamptonshire, England, 
about 1800. He sailed as a missionary to Kingston, 
Jamaica, in 1824; in 1828 removed to the Ridgeland 
Mission, in the north-western part of the island, 
and subsequently became pastor of the mission church at 
Palmouth. He exercised a very important part in 
bringing about the Emancipation Act of 1838, by which 
slavery was abolished in the island, and afterwards so 
exposed the apprenticeship system established by the 
same act as to secure the complete emancipation of 
apprentices in the island. In 1838 he erected a normal 
school at Kettering, in Trelawney, for training native 
and other schoolmistresses for both Jamaica and Africa, 
and in 1842 he visited England to promote the estab-
lishment of a theological seminary in connection with 
the native mission to Africa. He died at Kettering 
July 15, 1845.

**Knife** is the representative in the (Auth. Version) 
several Heb. terms: בָּשָׂר (che'râb, from its laying waste); 
a sharp instrument, e.g. for circumcision (Josh. v, 2, 8); 
a razor (Ezek. v, 1); a graving-tool or chisel (Exod. xx, 
28); an axe (Ezek. xxvi, 9); poet. of the curved (maska 
of the hippopotamus (Job xl, 19); elsewhere usually a 
"sword." מָכָלֶל (machal'eth, so called from its use 
in eating), a large knife for slaughtering and cutting up 
food (Gen. xxxii, 6, 10; Judg. xix, 29; Prov. xxx, 14). 
מַכָלֶל (makhalkh), so called from separating parts to the 
view), a knife for any purpose, perhaps a table-knife 
(Prov. xxiii, 2). מַכָלֶל (makhalkh), so called from 
gliding through the flesh), a butcher's knife for slaugh-
tering the victims in sacrifice (Ezra i, 9). See Swoon. 

"The probable form of the knives of the Hebrews 
will be best gathered from a comparison of those of 
other ancient nations, both Eastern and Western, which 
have come down to us. No. 1 represents the Roman 
cutor, used in sacrificing, which may be compared with 
No. 2, an Egyptian sacrificial knife. Nos. 3, 4, and 5 
are also Egyptian knives, of which the most remark-
able, No. 3, is from the Louvre collection; the others 
are from the <b>Monumenti Reali</b> of Rosellini. Nos. 6-9 are 
Roman, from Barcelonetta. In No. 7 we have probably 
the form of the pruning-hook of the Jews (יִֽסְכָּר, lxxv, 
ixviii, 22), though some rather assimilate this to the 
sickle (<b>ἄλσος</b>). It was probably with some such instru-
ment as No. 9 that the priests of Beal cut themselves." 
See ANION. The knife used by the fisherman for 
splitting his fish (q. v.) was of a circular form, with 
a handle, as likewise that used by the currier for cut-
ting leather (q. v.), only larger and heavier. In the 

1. The knives of the Egyptians, and of other nations 
in early times, were probably only of hard stone, and 
the use of the flint or stone knife was sometimes 
employed for sacred purposes after the introduction of iron 
(ii. 86) mentions knives both of iron and of stone at 
different stages of the same process of embalming (see 
<NAME>, *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 168). The same may perhaps 
also be said, to some extent, of the Hebrews (compare Exod. 
iv, 20).
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car of St. Sepulchre's, London. Nothing further is known to us of his personal history. He wrote in Defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity two treatments (1714–15), which are highly commended by Dr. Waterland (Moyer's Lectures). Knight also published five separate Sermons (1719–56), and eight sermons delivered at lady Moyer's Lecture in 1720–21 (1721, 1726).—Allibone, Dict. of English and American Authors, vol. ii, a. v.

Knight, James (2), a Congregational minister, was born at Halifax, Yorkshire, England, July 19, 1709, and was educated for the ministry at Homerton College, where he is said to have made rapid attainments in Biblical science. Upon his graduation he was called to the Church in Collierswaite, Southwark, where he was ordained in 1729. In 1730 he resigned his pastoral charge, after a faithful and successful service. He was one of the founders of the London Missionary Society. Mr. Knight's sermons, some of which have been published, were celebrated for their sacred union, and their thorough and searching appeals to the conscience. His eminence piety was both the strength and ornament of his character. He knew how not only to discuss a subject with logical precision, but also to infuse into it the spirit of vital evangelical piety. See Morison, Missionary Fathers.

Knight, Joel Abraham, a Methodist minister, was born at Hull, Yorkshire, England, April 28, 1754; was ordained at Speenfields Chapel, London, March 9, 1780, where he was also appointed master of the charity school and assistant preacher. In 1788 he preached at Pentonville Chapel, and in 1789 became pastor of the Tabernacle and Tottenham Court churches, London, a position which he occupied until his death, April 22, 1866. Mr. Knight was a zealous worker in the formation and proceedings of the London Missionary Society in 1793. His sermons, some of which were published in London in 1788–9, were always richly imbued with the distinguishing doctrines of evangelical Christianity, but they especially taught that "the cordial reception of the doctrine of salvation by grace must necessarily produce obedience to the law of God." In speech he was invariably chaste, and in manner affectionate and pathetic. —Morison, Missionary Fathers.

Knight, Samuel, D.D., an English divine of note, was born in London in 1675, and was educated at St. Paul's School and at Trinity College, Cambridge. He first became chaplain to Edward, earl of Oxford, and was by him presented to the rectory of Borough-green, in Cambridgeshire, in 1707; was made prebendary of Ely and rector of Blantsham (Huntingdonshire) in 1714; became chaplain to George II in 1736, and was promoted to the archdeaconry of Berks in 1735. He died Dec. 15, 1746. Between the years 1721 and 1728 he published several of his Sermons. He also wrote Life of Dr. John Coles, Dean of St. Paul's (London, 1724, 8vo; new edit. Oxford, 1828, 8vo).—Life of Erasmus (Cambridge, 1729, 8vo).—General Biog. Dict. vii, 40 sq.; Allibone, Dict. of Eng. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, a. v.

Knighthood, the condition, honor, and rank of a knight, also the service due from a knight, and the tenure of land by such service. In a secondary sense, the word is employed to denote the class of knights—the aggregate body of any particular knightly association; the institution itself, and the spirit of the institution. In these remoter meanings it becomes identical with Chivalry, and it is in this point of view that it will principally be considered here. The term is one of various significance, and is, therefore, apt for ambiguities; it is one whose applications were of gradual development, and which is, accordingly, of diverse historical import. Its explanation is thus necessarily intricate and multifarious, and care is requisite to avoid confounding different things, or different phases of the same thing, under the single common name. Neglect of this precaution has occasioned much of the extra-

Ancient Egyptian Flint Knives (from the Berlin Museum), No. 1 for general purposes; No. 2 probably for incisions is embalming.

2. In these, unlike the Jews, like other Orientals, made little use of knives, but they were required for slaughtering animals either for food or sacrifice, as well as for cutting up the carcass (Lev. vii, 33, 34; viii, 15, 20, 25; ix, 3; Num. xviii, 1; 1 Sam. ix, 24; Ezek. xxiv, 4; Ezra i, 5; Matt. xxvi, 23; Russell, negro, i, 172; Wilkinson, i, 189; Mashna, Tausud, iv, 3). See EATING.

Ancient Egyptian Slaughtering-knives. No. 1 is cutting up an Iber. No. 2 is sharpening a knife on a steel attached to his apron. Over them is the hieroglyph for the act.

Asiatics usually carry about with them a knife or dagger, often with a highly-ornamented handle, which may be used when required for eating purposes (Judg. ii, 21; Layard, Nin. ii, 342, 299; Wilkinson, i, 358, 360; Chardin, Voyage, iv, 18; Niebuhr, Voyage, i, 340, pl. 71). See GIRDLE.

Ancient Assyrian Knives (from the Britsh Museum). Two of them have a hook at the handle, as if for suspending in the girdle. For another form used by soldiers, see BUCKLE.

3. Smaller knives were in use for paring fruit (Josephus, Ant. vii, 7; Worr, i, 50, 7) and for sharpening pears (Jer. xxxvi, 23). See PENKNIFE.

4. The razor was often used for Nazaritish purposes, for which a special chamber was reserved in the Temple (Num. vi, 5, 9, 19; Ezek. v, 1; Isai. vii, 20; Jer. xxxvi, 3; Acts xvii, 18; xxi, 24; Mashna, Midd. ii, 5). See Razors.

5. The pruning-hooks of Isai. xviii, 5 were probably curved knives. See PRUNING-HOOK.

6. The lancets of the priests of Baal were probably pointed knives (1 Kings xviii, 28). See LANCET.
gance and complexity which are noticeable in speculations on this subject.

A knight under the feudal system—miles in the Latinity of feudal jurisprudence—was one holding land by military service (servitium militare), with horse, and shield and other uniforms. His function was to serve (Latin, servire, to serve). The crusades and the Teutonic Knights (Bledowicz, Commentaries, li, 62–3). Knighthood in this application corresponds closely with the French designation chevalerie, and its consideration is inextricably intertwined with that of chivalry.

The canons of knighthood have undergone many modifications in the lapse of centuries. The lord mayor of London is knighted for the presentation of an address to the sovereign, and Michael Faraday is deservedly made an officer of the Legion of Honor for chemical and other scientific discoveries; but in the main conception and strict usage of the term knighthood, liege service in war is implied.

"A knight ther was, and that a worthy man, That from the tyne that he first diggan Tothow wed, as well he loved. Trouthe and honour, freedom and curtsey. Ful worthi was he in his lordes were, And thereto bad he ridden, roman ferre, As wel in Cristendom as in hethene, And ever honoured for his worthinesse."

The character of knighthood, however, as distinguished from the mere tenure of land by knight-service, was entirely different. It is committed to the prince and attaches only for life, and is not descendible by inheritance. It cannot be assumed by one's own act, but must be bestowed by another of knighthood or of superior rank. The knight's estate was held by knight-service, or chivalry, and in the old age was entitled to receive the casual incidental to the rank. Hence arose the old adage: "Bon secuier vault mielz que pauere chevelier." But the reality or the obligation of personal military service was always entailed by knighthood.

I. Origin of Knighthood or Chivalry.—Under the impulse of the same uncritical spirit which referred the ascent of the Britons to Brutus and wanderers from Troy, the origin of knighthood has been traced back to the judges of Israel or to the heroes of the Iliad. More modest inquirers have been content to go no further back than the "Order of the Golden Angel" (313), or to the equally imaginary Etruscan "Order of St. Anthony," and the aborigines of the African deserts. Others, more modest still, ascend only to "King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table," or Charles Martel and the "Order of the Garter," or to "Charlemagne and his Paladins." In all such genealogies there is much fantasy, confusion, and retrospective legend. The incidents of war must all ages present some general resemblances. There must always have been leaders and followers, brothers in arms, and associations of heroes, in spite of too many "mournes ant Agamemnon." Such tendencies in human nature as prompted these military unions might furnish the impulse to subsequent institutions, but to ascribe the origin of the institutions themselves to the first recorded manifestation of these tendencies is to renounce all historic veracity, and hence it is confuted by the existence of a definite institution, with precise and distinctive characters, animated by a peculiar spirit, which gave its coloring to society for many generations, and which has moulded the type of life and manners. What is contemplated is a "military institution, prompted by enthusiastic benevolence, sanctioned by religion, and combined with religious ceremonies, the purpose of which was to protect the weak from the oppression of the powerful, and to defend the right against the wrong." (James, History of Chivalry, chap. i). The only important omissions in this definition are the obligation of "honour aux dames," knightly truth, and the thorough interpenetration of Christian profession, if rarely of Christian practice.

The term of knighthood, but only the germ, may unquestionably be found in the ancient usages of the Teutonic tribes and in the Teutonic comitatus, which coalesced with Roman customs and with the suggestions of the times in shaping feudalism. The very name of vassal, knight, successor, servitor, military follower, would indicate such a derivation. "Arms sumere non ante cuiquam moris quam civitas suffuturam probavit. Tum in ipso concilio principium aliquis, vel pa
ter, vel propinquus, scuto frameaque juvenem orant. Hoe aqua filos toga, hic publicus juvenil honor; ante hoc domus pars viduent, mex repiaeunt. . . . Ceteris roburisibus et jam pridem probatis adgresquant; nec rubor inter societes angusti." (Tacticus, Germa. c. xiii; comp. c. xiv). To this same source must be ascribed in part, but only in part, the chivalrous deference for women: "in oases quin etiam sanctam aliquid et providum pertagant; nec aut consilia eorum aspernatur aut responsum neglegunt" ( Ibid, c. viii). The intensification and spiritu-alization of this deference are due to Christianity.

Ethical temperaments, ethical tendencies, and ethical usages are seldom entirely eradicated. They continue to be reproduced under new forms, animate new institutions, and enter into strange and often undetected combinations. With this explanation, knighthood may be, in some measure, referred to the rude warriors of the forests of Germany, who are described in the great western monographs in terms more applicable to the Indians of North America than to any populations which really occupied the provinces of the crumbling empire of Rome. The actual historical origin of knighthood, though very obscure, may be safely assigned to a much later age, and to more potent influences than those which flowed from the Rhine, and the Elbe, and the shores of the Baltic.

Without recurring to the details of the feudal system [see Feudalism], it may be stated that feudal services (servitium) were strictly limited, and prescribed military service for a fixed time and of a fixed amount. Circumstances might occur which would demand longer, less restricted, and less formally organized warfare. Such circumstances did occur in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries. During the Norman ravages of France, the early history of the High Middle Ages, the decay of the Carlovian dynasty, universal anarchy, misery, and outrage covered the land. The perils from the barbarous enemy were scarcely greater than those from violent and rapacious barons, and from lawless and lordless plunderers. The multiplied horrors of the dismal period were aggravated by general depopulation, by famine, by plague, and by disastrous proclivities on the earth and in the heavens. The bonds of authority were snapped; the regular organization of the feudal society was rent and suspended; immediate protection and prompt service, in proportion to rank and subordination, were demanded on all sides. Those who had the power, the heart, and the will, found abundant work for active hands to do in the defense of women and children, of the old and infirm, of unarmed merchants and pilgrims, of priests and monks; and rode through the country endeavoring to repress disorders, if unable to establish order. The condition of things was even worse than such as might now provoke Lynch law or instigate vigilance committees. Of course, the vigilance committees of the closing millennium assumed the authority of the vassals, the power of the lords, and the domestic influence of the dukes. Accordingly, the avengers of iniquity were guided by an earnest, though usually rude and blundering sense of Christian obligation in their generous warfare. It thus became the avowed duty of the true knight to serve women, to protect the feeble, to minister to the wound-
ed, to comfort the wretched, to repress or punish wrong, and in all honor to uphold and to do the right.

"He had abroad in arms wonne muche fame,
And did far landes with glory of his might;
Ful true, and ful, true, and ever true,
And ever lov'd to fight for ladies right;
But in valye-glories frays he little did delight."

While these calamitous generations writhe through their long agony in Frans, the progress of the Holy Warfare in Spain against the Saracens invited and enriched the princes, nobles, and adventurers who fought for the Cross against the Crescent. Religious fervor was thus intimately conjoined with martial prowess. But, both in France and Spain, and, in less degree, in other countries, there was a few of those circumstances which produced such supernatural phenomena. In all cases there was a relaxation of the direct connection of military achievement with landed estates and feudal subordination. High moral qualities and Christian zeal were required of the landless or lonely knight, or were annexed as requirements to complete the character of the accomplished feudal vassal. Thus the true knight came to be distinguished from the knight by feudal tenure; though the feudal knight might possess, and was expected to possess, knightly characteristics in addition to his feudal dominion, he was, in general, treated with less respect.

Doubtless in France and Spain, and elsewhere, chivalrous enterprise was encouraged, if not originated by the Church, the sole moral authority of those days, which was anxious for peace, earnest for order, vowed to the maintenance of right, and eager to subordinate to spiritual rule and guidance the military ardor and the temporal power of the time.

All these influences and all these tendencies, of various age and origin, converged and commingled, with augmented energy in each, in the Crusades. These romantic and persistent enterprises may have been undertaken and prolonged by the instigation and for the interest of the Papacy, but they were none the less the outburst of popular enthusiasm, and of a popular enthusiasm which gave form and active reality to an instinctive perception of urgent policy. Whole nations are not impelled for centuries to arduous and perilous undertakings by any extrinsic force; the enduring impulse by which they are set and kept in motion must be a living power in their own bosoms, "bequeathed by bleeding sire to son."

Looking back from the safe vantage-ground of a half-century which has been with several of us more than two hundred years, it is difficult to appreciate justly the alarming dangers to which Christianity and Christian nations were exposed from Moslem aggression at the commencement of the second millennium of our era. The apprehension was not dispelled entirely till the victories of John Scipio and the Alcázar under the walls of Vienna (1683). It is equally difficult to estimate now the effect of a wild, warlike fanaticism against Saracens and Pagans in implanting the recently acquired and imperfectly received creed in turbulent spirits, and perhaps more difficult to recognize the part rendered by the Holy War in diffusing and deepening the sentiment of a common faith, a common interest, a common civilization throughout Western Europe—a Christendom, or dominion of Christ.

All of these feelings were quickened by the Crusades, and were both exalted and rendered, in some sort, self-conscious by them. It must be remembered that the Crusades did not begin with Peter the Hermit and the Council of Clermont, but that the crusading spirit had been previously manifested and cherished in Spain, in Sicily, and in northern Africa. In this spirit only received its full development and definite purpose by being directed to the recovery of Jerusalem. Through distant Asian expeditions the desultory and unregulated adventure for the maintenance of Christian belief and Christian security was generalized, organized, disciplined, and directed toward a common end. The military barons were withdrawn from domestic discords, and a guided to a great European aim. War was in some degree sanctified; it was ennobled, at least in the conception of the warrior, by being employed for the defense and maintenance of the faith. A war of holy war, an unfruitful union was thus effected between devotion and military prowess. There is no question here of the use which was made of this combination for the extension of ecclesiastical domination. All that is contemplated is the consequence of this union in the production of chivalry and of the knightly character—this magnificent and previously unimagined ideal, however far human vices, and passions, and frailties may have prevented the perfect realization of that ideal. In Christianity to be condemned in these late ages because so few of those who profess its beliefs have beheld such the noblest, and the most magnificent of all human achievements, and because so many fail to add the Christian graces to the plainer merits of Christian belief and morals? The vision of the Holy Grail may visit this sorrowful earth, but it is not on earth that it can be won even by Sir Galahad.

Another inference must be admitted to have exercised a beneficial effect on the formation of knighthood. This is the contact and comparison with the intellectual and social culture of the degenerate Greeks, and with the elegance and courtesy of the Saracens. This influence must have been more felt in France, particularly in the south, in the works of Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Joinville, the father of the encycloped, and Raymond of Toulouse, and Godfrey of Bouillon, and Robert of Normandy carried with them to the Holy Land in the First Crusade much of that courtly bearing and generous sentiment which did not become generally disseminated through the Christian West, or through the nobility at home, till the Second and Third Crusades. These qualities may have been directly and indirectly communicated by the Saracens in Spain, Sicily, and Southern France.

Old institutions of the German forest life: the effects of the economic and of feudal organization on the characteristics of a ravaged, ruined, and distracted country; the operation of religious zeal, and even of general religious fanaticism; the action of the priesthood, and collision with cultivated Greeks and brilliant Saracens, all contributed to the formation of the type of a Christian soldier—a true knight, a preux chevalier, sans tâche et sans reproche. The judgment is accordingly correct which regards the era of the Crusades, when the regular and permanent Orders were instituted, as the true period of the formation of that ideal of knighthood which was one of the most precious legacies for which modern times were indebted to the Middle Ages. Undoubtedly there was a previous growth of the same kind, but the growth did not proceed to mature and perfect frugality until all agencies were efficaciously combined on the sacred soil of Palestine. It is a cause of great embarrassment in endeavoring to ascertain the characteristics and origin of any institution which has widely prevailed in obscure ages, that such institutions only gradually assume the complete form which is their familiar shape, that many concurrent streams flow in at different periods and add their contributions, and that the darkness of the foregoing time affords every opportunity and every temptation to throw back into the past those characteristics which only belong to the institution in its final development. The same confusion which presented Vergil as a necromancer to medieval fancy, and made Thebes a feudal duke of Athens in the imagination of Chaucer and Shakespeare, and exhibited Dan Hector and Sir Alexander to the admiring regards of baronial circles in the thirteenth century, pushed back the distinctions of knighthood to periods in which the germ of chivalry existed only in a lower and disconnected form.

By this glamour the Arthurian cycle and the Carolvian myths were fashioned, and the inventions and ideas of the twelfth century were provided with a historical existence in the sixth and eighth. After knighthood became an established institution, it was not only known all over, but generally that it seemed to be a necessary part
of social order. Saladin is said to have sought and received the accoed from a Christian lady, and the Byzantine emperor Manuel Comnenus held jousts and tourneys on the plains of Antioch. (*Necit. Chomat. iii. 8; comp. Joann. Cantacuzenus. l, 42). II. Nature of Knighthood.—A knight was a soldier (miles), usually, but not necessarily, of gentle blood—a soldier in the good sense of the word (*Cavallarius, chevalier, caballero) with panoply complete—

"From top to toe no place appeared bare,
That deadly dint of steel endanger may."

In the feudal hierarchy he was the holder of a knight’s fee, but, as chivalry was developed, he might be “lord of all the land beside,” and so he was; his position was thus distinguished from the estate, and, although penalties were imposed for conferring the character on any one not of knightly blood and of knightly havings, yet the honor, once bestowed, was indelible except by degradation for unworthy conduct. This point was decided in an English court of law by lord Coke, and the decision was more recently confirmed by lord Kenyon in the case of “Sir John Gallini,” a ballet-master. Knighthood thus came to designate personal character and station, in contradistinction to political rank. The importance of this distinction was that in war the fate of the outcome was often in the hands of one man. The French du Guesclin, or the Chevalier Bayard, might be the pearl of knights, and might sit down with princes; the powerful and wealthy baron might be wholly destitute of knightly estimation.

The virtues that were rendered to morals and civility when lofty virtues were thus broadly discriminated from territorial possessions and worldly rank. It was a noble model of personal purity and elevation which was presented for imitation to a warlike and stormy age. The knightly character, and the obligations imposed by that character, were strikingly delineated in the instructions of Alphonso V of Portugal to his son and heir, when he knighted him after the conquest of Azirilla (1471), in the presence of his slain Count de Marialva. "First, to instruct you," said the king, “what the nature of knighthood is, know, my son, that it consists in a close confederacy or union of power and virtue, to establish peace among men, whenever ambition, avarice, or tyranny troubles states or injures particulars; for knights are bound to employ their swords on these occasions, in order to dethrone tyrants and put good monarchs on their throne. But they are likewise obliged to keep fidelity to their sovereign, as well as to obey their chiefs in war, and to give them salutary counsels. It is also the duty of a knight to be frank and liberal, and to think nothing of his own but his horse and arms, which he ought to keep for the sake of acquiring honor with them, but not to keep them in order to render service and country, and of those who are unable to defend themselves; for, as the priesthood was instituted for divine service, so was chivalry for the maintenance of religion and justice. A knight ought to be the husband of widows, the father of orphans, the protector of the poor, and the prop of those who have no other support; and they who do not act thus are unworthy to bear that name. These my son, are the obligations which the order of knighthood will lay upon you.” Striking the infant thrice on the helmet with his sword, Alphonso added, "May God make thee as a knight of this body as thou seest before thee, pierced in several places for the service of God and of his sovereign" (cited by lord Lyttelton, Hist. of Hen. II, iii. 159, 160. See also Digby, Morea Catholici, bk. ix, chap. x; James, Hist. of Chivalry, chap. 1.).

This lofty exemplar may have been rarely approached in the ages of chivalry. The Black Prince was guilty of sanguinary atrocities. The passions of men were brutal and untamed; temptations were great and frequent; but continual failures would not furnish strange instances of the disproportion between conception and performance. Nevertheless, men, however, by the constant contemplation of excellence, even though it was unattained, and by the repeated efforts after each-decrescence to aspire to the perfection so often abandoned. Much, too, was pathed by the spirit and occasional accomplishment of the high duties required. Even more, perhaps, was slowly secured by the bitter shame and repentance which ever revived, and thus perpetuated, the desire and the image of better things. “Altius ibunt qui ad summam nuntiatur.”

M观光ions, in a word, undoubtedly flowed from the conjunction of chivalry with the Provençal courts of love, which were of mingled Greek and Saracenic descent. They contributed much to the obscurantism and debasement of the wise idea, but they contributed fully as much to the enrichment and polish of the intercourse between the sexes. They added life and intellectual culture to martial bearing; they toned down the rough, blunt manner of the battle-field to the elegant and respectful courtesies of the boudoir. They exacted from “the dauntless in war” who should be equally gentle in peace and “faithful in love.” Thus gallantry was mollified and softened into civility, which was the antithesis of military brusquerie, as in the abbe Talleyrand’s celebrated vitriolism. Hence sprung that thoroughly modern and Christian product, “the gentleman of the olden time,” of whose Sir Harry Lee of Ditchley might speak, “many a handsome, pleasant, and licentious accompanied those amiable graces in Provence, Languedoc, Aquitaine, and other sunny southern lands, at any rate wise was stripped of its brutality and coarseness, and lost its brazen shamelessness and virulent contumely. The name of chivalry itself, the laudable” were always demanded of the knight, the sensualism of the countries of romance was only accidentally connected with knightly conduct, and never formed any part of its nature. Moreover, though it be true that “The evil that men do lives after them, And their names rung down through time from their bones,” the converse is equally true; and modern generations unquestionably owe much of those rarely-attained perceptions which are now most admired to the fragrant naivety and ornate prunesc of the Cours d’Amar and Jezu Fauranc.

In an splendid Arthurian cycle—a brighter realm of romance than all the legends of Homer and the Homeric—the heroes and heroines are sadly stained and spotted with moral blurs and blotches, and even with gross crimes. Sir Lanceot, “first of knights,” bears an ineradicable brand; but still is scarce “Less than a changeling roused, and the excess Of glory obscured.”

The birth and the marriage of King Arthur are equally foul; and the champions and dams that encircled him are all tainted, except Sir Galahad—“among the faithless, faithful only he.” But, despite the endless detail of weakness, of ruf, and of sin, the central idea comes forth, like the sun emerging from a bank of clouds—the noblest dream of human fantasy, the highest evidence of eternal aspirations from the midst of vicious indulgences and multiplied contaminations. This type is true knighthood, and what knighthood was has been already partly explained; what it is in the Arthurian romances is shown by Arthur’s latest bard:

“In that fair Order of the Table Round, A glorious company, the flower of men, To serve as model for the mighty world, And be the fair beginning of a time. I made them lay their bands in mine, and swear To reverence the king, as if he were Their conscience, and their conscience as the king; To break the heathen, and uphold his fait; To ride abroad rebreeding human wrogs; To speak no slander, nor listen to it; To lead sweet lives in pure chastity; To love one maiden only, cleave to her, And worship her by years of noble deeds, Until they love her; for indeed I know Of no more subtle master under heaven Than the disdainful passion for a maid, Not one to keep down the base, base man. But teach high thoughts, and amiable words, And be not dissatisfied, and the desire of God. And love of truth, and all that makes a man.”
III. Classes and Degrees of Knighthood.—Knighthood may be loosely distributed into six classes: 1. Feudal knighthood; 2. Simple knighthood; 3. Regular knighthood, or the knighthood of the spiritual orders, like the Knights of Malta; 4. Honorary knighthood, as of the Garter; 5. Titular knighthood, as in England and many other countries, constituting a dignity of lesser nobility; 6. Masonic knighthood, which has been the order of the Knights in Freemasonry, the Knights of Pythias, etc. The first of these classes furnishes the foundation and origin of all the rest, but needs no further notice than has been already given. The last is foreign to the present purpose. The fifth may be excluded, as it is less pertinent than the regular, and honorary knighthood require further, but brief consideration.

Each of these classes exhibits the same general constitution, though the third is only an imitation, and a preposterous prolongation of the first with the forms of the second. In each there are usually three degrees. In actual chivalry, these were the page, the squire, and the knight. The young son of a knight, or of a noble who was also a knight, was placed at the age of seven years in the service and charge of another knight, selected on account of family connection, friendship, or personal connection. At the age of fourteen he was placed in the livery of his lord, to serve him during the term of service, and was trained in the exercises of military and chivalric education. The young valet (valetudinarian, valet de chambre) was taught to ride, to run, to leap, to shoot with the bow, to hawk, to play on the lute. He was taught obedience and attention to his superior, and was supposed to be kept in the observance of religion and morals. He attended his patron in war, but armed only with a short dagger. His person was safe in the melee, for it was dastardy to assail a page. In the intervals of serious occupation he received guests and ministered to their comforts, and waited on the châtelaine and the other ladies of the household, receiving instruction in legend, and poesy, and song; in manners, and in the formalities of love. The character of the instruction in the last easy science may perhaps be conjectured from the tenor of the lessons composed for his daughters by the knight De la Tour Landry in 1571.

At the age of fourteen the young valet—the term is often extended to the second stage—received a sword, consecrated by religious benedictions, in exchange for his dagger, and entered on the degree of squire (escuyer, escuyer, armiger). His exercises were now mainly directed to horsemanship. He was taught the manege, and to act the part of a noble man in the battlefield. He was trained to ride a horse without touching the stirrup. He was taught the maniere, and was trained in the art of noble horsemanship. He learned the lance, or shield, or helmet, or gauntlet, or sword, or lance, or on horseback without touching the stirrup. He was taught the manege, and the whole art of "noble horsemanship." He conducted the knight's lance, or shield, or helmet, or gauntlet, or on horseback, or horse, or led his destrier. He attended him in the tourney and in the battle. He was a regular combatant in the fight, but he was not trained to surrender, or to defend, or to remount his principal. He cultivated courtoise, protected his pleasant studies in the art of love, began to wear ladies' favors, sought to become démoniaque—that is, neither shy, nor haughty, nor awkward; and diligently imitated the procedure and imitated the spirit of his senior.

At full age—though the honor was often postponed, and sometimes accelerated—the squire was advanced to the complete knighthood, which was bestowed with much solemnity, ceremonial, and religious intervention. These accompaniments were, of course, dispensed with when the promotion was conferred on the battle-field. Usually, however, the reception of knighthood was ordered at some high festival, and was surrounded with imposing and ornate rites.

The various ceremonies and spiritual procedures were adopted in different countries, in different orders, and at different times. They were all symbolic, in accordance with that love of symbol and allegory which characterized unsettled times. There was, however, such a general resemblance in the form and spirit of the ceremonies that a general description of the procedure may be readily given. It is only necessary to understand that some of the incidents were at times omitted, and that others were frequently modified.

The most elaborate of all investitures appears to have been that of the Order of the Garter, as described in a manuscript in Frend, first published by Edward Basse, and cited textually by Du Cange (s. v. Miles). The novice was intrusted to the charge of select squires. His beard was shaved and his hair was shorn. In the evening, dressed as a simple valet, the novice was sent to instruct him in his obligations. Minstrels and squires came singing and dancing to conduct him to the bath that had been prepared. He was stripped naked and put into the bath. He then received further instructions. When he issued from the bath, he was put to bed to dry off. When dry, he was taken up and clad warmly, with a red garment over the rest, having sleeves and a coat like a hermit's. The novice led him to the chapel, the attendant squires singing and dancing again. He remained at his vigil and prayers all night. At break of day he was conducted and received in the chamber of the valet (valetudinarian, valet de chambre), which he was to inhabit. After he had rested, the knights and squires reappeared, and clothed him. He was then conducted on horseback, with song and dance, to the great hall. His spurs were fastened on by the two noblest knights present, who held the stirrups for him, and then conducted him to his apartment (chambre du jour, chambre des amis), and then to his office. His sword, suspended from a baldric (scutulum), was buckled on by another knight. The king, or officiating knight, then struck him thrice on the cheek (clop, a slap), or on the head, or helmet, or with the flat of his sword (scutella, scutella, doppo : see these titles in Du Cange, and that of scutella, doppo in le Sermoi, and kissed him. The spurred and belted knight was now led back to the chapel, when he knelt, and, laying his hand on the altar, swore to uphold Holy Church through life. Guizot enumerates twenty-six engagements in a knightly oath. The postulant, with his attendant knights, next proceeded to hold high festival, but the young knight was not allowed to eat, to drink, or to move, or to look about him, while the rest were feasting. After further ceremonial, he mounted his horse, assumed his arms, and exhibited feats of warlike dexterity, in the entertainment and admiration of the assembled ladies.

This is an abridged, if not a brief account of knighthood investiture. These minute and tedious formalities, which are traversed by Don Quixote, belong only to times of peace, and subsequent to the establishment of the regular orders.

V. The Regular Orders grew out of the necessities of the Holy War in Spain and in Palestine. The knights, like priests, were vowed to celibacy, and were designed to be ecclesiastical soldiers. They were to protect pilgrims, to feed the hungry, to entertain the poor, to shield the weak, to nurse the sick and the wounded, to assert the faith, to defend the Christian land, and to do zealously all duties of charity, devotion, and war. The most noted of these Orders were:

1. The Knights of the Holy Sepulchre, instituted by Godfrey de Bouillon in 1099 to guard the sepulchre of Christ. They were distinguished by a golden cross, crowned with four crosses of the same, pendent from a black ribbon. They languished and expired after the fall of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem.

2. The Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, or Knights Hospitallers, afterwards successively Knights of Rhodes (q. v.) and Knights of Malta (q. v.). They were founded about 1048 by some Neapolitan merchants, and organized in 1104. In peace they wore the black robe of the Augustinian friars, with a cross of silver on it. In war they exchanged the black robe for a white gown. On the expulsion of the Christians from Palestine they passed over to Cyprus, where they remained till their
conquest of Rhodes, 1308. Driven out of Rhodes by the Turks, 1322, they received Malta from the emperor Charles V, 1350. The order expired with the surrender of the island to Napoleon in 1798. See HOSPITALITIANS (HL). The Knights of the White Elephant, or Knights of the Cross, founded in 1118 by two French Crusaders, Hugo de Pagani and Godfrey Aldemar (or of St. Omer), and organized in 1126. Their rules were drawn up for them by Bernard of Clairvaux. Their badge was a red cross embroidered on a white cloak; their emblem, two knights on one horse, was to indicate their vow of poverty. They soon, however, acquired immense wealth, and were accused of horrid vices and crimes; but Ashmole remarks that many sober men judge that their wealth was their greatest crime. After sharp persecutions and iniquitous trials, they were suppressed with savage cruelty in France by Philippe le Bel, 1310, and soon after in other countries. They were charged with the possession of 40,000 lordships in Europe. See TEMPLARS.

(IV.) The Knights of Mary, or the Teutonic Order, established for the support of poor pilgrims of all nations by German knights, organized in 1190 by the survivors of the army of Frederick Barbarossa. Their distinctive garb was a white mantle, having on the front a black cross with a white potence. Before the loss of Palestine, the Teutonic knights, under their grand-master Hermann von Salza, fought and armed against the Prussians, Lithuanians, and heathen tribes of north-eastern Europe. By the secularization of Prussia, in 1325, under their grand-master Albert of Brandenburg, the order was broken up, was deprived of its most valuable possessions, and passed out of notice. See TEUTONIC KNIGHTS.

(V.) The Knights of San Sicoladro, founded by Alphonso V of Aragon in 1118. Extinguished, and its commanderies added to the crown, by Charles II, 1665.

(VI.) The Knights of Santiago de la Espada, in Spain, refer their origin to 887, but received their definite constitution in 1170. See TEUTONIC KNIGHTS.

(VII.) The Knights of Alcantara, 1158, and,

(VIII.) The Knights of Calatrava, 1199, were instituted to guard the western and southern portions of Spain against the Moors. The grand-mastership of both was ultimately assumed by the crown of Spain. The regular orders of knighthood were designed to promote Christian virtues and Christian conduct, and to employ chivalrous energies for the maintenance and extension of Christianity, and the protection of Christendom against Saracens and Pagans. These functions they have not always discharged in directer age, and, while such services were essentially necessary. With merit came favor, and power, and wealth, and arrogance, and negligence, and idleness, and luxury, and other vices. It is the old and oft-repeated story of energy declining into corruption. But they had afforded Europe time and security to develop, knit together, and confirm its civilization and its strength. When they were extinguished by secular greed for their possessions, their aptitude had disappeared. "Othello's occupation was gone" when "villainous salt-petre" had totally changed the organization of armies and the conduct of battles. It was chiefly during this period of confusion that sovereigns and princes, desirous of preserving the amusements, exercises, attachments, loyalty, splendor, and honors of knighthood—perhaps, also, of perpetuating its spirit—instituted the order in imitation of the regular orders. The enumeration and description of the multitude of such associations would afford little additional illustration of knighthood. It must suffice to name a few of these imitative establishments.

VI. Honorary Knighthood.—Of this there were the following:

The Order of the White Elephant of Denmark

The Order of the Holy Roman Empire

The Order of Saint Louis

The Order of Saint Andrew and Saint Catherine

The Order of Saint George (of Prussia)

The Order of Saint Patrick

The Order of Saint Honor

The Iron Crown (for Italy)

There is no necessity, and would be little propriety in noticing titular and social, or fantastic knighthood here. In 1738, Burke lamented that "the age of chivalry was gone." Its expiring gleams glazed the stark forms of Bayard at the Seina and of Sir Philip Sidney at Zutphen. An institution which, even after a long decline, could breed such characters as these, had obviously rendered a service to humanity of the highest degree. The age of chivalry may be gone, and the forms of chivalry may be relegated to the domain of Romance, but its spirit lives on, offering examples which the young still welcome in their dreamy and joyous days, and which the mature and the old still contemplate with fond and reverential regard. The ideal remains the same, but purified and cleansed from the frivolities and alloys of its former embodiment—and aids in fashioning modern sentiment to the conception and admiration of the Christian gentleman. Disregarding the vices which connected themselves with chivalry, which were not, in the main, not of its essence, the merit and condemnation invariably bestowed upon it by discerning historian. It aimed to achieve—as far as the circumstances of its actual manifestation permitted—it did achieve, in thought, if rarely in act—what the oath of the new-made knight bound him to pursue as his rule of action through life. Its influences are transmitted to the passing generation, which has itself witnessed shining illustrations of their abiding efficacy.

VII. Literature.—Mills, History of Chivalry (London, 1825); James, History of Chivalry and the Crusades (London, 1860), are well known to general readers. Familiar also are the notices in Blackstone's Commentaries, bk. ii, chap. v; Robertson, History of Charles V, Introduction; Hallam, Middle Ages, and Guizot, Histoire de la Civilisation en France, ii, Chap. vi. The more important and authoritative works on the subject are less known, and some of them are inaccessible to students in this country. Among them may be specified, Lord Lyttonel, Life and History of Henry II (London, 1777, 6 vols., 8vo); tedious, but full of information; K. H. Digby, The Bookstone of Honor (London, 1845-5, 3 vols., 12mo); and More, Catholic and Civilized (London, 1877, 3 vols., 8vo). Dugdale, Dissertation upon Knighthood in The Antiquities of Warwickshire (London, 1656, folio); Selden, Titles of Honor (1614, 4to); Segar, Honor, Military and Civil (1602, folio); Spelman, Dissertation de Milite; Upton, De Studio Militari, etc. (London, 1654, folio); Clarke, Knights of the Middle Ages; Sir H. N. Wright, Ancient Literature Works; Du Cange, Gloss. Med. et Inf. Latin, title Miles, Adorable, Alope, Armiger, Calcar, Cinclusum, Vali, et, etc., and Declinationes sur Joannou; Muratori, Antiq. Italy; Mireus, Originis Equitum rite Militari Ordini; Paul, Vie de la Chevalerie, etc.; Memorie de la Chevalerie Ancienne et moderne; Vouco de la Colombrie, Le Vrai Théâtre d'Honore et de la Chevalerie; De la Chevalerie de St. Valaye, Memoires sur l'ancienne Chevalerie (Paris, 1759-78); Ampeire, De la Chevalerie; Perrot, Collection Historique des Ordres de Chevalerie (Paris, 1836); Gourdon de Genouillac, Dictionnaire Historique des Ordres de Chevalerie (Paris, 1853); Reibich, Geschichte der Ritterorden (Stuttgart, 1842). A very copious account of the regular and natural Orders of Honorary Knighthood—extending to 157 associations, but not including the Order of the Victoria Cross and other recent orders—may be found in the cyclopedia Littiumarienses.

KNILL, richard, an English missionary of the Independents, was born of humble parentage, at Brauntorp, April 14, 1787. In 1816 he proceeded as a missionary to India under the London Society, where he continued until 1819, and then returned to England.
Kniperdolling, Bernard, one of the leaders of the Anabaptists of Münster, was born, probably in that city, towards the close of the 15th century. His attachment to Lutheran principles caused him to be exiled from Münster, and in his travels he connected himself with the Anabaptists in Sweden. Returning to Münster, he became the leader of the religious enthusiasts there, together with Rothmann, Matthiesen, and Bockhold, and, by disturbing the quiet and tranquility of the city, he succeeded in obtaining the expulsion of the bishop of Münster. His imprisonment by order of the bishop of Münster. Imprisonment by no means dampened his ardor, and no sooner had he been released than he placed himself at the head of his partisans, and actually succeeded in becoming master of the city. Taken and imprisoned again, he was released by his friends, and soon acquired such reputation that the Anabaptists elected him in 1534 burgomaster of Münster. The same rabble which had succeeded in electing him to the principal office of the city now assumed control over him, and, making common cause with the imperial princes, they elected John of Leyden, with Matthiesen, they immediately filled all public offices with their adherents, and proclaimed equality of estates, community of goods, and polygamy. All who showed the least signs of opposition were summarily dealt with; but so severe became Kniperdolling, who had subsequently been elected stadtholder, and had appointed John of Leyden king of Münster, that he was arrested by order of the "king" and imprisoned. The Roman Catholic party finally gained the upper hand in 1536, when Kniperdolling was taken, convicted of adhering to that party, and to be afterwards put to the sword, which sentence was executed Jan. 23, 1536. He persisted to the last in his opinions, and refused to become reconciled to the Roman Catholic Church. His body was exhibited in an iron cage (which still remains) suspended from the belfry of St. Lambert's Church, Münster. See Catrou, Hist. des Anabaptistes, vol. ii.; Mencken, Scriptores Reu. Germ. iii, 1534 sq.; Hamelmann, Hist. Eccles. remati Ecgang. in Urbe Monat. Opp.; Conr. Heresbachie, Hist. factionis Monasteriensis, ed. Bouwerck (Elberf. 1866., Svo.). See Anabaptists. (J. H. W.)

Knipstro (also KNIPSTROH of KNIPSTROW, Latin Knipstrovisus), John, a German reformer, was born at Sandrow, near Lovelberg, Silesia, May 1, 1497. Educated among the Franciscans, he was sent by the abbot of his convent to finish his studies at the University of Frankfurt-on-the-Oder. Here he was a witness of the famous "Actus disputations" in which John Tetzel attempted to prove Luther's heresy against Ither's gen. Knipstro, who had read the theses preserved at Loussau so conclusively that the latter withdrew from the contest. Knipstro was then sent to the convent of Pyritz, in Pomerania, in the hope that quiet and rest would calm his revolutionary ardor; but he improved his time in disseminating the reform in every manner. He brought the whole convent to share in his views. The town heard of this, and Knipstro was invited by the citizens to preach to them, which he did with such success that the whole town soon became Protestant, but the bishop interfered in favor of Roman Catholicism, and Knipstro was obliged in 1522 to flee to Stettin, where he married. In 1524 he went to Stargard, and thence to Stralsund, where his eloquence proved fatal to the Roman Catholic party, and where, in 1525, he was appointed the bishop-interpreter of ecclesiastical affairs. He took part as the general synod of Pomerania in 1585, and was then appointed the first general superintendent of the Church in Wolgast. In 1589 he was made professor at the University of Greifswald, Pomerania, and in 1547 became its rector. A controversy arose with Frederick of Prussia, and the emperor gave him such annoyance that he withdrew to Wolgast, and devoted the remainder of his life to teaching and to Church administration. He died at the last-named place Oct. 4, 1565. His works are: Vom rechten Gebrauch d. Kirchen-Güter (Stralsund, 1588); Bedenkend wider d. Interim, etc. (Stralsund, 1548); Epistola ad D. Melanchthonem, qua Convenimus Ecclesiae Pomeranici ad susplicandum Aug. Confessionem repetitionis declaratur (1562); Widerlegung d. Bekennnisses And. Osiandri e. d. Rechtfertigung (1557); F. Revers et scintellis ecclesiannis (1557), and on the Bible. See Geburth, Geschichte der Gelehrten Pommernland; H. Schmid, Einleitung z. Brandenburg Kirchen Gesch. (J. H. Baltasar), Sammlung einiger Pommerschen Kirchen-Hist. gehörigen Schriften, i. 98; ii. 317 sq.; Zeller, Universal Lexikon, s. v.; Hoefcr, Nouv. Bibliogr. Germ., xx. 856; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, vii. 765. (J. N. P.)

Kittel, Franz Anton, a German theologian of note, was born at Salzdahlum, April 3, 1721, and was successively archidiaconus, general superintendent, and consistorialrath at Wolfenbüttel. He died April 13, 1792. He is celebrated as the discoverer (in the library at Wolfenbüttel) of a MS., a fragment of Ulfila's Gothic version of the New Testament, which he published in 1755. The oldest MS. to which it can be traced is the British Museum MS. Add. 2972. In the earliest part of it, the newer surface being occupied with the Origins and some letters of Isidorus Hispalensis. The portions of the Gothic version of the Epistle to the Romans contained in it are xi, 36-36; xii, 1-5, 17-21; xiii, 1-5; xiv, 9-20; xv, 5-18. These MS. translated (in all probability in 1762 or 1763) in a volume entitled Ulpianus Versionis Gothicæ nova editio copiæ Ep. ad Rom., venerandum antiquitatis monumentum . . . et Latina codices cujusq. MS. scripti . . . una cum varia variae litterarum monumenta hac.usque inediti, etc. The text is the basis of the Nuremberg letterpresses, and in each word is Kittel's reading of it in italics, and under that a Latin translation of each. On the other side there is a Latin version found in the Codex, under that the reading in the Vulgate, and under that the Greek text. There are also twelve plates, containing admirably-executed fac-similes of different codices; and among the notes is found an extract of considerable length from Otfried's Gospel Harmony. The volume contains also two fragments from ancient Greek codices of the N. T. in the Wolfenbüttel library, and a copious critical commentary by Kittel, and is altogether a splendid one; but, as Kittel's knowledge of Gothic was rather imperfect, its literary merits are not quite equal to its sumptuous appearance. Kittel deserves, however, the praise of great laboriousness, as is evinced by his collection of a vast amount of curious matter not elsewhere to be found. The book is very rare, but is generally present at least copies containing all the plates.—Kitto, Dict. Bibl. Lit. vol. ii. s. v.; Dörring, Gelehrten Tecl. Deutschlands, vol. ii. s. v. See Gothic Version.

Knoebel, Karl August, a German theologian, highly distinguished as an exegetical scholar in the Old Testament and as an archiologist, was born Aug. 7, 1807, near Sorau, Silesia. In this town he studied under associate professors Blum and Babich, who were cultured, and had a zeal for learning, and also befriended him with money to pursue his university course at Breslau after his father's death. David Schultz, to whose children he be-
came tutor, exerted a special influence in determining his choice of teaching as a profession, and in fixing the untenable rationalistic tendency of his mind. He began lecturing in 1851, and his freshness, power, and genuine worth at once drew and ever attracted to him numerous hearers. In 1835 he was made extraordinary professor, and in 1837 he received from Breslau the degree of doctor in theology, Chiefly in recognition of his exceedingly valuable work on Hebrew Prophecy (Prophezeitum d. Hofbräer, Breslau, 1837, 2 vols. 8vo). The fame of this work brought him at once the offer of a professorship in Göttingen, in Ewald's place, and of one in Giessen, which latter he accepted. Thenceforth his attention was confined to the study of the Old Testament; but his studied and untrammelled spirit of independent study little to a right appreciation of the theological import or even poe-
etical beauty of the Scriptures. His publications during his twenty-four years' labor at Giessen (nearly all exe-
etical) bear the same defect of insight, with the dis-
play of great learning. The Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah appeared in the Kurzeüf. exeget. Handb. z. A.T. in 1843 (2d ed. 1854, 3d ed. 1861); on Genesis in 1852 (2d ed. 1860); Exodus and Leviticus, 1857; Numbers, Deu-
teronomy, and Joshua, 1861. These commentaries are characterized by special sobriety and thoughtfulness, hence the historical and theological views standing in a comprehensive knowledge of Oriental antiquity. In the first-
mentioned feature they have the advantage of Hitzig. Knobel is independent, and gives positive views on many points which he was obliged earnestly to defend. He so well understood Ewald, as he so especially in refer-
ence to the origin of the Pentateuch with Hupfeld, Tuch, Bertheau, and Stächlin. He is deserving of credit for his ingenuity in bringing out the "Composi-
tion theory" concerning the production of the Pente-
ateuch. Knobel died, after long and severe suffering, from a cancer in the stomach, May 25, 1863. In addi-
tion to the works already mentioned, Knobel published Commentar über das Oselet (Lpz. 1836, 8vo); and die Med-
tafel der Genesis (1850, 8vo), a very learned work, and frequently cited in the exegetical department of this Cyclopaedia. See Herzig, Real-Encyclopädie, vol. xix. 5.

Knobelsdorff, Eustachius von, a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born of noble parentage in 1519, at Heidelberg, Prussia; was educated at the universities of Frankfort-on-the-Oder, Leipzig, Wittenberg, and Paris, and upon the completion of his studies took orders in 1541. After a visit of the card-
inal of Wormsland to Rome, Knobelsdorff administered the duties of the episcopal office, and in 1563, upon the return of the bishop, was appointed dean-cathedral. He died in 1571. His writings are of but little account. See Alten. Hist. Lex. iij. 41.

Knock (ךֳנָכָקָכ, Cant. v. 2; "beaut," Judg. xix. 22; סָפוֹא, Matt. vii. 7; Rev. iii. 20, etc.). Though Orient-
tals are very jealous of their privacy, they never knock when about to enter your room, but walk in without warning or ceremony. It is nearly impossible to teach an Arab servant to knock at your door. They give warning at the outer gate or entrance either by calling or knocking. To state and call are in general and respectful mode. Thus Mosses commanded the holder of a pledge to stand without, and call to the owner when about to come out (Deut. xxiv. 10). This was to avoid the vio-
etal intrusion of cruel creditors. Peter stood knocking at the outer door (Acts xii. 15, 16), and so did the three men sent to Joppa by Cornelius (Acts x. 17, 18). The idea is that the guard over your privacy is to be placed at the entrance to your premises" (Thomson, Land and Book, i, 192 sq.). See House.

Knollis, Francis, a distinguished English states-
man, was born at Gray's, Oxfordshire, about 1580. He studied at the University of Oxford. Admitted at court, he held principal stations in the reign of the King, and during the reign of the Queen Mary ascended the throne he was obliged to retire to the Continent. At Elizabeth's accession he returned, became privy councillor, treasurer of the queen's household, and knight of the Garter. He was one of the judges of Mary Stuart. He died in 1596. Knollis wrote a trea-

Knollys, Henry, an eminent English Baptist minister and author, born at Chalke, Wilts, in 1598. He was educated at the University of Cambridge, and after his graduation was ordained as a deacon, and then as a presbyter of the Church of England, and was pre-
bented by the bishop of Lincoln with the living at Hum-
mston, in Lincolnshire. Beginning to doubt the truth-

Knopf, that is, Knor (Anglo-Saxon ceor, a word employed in the A. V. to translate two terms, of the real meaning of which all that we can say with certainty is that they refer to some architectural or ornamental ob-
ject, and that they have nothing in common.

1. Kapktor (ןַקקַק or קַקַק) occurs in the descrip-
tion of the candlestick of the sacred tent (Exod. xxv. 31-86, and xxxvii. 17-22, the two passages being identi-
tical). The knop is here distinguished from the shaft, branches, bowls, and flowers of the candlestick; but the knop and the branches go together, and are represented to imitate the produce of an almond-tree. In another part of the work they appear to form a boss, from which the branches are to spring out from the main stem. In Amos ix. i, the same word is rendered, with doubtful ac-
curacy, "lintel." The same rendering is used in Zeph. ii. 14, where the reference is to some part of the palace of Nineveh, to be exposed when the wooden upper story — the "cedar work" — was destroyed. The Hebrew word seems to contain the sense of "covering" and "crowning" (Gezenius, Thes. Heb. p. 709). Josephus's description (Ant. iv. 16. 7) mentions the pome-
granates (pœxvix), either of which may be the kapktor. The Targum agrees with the latter, the Sept. (πα-
πουπαίος) with the former. See LINTER. All these circumstances point to a signification corresponding es-
pecially to that of crown; and in the case of the sacred candelabrum, the term seems to point to a sharp orna-
mental swell placed (like a horizontal button) immedi-
ately beneath the cups that surmounted each arm and section of the shaft. See Tabernacle.

2. The second term, pekalem (ץַקַק), is found only in 1 Kings vi. 16, and vii. 24. It refers in the former to carvings executed in the cedar wainscot of the interior of the temple, and in the latter to the leaves of the cedars which were ornamented with flowers. In the latter case it denotes an or-
nous book called *The Religion of Protestants*, was born at Pagsworth, near Morpeth, in Northumberland, in 1680. He was entered among the Jesuits in 1666, being already in priests' orders; and is represented in the *Bibliotheca Patrum Societatis Jesu* as a man of low stature, but of great abilities. He taught divinity a long time in the English College at Rome, and was a member of that discipline which he so rigidly exacted from others. He was then appointed sub-provincial of the province of England; and, after he had exercised that employment out of the kingdom, he was twice sent thither to perform the functions of his office. He was present, as procuring a general synod at the general assembly of the Jesuits held at Rome in 1646, and was elected one of the definitors. He died at London January 4, 1656-5. Knott was a great controversialist, and wrote largely, displaying in all his works great acuteness and learning. His first book was a little work entitled *Choir Misraiken* (Lond. 1630), with the "want whereof Catholicks are unjustly charged, for affirming, as they do with grief, that Protestantism, unrepentant, destroys salvation," which was answered by Dr. Potter, provost of Queen's College, Oxford (in 1652), by a piece entitled *Wand of Charity, justly charged on all such Romanists as dare, without truth or modesty, affirm that Protestantism destroys Salvation.* To this Knott replied, under the title *Merry and Truth, or Charity maintained by Catholicks* (in 1654), which occasioned Chillingworth to publish *The Religion of Protestants*. Chillingworth, in 1638, came to the defence in 1638, in a pamphlet entitled *Christianity Maintained*, and later in a work under the title of *Vindicatio Unmaskata*, etc. (Ghent, 1652, 4to). At this time, however, Chillingworth had been dead nine years, and in behalf of the noted deceased a reply was made by Thomas Smith, fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge (in 1658), in the preface to an English translation of Daille's *Apology for the Reformed Churches*. See *Gen. Biog. Dict.* viii, 49 sq.; *Wood, Athenae Oxoni.*; *De Maizaux, Life of Chillingworth.* (J. H. W.)

Knott, John W., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Blairsville, Westmoreland County, Pa., Oct. 7, 1812. He was educated at Jefferson College, Pa., and studied theology at Western and Princeton theological seminaries. After graduation he preached at Gilgal, Pa., for about a year, when he removed to Ohio, and was installed over the churches of Leesville and Ontario; there he continued three years, and then for four years served as pastor of the churches at Hayeville and Johnsville. He was next called to the churches of Keene and Jefferson, where he officiated for seven years. During the remainder of his life, with intervals of relaxation on account of ill health, he preached at Eden, Caroline, Waynesburg, Nevada, and Sandusky, Ohio. He died in Shelby, Ohio, Sept. 5, 1864. Mr. Knott made many sacrifices of personal advancement and comfort to further the cause of religion. He was a man of unbounded faith in the Bible, from which he drew all his theology and philosophy. The burden of his preaching was Jesus Christ and him crucified. He believed, "when he had proven his position from the Bible, he had established it immovably." See Wilson, *Preb. Historical Almanac*, 1863.

Know (properly ፥, γνώσις) is a term used in a variety of senses in the Scriptures. It signifies particularly to understand (Ruth iii, 11), to approve of and delight in (Psa. i, 6; Rom. viii, 29), to cherish (John x, 27), to experience (Jas. ii, 23), to be acquainted with. It is also used of an inanimate object: "He shall return no more to his house, neither shall his place know him any more." By a euphemism it frequently denotes sexual connection (Gen. iv, 1; Matt. i, 25). The other scriptural applications of the word (e.g., knowledge, account, information) must have acquired information respecting a subject. (2) It implies discernment, judgment, discretion; the power of discrimination. It may be partial; we see but in part, we know but in part (1 Cor. xiii, 9).
It frequently signifies to have ascertained by experiment (Gen. xxii. 12). (4.) It implies discovery, detection; by the law is the knowledge of sin (Rom. iii. 20).

Natural knowledge is acquired by the senses, by sight, hearing, feeling, etc., by reflection by the properties of the external powers; by natural genius; dexterity improved by assiduity and cultivation into great skill.

So of husbandry (Isa. xxviii. 36), of art and elegance (Exod. xxxvi. 31), in the instance of Bezaleel. Spiritual knowledge is the gift of God, but may be improved by study, consideration, etc. See Knowledge.

Particular Phrases. - The priests' lips should keep knowledge (Mal. ii. 7); not keep it to themselves, but keep it in store for others; to communicate knowledge is the way to preserve it. Knowledge is spoken of as and through the person, as riches, as treasures, as excellence, and as the gift of God (Prov. i. 29; viii. 10, etc.). See Wisdom. "Knowledge puffeth up, but charit

Edifieth" (1 Cor. viii. 1), i.e. the knowledge of speculative and useless things, which tend only to gratify curiosity and vanity, which contribute neither to our own salvation nor to our neighbor's, neither to the pub

lic good nor to God's glory; such knowledge is much more dangerous than profitable. The true science is that of salvation; the best employment of our knowledge is in sanctifying ourselves, in glorifying God, and in selfifying our neighbor: this is the only sound knowledge (Prov. i. 7).

God is the source and fountain of knowledge (1 Sam. ii. 8; 2 Chron. i. 10; James i. 5). He knows all things at all times, and in all places. See Omniscience. Jesus Christ is possessed of universal knowledge; knows the heart of man, and whatever pertains to his mediatorial kingdom (John ii. 24, 25; xvi. 30; Col. ii. 3). Men know progressively, and ought to follow on to know the Lord (Hos. vi. 8); what we know not now we may know hereafter (John xiii. 7). Holy angels know in a manner much superior to man, and occasionally reveal their knowledge to him. Unholy angels know many things of which man is ignorant. The great discretion of life and of godliness is to discern what is desirable to be known, and what is best unknown; lest the knowledge of "good host and evil got," as in the case of our first parents, should prove the lamentable source of innumerable evils (Gen. ii. 9; iii. 7).

Knowledge of God is indispensable, self-knowledge is important, knowledge of others is desirable; to be too knowing in worldly matters is often accessory to sinful knowledge; the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ is a knowledge in which we all need to rejoice (John xviii. 3). Workers of iniquity have no knowledge, no proper conviction of the divine presence (Psa. xiv. 4). Some men are brutish in their knowledge (Jer. ii. 17): e.g. he who knows that a wooden image is but a shapely-formed stump of a tree, yet worships it; he boasts of his deity, which, in fact, is an instance of his want of discernment, degrading even to brutality (Isa. xiv. 20). Some are wicked in their knowledge, "knowing the depths of Satan, as they speak" (Eph. iv. 29). See Gnosticism.

Knowledge. - By this, according to Sir William Hamilton, 'is understood the mere possession of truths,' and the possession of those truths about which our faculties have been previously employed, rather than any separate power of the understanding by which truth is perceived. "I know no authority," says Dr. Reid, "besides that of Mr. Locke, for calling knowledge a faculty, any more than for calling opinion a faculty." Knowledge is of two kinds, viz. historical or empirical, and philosophical, or scientific or rational. Historical is the knowledge that the thing is; philosophical is the knowledge why or how it is. The first is called historical because in this knowledge we know only the fact—only that that phenomenon is; for history is properly only the narration of a consecutive series of phenomena in time, or the description of a co-existent series of phenomena in space; the second philosophical, to imply that there is a way of knowing things more completely than they are known through simple experiences mechanically accumulated in memory or heaped up in cyclopedias. It seeks for wide and deep truths, as distinguished from the multitudinous detailed truths which the surface of nature presents and actions present, for those a knowledge of the highest degree of generality. "The truth of philosophy," says Herbert Spencer, "bears the same relation to the highest scientific truths that each of these bears to lower scientific truths. As each widest generalization of science is the conclusion of a number of narrower generalizations of its own division, so the generalizations of philosophy comprehend and consolidate the widest generalizations of science. It is therefore a knowledge the extreme opposite in kind to that which experience first accumulates. It is the final product of that process which begins with a mere collection of crude observations, goes on establishing propositions that are broader and more separate from particular cases, and ends in universal propositions. Or, to bring the definition to its simplest and clearest form, knowledge of the largest kind is unfulfilled knowledge; science is partially unified knowledge; philosophy is completely unified knowledge."

This term, however, is associated with the greatest problems and controversies of philosophy, all of which are involved in the discussion of what is meant by knowledge. The different problems, therefore, of the philosophy of knowledge will be found discussed under those names that severally suggest them. — Watts, On the Mind; Dr. John Edwards, Uncertainty, Deficiency, and Corruption of Human Knowledge; Reid, Intellectual Powers of Man; Stennett, Sermon on Acts xxi. 24, 25: Upham, Intellectual Philosophy; Douglas, On the Advancement of Society; Robert Hall, Works; Amer. Library of Useful Knowledge. See Faith and Reason; Idealism; Judgment; Moral Philosophy; Religious Philosophy.

Knowledge of God. - By this is meant a mere knowledge of his existence, for the devils believe that God is; they tremble as they believe it, and they hate the God before whom they tremble. It cannot be a mere partial acquaintance with the character of God, because we cannot for a moment doubt that the Jesus were partially acquainted with God's character, and yet our Lord said to them, "Ye neither know me nor my Father; look, if it be a dry, unfruitful place." There is a knowledge of God, however accurate in its outline that knowledge may be. The knowledge of God includes far more than this. It implies a real, personal, experimental, sanctifying acquaintance with him. It especially includes the renewed God in Christ—that is, the reconciliation of all his perfections in the way of his mercy, unfolding them as the basis for the soul's confidence; that he is righteously and holily merciful, pardoning sin at the expense of no other perfection, but in the full and perfect harmony of all his perfections. Without this knowledge, all our advances in other branches of knowledge are but vain and unprofitable. All other knowledge is useful, entertaining; this alone is needful. This may do without other knowledge, but no other knowledge will do without this. If you teach men of education, you put into their hands a powerful weapon either for good or for evil, according to the direction that may be given to it. If you put into their hands the elements of sound religious knowledge, you give their minds a right and safe exercise, while the knowledge will keep them from the abuse of the tremendous power you put into their hands. See Charnock, Works, ii. 881; Saurin, Sermons, i. sermon 1; Gill, Body of Divinity, iii. 12 (8vo); Tillottson, Sermons, sermon 113; Watts, Works, i. sermon 45; Hall, Sermon on the Advantages of Knowledge to the Lower Classes; Foster, Essay on Popular Ignorance; Dwight, Theology; Martensen, Dogmatics. See Know.

Knowledge, Divine. See Omniscience.
KNOWLE

KNOWL

Knowles, William, LL.D., an English divine, was born in May, 1692, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. He was first chaplain to the first marquis of Rockingham, and was by him presented with the rectory of Ithingborow, and afterwards with Bodington, both in Northamptonshire. He died, in all probability, in 1778. Dr. Knowles published an English translation of the Povel's 'Epistles to the Galatians,' with an account of both of Chrysostom and of Jerome. —New Gen. Biog. Dict. viii, 58; Allibone, Dict. Engl. and Am. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.

Knowles, James Davis, a Baptist minister, was born in Providence, R. I., July, 1798. He learned the printing business, and in 1817 emigrated to the Island of Hawaii. Having joined the Baptist Church in March, 1820, he was in the fall following licensed to preach. Shortly after he entered the sophomore class of Columbian College, Washington, D. C., graduated in 1824, and was immediately appointed one of the tutors of the college, which position he held until called as pastor to the Second Baptist Church of Boston, where he was ordained Dec. 28, 1825. In 1832 impaired health obliged him to resign his pastoral charge, and he became professor of pastoral duties and sacred rhetoric in the Newton Theological Institution, acting at the same time for over two years as editor of the Christian Review, a Baptist quarterly. He died May 9, 1838. Mr. Knowles published a number of occasional Sermons, Addresses, etc. ; Memoir of Mrs. Ann H. Judson, late Missio- nary to Burma (1828); and Memoir of Roger Wil- liams, the Founder of the State of Rhode Island (Boston, 1843).—Sprague, Annals, vi, 707; Appleton, New Amer. Cyclopaedia, x, 192.

Knowles, James Sheridan, the celebrated modern dramatist of England, in later years a minister in the Baptist Church, was born at Cork, Ireland, in 1784, and early distinguished himself as a dramatic writer. In 1814 he began to entertain religious scruples about his connection with the stage, was finally converted, and in 1820 joined the Baptist Church and entered the ministry. He died Dec. 1, 1862, at Tor- quay, in Devonshire. Several of his sermons have been published, but they do not so greatly merit our notice as his exhibition of the Protestant view on the Lord's Supper, which he defended in The Idol demolished by its own Priest (London, 1851, 12mo), an answer to cardinal Wigan's lectures on transubstantiation. He also wrote The Rock of Rome, or the Ark of Israel (London, 1819, 1819, 1823, 1831), a work of his dramatic severity which was rejected and published in 3 vols. sm. 8vo, in 1843 and since. See Allibone, Dict. Engl. and Am. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.; North Amer. Review, xvi, 141 sq.; Chambers, Cyclop. s. v. (J. H. W.)

Knowles, John, a Congregational minister, was born in Lincolnshire, England, and educated at Magdalen College, Cambridge. In 1625 he was chosen fellow of Katharine Hall, and while employed in his duties as a teacher, upon the invitation of the mayor and alder- men of Colchester, became their lecturer. In conse- quence of his opposition to archbishop Laud, his license was taken away, and he immediately removed to New England, and was ordained co-pastor at Water- town, Mass., Dec. 19. In October, 1649, he departed to Virginia, in response to a call for ministerial aid in that destitute region. In a few months, however, he returned to Watertown, whence he returned to England in 1650. He was twice additionally married in the same year. In 1667 he married at Bristol. From this place he was ejected at the Restora- tion, and in 1662 was prevented from public minis- trations by the Act of Uniformity. By permission of king Charles II, in 1672, he became colleague of the Rev. Thomas Kentish at St. Katharine's, London, where he preached until 1685, with the title of municipal preacher. It is said of him that sometimes, while preaching, his very earnestness and zeal so exhausted him that he fainted and fell. Mr. Knowles is represented as having been "a godly man and a prime scholar."—Sprague, An- nals of the American Pulpit.

Knowles, Thomas, D.D., an English divine of great learning and talents, was born at Ely in 1728; studied at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, of which he was chosen fellow, and was afterwards, for over thirty years, lecturer of St. Mary's, in Bury St. Edmund's. He be- came successively rector of Bury St. Edmund's, and of North and Chelbrough, and, finally, vicar of Winston, Suffolk. He died in 1802. His principal works are, The Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ (London, 1780, 12mo) ; a new ed., with additions, by the Rev. H. Hasted, London, 1800, 12mo);—Twelve Sermons on the Attributes (Camb., 1769, 8vo);—A Sermon Preached at the Anniversary of the University of Cambridge (1767, 8vo); —Primitive Christianity (1789, 8vo). He also wrote several pamphlets on religious subjects. See Gent. Magazine, vol. lixii; Chalmers, Gen. Biog. Dict.; Allibone, Dict. Engl. and Am. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.

Knowton, Gideon A., a Methodist Episcopalian, was born in East Haddam, Conn., entered the itinerancy in Central New York in 1800, was soon em- ployed in what was the old Genesee Conference, st. tioned at Albany in 1804, at Saratoga in 1805, and died at Whitestown, N. Y., Aug. 15, 1810. He was deeply pious, a plain, practical, and useful preacher, and of great force and energy. He was a man of much work in the office of the Master.—Minutes of Conferences, 1, 195.

Knowne, men, or justus-men, a name for persons who, in the reign of Henry VII, suffered martyr- dom at the instigation of John Longland, bishop of Lin- coln, either for reading the Scriptures or treaties of Scripture in English, or for hearing the same read. See Hardwick, Hist. of the Reformation, p. 180, note 8; Fox, Book of Martyrs (London, 1653), p. 920-37; Burnet, Hist. of the Reformation (London, 1881), i, 27 sq.

Knox, John (1), the Reformer of Scotland.

1. Early Life.—He was born in Gifford, a village in East Lothian, in 1505, of respectable parents, members of the Romish Church, who were able to give their son a liberal education. After spending some time at the grammar-school of Haddington, he was sent by his father, in 1521, to the University of Glasgow. Here he studied under Maeyer, a famous professor of philosophy and theology. A disciple, by the way, of Gerson and Pe- ter d'Ailly, he advocated the supremacy of general councils over the popes, and, carrying this view into politics, held also that the king's authority is derived from the people—a doctrine which he inculcated in his pupils (Knox as well as Buchanan), and which fully explains the democratic tendencies of the Scotch nation. Knox soon after taking the degree of M.A., Knox became an assistant professor, and rivalled his master in the subtleties of the dialectic art. He obtained clerical orders even before he reached the age fixed by the canons, and about 1580 went to St. Andrew's, and began to teach there. A veil of obscurity hangs over his life for several of the fol- lowing years. It is supposed, however, that the study of the fathers, especially Jerome and Augustine, shook his attachment to the Romish Church as early as 1558, but he did not become an avowed Protestant until 1542 —a fact which shows that he did not yield to turbulent impulses, but with prudence and deliberation. His reproof of existing corruptions compelled him to re- retire from St. Andrew's to the south of Scotland, and he was degraded from his orders as a heretic.

2. In the Reformation. During this period he became a frequent companion of the reformer and martyr Geo. Wishart, to whose instruc- tions he was greatly indebted. When Wishart was apprehended, Knox would fain have come to him and shared his fate, but his friend refused, saying, " Nay, re- turn to your bards, and God will make you suffi- cient for a sacrifice." Wishart was burnt at the stake, under cardinal Beaton's orders, in March, 1546, and with- in two months afterwards the cardinal was put to death.
in his own castle of St. Andrew's by a band of nobles and others who held the castle as a stronghold of the reforming interest. Knox, who was daily in danger of his life from Beaton's successor, determined to go to Geneva to prolong his studies, but induced by the parents of his pupils to give up his purpose and take refuge in the castle, which he did with many other Protestants in Easter, 1547. Here for the first time he entered upon the public ministry of the Gospel, and he distinguished himself both as a powerful preacher and a firm opponent of the papacy. But this did not continue long.

II. His Exile.—The arrival of a French fleet enabled the regent of Scotland to invest the castle by sea and by land, and on the last day of July the garrison was compelled to surrender. In May, the Galley-Slaves. The following winter the galleys lay on the Loire, but the next summer they cruised on the east coast of Scotland, often in sight of the steeple of St. Andrew's. Knox's constancy continued unshaken under all toils and trials, which were greatly increased at one time by disease, until in Feb., 1549, after nineteen months of bondage, he was released. At the national interdict of England with the king of France. He immediately repaired to England, where he was warmly welcomed by Cranmer and the council. He was stationed in the north at Berwick, and afterwards at Newcastle, where he labored indefatigably, preaching often every day in the week, notwithstanding many bodily infirmities. He enjoyed the confidence of the English reformers, was made one of King Edward's chaplains, was consulted in the revision of the Prayer-book, and also of the Articles of Religion, and was offered the bishopric of Rochester, but declined it from scruples as to the divine authority of the office. After five years of great and faithful activity, at the end of which he married a Miss Bowes, of Berwick, the accession of Mary to the throne put an end to his usefulness and endangered his life. His own desire was to remain and meet the issue, for, as he said, "never could he die in a more honest quarrel," but the tears and importunity of friends prevailed on him to fly. Accordingly, in January, 1554, he took ship to Dieppe, where he spent his first leisure in writing suitable advices to those whom he could no longer reach by his voice. He also labored indefatigably, preaching often every day in the week, notwithstanding many bodily infirmities. At Geneva he studied Hebrew, and formed a celebrated Calvin an intimate friendship, which ended only with Calvin's death. By Calvin's influence he was induced to take charge of the Church of England exiles at Frankfurt-on-the-Main, but unhappy disputes about the service-book led to his withdrawal after less than six months' service, in March, 1555. He immediately turned his steps to Geneva, where he took charge of an English congregation. But in the same year he made a flying visit to Scotland, during which he preached incessantly, and labored night and day. Among the many distinguished converts he made at this time figured three young lords, who afterwards played no unimportant part in the affairs of their country: Archibald Horn, later earl of Argyll; James Stuart, natural brother of Mary, and later earl of Murray, and regent during the minority of James VI; and John Erskine, who, under the title of earl of Marr, also acted as regent. His influence rendered the reformers more decided in their course, and he instituted in 1556 the famous English or Scottish Church on the Calvinist plan, which had so marked a feature in Scottish ecclesiastical history.

But he judged that the time was not ripe for a general movement, and accordingly returned to Switzerland. After his departure he was cited to appear before an assembly of the Romish clergy, and in his absence was condemned to be burnt as a heretic, and the sentence was executed upon his effigy. In Geneva he spent nearly three years, the happiest and most tranquil of his life. He counted it "the most perfect school of Christ that ever was in the earth since the days of the apostles." He was supplied with a pension by his family, which set him at ease and harmony with his colleague, Goodman, and the small flock under his charge. During his stay he took part in the preparation of what is called the Geneva Bible. He also wrote a number of letters and appeals which were forwarded to Scotland, and had great influence in guiding the councils of the friends of the Reformation. His most singular treatise was a volume entitled The First Blast of the Trumpet against the monstrous Regiment of Women. Although undoubtedly honest in his opinions, it is certain that he was led to them by his abhorrence of the abuses of Mary's reign, and by the servility of English women to her cruelties. But it was an unfortunate publication, for it subjected him to the resentment of two queens, during whose reign it was his lot to live; the one his native princess, Mary, queen of Scots, and the other Elizabeth, exercising a sway in Scotland scarcely inferior to that of any of its own sovereigns. Although his residence at Geneva was so agreeable in many ways, yet duty to Scotland was always uppermost in his mind, and when a summons came from the leading Protestants there for his return, he yielded at once. He left Switzerland, and on the 23d of May, 1559, after a residence of five years, reached Edinburgh, where he was received by the queen. She tried to induce him to return was the concession of liberty of worship promised by the queen regent, but upon his arrival at Leith in May, 1559, he found that she had thrown off all disguises (she had just stipulated to assist the Papal claims against the Protestants) and determined to suppress the Reformation by force. Not only did she refuse the demands of the Protestants, but even summoned a number of the preachers for trial at Stirling. But Knox was not disheartened. He wrote to his sister, "Satan rageth to the uttermost, and I am come, I praise my God, even in the brunt of the battle." The regent, alarmed at the attitude of the Protestants, promised to put a stop to the trial, and induced the accused to stay away, and then outlawed them for not appearing. The news of this outrage came to Perth on the day when Knox preached against the idolatry of the mass and of image worship. At the conclusion of the service, an encounter between a boy and a priest who was preparing to celebrate mass led to a terrible riot. The altar, the images, and all the ornaments of the church were torn down and trampled under foot; nor did it end with this. The "antependium," or altar cloth, was torn out by the houses of the Gray and Black Friars and the Carthusian Monastery were laid in ruins. Treating this tumult as a designed rebellion, the regent advanced upon Perth with a large force, but finding the Protestants prepared for battle, and the Church of England exiles at Edinburgh, the latter came to be distinguished as the Congregation, and their leaders as the lords of the congregation. Under the advice of Knox, they reformed the worship wherever their power extended, and the iconoclasm of Perth was repeated at St. Andrew's and many other parts of the kingdom, not; however, by a riotous proceeding, but by the harmonious action of the authorities and the people. The briefest and best defence of this course was the reformer's pithy saying, that "the rookeries were demolished that the rooks might not return." The contest between the two parties went on for a year, during part of which Knox prosecuted a flaming evangelist in the southern and eastern counties, while at other times he acted as chief agent in securing foreign help for his oppressed countrymen. In this occurred the only serious blot on his fair fame. He wrote to the English government and Parliament that he had received their aid, and, then, to escape reproach from France, might disown them as rebels. The repute which he received from Sir James Croft was well deserved. The civil war was at length terminated by the entrance of an English army, which invested Edinburgh, and by the death of the queen regent. These events led to a truce,
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and the calling of a free Parliament to settle religious differences.

This body met in August, 1569, and, carrying out what was undoubtedly the wish of the greater part of the people, established the Reformed religion, and interdicted by law any performance of Roman Catholic worship. In all this Knox was not only an active agent, but the spirit which animated all his labors. He prepared and published the first Book of Discipline which bore the impress of his mind. Thus a great step was taken, from which there never afterwards was any serious recession. Knox did not attain all that he desired, especially in respect to the provision for the support of the Church and of education throughout the country. Still he accomplished a radical work, of which all that followed was only the expansion and consolidation. The arrival in the next year (1561) of the youthful queen Mary, who had high notions of prerogative, as well as an ardent attachment to Romanism, occasioned new difficulties in which Knox, as minister in the metropolis, was actively engaged. He had prolonged interviews with her, in which she exerted all her wiles to win him to her side, but in vain. He was always uncomprising, and once drove her into tears. In a letter to the Queen, dated 24th of December, 1560, he said, "There is no respect due to the Queen's Majesty from me. I am not her subject; I am the subject of the commonwealth through his silence. Meanwhile his activity in the pulpit was unabated. In the Church of St. Giles, where sometimes as many as three thousand hearers were gathered, he preached twice on Sundays, and thrice on other days of the week. To these were added other services in the surrounding country. The effect of these labors was immense, as we learn from what the English ambassador wrote to Cecil: "Where your honor exhorteth us to stoutness, I assure you the voice of one man is able in an hour to put more life into us than six hundred trumpets continually blustering in our ears." The vehemence, however, of his public discourses offended some of his friends, and his outspoken opposition to the court led to his alienation from the more moderate party who tried to govern the country in the queen's name; so that from 1563 to 1565 he retired into comparative privacy, but he continued his labors in the pulpit and in the assembly of the Kirk.

The rapid series of events which followed Mary's marriage with Darnley in July, 1565, the murder of Darnley in the next year, the murder of Mary's first husband, and the marriage which was shortly after it, brought him to the front. Mary was compelled to abdicate in favor of her son, and Murray, Aug. 1567, became regent. Further reforms were effected by the Parliament of 1567. The sovereign was bound to be a Protestant, and some better provision was made for the support of the clergy. Knox and Murray were in complete accord, and the affairs of religion seemed so settled that the former desisted from his work, and thought of retiring to Geneva to end his days in peace. But in 1570 Murray was assassinated. Knox shared the general grief, and this event, with the confusions that followed, led to a stroke of apoplexy, which affected his speech considerably. He recovered in part, and was able to resume preaching, but mis understandings sprang up between him and the nobles, and even some of his brethren in the General Assembly. His life being threatened, he, in 1571, by the advice of his friends, who feared bloodshed, retired to St. Andrew's, where he preached with all his former vigor, although unable to walk to the pulpit without assistance. In the latter part of 1572 he was recalled to Edinburgh, and came back to die, "weary of the world," and "tired to death." One of his last public services was an indignant denunciation of the inhuman massacre of St. Bartholomew's. On the 24th of November he quietly fell asleep, not so much oppressed with years as worn out by his incessant and extraordinary labors of body and mind. In an interview with the session of his Church a few days before, he solemnly protested the sincerity of his course. Many had complained of his severity, but God knew that his mind was void of hatred to those against whom he had thundered the severest judgments, and his only object was to gain them to the Lord. He had never made merchandise of God's word, nor studied to please men, nor indulged his own or others' private passions, but had faithfully used whatever talent was given to him for the edification of the Church.

IV. His Character. — Knox was a man of small stature, and of a weakly habit of body, but he had a vigorous mind and an unconquerable will. Firmness and decision characterized his entire course. His piety was deep and fervent, and the zeal which consumed him never knew abatement. Yet it was not unintelligent. He was well educated for his time, and always endeavored to increase his knowledge, even in middle life seizing his first opportunity to learn Hebrew. An inward conviction of eternal realities inspired him with a bold and fervid eloquence which often held thousands of his countrymen and foreigners spell-bound. In a statement to Mary at the time that he took no delight in any one's distress, that he could hardly bear to see his own boys weep when corrected for their faults, but that, since he had only discharged his duty, he was constrained, though unwillingly, to sustain her majesty's tears in a public speech, while one of his own members was crying out, "I cannot endure to see my country perish by your silence. Meanwhile his activity in the pulpit was unabated. In the Church of St. Giles, where sometimes as many as three thousand hearers were gathered, he preached twice on Sundays, and thrice on other days of the week. To these were added other services in the surrounding country. The effect of these labors was immense, as we learn from what the English ambassador wrote to Cecil: "Where your honor exhorteth us to stoutness, I assure you the voice of one man is able in an hour to put more life into us than six hundred trumpets continually blustering in our ears." The vehemence, however, of his public discourses offended some of his friends, and his outspoken opposition to the court led to his alienation from the more moderate party who tried to govern the country in the queen's name; so that from 1563 to 1565 he retired into comparative privacy, but he continued his labors in the pulpit and in theassembly of the Kirk.

The rapid series of events which followed Mary's marriage with Darnley in July, 1565, the murder of Darnley in the next year, the murder of Darnley in 1567, and the marriage which was shortly after it, brought him to the front. Mary was compelled to abdicate in favor of her son, and Murray, Aug. 1567, became regent. Further reforms were effected by the Parliament of 1567. The sovereign was bound to be a Protestant, and some better provision was made for the support of the clergy. Knox and Murray were in complete accord, and the affairs of religion seemed so settled that the former desisted from his work, and thought of retiring to Geneva to end his days in peace. But in 1570 Murray was assassinated. Knox shared the general grief, and this event, with the confusions that followed, led to a stroke of apoplexy, which affected his speech considerably. He recovered in part, and was able to resume preaching, but misunderstandings sprang up between him and the nobles, and even some of his brethren in the General Assembly. His life being threatened, he, in 1571, by the advice of his friends, who feared bloodshed, retired to St. Andrew's, where he preached with all his former vigor, although unable to walk to the pulpit without assistance. In the latter part of 1572 he was recalled to Edinburgh, and came back to die, "weary of the world," and "tired to death." One of his last public services was an indignant denunciation of the inhuman massacre of St. Bartholomew's. On the 24th of November he quietly fell asleep, not so much oppressed with years as worn out by his incessant and extraordinary labors of body and mind. In an interview with the session of his Church a few days before, he solemnly protested the sincerity of his course. Many had complained of his severity, but God knew that his mind was void of hatred to those against whom he had thundered the severest judgments, and his only object was to gain them to the Lord. He had never made merchandise of God's word, nor studied to please men, nor indulged his own or others' private passions, but had faithfully used whatever talent was given to him for the edification of the Church.

The sovereign was bound to be a Protestant, and some better provision was made for the support of the clergy. Knox and Murray were in complete accord, and the affairs of religion seemed so settled that the former desisted from his work, and thought of retiring to Geneva to end his days in peace. But in 1570 Murray was assassinated. Knox shared the general grief, and this event, with the confusions that followed, led to a stroke of apoplexy, which affected his speech considerably. He recovered in part, and was able to resume preaching, but misunderstandings sprang up between him and the nobles, and even some of his brethren in the General Assembly. His life being threatened, he, in 1571, by the advice of his friends, who feared bloodshed, retired to St. Andrew's, where he preached with all his former vigor, although unable to walk to the pulpit without assistance. In the latter part of 1572 he was recalled to Edinburgh, and came back to die, "weary of the world," and "tired to death." One of his last public services was an indignant denunciation of the inhuman massacre of St. Bartholomew's. On the 24th of November he quietly fell asleep, not so much oppressed with years as worn out by his incessant and extraordinary labors of body and mind. In an interview with the session of his Church a few days before, he solemnly protested the sincerity of his course. Many had complained of his severity, but God knew that his mind was void of hatred to those against whom he had thundered the severest judgments, and his only object was to gain them to the Lord. He had never made merchandise of God's word, nor studied to please men, nor indulged his own or others' private passions, but had faithfully used whatever talent was given to him for the edification of the Church.

Says Cunningham (Church Hist. of Scotland [Edinb. 1859, 2 vol., 8vo], i, 407 sq.), "Knox was not perfect, as no man is. He was coarse, fierce, dictatorial; but he had
great redeeming qualities—qualities which are seldom found in such stormy, changeable periods as that in which he lived. He was consistent, sincere, unselfish. From first to last he pursued the same straight, unswerving course, as if he, like the right-angled triangle of the left-angled firm amid continual vicissitudes; and if he could have burned and disemboweled unhumble Pupati, he would have done it with the fullest conviction that he was doing God service. He hated Popery with a perfect hatred; and regarding Mary and her mother as its chief personages in the land, he followed them through life with a rancor which was all the more deadly because it was rooted in religion. He was, perhaps, fond of power and popularity, but he gained them by no mean compliances. On a question of principle he would quarrel with the Pope, as much as with his quarrel, hesitated not to vitiolate to vise them to their face. His hands were clean of bribes. He did not grow rich by the spoils of the Reformation. He was content to live and die the minister of St. Giles’s. Is not such a one, rough and bearish though he be, more to be venerated than the supple, time-serving Churchmen who were the tools of the English Reformation? Does he not stand out in pleasing relief from the grasping barons with whom he was associated, who hated monks because they coveted their corn-fields, and afterwards disgraced the religion they professed, by their corruption, and cold-blooded assassinations? But perhaps the greatest tribute that has ever been paid to the memory of John Knox has of late been penned by Froude (Hist. of England, x, 457 sq.). Frequently the charge of fanaticism has been laid at the door of the great Scottish reformer; this Froude unhesitatingly refutes, and assures us that it was only against Popery, the system that enslaves both the Church and the State, that he fought. He was no narrow fanatic who, in a world in which God’s grace was equally visible in a thousand creeds, could see truth and goodness nowhere but in his own formula. He was a large, noble, generous man, with a shrewd perception of actual facts, who found himself face to face with a system of hideous imiquity. He believed himself a prophet, with a direct commission from heaven to overthrow it, and his return to Scotland became the signal, therefore, for the renewal of the struggle."

V. Works and Literature.—Besides the Geneva Bible and occasional pamphlets, John Knox wrote, Historical of the Reformation of Religion within the Realm of Scotland from 1422 to 1567 (Lond. 1644, folio; Edinb. 1732, folio). His words have been collected and edited by Dr. Living (Edinb. 1846, 8vo). See M'Crie, Life of John Knox (Edinb. 1814, and often since; Ch. Nicmeyer, Knox Leben (Lpz. 1824, 8vo); T. Branden, Life of John Knox (London, 1863); Hetherington, Hist. of John of Scotland; Burton, Hist. of Scotland, particularly ch. xxviii; Tyler, Hist. of Scotland, vol. vi and viii; Hardwick, Hist. of the Reformation, p. 142 sq.; Russell, Ch. in Scotland; Hallam, Const. Hist. Eng., i, 140, note, 171, 280; ii, 210; Froude, Hist. of Engl. vol. iv, vi, vii, ix, and x, and his Studies on great Subjects, series i and ii; Elect. Hist. xxxii, xxvi sq.; Wintemer Rev. xii, 37 sq.; London Qu. Rev. iv, 418 sq.; Lxvii, 148 sq.; Moch. Qu. Rev. ii, 825 sq.; Edinb. Rev. July, 1853. (T.W.C.)

KNOX, John (2), D.D., an American divine of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born in 1730 near Gettysburgh, Pa., graduated at Dickinson College in 1811, studied theology under Dr. John M. Mason in New York, and was elected to preach by the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Philadelphia in 1815, became pastor of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church, New York, in 1816, and remained there until his death in 1858. This brief chronological record covers the life and ministry of one of the most eminent and useful of American pastors. Without the rare gift of popular eloquence, he was remarkable for earnestness of thought and purity of diction, for comprehensive and instructive discourses, and for practical usefulness. The best designation of his character is that of its completeness. He was a judicious counsellor, a safe guide, a devout believer, and a model pastor. In the ecclesiastical assemblies of the Church he was often a conspicuous leader. In the American Tract Society, with which he was for many years connected, he was, from the time of its organization to within a few weeks of the time of his death, a member of the executive committee, in which capacity, he did much to shape the policy and direct the publications of that great catholic institution. He was active in many other public charities of the country. Dr. Knox published a number of occasional sermons, among which those on "Parental Responsibility" and on "Parental Solicitude" are worth attention. He was also the author of several useful tracts and addresses, and was a frequent contributor to the religious newspapers. He was, in respect of piety, a very Barnabas, "a son of consolation," "full of faith and of the Holy Ghost." In the Edinburgh Review he was, in one of its early numbers, Thomas De Witt; Sprague, Anon., vol. v. (W. J. R. T.)

KNEUTZEN, Vicesimus, D.D., a distinguished English writer and divine, born at Newington Green, Middlesex, Dec. 8, 1752, was a son of the Rev. Vicesimus Knox, LL.B., fellow of St. John’s College, Oxford, and head master of Merchant Taylors’ School, London. Young Vicesimus Knox was also educated at St. John’s College, Oxford, and in 1778 was elected master of Tumbridge School, Kent, where he remained some thirty-three years, and was then succeeded by his eldest son. He was also rector of Runwell and Ramsden Crays, in Essex, and minister of the chapel of Shipbourne, in Kent. At the close of his career part of his life he resided at Ramsgate, and another part at Oxford. He was much admired as a preacher, and frequently gave his aid in behalf of public charities by delivering a sermon. He died while on a visit to his son at Tumbridge, Sept. 6, 1821. Dr. Knox’s chief theological works were: 1. Essays, Moral and Divine, (London, 1777, 12mo, anonymously; republished in 1787, with additional essays, in 2 vols. 12mo: many additions have been since published);—2. Liberal Education, or a practical Treatise on the Methods of acquiring useful and polite Learning (1781, 8vo; enlarged in 1786 to 2 vols. 8vo); this work was chiefly intended to point out the defects of the system of education in the English universities, and is said to have had some effect in producing a reformation;—3. Sermons intended to promote Faith, Hope, and Charity (1792, 8vo);—4. Christian Philosophy, or an Attempt to display the Evidence and Excellence of Revealed Religion (1785, 2 vols. 12mo):—5. Considerations on the Nature and Efficacy of the Lord’s Supper (1792, 12mo). He also published occasional sermons and pamphlets. Dr. Knox’s writings were once much esteemed. His style has considerable neatness and brevity, but he has little originality or power of thought, and his popularity has for some years been gradually decreasing. They have been reprinted under the style Works (London, 1824, 7 vol. 8vo).—Engl. Cyclop. s. v.; Allibone, Dict. of English and American Authors, vol. ii, s. v.

Knutzen, Martin, a German writer and philosopher of the Leibniz-Wolff school, was born in Königsberg, Prussia, in 1713, and held a professorship of philosophy in the university of his native place. He died there in 1751. His most important work is Von der immateriellen Natur d. Seele (Frankfort, 1747, 8vo). See Krug, Philosoph. Worterb. ii. 627.

Knutzen, Matthias, a noted German atheist, was born at Oldenswool, in Schleswig-Holstein, in the early part of the 17th century, and was educated at Königsberg and Jena Universities. He was the founder of the Conscientiorians, advocating the doctrine that reason and conscience are sufficient to guide all men; besides conscience, he asserted there is no other God, no other religion, no other lawful magistracy. He gave the substance of his system in a short letter (preserved in the edition of Microeli syntagma historia ecclesiasti- ca [1693]), dated from Rome, the contents of which may be reduced to the following heads:—1. First, there is neither a God nor a devil; secondly, magistrates are not
to be valued, churches are to be despised, and priests rejected; thirdly, instead of magistrates and priests, we have learning and reason, which, joined with conscience, as such we have, and as we pretend himself in having found adherents to his doctrine at Jena, Prof. John Murray attacked and refuted him, mainly to dispel the impression which Knutzen sought to make that Jena was likely to become a convert to his views. He died about 1678, or later. See Boyle, Hist. Diet, s. v.; Gen. Bish. Dict., s. v.; Rossel, in Stud. und Krift. 1844; Hall, Encyclop. vol. lvii. (J. H. W.)

Ko'á (Heb. id. 7727, Sept. 'Yqo yi v. Kasó, Kové i, Asú. Vulg. princeps), a word that occurs but once, in the prophetic denunciations of punishment to the Jewish people from the various nations whose idolatries they had adopted: "The Babylonians and all the Chaldeans, Pekód, and Saked, and Eshta'lul, and all the Assyrians with them, all of them desirable young men, captains and rulers, great lords and renowned, all of them riding upon horses" (Ezek. xxiii, 23). The Sept., Symmachus, Theodotion, Targums, Peshito, and Vers. E., followed by many interpreters, regard it as a proper name of some prominent person, but the Sept. elsewhere renders it "Nestor", as the name of a man. The judgment on such has been found, and the evident paraenesis with the preceding term in the same verse suggests a symbolic significance as an appellative, which appears to be furnished by the kindred Arabic a'ad, the designation of a k'abam or stallion for breeding (a figure in keeping with the allusions in the context to gross lewdness, as a type of idolatry), and hence tropically a prince or noble. This is the sense defended by J. D. Michaelis (Steph. 2175), after Jerome and the Heb. interpreters, and adopted by Gesenius (Theol. Hebr. p. 1297). See Stoas; Pekón.

Konisch. See Chapelleon.

Kobawich, Andreas, a noted Jesuit, was born at Corkville in 1594, and died at Triste Feb. 22, 1644. Of his personal history nothing further seems to be known. He wrote Vita B. Johannis fundatoris fratum misericordiae.—Algerm. Histor. Lex. iii, 48.

Kobler, John, an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Culpeper Co., Va., Aug. 29, 1768; was converted in 1787; entered the literary field; volunteered a missionary to the North-western Territory, and for eighteen years labored with great success in that vast and varied field. In 1799 his health obliged him to locate, but he labored as his strength till his death. In 1809 the Baltimore Conference, unsolicited, placed his name on its list as a superannuate. The remainder of his life was spent with great usefulness at Fredericksburg, Va., where he died July 26, 1843, full of years and honored labors.—Minutes of Conf.; iii, 465.

Kobudži, a celebrated Buddhist pilgrim of Japan, was born in the year 774. In early youth he began studying the Chinese and Japanese writers, and, in order to obtain more time to indulge in his studies, he embraced religious life at the age of twenty. Having become high-priest, he accompanied a Japanese ambassador to China in 804, to study more thoroughly the doctrines of Chakia. A learned Indian named Asari gave him the information he desired, and presented him with the books he had himself collected in his pilgrimages. Another hermit of northern Hindustan gave him also a work he had translated from the Sanscrit, and several MSS. on religious subjects. With these Kobudži returned to Japan in 806, where, by his preaching and miracles, he succeeded in converting the religious emperor of Japan, who embraced Indian Buddhism, and was baptized according to the rite of Chakia. Encouraged by his success, Kobudži published a number of ascetic works, and a treatise in which he exposed the fundamental dogmas of Buddhism. According to Kobudži, the four sources of humanity are hell, women, bad men, and war. There is no end to the number of miracles he is said to have wrought, or to the number of pagodas he caused to be built. He also caused the foundation of three chairs of theology for the interpretation of the sacred writings. He died in 865. See Tillemont, Bibliotheque Japonaise; Abel Remusat, Notices des Monuments Asiatiques; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Génér. xxvii, 935. (J. N. P.)

Koburg. See Saxony.

Koch, Henry, a pioneer minister of the German Reformed Church in Western Pennsylvania, was born in Northampton Co., Pa., in 1795; pursued his theological studies with Dr. Becker, of Bethlehem, Md., was licensed and ordained in 1819, and settled in what is now Clarion Co., Pa. He died August 7, 1845. He laid the foundations of numerous congregations. Five charges have grown up on his field, which constitute the heart of what is now Clarion Classis. His memory is blessed.

Koch, John Henry, a German journalist and writer, was born of Lutheran parents in Wollmian, electorate of Hessen, Germany, Feb. 14, 1807, and emigrated in 1834 to this country. At New Orleans, La., he was attacked with yellow fever, and resolved on his sick-bed to serve God with his whole heart. He removed afterwards to Charleston, but here he resigned, and in 1839 he was invited by the Methodists to attend the meetings of German Methodists, and there, under the preaching of Dr. Schumacher and Dr. William Nast, he was awakened and converted. He was licensed to preach in 1841, and in 1845 joined the Kentucky Conference. He was successively appointed to the following charges: West Union, Pomory, Captina, in Ohio; Wheeling, W. Va.; Portsmouth, Madison, New Albany, Mount Vernon, Ind.; Louisville, Ky.; Madison Street, Lawrenceborough, Batesville, Poland and Greensville, La Fayette and Bradford. His health failing, he retired from the field. Divorced, but re-married, he again, in the active work three years later, and served two years at Madison and one year at Charlestown, Ind., where he died Oct. 1, 1871. "Brother Koch was an earnest Christian and a faithful itinerant. Many were converted under his ministry, and great is his reward in heaven."

Minutes of Conferences, 1871, p. 227.

Kochanowski, John, a Polish nobleman and distinguished poet, who was born in 1582, and died in 1684, deserves our notice for his translation of the Psalms into Polish verse, which he performed in so masterly a manner that he was named the "Pindar of Poland." See Bentkowski, History of Polish Literature (Lippincott, 1888).

Kochberg, Johann Franz, a German theologian and descendent of a noble family, flourished in the early part of the second half of the 14th century. He was in high position at the convent St. Michael, at Jena, about 1366. —Algerm. Histor. Lex. iii, 48.

Kocher, Johann Christoph, D.D., a German theologian, was born at Lobenstein April 25, 1639. He was successively regent of the gymnasmium at Gombrich, superintend at Brunswick, and professor of theology at Jena, and died there Sept. 21, 1772. He published a continuation of Wolf's Curae Philosophiae, under the title Analecta Philosophiae et Exegetica in Quatuor Evangelia (Altenburg, 1766, 4to). "He supplies the non-applied part of the desiderata of Woll's work, and brings down the account of the sentiments of the modern writers on the Gospels to the period of its publication" (Biblioth. Bibb. p. 276). For a list of all his works, see Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutslands, ii, 47 sq.

Kodashin. See Talmud.

Kyoebger, Wenzellaus, a noted Fleming painter and architect, was born in Antwerp about 1550; studied in his native city, and later at Rome; and died either in 1610 or in 1684. He selected chiefly religious sub-
 Koehler, John, a Roman Catholic missionary to Cochín China. We have no details of his life until after he departed for that country in 1740. He remained there fourteen years, and, being made physician to the king, revealed himself of this position to further his missionary purposes. The persecution of the Christians in China led, however, to similar measures in Cochín China, and, with the exception of Koehler, whom the king prized highly on account of his medical knowledge, all the missionaries were arrested and shipped to Macao August 20th, 1754, and the same year Koehler was sent to a monk Koehler in 1755. Arriving at Macao, he was arrested, and sent with his colleagues to Portugal, where they were imprisoned as having encroached upon the monopoly granted to the Portuguese government by the Holy See, and which it claimed gave that nation the exclusive right of evangelizing the East Indies. Koehler was finally released through the intervention of the empress Maria Theresa in 1765, and was sent on a mission to Transylvania, where he labored until his death in 1780. While in prison he wrote a memoir of his travels, which was published by Eckart, and reprinted by De Murr, under the title, Joannis Koehler historica Cochinesis Descriptio in epistola redacta ab J. F. Eckart, edente De Murr (1805, 8vo). See Migne, Bio-gr. Chrétienne et Anti-chrétiennne: De Montermin et Estève, Mission de la Chine, Paris, 1838.—Hoefler, Nouv. Bio-gr. Gén., xxvi, 28. (J. N. P.)

Kögler, Ignaz, a Jesuit German missionary to China, was born at Landsberg, Bavaria, in 1680, entered the order of Jesuits in 1696, prepared for missionary work in 1715, and departed the year following for China, where he enjoyed the favor of the emperor in a remarkable degree. Kögler was employed on the sciences, and especially in astronomy displayed superior acquisition. He died in Peking in 1746.—Hoefler, Nouv. Bio-gr. Gén., xxvii, 909.

Ko‘ath (Heb. Ko‘oth, קֹאת, assembly, Num. iii, 19, 29; iv, 2, 4, 15; vii, 9, 11; of other Ko‘oth, קֹאת, Gen. vii, xi, 17, 16, 18, 19, 16, 17, 27; xxvi, 57, 58; Josh. xxxi, 5, 20, 28, 1 Chron. vi, 1, 2, 16, 18, 22, 26, 61, 66, 70; xxvi, 5, xxiii, 6, 12; 2 Sam. xxiv, 11, 13; 2 Kings xvii, in 15; of the second son of Levi, and father of Amram, Ishar, Hebron, and Uziel (Num. xi, 11, 12; Num. iii, 19, etc.). B.C. 1873. The descendants of Koath formed one of the three great divisions of the Levitical tribe. This division contained the priestly family which was attached to Aaron, the second son of Levi, and formed part of the service of the tabernacle, as settled in the wilderness, they had the distinguished charge of bearing the ark and the sacred vessels (Exod. vi, 16; Num. iv, 4-6). See Ko‘athite.

Ko‘athite (collective "Ko‘athites, קֹאת, Ko‘athith, Num. iii, 27, 80; iv, 18, 54, 57; x, 21, xxvi, 57; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 12; or "Ko‘athites, קֹאת, Josh. xii, 4, 10; 1 Chron. vi, 35, 54; ix, 62; 2 Chron. xxv, 10; xxix, 12; Sept. Kədî: Authority, in "Ko‘athites"), the descendants of Ko‘ath, the second of the three sons of Levi (Gershon, Kohath, Merari), from whom the three principal divisions of the Levites derived their origin and their name (Gen. xvi, 11; Exod. vi, 16, 18; Num. iii, 17; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 12, etc.). Kohath was the father of Amram, and he and Moses and Aaron. From him, therefore, were descended all the priests; and those of whom the Ko‘athites who were not priests were of the highest rank of the Levites, though not the sons of Levi's first-born. Korah, the son of Kohath, was a Ko‘athite, and hence, perhaps, his immediate ancestor of the priestly duty of his paternal uncle, Moses and Aaron. In the journeyings of the tabernacle the sons of Kohath had charge of the most holy portions of the vessels, to carry them by staves, as the vail, the ark, the tables of show-bread, the golden altar, etc. (Num. iv); but there was no task to touch them or look on them "lest they die." These were all previously covered by the priests, the sons of Aaron. In the reign of Hezekiah the Ko‘athites are mentioned first (2 Chron. xxix, 13), as they are also 1 Chron. xv, 5-7, 11, when Uriel their chief assisted, with 120 of his brethren, in bringing up to Jerusalem in the ark the sword and the spears. It is also remarkable that in this last list of those whom David calls "chief of the fathers of the Levites," and couples with "Zadok and Abiaathar the priests," of six who are mentioned by name four are descendants of the line of Pelatiah, which is that of Kohath, Uriel, Shemaiah, Eliel, the son of Elkan, and the son of his brother Eliezer, Shammah the son of Elkan. These six, and Aaron, with 80 of his brethren; and Amminadab, the son of Uzziel, 112 of his brethren. For it appears from Exod. vi, 18-22, comp. with 1 Chron. xxiii, 12, and xxvi, 25-29, that there were four families of sons of Kohath—Aramites, Ishariites, Hebronites, and Uzziel. The number of Elkan and Amminadab were both Uzzielites (Exod. vi, 22), and Eliezer a Hebronite. The verses already cited from 1 Chron. xxvi, Num. iii, 19, 27; 1 Chron. xxiii, 12, also disclose the wealth and importance of the Ko‘athites, and the house of Kohath, which filled the keepers of the dedicated treasures, as judges, officers, and rulers, both secular and sacred. In 2 Chron. xx, 19 they appear as singers, with the Kor‘ites.

The number of the sons of Kohath between the ages of thirty and fifty, at the first census in the wilderness, was 1860, the number of males of this month old was 8600 (Num. iii, 28; iv, 36). Their number is now given at the second numbering (Num. xxvi, 57), but the whole number of Levites had increased by 1900, viz. from 22,000 to 25,300 (Num. iii, 39; xxvi, 62). The place of the sons of Kohath in marching and encampment was south of the tabernacle (Num. iii, 29), which was also the situation of the Reubenites. Samuel was a Ko‘athite, and, of course were his descendants, the men of the tribe of Levi, who were not priests lay in the half tribe of Manasseh, in Ephraim (1 Chron. vi, 61-70), and in Dan (Josh. xii, 5, 20-26). Of the personal history of Kohath we know nothing, except that he came down to Egypt with Levi and his brother Amram (Exod. vi, 20), and that he lived to the age of 138 years (Exod. vi, 18). He lived about eighty or ninety years in Egypt during Joseph’s lifetime, and about thirty more after his death. He may have been some twenty years younger than Joseph his uncle. A full table of the genealogy of the Kohathite, in the Burrowton’s Genealogies, Tab. X, No. 1. See Levite.}

Kohaleth. See Ecclesiastes.

Kohen, Naphthali, a great Cabalistic rabbi, "a man whose life was full of incidents which would give a biography of him the air of a romance," was born at Ostrow, in the Ukraine, Poland, about 1660. While yet a youth he was carried off by some Cossacks into the wilds of Poland, and for several years there followed the employments of a hunter and a shepherd. He learned to excel in horsemanship and archery, in which he took great delight all his after life. At length he succeeded in making his escape from the Tartars, and travelled in Poland. Here new impulses stirred within him, and his naturally vigorous mental powers were roused to earnest efforts after learning. He made rapid progress in the study of the Talmud and Cabala, was ordained rabbi, and subsequently elected chief rabbi at Posen. He studied the Cabala profoundly, and was at once admired and feared for his supposed ability to command the intervention of the supernatural powers. But in 1711, while he was in charge of the Hebrew congregations at Frankfort-on-the-Main, where, as in Poland, he enjoyed for a time a high reputation as an expound-
er of the law and a Cabalist hierophant, there occurred a frightful conflagration, in which all the Jewish quarter of the city perished in the calamity. Kohen, as a potent Cabalist, was called upon by the distracted people to bring into exercise those supernatural resources which he professed to command, in order to stay the progress of the fiery flood. He was weak enough to make the trial. Of course he utterly failed. The fire continued to rage, and the popular feeling of the Jews against him, and Rabbi Naphthali Kohen was once more obliged "to grasp the wandering staff," and begin the world anew. He now bent his footsteps toward the place of his birth, and ended his days in connection with the synagogue at Ostrow. Kohen was quite a poet, and wrote several hymns and anthems which have become the common property of the synagogue and the Jewish people. Many curious notices of him may be found in the Jüdische Merkmals-Abhandlungen of Johann Jacobs Schultz. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, x, 348 sq.; see also Etheridge, Intro. to Hebrew Literature, p. 445 sq. (J. H. W.)

Kohen, Nehemiah, a noted Jewish fanatic, who flourished in Poland in the second half of the 17th century, and pretended to be a prophet or precursor of the Messiah. He was a rival of the celebrated Sabbatai Zevi, who claimed about the same time to the same title. Nehemiah so long looked for by this people. Invited by Sabbatian to visit him, Nehemiah quickly set out for Abyssin, and was immediately upon arrival admitted to an audience which lasted some three days. The rivalry which, on account of their peculiar profession, naturally existed between the two pretenders, made each fear for his life from the other, and, as Sabbatian had actually hired several base fellows to assassinate Nehemiah, the latter fled to Adrianopel. He there embraced Mohammedanism, and revealed to the Turkish government the plotings of Sabbatian, and this course ultimately led to the accession of this pretended Messiah likewise to the fold of the prophet of Islam. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, x, 241 sq. See SABBATIAL.

Kohen-Zedek, ben-Joseph, a noted Jewish rabbi, and head of the school at Pumbeditha, flourished from 917 to 936. He was one of the ablest presidents of this Jewish high-school, and labored earnestly, and for some time with considerable show of success, to make it the first and best authority of Rabbinic learning. Sura Academy was several times worsted in the struggle, and Kohen-Zedek well-nigh succeeded in abolishing the existence of the school. Sura possession was finally led to acknowledge David ben-Sakki as exilarch, and in turn secured Sura's confirmation of his graduate at Pumbeditha. Kohen-Zedek died in 936. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, v, 296 sq.

Kohl, Johann Peter, a learned German, was born at Kiel March 10, 1698. In 1725 he was called to St. Peter's University in Halle to teach belles-lettres and classical history. Three years after he left that city because he became passionately in love with Elizabeth, daughter of Peter the Great, a passion which caused him to commit many extravagances. He retired first to Hamburg, after which he again transferred himself to Kiel, and in Sura possession was finally led to acknowledge David ben-Sakki as exilarch, and in turn secured Sura's confirmation of his graduate at Pumbeditha. Kohen-Zedek died in 936. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, v, 296 sq.

Kohler, Johann Bernhard, a German philological writer, was born at Lütbeck Feb. 10, 1742, and was educated in the celebrated universities of Germany, France, and Holland. In 1781 he was appointed professor of the Greek and Oriental languages at the University of Königsberg. He died April 8, 1802, at Basle, Switzerland. Those of his works of special interest to us are, De Dote opud veteres Hebraeo subvenientium (Lüb. 1757); Observationes in Sacrum Codicem, ex scriptoribus profanis (Göt. 1758); Observationes in Sacrum Codicem, maxime ex scriptoribus Graecis et Arabis (Rost. 1758); Lex. 1765; Emendationes in Dionis Chrysostomum Sacram, quatuor Pars (Göt. 1770, 4to).—Hoefner, New. Biogr. Gén. xxxiv, 2; Neue Allg. deutsche Bibliothek, lxxiii, 389.

Kohler, Gottfried, a German theologian, born at Strzelitz Oct. 11, 1674, was the son of M. C. Kohler, a noted presbyter. The son was educated at the University of Jena, and is a man of great learning. Gottfried was educated at the University of Rostock, where he entered in 1692. Shortly after the opening of the University at Halle he went thither to attend lectures on philosophy, but returned, after a short stay at Leipzig, to his place of residence at Jena. He was appointed professor of the Greek, and in 1695, was transferred to Rostock (1696). About 1699 he went to Hamburg, and resided there until 1701, when he became pastor of a church at Newenburg; later he removed to
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Ratsburg, where he died, August 18, 1750. Kohbreif wrote largely in the different departments of theological science, but he has earned special credit by his contributions to Biblical chronology. His most important works are, Chronologia Sacra (Hamburgh, 1724, 8vo) — Chronologia Lipractum (Luth. and Lapug. 1732, 8vo) — Geographia Sacra (Cuyler u. Moshower in Kehle, 1738, 8vo). A complete list of his writings is given by Düring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, ii, 163 sq.

KÖNIA (cosmvsia), the Greek word for communio, was one of the names by which the early Church referred to the Lord's Supper. See Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 542 sq. See COMMUNION.

Kokabim. See Talmud.

Koken, Johann Karl, a German theologian, was born at Hildesheim June 9, 1711, and was educated at the universities of Heilbronn and Göttingen. In 1740 he accepted a call to Martin's Church, Hildesheim, and in 1756 became superintendent of the Hildesheim church. In 1757 the theological faculty of Rinteln conferred on Koken the doctorate of theology. He died March 15, 1778. Besides a number of small but valuable contributions to practical religious literature, he wrote Vortragsfrühstück d. chri. Relig. (Hildesb. 1761, 4to; 1762, 4to); — Kern der Sittlichkeit Jesu u. seines Apostel (Bremen, 1760—72, 6 vols. 8vo). See Düring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, i, 168 sq.

Kolat’iah (Heb. קֹלָתיה, 'qolatiah, voice of Jehovah), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. קֹלָתְיָה) v. t. קֹלָתְיָה or קֹלָתְיָה; Vulg. Cola-

tas.) The father of Ahab, which latter was one of the false and immoral prophets severely denounced by Jeremias (Jer. xxii. 21). B.C. ante 954.

2. (Sept. קולות, Vulg. Colotes.) Son of Maseiah and father of Pedahzur, a Benjamite, and ancestor of Sal-

lum, which last led back a party from Babylon (Neh. xi. 7). B.C. much ante 586.

Kollar, Jan, one of the most conspicuous Slavic poets and preachers, was born July 29, 1739, at Mosch-

owce, in the north-west of Hungary, studied at Pressburg and Jen, and in 1819 became pastor of a Protestant congregation at Pesth. He wrote many poems of great literary value, and was one of the earliest and most zealous advocates of Panславism. In 1831 he published a volume of his sermons, Kane (Pesth, 1831, 8vo), which were found so eloquent that they were at once translated into the modern languages. The revolution in Hungary compelled him to abandon his country. He withdrew to Vienna, where he was made professor of archaeology in 1849, and died there Jan. 29, 1852. See For. Quart. Rev. April, 1828; Jungmann, Greek, d. Ἐβραι-

ischen Litteratur.

Kolle, John, a German Methodist minister, was born at Dillenhausen, Württemberg, Germany, on the 16th of July, 1823; came to the United States Aug. 25, 1852; became acquainted with some intelligent and pious members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and soon saw it led to a knowledge of his sins, and was enabled to realize the faith of John the Baptist. In 1857 he was licensed to preach, and in the spring of 1858 was sent to Cape Girardeau, and joined the Southern Illinois Conference. In 1861 he was ordained a deacon, and sent to Benton Street, St. Louis, where he labored two years with great acceptability. In 1863 he was ordained elder, and was sent to St. Louis, where he again labored successfully for two years. His next appoint-

ments were Manchester Mission, one year, and Union Mission, three years. After this he was sent to Boone-

ville and Manisco Mission, where he labored till his course was finished, Feb. 1870. "As a preacher, Mr. Kille was faithful and punctual. He was a diligent student and acquired a considerable amount of theologi-

cal knowledge. In his preaching he was original and practical, and it was easy to perceive that he loved the souls of those to whom he ministered. His motto was 'Holiness to the Lord,' and that in an especial sense, as he considered it to be his calling to bear the vessels of the Lord." He contributed largely to the Christliche Apologete, the German organ of the M. E. Church.— Conference Minutes, 1871.

Kolbenbusch (also Collenbusch), Samuel, M.D., an eminent German pietist, and the founder of a theo-

logical school, was born of pious parents in the town of Barmien (Rhinen District), Sept. 1, 1724. He hesitated long between theology and medicine, but finally decided for the latter, and studied at Duisburg and Strasburg. Through all his studies, however, he did not forget to attend to his spiritual improvement, and attained great Christian knowledge and moral perfection. While studying at Strasburg he began to inquire into mysticism and alchemy, which were then considered as having a close connection with each other. Upon the completion of his university studies he began the practice of medicine at Duisburg, but in 1784 returned to Barmen, and there spent the remainder of his life, partly in the practice of medicine, partly in disseminating his peculiar religious views. He died Sept. 1, 1803. Dr. Kolbenbusch can, in many respects, be considered entitled to a place between the mystic separatist Tersteegen (q. v.), born twenty years later, and Jung-Stilling (q. v.), sixteen years younger. Like the latter, he first inclined to Leib-

nitz and Wolff's philosophical system, then became a Bengelian, though without approving all Bengel's views. He attached especial importance to the visions of Doro-

theo Wuppermann, of Wichlinghausen, a patient of his acquaintance. Among the resources of Kolbenbusch's practical activity are to be named the Bar-

men Missionary Society, and the Barmen Mission estab-

lishment. He wrote Erklärung bibliischer Wahrheiten (Elberfeld, 1807) — Goldene Arpeln in silbernen Schalen (Bar-

men, 1834). See T. W. Kroeg, Die Lehre d. Dr. D. Rettie (Elberfeld, 1846); same, Krisitische Geschichte d. protest.-reform. Schuwererei, etc. (Elberfeld, 1851); Baur, Die Dreireig-


Kollock, Henry, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born Dec. 14, 1776, at New Providence, Essex County, N. J., and graduated at New Jersey College in 1794. Having devoted himself to study for the three successive years, he was appointed tutor in his alma mater. In this position he distinguished himself for his skill in debate, passing his leisure hours in the study of theology. In 1802 he was licensed, and preached for five months at Princeton, where he also delivered a series of discourses on the life and character of St. Peter, which were remarkable for their brilliance and attraction. On leaving Princeton he took charge of the Church at Eliz-

abethtown, and was a zealous promoter of missions to the destitute regions in Morris and Sussex County. In 1803 he returned to Princeton as pastor and professor, and in 1806 accepted a call from the Independent Pres-

byterian Church at Savannah, Ga., where his labors were abundant. He sailed for England in 1817, not only in quest of health, but also to collect materials for a life of John Calvin, and after an absence of eight months returned to Savannah, where he died, Dec. 29, 1819. A collection of his Sermons was published in 1822 (Savannah, 4 vols. 8vo). Dr. J. W. Alexander (Life of Dr. Archi-

bald Alexander, p. 339) pays Dr. Kollock a very high tribute as a scholar, and says of him as a preacher that he was "one of the most ornate yet vehement orators whom our country has produced." — Sprague, Amaws, iv, 263 sq. See Cambridge General Repository, i, 135; Chris-


Kollock, Shepard Koelsch, a Presbyterian minister, and brother of the preceding, was born in Elizabeth, N. J., June 26, 1755; graduated with high honors from Princeton College when but sixteen years of age, and soon thereafter pursued a course in theology with the Rev. Dr. McDowell, and afterwards with his
Kolonat, Hugo, a Polish Roman Catholic theologian of note, was born in the county of Sandomir April 1, 1779; was educated at Pinczew and Cracow, and in 1774 became canon at the cathedral of Cracow. He was a decided opponent of the Jesuits, and did all in his power to purge the churches of Poland from Jesuitical aid or influence. In 1783, he published a work in Pomerania, in which he denounces the errors of the Society of Jesus. In 1787 he was appointed professor of moral philosophy at the University of Posen, and in 1790 he was appointed chief of the seminary of the same city. He was also a prominent committees of the National Assembly of Poland, and was a member of the Polish Senate. He died in 1850.
he became pastor at Elberfeld, and remained there until 1747, when he removed to Amsterdam, where he taught the Oriental languages. He died at Leyden in 1782. His principal work is Weisungung Mosia in den letzten Tagen (Frankfort, 1741, fol.). A list of his writings is given in Döring's Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl., ii, 152 sq.

König, Georg, a German Lutheran theologian, was born at Amberg Feb. 5, 1590, and was educated at the universities of Wittenberg and Jena. In 1614 he was called as professor of theology to Aldorf, and in 1644 he added to the duties of his chair the librarianship of that high-school. He died Sept. 10, 1654. He wrote Costas Conscientiae, etc.—Allgym. Hist. Lexikon, iii, 45.

König, Johann Friedrich, a German Lutheran theologian, was born at Dresden October 16, 1619. He studied at Leipzig and Wittenberg; became professor of theology at Greifswalde in 1651, superintendent of Mecklenburg and Ratzeburg in 1656, and finally professor of theology at Rostock in 1659, where he died Sept. 15, 1664. His Thesologiae artes, academicis (Rostock 1664; 6th ed. 1690, 8vo; Wittenaal, 1752) became, notwithstanding its dryness, a very popular text-book of dogmatics.

Hahn, Richter, and Haferung have expounded and commented upon it, and it became the foundation of J. A. Quentelstädter's celebrated work. See Walch, Bibl. theol. s., ii, 782; Liebe, Gesch. einer Theoret. in verschiedene Lehrarten d. christlichen Glaubenslehr, etc. (Leipzig, 1790); Schröder, Kirchengesch. seit d. Refor. vij., 11 sq.; Gaas, Gesch. d. prof. Dogmatik, i, 821 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encylopädie, vi, 1 sq.

König, Mauritius, a Danish prelate of note, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was professor of theology at Copenhagen, and later bishop of Aalborg, and died May 2, 1672.—Allgym. Hist. Lexikon, iii, 46.

König, Samuel, celebrated in the annals of Swiss piety, was born at Gergensee, in the canton of Berne, about 1670. He studied at Berne and Zurich, and afterwards made a journey to Holland and England, as was customary in those days. He excited great zeal and talents in the Oriental languages, which were then much studied by the Protestants, and was considered by his followers as a first-class Orientalist. He was also noted for his participation in the mystic tendencies of his day, and after studying Petersen's chiliasmic expositions, became himself a zealous partialist of the doctrine of the Millennium. After his return to Berne he was ordained, and appointed at first preacher in the hospital attached to the Church of the Holy Ghost. About the same time Spener's piety was beginning to gain adherents, especially through the exertions of Zumthor of Luzi (Lucius). König, who at first held aloof, was gradually drawn into connection with them, and thus became identified with the development of piety in Berne. Here, as elsewhere, piety was strenuously opposed by the orthodox party in the Church, who, on April 8, 1690, appointed a special committee to proceed against "Quakerism, unlawful assemblies, and doctrinal schism." In August of the same year the upper council appointed a committee on religion, for the purpose of ascertaining all about piety (in Berne), and reporting thereon to the council. König was several times summoned before this committee, and courageously defended his views on these occasions on chiliasm, as also his sermons, in which he insisted with peculiar force on the necessity of repentance and of regeneration. Among his theological contemporaries he was most distinguished by the grandeur of his style; and even his professors of theology, Wyss and Naudorf. König was finally ejected and exiled, the pietsists were persecuted, and the so-called "association oath" was instituted, July, 1699, with a view to prevent separation. To these measures were added a strict censorship of books, and the prohibition of religious reunions. König retired to Herborn, but was soon driven out from that place also, and went to the county of Sayn-Wittgenstein, the general refuge of all pietsists and illuminati. In 1700 he went to Hallo, where he gained many adherents, and afterwards to Magdeburg, where he found congenial spirits, especially in Petersen and his wife, Johanna Eleonora von Merlau, Nik. von Rodt, and Fellenberg. Finally he returned to active life as pastor of a French Church in Bidden- gen. Here he resided eighteen years, during which he wrote a number of works. In 1717 he returned to Berne, and secured an appointment as professor of mod- ern languages and mathematics in the university. He continued to hold religious meetings, and travelled occasionally in the interest of piety, but, having attempted to establish meetings for mutual edification at Basel in 1714, he was expelled from that city and died May 30, 1750. His principal works are, Betrach- tung d. inwendig. Reicht. Gottes, wie es im Herzen d. Men- schen aufgerichtet wird (Basel, 1734);—Theologiae My- sticae (Berne, 1786). See F. Trechsel, Samuel König u. d. Pietisten in Berne (Bern, Taschenthuch, 1862); Schle- ger, Kirchengeschichte d. 18. Jahrhunderts, ii (1), 387 sq.; Schuler, Thaten und Sitzen d. Edigmesen, iii, 298 sq.; Hurst's Hagenbacb, Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cnt., i, 179, 183.

Königsdorfer, Cölestin Bernhard, a German Roman Catholic monastic, was born Aug. 18, 1756, at the village of Petershausen; was educated at Augsburg from 1768 to 1776, and entered the Benedictine order in 1777, at Donauesch. He was ordained priest Dec. 23, 1780, and was sent to the university at Ingolstadt to continue his theological studies and the acquisition of the Oriental languages. In 1790 he was called to a professorship at Salzburg; and in 1794 he was elected abbot of his house at Freising. König d. Klosters zu heiligen Kreuze in Donauesch (1819-1829, 3 vols. in 4 parts). He also published several sermons (1800, 1812, 1814).—Kathol. Real-Encyklopädie, vi, 829.

Königsdorfer, Martin, brother of the preceding, a popular pulpit orator, was born at Flotzkheim Oct. 20, 1752; studied theology at Dillingen; was ordained priest at Augsburg March 14, 1777, and was successively appointed to Monheim, Heideck, Selboldsdorf near Neu- burg, and Lutzenjug near Hochstädt. He died about 1815. Königsdorfer was noted as a preacher for his rare ability in adapting himself to the standard of his audi- ence; thus, in his appointments in rural districts, he knew how to interest the peasants in his sermons, and did much good among them. He published Katholische Homilien und Erklärungen d. heil. Evangelien auf alle Sonn- u. Feiertage (Augsburg, 1800, and often).—Kathol. Geheimnisse u. Gütternamen (1812-18; 8 vols. 8vo).—Kathol. Christenlehen (1806, 2 vols.).—Die chrünstl. Kirchen- dersucht (six sermons, 1814).—Das eigwe Priesterthum d. Kathol. Kirche (1832).—Kathol. Real-Encyklopädie, vi, 829.

Königswarter, Baron Jonas, a celebrated Jewish philanthropist, was born at Frankfort-on-the-Main about 1806, and removed to Vienna about 1860, when a man of only moderate wealth. There his means increased rapidly, and he died Dec. 24, 1871, leaving an only son heir to a property worth fifteen million dollars. He was a great benefactor to the Jews of the Austrian capital, over whom he presided as chief, and took particular care of the charitable interests of the Jews in Vienna. He left large sums to benefit each of these, without any regard to confession or creed. —New York Jew- ish Messenger, Jan. 26, 1872.

Könrad of Marburg, a German Dominican of the 13th century, one of the most trusted of Rome's vota- ries, was confessor of princess St. Elizabeth of Thuringia, and was the most distinguished of German Dominicans, but little is known. Some suppose him to be identical with the Konrad who, as a scholastic of Mentz, enjoyed the favor of Honorius III (q. v.). Konrad of Marburg
was a particular favorite of pope Gregory IX, by whom he was intrusted with various disciplinary offices, particularly with the punishment of heretics and the excommunication, who took him into his own protection during the persecution against the Franciscans (q. v.). He was perfectly situated, but no less inhuman was the treatment which the *Patarensis* (q. v.) received at his hands. He was finally slain in 1238 by, or at the instigation of, some German nobles whom he had opposed. See Hausrath, Konrad von Marburg (1861); B. E. B., 1861; Henry of *Aix-la-Chapelle*, viii, 25; and the Roman Catholic *Kirchen-Lehrbuch*, by Wetzer und Weite, ii, 805 sq. (J. H. W.)

**Konrad III.** emperor of the Germans, the founder of the Hohenstaufen dynasty, eminent among the Crusaders, was the son of Frederick of Swabia, and was born in 1130. He was elected successor to Lothaire by the princes of Germany at Aix-la-Chapelle, Feb. 21, 1136, to prevent the increasing preponderance of the Guelph party. For his quarrels with Henry the Proud, duke of Bavaria and Saxony, and head of the Guelph party in Germany, etc. See *Guelphs* and *Ghibellines*. When St. Bernard of Clairvaux commenced to preach a new crusade, Konrad, seized with the general infatuation, set out for Palestine at the head of a large army [see Crusades] in company with his old enemy, Guelph of Bavaria, who proved treacherous, however, returned to Germany, meeting with the defeat of the *[Elbe] the Lion*, renewed, though unsuccessfully, the former attempt to gain possession of Bavaria. Konrad took sides with the pope and the northern Italians against Roger of Sicily, but, while preparing for an expedition against the latter, he was poisoned, Feb. 15, 1152, at Bimberg. Konrad was largely endowed with the virtues necessary for a great monarch, and, though himself unlearned, was a warm patron of science and letters. His marriage with a Greek princess was symbolized by the two-headed eagle which figured on the arms of the emperor of Germany, and now appears on the arms of the sovereigns of Austria. See Germany.

**Konradin of Swabia**, the last descendant of the house of the Hohenstaufen, son of the excommunicated Henry IV, was born in 1292. He desires our notice for the relation he sustained to the intriguing pope Innocent IV, and the treatment he received at the pope's hands. His Italian possessions were seized by Innocent IV on the plea that the son of a prince who dies excommunicated has no hereditary rights, an example which the other enemies of the house of Hohenstaufen rejoiced to follow. Konradin's cause was befriended by his uncle Manfred; who took up arms in his behalf. He drove the pope from Naples and Sicily, and, in order to consolidate his nephew's authority, declared himself king till the young prince came of age. The pope's inveterate hatred of the Hohenstaufen induced him thereupon to offer the crown of the Two Sicilies to Charles of Anjou, a consummate warrior and able politician. Charles immediately invaded Italy, met his antagonist in the plain of Granitella, where the defeat and death of Manfred, in 1266, gave him undisturbed possession of the kingdom. But the Neapolitans, detesting their new master, sent delegates to the emperor in Bavaria to invite Konradin, then in his sixteenth year, to come and assert his hereditary rights. Konradin accordingly made his appearance in Italy at the head of 10,000 men, and, being joined by the Neapolitans in large numbers, gained several victories over the French, but was finally defeated, and, along with his retinue, took refuge in the castle of Austria, taken by *Tagliacozzo*, Aug. 22, 1268. The two unfortunate princes were, with the consent of the pope, executed in the market-place of Naples on the 20th of October. A few minutes before his execution, Konradin, on the scaffold, took off his crown, and, addressing the crowd, as a sacrifice of vengeance, requesting that it might be carried to his heir, Peter of Aragon. This duty was undertaken by the chevalier De Waldburg, who, after many hair-breadth escapes, succeeded in fulfilling his prince's last command. See *Innocent IV*; *Sicilian Vespers*.

**Koolhaas, Caspar**, often named with Koornhert, in Holland, as the predecessor of Arminius, was born at Cologne in 1586. He studied at Düsseldorf, and in 1566 renounced his professed adherence to the Reformation. He afterwards held some situations as pastor in the duchies of Zweibrücken and Nassau. In 1574 he was called to the University of Leyden, then opening, as a professor. He subsequently resigned the professorship, and died a private teacher at Leyden in 1615. His opinions had been the cause of his resignation: he maintained nearly the same views professed afterwards by the Arminians on the extension of the authority of superiors in ecclesiastical affairs, reduction of the doctrine of the Church to a few simple, fundamental points, and the construction or adoption of the doctrine of predestination. His work De *jure Christiani magistratus circa disciplinam et regimen ecclesiae* gave great offence. He was summoned before a synod held at Middelburg in 1601, and requested to recant and sign the Belgian Confession, but refused, and appealed to the States. A provincial synod of 1602 functioned; and on the 21st of November 1602 he was compound of Arminius, but he was protected by the chief magistrate of Leyden, who reported to the Dutch States against the renewal of religious persecution, as well as against the acts of the synods, and the encouragements of the ecclesiastical colleges on the right of their faculties. See A. Schweitzer, *Gesch. d. ref. Centraldeken, ii, 40; Benthem, *Holland Kirchen- u. Schulenstaat*, ii, 85; *Uitgeboogd Kerkel. Hist*, p. 214.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopaedie*, viii, 26.

**Koordistan.** See *Kurdistan*.

**Koornhert.** See *Cornarists*.

**Kopacy, Joseph von**, a Hungarian Roman Catholic prelate, was born of noble parentage at Wesprim in 1774, and was consecrated the semi-archbishop of St. Elizabeth the Lion, in 1791, and was preferred to the see of Győr in 1793, and shortly after received an appointment as professor of church history and ecclesiastical law. In 1806 he became preacher at Wesprim, in 1822 he was made bishop of Stuhlweissenburg, and in 1824 bishop of Wesprim. In 1839 he was promulgated to the archbishopric of Gran, and at the same time was made primate of Hungary. He died Sept. 18, 1847. Bishop Kopacy published a German translation of Fleury's *Customs and Usages of Jews and Christians* (1803).—Kathol. Real-Encykl. xvi, 661.

**Koph.** See *Aph.*

**Kopher.** See *Campbier*.

**Kopfaii.** See *Cophait*.

**Kopistenakl, Zacharias, a Russian theologian, flourished in the beginning of the 17th century as archimandrite of a convent of St. Anthony at Kief, and died there April 18, 1626. He translated into Slavonic the commentary of St. Chrysostom on the Acts and Paul's epistles (Kief, 1623 and 1624, folio). He also published a *Funeral Sermon*, in which he seeks to prove that the doctrine of Purgatory is sanctioned by apostolic authority; and a *Nomenoxis*, or review of the nomens, (Kief, 1624 and 1629; Moscow, 1639; Lemberg, 1646).—Hoefer, *Nov. Bibl. Générale*, xxvii, 75.

**Kopitar, Bartholomäus, a learned Orientalist, was born at Repče in 1780, and educated at the University of Vienna. In 1809 he was appointed assistant at the Imperial school, was promoted to the professorship in 1848, and died Aug. 11, 1844. He published an edition of the Polish Psalter found in the convent of St. Florian, with a German and Latin translation (Vienna, 1834), etc.—Kathol. Real-Encyklop. vi, 362.

**Köpke, Adam, a German fanatic, who flourished in the first half of the 18th century as pastor at Walmo, Durbach, and some other places, who was an adherent of Dippel (q. v.), and, with Haegenbuch (Church Hist, 18th and 18th Cent., trans. by Dr. Hurst, i, 168 sq.), we are in doubt what place to assign any of Dippel's followers; he was measurably a Mystical, yet he can neither be definitely classed with them nor with any of the sects known as Pietists or Rationalists.
isto, fanatics or scoffers, Mystics or Illuminists. He wrote Histor. Nachricht v. Caspar Schwenkfeld (Prenz-
lau, 1745, 8vo): — Wegweiser zum göttlichen Leben, etc. (ibid, 1744, 8vo). — Die reinigung der Kraft des Gött-Bletes Jesu Christi (ibid, 1744, 8vo). See Kraft, Theol. Bibl-

Koppe, Johann Benjamin, a distinguished German Biblical scholar, was born at Dantzig Aug. 19, 1750. He studied philosophy and theology at the universities of Leipzig and Göttingen, and became professor of Greek at the college of Mittau in 1774, and professor of theolog-
y at Göttingen in 1775. He subsequently became (in 1777) director of the seminary for preachers, superin-
tendent and president of the consistory at Gotha (in 1784), and preacher at the court of Hanover (in 1788). He died Feb. 12, 1791. He wrote De Crítica Veteris Test-
amenti caute adhibenda (Göttingen, 1789): — Viniciae arvoretum: a demonum aequo imperio ad sacraeam fraudulenta (Göttingen, 1784, 8vo): — Israelitae non seil 450 annos in Ægypto commoratos esse (Göttingen, 1777, 4to; reprinted in Post and Ruperti's Syllogos Commenta-
tionum theologicaum, vol. iv): — Interpretatio Janson, viii, 29 (Götting, 1780, 4to): — Ad Mattheii librum xii, 31 (Ad Peccato in peccatum perdidit, Gottingen, 1781, 8vo): — Re
ges Marci (Götting, 1782, 4to): — Explicatio Moseis, iii, 14 (Göttingen, 1783, 4to): — Marcus non epimomator Matthaei (Göttingen, 1782, 4to): — Predigten (Göt. 1799-3, 2 vols. 8vo). He also edited three vols. of the Novum Testamentum Graece (1805). The work comprises a concordance, for use in the study of the Gospels. He published, at Göttingen, 10 vols. 8vo, at the close of the 18th century. This work, which he began, but did not live to com-
plete, bears his name, as the plan, which is excellent, is his. It furnishes a corrected edition of the Greek text, mostly agreeing with Griesebach, with critical and philo-
osophical notes on the subject of each book, and excursus on the more difficult passages. On this plan Koppe gave a volume on the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, and Thessalonians, and another on the Epistle to the Romans, which closed his labors. Heinrichs, in continuation of the original design of Koppe, has published the Acts, and all the remaining epistles of Paul, except those to the Corinthians; and Potter has published the Epistles of Peter, and that of James. Koppe is esteemed a safe and judicious critic; Heinrichs and Potter less so. Koppe's Romans has been republished by Ammon, the well-known neologist, with characteristic notes of his own (Orme). See Koppen-

Köppen, Daniel, a German divine, was born at Lubeck in 1736. He was pastor at Zeitemím for thirty-nine years, and died June 7, 1807. Koppen secured for himself, by earnest literary labors, the reputa-
tion of a great scholar, and his works are all valu-
able. He wrote Hauptsynck des Freihumteises (Leipzig, 1778, 8vo): — Die Bibel, ein Werk der göttlichen Weisheit (ibid, 1787-88, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d edition, 1797-98): — Wir ist Chrst (ibid, 1800, 8vo): — Düring, Ge-
lehrte Theol. Deutschlands, ii, 155 sq.

Köppen, Friedrich, a German theologian and philosopher, was born at Lubeck in 1776; became preache-
er in Bremen in 1805; professor of philosophy in 1807, at Landshut; and in 1826 was appointed professor at Erlangen. He died Sept. 4, 1858. Köppen was an ar-
dent follower of Jacobi (q. v.), and wrote Uber die Ofl-
fenbarung in Beziehung auf Kantakte u. Eidkrate Phi-

Kor. See Cor.
Lord himself, by some manifest token, might make known his will in this great matter. As this order was particularly addressed to the rebellious Levites, the Reubenites left the place, and when afterwards called back by Moses, returned a very insolent refusal, charging him with having brought them out of the land of Egypt under great fear, "to kill them in the wilderness" (Numb. xvi, 1-17).

The next day Korah and his company appeared before the tabernacle, attended by a multitude of people out of the general body of the tribes. Then the Shekina, or symbol of the divine presence, which abode between the cherubim, advanced to the entrance of the sacred edifice, and a voice therefrom bid Moses and Aaron to stand apart, lest they should share in the destruction which awaited the whole congregation. On hearing these awful words the brothers fell on their faces, and, by strong intercession, moved the Lord to confound his wrath to the leaders in the rebellion, and spare their unhappy dupes. The latter were then ordered to separate themselves from their leaders and from the tents in which they dwelt. The terrible menace involved in this direction had its weight, and the command was obeyed; and after Moses had appealed to what had been done as a proof of the advantage by which he acted, the earth opened, and received and closed over the tents of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. The Reubenite conspirators were in their tents, and perished in them; and at the same instant Korah and his 250, who were in the court, at the door of the tabernacle, were destroyed by a fire which "came out from the Lord;" that is, most probably, in this case, from the cloud in which his presence dwelt (Numb. xvi, 18-35). The censers which they had used were afterwards made into plates, to form an outer covering to the altar, and thus became a standing monument of this awful transaction (Numb. xvi, 36-40). The rebellious spirit excited by these ambitious men vented itself afresh on the next day in complaints against Moses as having been the cause of death to these popular leaders! a degree of obduracy and presumption that called forth the divine indignation so severely as not to be alloyed till a sudden plague had cut off thousands of the factious multitude, and threatened still further ravages had it not been appeased by Aaron's offering of incense at the instance of Moses (Numb. xvi, 41-50). The recurrence of a similar jealousy was prevented by the divine choice of the family of Aaron, attested by the miraculous vegetation of his rod alone out of all the tribes (Numb. xvii). On, although named in the first instance along with Dathan and Abiram (ver. 1), does not further appear either in the narrative of its punishment. It is generally supposed that he repented in time; and Abana and other Rabbinical writers allege that his wife prevailed upon him to abandon the cause.

It might be supposed from the Scripture narrative that the entire families of the conspirators perished in the destruction of their tents. Doubtless all who were in the tents perished; but, as the descendants of Korah afterwards became eminent in the Levitical service [see Korahite], it is clear that his sons were spared (Exod. vi, 24). They were probably living in separate tents, or were among those who sullenly themselves from the conspirators at the command of Moses. There is no reason to suppose that the divorcement of the daughter of Dathan and Abiram, when their father perished. Perhaps the fissure of the ground which swallowed up the tents of Dathan and Abiram did not extend beyond those of the Reubenites. From Numb. xvi, 27 it seems clear that Korah himself was put to death with Dathan and Abiram at the same time. His tent may have been one pitched for himself, in contempt of the orders of Moses, by the side of his fellow-rebels, while his family continued to reside in their proper camp nearer the tabernacle; but it must have been separated by a considerable space from those of Dathan and Abiram. Or, even if Korah's family resided among the Reubenites, they may have fled, at Moses's warning, to take refuge in the Kohathite camp, instead of remaining, as the wives and children of Dathan and Abiram did (verse 27). Korah himself was doublet with the 250 men who bare censers nearer the tabernacle (verse 19), and perished with them by the "fire from Jehovah" which accompanied the earthquake. It is nowhere said that he was one of those who "went down quick into the pit" (compare Ps. civ, 17, 18), and it is natural that he should have been with the censern-bearers. That he was so is indeed clearly implied by Numb. xvi, 16-19, 55, 40, compared with xxvi, 9, 10.

The apostle holds up Korah as a warning to presumptuous and coming treachery, who dwell in the same city with those of Cain and Balaam, as being of similar enormity (Jude 11). The expression there used, "gainingayng," (ἀδισκολία, contraddiction), alludes to his speech in Numb. xvi, 5, and accompanying rebellion. Compare the use of the same word in Heb. xii, 3; Ps. civ, 22, and of the verb, John xix, 12, and Ps. xxii, 22, ac. 39 (Sept.), in which latter passage, as quoted Rom. x, 21, the A. V. has the same expression of "gainingayng" as in Jude. The Son of Sirach, following Ps. civ, 16, ἀδισκολίαν, etc. (otherwise rendered however, by the Sept., παρακώνασαν), describes Korah and his companions as envious or jealous of Moses, where the English "malicious," an equivalent of ἄδισκολία (Eccles. xiv, 18). A late ingenious writer (Prof. Reichel, of Dublin, Sermons, Camb. 1855) distinguishes the crime of Korah from that of Dathan and Abiram (q. v.) as being an ecclesiastical insubordination, whereas the latter was a violation of the law. For he also speaks of them as being in a parallel between the position of Aaron as representing the high-priesthood of Christ—the one undervied, perpetual, and untransferable pontificate, "after the order of Melchisedek," and the Levitical order represented by Korah corresponding to the Christian ministry; and he arrives at the following conclusion: "The crime in the Christian Church corresponding to that which Korah and his followers committed in the Jewish Church consists, not, as is often stated, in the people taking to themselves the functions of the ministry, but in the Christian ministry imiously usurping the functions of Christ himself; and, not contented with their Master's having separated them from the congregation of his people to bring them near unto himself, to do the service of his house, and to stand before the congregation to minister to them, in their seeking the priesthood also." This is the gainingayng of Korah. He thus invests the authority of the Church's declaration of this ordinance should be repeated even in the earliest ages of the Christian Church, and which is significantly coupled by the apostle Jude with the way of Cain, and with the running greedily after the error of Balaam for reward." In short, it was an attempt on the part of such as were ready invested with an official rank in the Levitical cultus to supplant those occupying the higher offices in the same economy, and even to derogate the supreme and exclusive control of its dispensation; and all this for the sake merely of the honors and emoluments of the promotion. It is therefore at once apparent how little this narrative supports the arrogant claims of any class of so-called priests in the modern Church, and that it altogether fails to warrant their exclusion and condemnation of others who have as clear a divine call as themselves to the same order of functions, especially when the matter is in a difficulty of capacity, is actuated by the most unselfish motives, and proceed in accordance with the most imperious demands of circunmstances.

3. The first named of the four sons of Hebron, of the family of Caleb, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 43). B.C. considerably post 1612.

Korahite (Hebrew Korah', כֹּרָה, Exod. vi, 24; Numb. xxvi, 58; 1 Chron. ix, 31; xxvi, 19; plur. Korachim', כְּרוֹךְֵי, 1 Chron. ix, 19; xii, 6; xxvi, 1; 2 Chron. xx, 19; Septuagint Kórarp̄a, 1 Chron. ix, 31; Kópar̄a, 1 Chron. ix, 19; xii, 6; elsewhere paraphrases wóll, δύναμις, or γενειαν Κώρη; Auth. Vera. "Korahites," 1 Chron. ix, 19; xii, 6; xiii, 14; xiv, 1; 1 Chron. xxvi, 6; 2 Chron. xx, 19; Numb. xxvi, 58; "Kore," 1 Chron. xxvi, 19; elsewhere "Korhites"), the patronymic designation of that portion of the Kohathites who were descended from Korah, and are frequently styled by the synonymous phrase Sons of Korah (1 Chron. vii, 17-19; compare 1 Chron. xxvi, 7). They appear at first sight, from Exod. vi, 24, that Korah had three sons—Asa'ir, Elkana, and Abiasaph—as Winer, Rosenmuller, etc., also understand it; but as we learn from 1 Chron. vii, 22, 23, 37, that Asa'ir, Elkana, and Abiasaph were respectively the son, grandson, and great-grandson of Korah, it seems more likely (as Exod. vi, 24 gives us the chief houses sprang from Korah, and not his actual sons, and therefore that Elkana and Abiasaph were not the sons, but later descendants of Korah. See Samuel. The offices filled by the sons of Korah, as far as we are aware, are the following:

1. They were an important branch of the minstrels in the Kohathite division, Heman himself being a Korahite (1 Chron. vi, 33), and the Korahites being among those who, in Jehoshaphat's reign, "stood up to praise the Lord God of Israel with a loud voice on high" (2 Chron. xx, 19). See Heman. Hence we find eleven psalms (or twelve, if Psa. xliii is included under the same title as Psa. xiii) dedicated or assigned to the sons of Korah, viz. Psa. xiii, xiv—xlix, lxxxiv, lxxxv, lxxxvi, lxxxviii. Winer describes them as some of the most beautiful in the collection, from their high lyre tone. Ogien says it was a remark of the old interpreters that all the psalms inscribed with the name of the sons of Korah are full of pleasant and cheerful subjects, and free from anything sad or harsh (Homil. on 1 Kings, i. e. i Sam.), and on Matt. xviii, 20 he ascribes the authorship of these psalms to "the three sons of Korah," who, because they agreed together, had the care of God in the midst of them" (Homil. xiv). St. Augustine has a still more fanciful conceit, which he thinks it necessary to repeat in almost every homily on the eleven psalms inscribed to the sons of Korah. Adverting to the interpretation of Korah, Calebites, he finds in it a great mystery. Under this term in the Pentateuch, North Christ, was entitled Calvary because he was crucified on Calvary, and was mocked by the by-standers, as Eliaha had been by the children who cried after him "Calee, calee!" and who, when they said "Go up, thou bald pate," had prejudiced the crucifixion. The sons of Korah are therefore the children of Christ the bridegroom (Homil. on Psalms). Of moderns, Rosenmuller thinks that the sons of Korah, especially Heman, were the authors of these psalms, which, he says, rise to greater sublimity and breathe more vehement feelings than the Psalms of David, and quotes Hengler and Eichhorn as agreeing. De Wette also considers the sons of Korah as the authors of them (Einl. p. 333—339), and so does Just. Olshausen on the Psalms (Exeg. Hundt, Einl. p. 22). As, however, the language of several of these psalms, e.g. of xlii, lxxxiv, etc., is most appropriate to the circumstances of David, it has seemed to other interpreters much simpler to explain the title "for the sons of Korah" to mean that they were given to them to sing in the Temple services. If their style of music, vocal and instrumental, was of a more sublime and lyric character than that of the sons of Moses or Gershom, then Heman had more to do in his execution than Asaph and Jeduthun, it is perfectly natural that David should have given his more poetic and elevated strains to Heman and his choir, and the simpler and quieter psalms to the other choirs. A serious objection, however, to this view is that the same titles contain another phrase dedicating the psalms in question to "the chief musician," so that the following expression must be rendered by (? "auctorius") the Korahites. See Psalms. J. van Iperen (ap. Rosenmuller) assigns those psalms to the times of Jehoshaphat; others to those of David. Ewald attributes the 42nd Psalm to Jeremiah. The purpose of many of the German critics seems to be to reduce the antiquity of the Scriptures as low as possible.

2. Others, again, of the sons of Korah were "porters," i.e. doorkkeepers, in the Temple, an office of considerable dignity. In 1 Chron. ix, 17-19, we learn that Shallum, a Korahite of the line of Ebiaphah, was chief of the doorkkeepers, and that he and his brethren were over the works of the service, keepers of the gates of the tabernacle (compare 2 Kings xxxv, 18) apparently about the time of the Babylonian captivity. See also 1 Chron. ix, 22-29; Jer. xxxv, 4; and Ezra ii, 42. But in 1 Chron. xxvi we find that this official station of the Korahites dated from the time of David, and that their chief was then Shelemiah or Riseblemeiah, the son of (Abi)azaph, to whose custody the east gate fell by lot, being the principal entrance. Shelemiah is thought to have been the same as Shallum in 1 Chron. ix, 17, and perhaps Meshullam, 2 Chron. xxiv, 12; Neh. xii, 25, where, as in so many other places, a name may designate, not the individuals, but the house or family. In 2 Chron. xxxi, where the son of Immer is in the Levite, the doorkkeeper towards the east, who was over the door-keepers offering of God to distribute the oblations of the Lord and the most holy things, was probably a Korahite, as we find the name Kore in the family of Korah in 1 Chron. ix, 19. In 1 Chron. ix, 81 we find that Matti-diblah, the first-born of Shallum the Korahite, had the set office over the things that were made in the pans. See Levites.

Koradithites is a name sometimes applied to the unfortunate Jewish tribe of Koradhith, of Northern Arabia, which Mohammed extirpated upon their refusal to accept him as God's "prophet." For a detailed description of the sufferings of the Jews of Koraditha, see Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, v. 125—137; Milman, Hist. of the Jews, iii, 99 sq.; Muir, Life of Mohammed, iii, 185 sq.; Sale's Koran, p. 345, note A. See Mohammed.

Koran, often Anglicized (when, as properly, it has the article prefixed) Al-Koran, but more precisely Qiurn. The emphasis is not on the first syllable, as many persons place it. The word is from the Arabic root korah or kera, to separate or divide, and literally the Koran is "the separation or division," the wordought to be read; corresponding nearly to the Chaldean Keri (q. v.). The book is also called Furgam, from a root signifying to divide or distinguish; Sale says to denote a section or portion of the Scriptures; but Mohammedans say because it distinguishes between good and evil. It is furthermore spoken of as Al-Mosod, "The Volume," and Al-Kiadh, "The Book," by way of eminence; and Al-Dikhr, "The Admonition." The Koran is the Mohammedan Book of Faith, or, as we may say, Bible.

Divisoria.—It consists of one volume, which is divided into one hundred and fourteen sections or portions called Surds, which signifies a regular series. These suras or sections are not numbered in the original, but bear each its own title, which is generally some key-word in the chapter, or the first word or name of the place where it is taken from near the close of the chapter, it is probable that that portion was originally uttered first. Some suppose these titles to have been matter of revelation, as also the initial Bism-llah, "In the name of God", etc., which is likewise placed as a prefatory phrase at the beginning of all Mohammedan books or of sections of each chapter or sura. There are twenty-nine chapters which begin with certain letters, and these the Mohammedans believe to conceal profound mysteries, that have not been communicated to any but the prophet;
notwithstanding which, various explanations of them have been professed. For these curious but unimportant theories, see Sale, p. 43. The chapters or suras do not now stand in the order in which they were originally uttered. As the Mohammedan theory concerning the recension and redactions in the authority, the last revelation arrogates any former one with which it conflicts, and as some two hundred and twenty-five of the passages of the Koran are admitted thus to have been cancelled, their chronological order frequently becomes a matter of considerable importance. The real order in point of time, and therefore in authority, as now determined, after immense painstaking, is the following: Suras numbered 108, 109, 110, 99, 91, 106, 1, 101, 95, 102, 104, 82, 92, 105, 89, 90, 93, 94, 108, were delivered in the order in which they are here set down in the first stage of Mohammed's prophetic career. Suras numbered 112, 74, 111, belong to the second period of his career, and extend to his fortieth year. Those numbered 87, 57, 88, 90, 81, 84, 86, 110, 85, 78, 77, 76, 75, 109, 107, 55, 56, belong to the third period. Numbers 67, 38, 32, 39, 73, 79, 54, 54, 61, 68, 64, 71, 52, 55, 45, 44, 37, 30, 25, 15, cover the time from the sixth to the tenth year of Mohammed's mission. Numbers 46, 72, 35, 36, 19, 18, 27, 42, 40, 38, 21, 20, 43, 12, 11, 10, 14, 6, 64, 28, 23, 22, 21, 17, 16, 33, 29, 7, to the fifth stage. The date of the number 113, 114 is not known. Numbers 2, 47, 5, 7, 8, 56, 59, 82, 50, 24, 62, 48, 41, 2, 5, 3, 58, 60, 44, 49, are those delivered at Mecca, though some were delivered partly at Medina and partly at Mecca. The Koran is further subdivided by the equivalent of our verses, called Ayat, which means signs or wonders, as the secrets of God's attributes, works, judgments, etc. It is again arranged in sixty equal portions called Hejz, each of which is divided into four equal parts (or into thirty portions twice the length of the former, and subdivided into four parts), at the use of the readers in the royal temples or in the adjoining chapels where the emperors and great men were interested. Thirty of these readers belong to each chapel, and each reads his section every day, so that the whole Koran is read through once a day (Sale, p. 42).

Contents.—The matter of the Koran is exceedingly incoherent and sententious, the book evidently being without any logical order of thought either as a whole or in its parts. This agrees with the desultory and incidental manner in which it is said to have been delivered. The following table of the suras (condensed from Sale) will give the reader some idea of its miscellaneous range of topics. Many of the headings, however, are, as said before, hardly translations from a prose, but rather original phrases containing some prominent word or expression. Most of the contents are preceptive merely; some are a travesty of Bible history; others recount in a vague and fragmentary way incidents in the prophet's personal or public career; and a few are somewhat speculative. Generally these elements are indiscriminately mixed in the same piece.

Manner of Preservation.—Mohammed's professional revelations were made at intervals extending over a period of twenty-three years, when the canon was closed. We have no certain information about the manner of their preservation during the prophet's life. Many persons wrote them on palm-leaves and various other substances which were conveniently at hand. A writer in the Cbrutica Religiosa (Colenso), says: "It may be supposed that the prophet had many Arabic amanuenses; some of them occasional, as Ali and Othman, others official, as Zeid ibn-Thabit (who also learned Hebrew expressly in order to conduct Mohammed's business at Medina). In Wackiay's collection of dispatches the writers are mentioned, and they amount to fourteen. Some there were four-and-twenty of his followers whom he used more or less as scribes, others as many as forty-two (Weil's Mohammed, p. 590). In his early life at Mecca he could not have had these facilities, but even then his wife, Khadija, who was the first (and who read the sacred language), might have recorded his revelations; or Waraqa, Ali, or Abū-Bekr. At Medina, Obey ibn-Kab is mentioned as one who used to record the inspired recitations of Mohammed (Wackiay, p. 277). Abdullah ibn-Sād, another, was an executioner of inconsistencies in the Koran that he had falsified the revelation dictated to him by the prophet (Weil's Mohammed). It is also evident that the revelations were recorded, because they are frequently called throughout the Koran itself Kibb, 'the writing,' i.e. Scriptures." Besides this, however, there were many persons who recited these sayings daily, considering their repetition to be a duty, and persons generally repeated some parts of them. It was said that some could repeat literally every word of the Koran. The recital of a portion of it was essential in every celebration of
public worship, and its private prayer was urged as a duty and considered a privilege. No order was, however, observed in their prayer, in public the imam or preacher selecting according to his own pleasure.

"Collected by Zaid."—Many of the best memorizers of the Koran were slain in battle at Yamana, whereupon Omar advised caliph Abu-Bakr, "as the battle might again wax hot among the repeaters of the Koran," that he should appoint Zaid to collect from all sources the matter of the Koran. This Zaid did from date-leaves, tablets of white stones, breasts of men, fragments of parchments, any writing, pieces of paper, and pieces of leather, and the small birds and ribbes of camels and goats. Sale supposes that Zaid did not compile, but merely reduced to order the various suras. This, however, was but imperfectly done. Zaid's copy was committed to the care of Hafsa, the daughter of Omar.

Recension in Othman's Time. A variety of expressions either originally prevailed, or soon crept into copies made from Zaid's edition. The Koran was "one," but if there were several varying texts where would be its unity? There were marked differences between the Syrian and Iranian readings. The caliph Othman ordered that the second recension of the Koran be published as an authorized version from the copy of Hafsa, and this was subsequently sent into all the principal cities, all previous copies being directed to be burned. This recension being objected to in modern times on the ground that it is an unprofitable mass of jargon, and preserved from all error and variety of readings by the miraculous interposition of God, the Mohammedans now say that it was originally revealed in seven different dialects of the Arabic tongue, and that the men in question only selected from these. The variations in the copies of Othman's edition are marvellously few. There is probably no other work which has remained twelve centuries with so pure a text.

Authenticity. It would appear difficult, notwithstanding the care taken since Othman's day, to prove that the Koran has been entirely uncorrupted. The Shiites Musulmans say that Othman struck out ten sections, or one fourth part of the whole; and the Dabihat, translated by Shea and Ivery (ii, 368), contains one of the sections said to have been struck out. Again, while the Koran was in the care of Hafsa, one of Mohammed's wives, we cannot say that it was not in any way tampered with. The balance of evidence, however, is probably against the views of the Shiite sect. At the time of the recension there were multitudes who had transcribed, and who remembered accurately what they had heard. The political prestige of Othman was sufficient to head them up, if not waver, and they would gladly have stood on any such sfaw or failure. Abu-Bakr was a sincere follower of Mohammed, and all the people seem to have been earnest in their endeavor to reproduce the divine message. The compilation was made within two years of the prophet's death, while yet there were official rectors and tutors of the Koran in every quarter. The very fragmentary and patchwork character of the arrangement of the book bears marks of honesty; yet passages revealed at various periods may, after all, not be all in order, as very little can be reckoned for the recension of Othman's is, on the other hand, urged as evidence of acknowledged corruption.

The Koran as a Revelation. The Mohammedan theory is that the Koran is eternal and uncreated, and was first written in heaven on a table of vast size, called the "Preserved Table." A copy of this volume was made on paper, and brought by Gabriel down to the lowest heaven in the month of Ramadan, from which copy the work was at various times communicated to the prophet. The whole was shown to Mohammed once a year, and the last year of his life he saw it twice. The copy was not to prove, however, the tradition of Muhammad, so far as found within the Koran itself, is as follows:

1. That Mohammed was foretold by Jesus in these words: "Oh children of Israel, I bring glad tidings of an apostle who shall come after me, whose name shall be Ahmad" (sura 6). Ahmad is from the same root, and has almost the same meaning as Mohammed. A passage of the New Test. (John xvi, 7), in which Christ promises to send the Comforter, is wrested for the same service, as also are Psa. i, 2, and Deut. xxxiii, 2.

2. Some suppose that the "two suras contain the accounts of miracles worked by Mohammed." The 34th sura contains what some Mohammedans interpret as an account of Mohammed's splitting the moon. The Mohammedan critics are not agreed as to whether the prophet that occasioned in the future of the moon or he does not merely affirm that the moon shall be split before the day of judgment admits of question. Mohammed elsewhere in the Koran distinctly and repeatedly denies that he could or would work miracles (sura 18-17, etc.). The night journey of Mohammed from Mecca to Jerusalem (sura 17), and the conversion of the jinn or genii who heard him reading the Koran (sura 46, 72), are also referred to as miracles by the Mohammedans, but it is doubtful if the language in the Koran was intended to assert what it has since been made to support. Various passages are referred to by Mohammedans as instances of their miraculous inspirations, as the 46th, 47th, etc. As to the passage (in the 80th sura) the Greeks being in over, but the commentators are not agreed as to the reference (sura 24, 27-48).

3. But the predictions in the Koran were never realized as evidence of Mohammed's inspiration. The real testimony to the inspiration of the Koran appealed to throughout by Mohammedans is the book itself. The author of it everywhere appeals to its literary miracles; it is "uncreated" and "eternal" (Sale, p. 46); it could not have been composed by any but God (Sale, p. 169); Mohammed challenges men and genii to produce a chapter like it (Sale, p. 169-293); no revelation could be more self-evident (Sale, p. 186); it contains all things necessary to know (Sale, p. 221, 273); it was so wonderful that it was translated by its enemies as a piece of sorcery (Sale, p. 169), as a poetical composition (Sale, p. 364); it was not liable to corruption (Sale, p. 175), and should not be touched by the ceremonially unclean (Sale, p. 437).

The Style of the Koran. It is difficult to make a precise judgment of its merits. It was written in a dialect of Arabic which may now almost be called a dead language. It is composed in a kind of balanced prose, with frequent rhyming terminations; a sort of composition once greatly admired by the Syrian Christians, but in Europe neither the poetic cadence nor the jingling sound of the Hebrew sound, as the Hebrew, is the same. We have learned Mohammedans have not considered it remarkably beautiful (Pococke's Specimen Hist. Arabum, ed. White, p. 224; Maracci, Prodomus, iii, 75; Lee's Martyr's Tracts, p. 124, 135). Gibbon is probably too severe in his judgment if his remarks have reference to its manner and not to its matter, when he calls it an "incoherent rhapsody of fable, and precept, and declamation, which sometimes cravils in the dust, and sometimes is lost in the clouds" (Decl. and Fall Roman Empire, i, p. 365, Milman's edition). Some affirm that Hamzah ben Ahmed wrote a book against the Koran and Musulman another, which surpassed it, and occasioned a defection of a great number of Musulmans. There is perhaps little reason to differ from the representations of Mr. Sale when he says, "The Koran is usually allowed to be written with the utmost elegance and purity of language, if not the beauty of the Koinia, the most noble and polite of all the Arabians, but with some mixture, though very rarely, of other dialects. It is confessedly the standard of the Arabic tongue, and, as the more orthodox believe, and are taught by the book itself, inimitable by any human pen (though some sects have been of this opinion), and therefore insisted on as a perpetual miracle, greater than that of raising the dead, and alone sufficient to convince the world of its divine original" (Koran, p. 48).
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Relation to the Bible.—The Koran maintains that revelation is gradual, and that God has given written revelations to many prophets from time to time, none of which are exact except the Pentateuch of Moses, the Psalms of David, and the Gospel of Jesus; that God revives, and reproduces or reproduces from time to time his revelations through his prophets, according to the necessity of the hour. By the doctrine of the unity of God, and of Christ, and that of the Mussulman—are equally inspired and divine. The preceding Scriptures are, however, to be interpreted according to the latest revelation, and are liable to have their ordinances modified in conformity therewith. This is thus made between belief in and obligation to obey these precepts. The Jewish and Christian Scriptures are variously spoken of as "the Word of God," "Book of God," Taurotd, etc.; they are described as "reveals made by God in ages preceding the Koran." Exhortations are given "to judge" in accordance therewith. Mohammed himself had sent to "attest the former Scriptures," etc. (Compare passages in the following suras: 2: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 32, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 53, 61, 62, 66, 74, 78, 95). There are various correcpondences with these Scriptures, as in the account of the fall of Adam and Eve, the narratives of Noah and the deluge, of Abraham, Sarah, Lot, Isaac, Moses, Joseph, Zacharias, John the Baptist, etc. The contradictions are, however, innumerable. The original record was lost in the Deluge (sura 11); the wife of Pharaoh saved Moses (sura 28); the wind was subject to Solomon (sura 21); Solomon was driven from his kingdom; devils built for Solomon, other devils dived for him (ibid.); thousands of dead Israelites were raised to life (sura 30) to establish his as died for a hundred years, and were then raised to life (sura 2); the grossest being that Jesus was not crucified, and is not the Son of God (sura 4).

Sources of Jewish and Christian Elements.—The Jewish and Christian elements in the Koran are readily to be accounted for. Jews from all parts of Arabia were in yearly attendance at the great fairs of Oczitz, Mijamna, Dnul, Majaz, etc., and great mercantile journeys were made from Mecca to Syria, Yemen, and Abyssinia at least once a year. Christianity was established in these quarters. Some Arabs even reached much further. Othman ibn-Huwairith, a citizen of Mecca, went to Constantinople, and subsequently returned a baptized Christian. Arabs frequented the Christian courts of Hira and Ghasanin, which adjoined Arabia on the north. Mohammed himself had been twice to Medina. More than this, there is the fact that it was in the Christian court of Abyssinia, both before and after the Hegira. Embassies were sent by Mohammed to the Roman and Persian courts, to Abyssinian and other Christian chiefs. "Mohammed had connection with Jews and Christians of every quarter of the civilized world" (Muir's Testimony, p. 118, 119). There are, moreover, many prominent individual cases: Zeid was of Syria, among whom Christianity prevailed. He was captured and sold into slavery, and was presented to Khadija shortly after her marriage to Mohammed, who loved him, and adopted him as his own son. He learned Hebrew. Waroc, a cousin of Khadija, was a convert to Christianity, acquainted with the religious tenets and sacred Scriptures of the Jews and Christians, copied or translated some of the Gospel in Arabic or Hebrew, and was of the family of Mohammed. The slaves generally of Mecca knew something of Christianity and Judaism (Muir's Mohammed).

Mohammedans, however, do not admit that our present Scriptures are trustworthy, but believe them to have been interpolated and otherwise corrupted. They quote a great number of passages from the Hebrew Bible, but they cannot establish this. Mr. Muir (Traditoiny, p. 119 sqq.) nevertheless shows that there is no charge in the Koran against the Christians on this account, and that even those against the Jews are of "hiding, concealing" the whole, and not of corrupting.

Doctrines and Morals.—The contents of the Koran as the basis of Mohammedanism will be considered under that head, while for questions more closely connected with authorship and chronology we must refer to Mohammed. Briefly it may be stated here that "the chief doctrinal teaching of the Koran is the unity of God, and the existence of but one true religion, with changeable ceremonies. When mankind turned from it at different times, God sent prophets to lead them back to truth; Moses, Christ, and Mohammed being the most distinguished. Both punishments for the sinner and rewards for the pious are depicted with great diffuseness, and exemplified chiefly by stories taken from the Bible, the apocryphal writings, and the Midrash. Special laws and directions, admonitions to moral and divine virtues, more particularly to a complete and unconditional resignation to God's will, legends, principally relating to the patriarchs, and, almost without exception, borrowed from the Jewish writings (known to Mohammed by oral communication only, a circumstance which accounts for their often odd confusion), form the bulk of the book, which is throughout throughout the most palpable traces of Jewish influence" (Chamber's, Cyclopaedia, v.).

Outward Reverence.—The Mohammedans regard the Koran with great esteem, never holding it below the girdle nor touching it without purification. It is consulted on all matters of importance, and is the basis of the daily and public prayers. It is from the Koran that the religious law is derived. Mohammedans make no regulations for the observance of certain days, even the most important, as such, and the Mohammedans follow the example of Abraham, by not observing the old Jewish festivals, or the Christian observances. Sentences from it are inscribed on their banners: they are written on tissue paper, and are suspended in gold and silver lookets from their necks. The materials of its binding are often costly, being embroidered with gold and precious stones. Mohammedans much dislike to see the book in the hands of "infidels," as they call all but Moslems. The bazaars or streets in which it is sold in Constantinople have become almost as sacred as mosques, and the dealers in the Koran have come to be as much reverenced as the preacher. Kemal Bey has recently had photographed a famous copy of the Koran, written nearly two hundred years ago (in 1094 of the Hegira) by Haif ez Osman, from the MS of Al-Kari, a celebrated doctor (Friend of India, Nov. 2, 1871; also Atheneum). Multitudes of Mussulmans know the entire Koran by heart; these are called Hatifs, and are much venerated in consequence.

Translations, Commentaries, Editions, etc.—Various versions of the Koran have been made. Mohammedans do not object to this (Sale, p. 60). Of French translations we have those of Du Royer, Savary (with notes, 1758), Gareau (1808), and by Kropel (1829). In Latin there is an early one (A.D. 1143) by Retenens, an Englishman (Baile, 1843), and an Italian one from it—but condemned by Sale. The Latin translation of Maracci (1698) is much quoted by authors. In German we have those of Meyer (1772) and Wacht (1779), and by Ullmann (1840). In English there is Rodwell's (1852), and the excellent one with notes by George Sale (first edit. 1734; last, Lond. 1861); also Lane's Selections from the Koran (Lond. 1843, 12mo.). Besides these there are a great number of Persian, Turkish, Malay, Hindustani, and other translations, made for the benefit of the various Eastern Molesmen.

Of concordances to the Koran may be mentioned that of Flügel (Leips.1842), and the Nújum al-Furkan (Calcutta, 1811).

The Koran has been commented upon so often that the names of the commentators alone would fill volumes. Thus, the library of Tripoli, in Syria, is reported to have once contained no less than 20,000 commentaries. The most renowned are those of Samachchari (died 539 Hegira), Beihdavi (died 686 or 716 Hegira), Mahalli (died 970 Hegira), and Sovuti (died 1011 Hegira). The American Oriental Society has in its library at New Haven a superior copy of the Persian Commentary on the Koran, by Kamil ed-Din Husain (2 vols. in one, folio). For a
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full list of these and the Oriental translations and edi-
tions of the Koran, see Trunber's pamphlet, A Catalogue of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish Books printed in the East (Egypt, Tunis, Oudh, Bombay, etc.). See ARABIC LANGUAGES.

The principal editions are those of Hinkelmann (Hamburg, 1694), Maracci (Padua, 1698), Fligel (Leipzig, 3d ed. 1838, a splendid one), besides many editions (of small critical value) printed in St. Petersburg, Kasaan, Teheran, Calcutta, Crawmore, Serampore, and the many newly-

erected Indian presses.

Literature.—In addition to the above, special refer-
ence may be made to W. Muir, The Testimony borne by the Koran to the Jewish and Christian Scriptures (Allah-
habad, India, 1860); Prof. Gerock, Christologie des Koran (Hamburg, 1883); Muir, Life of Mohamet (Lond. 1860), vol. iv (the first volume being almost entirely occupied with a discussion of the sources available for such a bi-
ography); a valuable article in the Calcutta Review, vol. xix; the Journal Asiatique, July, 1838, p. 41 sq.; De Tassy, Doctrines et devoirs de la Religion Musulmane tories du Coran; White (Hampton Lectures), Comparison of Mohammedanism and Christianity; Neal, Islamism, its Rise and Progress (2 vols. 12mo—valueless); Letters to Indian Youth, by Dr. Murray Mitchell, of Bombay; Life and Religion of Mohammed, in accordance with the Shite Traditions of the Husayn al-Kulayn (translated from the Persian by Dr. F. R. H. Birch, Bombay, 1830); Niidke (Theodor), Gesch. d. Quoran (Göttingen, 1860); Hist.

orische Einleitung in den Koran (Biefl, 1844); We, Moh-

mmed der Prophet sein Leben u. seine Lehre (Stuttg, 1843, 8vo); Sprenger, Leben u. Lehre von Mohammed (Berlin, 1861); Kremer, Alfred von, Gesch. d. herrschenden Ideen des Islam (Leips, 1869); Perceval (Caussin de), Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes, avant l'Islamisme, pendant l'époque de Mahomet, et jusqu'à la réduction de toutes les tribus sous la loi Musulmane (Paris, 1847—8, 3 vols. 8vo); and especially entries of Essays on the Life of Mohammed, and Subjects subsidiary thereto, by Seyd Ahmed Khan Bahader (London, 1870); Amer. Proc. Rev. Oct. 1862, p. 764; Revue des deux Mondes, Sept, 1, 1865. On the Chris-

Cor'athite (Numb. xxvi, 58). See KORAHITHE.

Kordes, Bennen, a German writer on exegetical theolology, was born at Lütbeck Oct. 27, 1762, and studied at the universities of Kiel, Leipzig, and Jena. In 1793 he became librarian of the university at Kiel, and died there Feb. 5, 1823. His exegetical works are, Observationes in Speciemina, Specimina.Paulina, etc. In I. (1786—8); Novi extversiones Septuaginta Interpretum (Jena, 1786)—Hoe-


Kor'ê (Hebrew Kore', פָּרָשֶׁה, but נְפָרָה in 1 Chron. xxvi, 1, a partrixxe, as in 1 Sam. xxvi, 20; Sept. Koph, but Kopj v. Kopj in 2 Chron. xxxi, 14), the name of two or three men. See also KORAI.

2. A Levite and Temple-warden of the Korahites, of the sons of Asaph, and father of Meremoth, or Shale-
miah (1 Chron. xxvi, 1). B.C. 1014. He was probably identical with the son of Ebiasaph and father of Shal-

nam, Levites of the family of Korah, engaged in the same service (1 Chron. ix, 19).

3. Son of Immah, a Levitical porter of the east gate, appointed by Hezekiah to take charge of the Temple offerings (2 Chron. xxxi, 14). B.C. 736.

3. By erroneous translation in the A.V. at 1 Chron. xxxvi, 19 for KORAHITHE (v. q.).

Korah is the name of a celebrated aboriginal tribe of Arabia, from whose ranks came Mohammed, the foun-
ders of the Koran. The submission of the Koran, which were supposed by the Arabian people that Mohammed had exerted in the early days of Mohammed is appar-
ent from the fact that they exercised the guardianship over the Kaaba (v. q.). When Mohammed claimed for himself the dignity of a prophet, and inveighed against the primeval superstition of the Korah (or Meccans, as they are sometimes called, after their principal place of residence, the city of Mecca), he was denounced by all the Korah tribe. Many of his people were still devoted to Sabaiism (q. v.), a somewhat refined worship of the planetary bodies (in all probability the belief of the Korah in the centur preceding the establishment of the Mohammedan creed; compare Sprenger, Life of Mohammed, i, 170; Milman's Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, v, 92 sq.; Milman, Latin Chris-
tianity, ii, 127; and the article ARABIA, vol. i, p. 543, in this Cyclopaedia), while many others, although disbe-

lieving the general idolatry of their countrymen, and not yet believers in Judaism, or in the corrupt Chris-
tianity with which alone they were acquainted, were looking for a revival of what they called the "religion of Abraham." Indeed, the greater the number of Mo-
hammed's converts, the greater the opposition of his tribe; for had not the new religions dared to question the sacredness of the holy temple, and call their ancient gods idols, and their ancestors fools? With all the an-

imosity of an established priesthood trembling for their possession, their power, and their wealth, the Korah re-

sisted the invasions of the new prophet, and though there were of their number those who had actually longed for the propagation of a monothestic faith, they now spurn-
ed its establishment, as it was likely to give superiority to the family of Hashem, only a side branch of the pow-

erful tribe of the Korah. The Korahites, therefore, could be ingenious in the art of annoyance; not a few were subjected also to punish-

ment. In consequence of this contest, Mohammed felt constrained to advise his followers to seek refuge in Abyssinia. He himself had hitherto escaped only by the 

promise of his son to the faithful Talib, who, though not a believer in the new religion, consid-
ered it his duty to afford protection to Mohammed and all his kindred. But the rapid spread of the Islamic doctrines made the Korah violent, and they now de-

manded that Mohammed should be delivered into their hands. In the war with Talib, no less than four battles were fought, and demands a feud resulted, and all the Hashemites were excommunicated. The Prophet himself, however, they sought to remove by secret assassination; a price was set upon his head—100 camels and 1000 ounces of sil-

er—and he escaped their vengeance only by the self-
nomination of his convers; and it is only on the strength of his conversion and the met the would be assassin Omar. 'Ere thou doest the deed," said Nueim, "look to thine own near kindred." Omar rushed intemperately to the house of his sister Fatima to punish her apostasy, but there the Koran was present-
ted to him, by a young child, with a letter of recommendation into a follower of the Prophet. Yet did not the Korah-
ites abate their hostility; and it is said that for three long years Mohammed was under the depressing influ-

ence of the interdict, and constantly obliged even to change his bed in order to elude the midnight assassins (comp. Sale's Koran, ch. xxxvi; D'Herbelot, Bibl. Orientale, p. 445). A fugitive from his native city, and despairing of making Mecca, the metropolis of the na-

tional religion, the centre of his new spiritual empire, he turned to the friendly city of Medina, whither more than a hundred of his faithful flock had preceded him. Here he found a kind reception, and succeeded in win-

ning for his cause and creed six of the most distinguished
dizens. From this flight, or rather from the first month of the next Arabic year, the Mohammedan era (Hariru, q. v.) is dated. See MOHAMMED.

Once successfully established at Medina, Mohammed's first object was to secure his native stronghold, and for this purpose he declared himself at war with the Meccans, and opened the contest even during the sacred month of the Hajab. The fair option of friendship, once promised, was in the event of their flight, renounced by all the Korah Mohammed. If they should profess the creed of Islam, they were to be admitted to all the temporal and spiritu-

al benefits of his primitive disciples, and to march un-

der the same banner to extend the religion which they had embraced. In his very first battle he routed the
KORHIME
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Keshites, and, notwithstanding a severe loss and a personal wound in the battle near Ohoud, his power had increased so rapidly that in the sixth year of the Hejira he determined upon and proclaimed a pilgrimage to Mecca. Although the Mecceans did not suffer him to carry out this project, he secured their recognition as a belligerent and equal power with themselves by a formal treaty of peace, into which they mutually entered. In the year following he was allowed to spend a three-days' pilgrimage undisturbed at Mecca. The unfortunate attitude of the Keshites towards Mohammed during his wars with the Christians emboldened him to seek immediate revenge for their treachery, and at the head of an army of 10,000 men he marched against Mec-
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Kosogarten, Bernhard Christian, a German theologian, was born at Parchim, in Mecklenburg, May 7, 1722; entered Rostock University in 1739; went to Halle in 1745, and became adjunct professor in 1750. He died June 17, 1808. Kosogarten made for himself quite a name by his Vorschau des Kirchen- und Dogma vom Stande der Klerikalgemeine Christi einer Prüfung zu unterwerfen (New Brandenburg, 1748, 4to).—Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlanda, ii, 174.

Kosogarten, Hans Gottfried Ludwig, a German Orientalist and historian, was born at Altenkirchen, Isle of Rügen, Sept. 10, 1729; studied theology and philology at the University of Greifswald; and in 1811 went to Paris to continue the study of the Oriental languages. He became adjunct professor at Greifswald in 1815, and in 1817 professor of the Oriental languages at Jenae, and of the same chair at Greifswald in 1824. He died in 1860. Kosogarten wrote De Mahomedae Emne Batuta Iosephi abicornu (Jena, 1818), and published editions of Amary ben-Kethem's Moalalka (Jena, 1820):—Libri Corone legio, id est Commentarii in Pentateuchum Karalucab ab Akrone ben-Eluiki concerupti aliquot particulas (Jena, 1824); etc. See Pierer, Universal Lexicon, ii, 783.

Kosogarten, Ludwig Theobald, a German divine and poet, was born at Greivamthlen, in Mecklenburg, Feb. 1, 1758; became rector at Wolgast in 1785; pastor at Altenkirchen in 1792, and in 1808 professor of history at the university in Greifswald; later, also professor of pastor and a pastor at St. James's Church in that place, and died Oct. 26, 1818. He was at one time honored with the rectorate of the university. His writings belong to the domain of belles-lettres. See Koberstein, Geschichte d. deutschen Nationalliteratur, iii, 2623 sq.

Kosoff, Sylvester, a Russian divine, who flourished near the middle of the 17th century, was metropolitan of Kief in 1647, and died April 18, 1657. Kosoff wrote a work on the Seven Sacraments (Koutimak, 1653, 4to), which an ecclesiastical council at Moscow in 1690 declared heretical.

Küster, Johann Friedrich Burchard, a German theologian, was born at Locum in 1791. He became professor of theology in Kief in 1839, and died about 1850. His works are, Officium divinae et eccelesiae in Sacerdotiis Proprietate, cap. 9-14 (Götting, 1818):—Das Christenthum (Kief, 1825)—Lehrb. der Pastoral Wissenschaft (Kief, 1827):—translations of the Psalms (1837) and the Prophecies (Leipzig, 1888).

Küster, Martin Gottfried, a German theologian, was born at Guntersblum Nov. 11, 1784; was educated at the University of Jenae, which he entered in 1792, and in 1795 became pastor at Wollersheim. In 1797 he was called to Weilburg as pastor and provost of the gymnasium in that place. In 1778 he was appointed professor at Giessen, and died there Dec. 6, 1802. Küster was decidedly orthodox in belief, and labored both by his tongue and his pen to stay the incoming tide of Rationalism. His most important work in this direction is his Neues Religionsbegründung (Giessen, 1778-1795), in which several eminent German theologians assisted him. He wrote also Vorarbeit für und wider die christ. Religion nebst einer Abhandlung von Zu- lassung des Bären (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1774, 8vo):—Erörterung der wichtigsten Sächerhiethen in der Lehre vom Tode (ibid., 1775, 8vo; another work on Satan, Giessen, 1776, 8vo). See Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutsclandu, ii, 159 sq.

Küster, Wilhelm, a German theologian, was born in 1765, and early devoted himself to the study of theology. He was a student of his pastor at Oppenheim, later at Espung, and died May 8, 1809. He devoted much of his time to the study of practical theology, especially to liturgy, and wrote Liturgie bei Bremenjagen (March, 1797, 8vo):—Allgemein. Alluirturis (ibid., 1799, 8vo).—Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlanda, ii, 162.
KOSTHA IBN-LUKA

KOSTHA Ibn-Lukah (or Luka), an Arabian philosopher, the originator of Heliopolis in Syria, flourished towards the close of the 9th century. He died, according to Abulfarag, about 890. He translated many works of Greek philosophers into Arabic, and wrote himself many original treatises, among which are, De Animae et Anima, De Montibus, and De Scriptio Sphaerarum Caelitarum; Liber apologeticus adversus librum astrologi 8 Abu Ismael Mohameti Apostolatu et Propheta. See Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca, ii, 801; D'Herbelot, Bibliothech. Orientale, p. 875.

Kota. See Thorn.

Kotter, Christoph, a German religious fanatic, was born at Sprottau, Silesia, in 1585. He claimed to have visions (which were published at Amsterdam in 1627). The first of these was in June, 1816. He fancied he saw an angel, under the form of a man, who commanded him to go and declare to the magistrates that, unless the people repented, the wrath of God would make dreadful havoc. His pastor and friends kept him in for some time, nor did he execute his commission, even though the angel had appeared six times; but in 1619, when threatened with eternal damnation by the same spirit, he would suffer himself to be restrained no longer. Kotter was laughed at; nevertheless, his visions continued, and were followed by ecstasies and prophetic dreams. He was tried on the elector palatine, whom the Protestants had declared king of Bohemia, at Breslau, in 1620, and informed him of his commission. He became acquainted, in 1625, with Comenius, whom he converted to be a believer in his prophecies, which at this time were rather of a political cast, pressing happiness to the elector palatine, and the reverse to the emperor; so he began at length obnoxious, and in 1627 was closely imprisoned as a seditionist impostor. He was finally libelled again and banished from the empire; went to Lussia, then subject to Saxony, and died there in 1647.

Kotzebue, Johann, a German divine, was born in Magdeburg about 1654. He was rector at Quedlinburg. He died September 8, 1692. Kotzebue wrote Sacerdotii Catholici Lectorum...; Confessio trostatis Be-ami de ecclesia, etc.—Allg. Hist. Lex., iii, 61.

Koyunjik. See Nineveh.


1. A descendant of Judah, concerning whose genealogy we have only the confused statement that he "begat" Anah and Zobelah, and the families of Aharhel, the son of Haran" (1 Chron. iv, 8). B.C. prob. cir. 1612.

2. The division of the seventh day of the Lord's week as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxiv, 10). B.C. 1014. He is probably the same whose descendants are mentioned as returning with Zerubbabel from Babylon, but as being excluded by Nehemiah from the priesthood on account of their defective pedigree (Ezra ii, 61; Neh. vii, 38). Talbot or Baalater, the family appears in the genealogy of Judah, whose son Meremoth is named as having repaired two portions of the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 4, 21).

Kraft, Adam, a celebrated German sculptor and architect, born at Nuremberg about 1480, and supposed to have died about 1567, deserves our notice for his prominent connection with ecclesiastical art. He has left some monuments remarkable his performances of his still extant is the tabernacle in stone, fixed against one of the columns of the choir of the church of St. Lawrence (Lorenzirkhe), Nuremberg, in the form of a square open Gothic spire, and is 64 feet high; the pinnacle being turned downwards like the crook of the crozier or an episcopal staff, to afford the arch of the church. The ciborium is placed immediately upon a low platform, which is supported partly by the kneeling figures of Adam Kraft and his two assistants, and partly by the four pillars of the platform, and is richly carved, and is ornamented with the figures of eight saints. The whole tabernacle is also profusely ornamented with small figures in the round and basi-relievi: immediately above the ciborium, on three sides, are representations in baso-relievo of "Christ blessing the infant of his Mother," the "Last Supper," and "Christ on the Mount of the Olives." Above these are "Christ before Caiaphas," the "Crowning with Thorns," and the "Scourging"; above these is the "Crucifixion;" and lastly, above that, is the "Resurrection," all in the round. This elaborate work was executed by Kraft for a citizen of the name of Urs Immof, and for the small sum of 770 florins. There is a print of this tabernacle in Doppelmayr's Historische Nachricht von den Nürnbergerischen Künstlern. Recent writers have indulged in various conjectures regarding the time and works of Kraft, but the circumstances of both are still involved in great uncertainty. See Fuss, Allgemeine Künstler-Lexikon, s. v.; Nagler, Allgemeine Künstler-Lexikon, s. v.

Kraft, Johann Christian Gottlob Ludwig, the modern reformer of the Protestant Church in Bavaria, was born at Dussberg Dec. 12, 1794. He studied first at Dussberg, where he held temporarily under the influence of infidelity. He then spent five years as a private tutor at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and this period was of great spiritual regeneration to him, though he did not succeed in allaying all his doubts. In October, 1808, he became pastor of the Reformed congregation at Weeze, near Cleve. He still felt dissatisfied, however, and continued to search the Scriptures. In 1817 he became pastor of the German Reformed congregation at Erlangen, and professor in the university in 1818. By this time his convictions had become settled, and he a firm believer in the ordinances of the Reformation. One of the most noticeable in his spiritual development, his conversion, took place, according to his own account, in the spring of 1821. He died May 15, 1845. Without being gifted with very brilliant talents or especial eloquence, Kraft, by his earnest practical faith, and his uncommon energy, can be said to have awakened the Protestant Church of Bavaria from the lethargic sleep into which it had fallen under the influence of ultra rationalism. He took great part in the progress of home missions, and was the founder of an institution for the daughters of the poor. He wrote De Luctibus et Libertatis, De Gratia Diversa, Seem Sermons on Isaiah, liii, and four on 1 Cor. i, 30; Jahrh. Predigten u. freie Texte (Erlang. 1828, 1835, 1845). After his death Dr. Burger published his Chronologie u. Harmonie d. vier Evangelien (Erlang. 1846).—Herzog, Real-Enzyklopädie, vol. viii, s. v. (J. N. P.)

Kraft, Friedrich Wilhelm, a German theologian, was born at Krauthim, in the district of Weimar, Aug. 9, 1712, and was educated at Jena and Leipzig from 1729 to 1732. In 1739 he became pastor at Frankendorf, and in 1747 university preacher at Göttingen, holding also after this an adjunct professorship of theology in this high-school. In 1750 he removed to Dantzig as senior preacher to Mary's Church, and died there November 19, 1758. His most important works are, Schriftdmändiger Bezieh v. d. Anknüpf d. Messias (Leipz. 1734, 8vo); Epitola de honore. Tria per honorem ministriarum ecclesiae. (Leipz. 1734, 8vo); De sacerdotio pontificō ephoricō. (Leipz. 1744, 8vo). He also published many of his sermons, some of them under the title Geistliche Reden (Jena, 1746, 8vo), and Neue theologische Bibliothek (Ips. 1746-1756; continued by Ermenz and later by Doderlein), many of which named work evinces Kraft's extended researches in theological literature. See Döring, Geistes Thol. Deutschland, ii, 176 sq.
Kraft, Johann Georg, a German theologian, was born at Baireuth, in the duchy of Baireuth, June 8, 1740, and was educated at the university in Erlangen. He entered the ministry at first, but in 1764 obtained the privilege of lecturing at the university, and in 1766 became extraordinary professor of philosophy, and in 1768 ordinary professor of theology and university preacher. He died July 2, 1772. He furnished many articles to theological periodicals, and published, besides a host of dissertations and several sermons, an edition of Hutten's Geschree, and the same of the zeuchmeister (Schwabach, 1768-1771, 3 vols. 4to).—Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, ii, 179 sq.

Kraft, Johann Melchior, a German theologian, was born at Wetzlar June 11, 1763. He pursued his theological studies at Wittenberg University, where he obtained the degree of Doctor of Theology in 1786. He then became professor at Halle. In 1792 he delivered a course of lectures on the history of church government and church discipline, which was published in 1802. He also wrote a history of the Reformation, which was published in 1803. In 1804 he became professor at Halle. In 1807 he published a history of the Reformation, which was published in 1809. He also wrote a history of the Reformation, which was published in 1810.

Kraft, Johann Wilhelm, a German theologian, was born at Allendorf March 11, 1806. He went to Marburg University in 1712, and in 1728 became pastor of the Reformed Church at Marburg; later in (1738) he re- moved to Hanau, but returned to Marburg in 1747, to assume the duties of a professorship in theology at the same seat. He died Nov. 25, 1767. His most important works are Fasciculi observationum sacrorum in, quibus varia Scriptura loco atque argumenta theologica illustratur (Marb. 1759-1766, 8vo).—Societatis theologico moralis ex regione et foie tamquam ex generali intellectu et comprehensionem fojus iunvi derivata (Kintel and Haxof, 1769, 8vo).—Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, ii, 185.

Kraft, Justus Christoph, a German divine, son of the preceding, was born at Marburg Jan. 2, 1782, and was educated at the university of his native place and at Gottingen. In 1757 he became pastor at Weimar, and in 1759 he became pastor at Cassel, where he remained on-the-Main in 1769. He died there Jan. 22, 1783. For a list of his sermons as published, see Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, ii, 187.

Kragh, Peter, a Danish missionary, born at Grimming, near Randers, Nov. 20, 1794, was sent as missionary in 1818, and returned to his native country in 1828. The date of his death is not known to us. Kragh wrote extensively, and translated into the vernacular of the people among whom he preached the Gospel of Christ, parts of the O.T., sermons, works on practical religion, etc. He also published in Danish and Greenlandish, HJbog Efterskyldeste med sine sidebemerkninger (Copenhagen, 1837, 8vo).—Varey, Dict. des Contemporains, s. v.

Kratz, Albert Joachim von, a German Lutheran divine, was born at Gevein, near Stargard, in Mecklenburg, May 29, 1764, and was educated for the ministry at the universities of Rostock, Copenaghen, Leipzig, and other German high-schools of note. He became professor of Hebrew at Rostock in 1768; in 1708 also professor extraordinary of theology, and in 1713 was promoted to the full professorship. In 1721 he removed to the university at Grefswald, and there held a prominent position as a theologian. His works, mainly of a controversial nature, are limited to pamphlet form. See Allgemeines Hist. Lexikon, Addenda, s. v.

Kraśnik, bishop of, the most celebrated Bohemian version of the Holy Scriptures, issued, in the 16th century, by the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. It was translated, in fifteen years, by a committee of their bishops and ministers, among whom the most prominent were John Hněvot, John Nemeckasky, Zacharias Ariston, and Iaasish Cepola, aided by two Hebrew scholars of Jewish extraction. The work of translating and printing was carried on in the castle of Kraśnik, hence the name of this Bible—near Willimowitz, in the west of Moravia, at the expense of Baron von Zierotin, the proprietor of the domain, and a member of the Brethren's Church. He set up for this purpose a special press, and dedicated it to the memory of his benefactor by Zacharias Solin, an ordained minister of the Brethren. The first edition appeared in six folio volumes, as follows: Part i, the Five Books of Moses, in 1579; Part ii, Joshua to Esther, in 1580; Part iii, the Poetical Books, in 1582; Part iv, the Prophetic Books, in 1587; Part v, the Apocalypse, and Part vi, the New Testament, in 1588. The sixth part was a reprint of the Bohemian N.T translated from the Greek by John Blahoslav, a very learned bishop of the Church, who was no longer living. In 1601 a second edition appeared, and in 1618 a third. The last was in one volume quarto. The Kraśnik Bible was the first Bohemian version made from the original, six other translations having preceded it, all based on the Vulgate. It was, moreover, the first divided into chapters and verses, and the first which separated the apocryphal from the canonical books. To each book of the Bible it appended a very brief commentary. The correctness of the translation is generally conceded, and the purity of the style universally admired. This Bible is still the classic standard for the Bohemian tongue. At the present day, however, it exists as an antiquarian work only, a copy costing about 300 florins. This is owing to the destruction to which it was doomed in the Bohemian anti-Reformation, when it was everywhere confiscated and committed to the flames by the Jesuits and soldiers who passed through the country in search of Protestant books. A considerable portion of it was republished at Prague, by J. L. Koher, in 1861 to 1865. It constitutes, moreover, the text, word for word, of the Bohemian Bible issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Gindely, Geschichte der Böhmischem Brüder, ii, 509, 510; Czernenka, Geschichte der Evang. Kirche in Böhmen, ii, 500, etc.; Cröger, Gesch. d. alten Brüderkurie, ii, 157, etc. (E. de S.)

Krama or Krasia, the practice of mixing water with the sacramental wine (the mixture bearing the name kramos, and the act of mixing krama), was adopted very early in the Church, on the assumption that the wine used at the Passover was mixed with water; but this is purely traditional, and the fact was not necessary to the piety of the early Church. In the Western Church, the mixture of cold water with the wine takes place only once before the consecration; wine being first poured into the cup, and the water added. In the Oriental Church a twofold mixture takes place. There is the first mixture of cold water with the wine in the cup before consecration, and then a second mixture with warm water after consecration, and immediately before distribution. This is said to have been designed to represent at once the water which flowed from our Saviour's side and the fire of the Holy Spirit.

Krain, Andreas, archbishop of. See Andreas of Caine.

Krantz, Albert, a German theologian and eminent historian, was born at Hamburg towards the middle of the 16th century. He studied at Hamburg, Cologne, etc., and became doctor in theology and canon law. After traveling through most of Europe, he was, on his return, appointed professor at Rostock, and rector of that university in 1492. In 1492 he settled at Hamburg, after having been employed in important diplomatic missions. In 1499 he was sent as envoy to England and France, and was often chosen to decide difficulties: thus he acted as arbiter between king John of Denmark and
KRAUS

KRAUSE

Krause, Christian Jacob, a German philosopher, was born at Bornheim July 27, 1878, entered the University of Königsberg in 1877, studied first theology and later mainly metaphysics; in 1777 went to Göttingen; was appointed professor of philosophy at the University in Königsberg in 1878, and died there Aug. 25, 1897. His writings were published under the title Fern"macht" Schriften (Königl. 1908-12, 7 vols. 8vo); etc.

—Katholische Real-Encyklopädie, vi, 397.

Krause, Johann Baptist, a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Regensburg Jan. 12, 1700, entered the Benedictine order in 1715, and in 1721 was sent by his superior to Paris to study in the convent St. Thomas, and on his return to Germany in 1724, and was ordained priest. In 1725 he was appointed to St. Emmeram Convent, and remained there until his death, June 14, 1762. Kraus was a decided Roman Catholic, rather ultramontane in his views, and as he was hardly suited for the liberal German schools with which surrounded him. He battled earnestly in behalf of his sect, and opposed vigorously the liberal tendency of the Benedictine Rothfischer, who had frankly confessed the failings of some of the institutions of the Roman Church. For a list of the works of Kraus, see Döring, Gehörte Theol. Deutschlands, ii, 189 sq.

Krause, Friedrich August Wilhelm, a German doctor in philosophy, was born at Dobrilugk in 1767, and flourished at Vienna, where he died March 24, 1827. He published Pauill ad Corinthios epistolae Gr., perpetua annotationes illustrator, vol. i (Franz. ad Mon. 1792); intended as a continuation of Koppe's New Testament, but never carried further. He had previously published Die Briefe an die Philipp. und Thessal. übersetzt und mit Anmerk., begleitet (Frankfort, 1790).—Kitto, Biblical Cyclopaedia, s. v.

Krause, Johann Christian Heinrich, a German divine, was born at Quedlinburg April 29, 1777, and entered the University of Jena, but later he began lectures at the University of Göttingen, but in 1788, on account of straitened circumstances, went to Jever as rector, and in 1797 was called to a like position at Hanover. He died Jan. 12, 1838. For a list of his works, see Döring, Gehörte Theol. Deutschlands, ii, 189 sq.

Krause, Johann Friedrich, a German theologian, was born at Reichenbach Oct. 26, 1770, and was educated at Wittenberg University, where, after securing the master's degree, he lectured a short time. In 1790 he was called to his native place as diaconus, and in 1802 the city of Saumberg called him as preacher to the cathedral. In 1810 he went to the University of Königsberg to fill a professorship in theology, which position he held until 1819, when he accepted a call as preacher to Weimar, and there he died, May 31, 1830. Krause's writings consist of seven academic programs, two on the Epistle to the Philippians, one on the first Epistle of Peter, and four on the second Epistle to the Corinthians, and of some discussions pertaining to philosophy and theology. They were collected by him, and issued together under the title Opuscula Theologic. s. p. et Historiae, collegii, et academici, 8vo, 1818. His sermons he published under the title Predigten über die gewöhnlichen Sonn- u. Feste in der anglikanischen kirche des ganzen Jahres (Lpz. 1803, 8 vols. 8vo; vol. iii,

Krause, Karl Christian Friedrich, a German philosopher, born in Eisenberg May 6, 1871, was educated at the University of Jena, where he attended the lectures of Reinhold, Fichte, and Schelling, and then lectured as "privat dozent" from 1802 to 1804. In order to make his lectures widespread he wrote a work in which he deemed necessary to give completeness to his philosophical system, more especially to studies in art, he quitted Jena, and resided successively in Rudolstadt, Dresden, and Berlin. He made several journeys through Germany, France, and Italy, and lectured at Göttingen from 1824 to 1831, when he retired to Munich. The variety of his speculations was to represent the collective life of man as an organic and harmonious unity; and he conceived the scheme of a public and formal union of mankind, which, embracing the Church, State, and all other partial unions, should occupy itself only with the interests of abstract humanity, and should labor for a uniform and universal development and culture. The germ of such a union he thought he found in freemasonry, to which he rendered great service by his works. He died in Munich Sep. 27, 1830. Among his works are Vorlesungen über das System der Philosophie (Göttingen, 1828, 8vo)—Abriß der Religionphilosophie (1828)—Vorlesungen über die Grundzüge der Wissenschaft (Göttingen, 1829). See Krog, Philosophisches Lexicon, ii, 544: Kattell, Real-Encyclopädie, vi, 519, 529: Apolodor, Gymn. mus. Cyclopaedia, x, 217. (J. H. W.)

Krauth, Charles Felip, D.D., an eminent divine in the Lutheran Church, born in Montgomery Co., Pa., May 7, 1797. Originally designed for the medical profession, he commenced his studies under the direction of Dr. Selden, of Norfolk, Va., and subsequently attended a course of lectures in the University of Maryland. By a providential interruption, as he always regarded it, his attention was directed to the ministry as a field of usefulness. Brought under the influence of saving truth, and having consecrated himself unreservedly to the Master, he felt that "work would be unto him if he preached not the Gospel. He very soon commenced his theological studies with Rev. Dr. Scheffer, of Frederick, Md., and concluded them with Rev. A. Reck, of Winchester, Va., whom he also aided in the pastoral work. He was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of Pennsylvania in 1819. His first pastoral charge was the united churches of Maryland and Shenandoah, Va., where he labored for several years with most excellent success. He removed to Philadelphia in 1827; advanced rapidly as a scholar, a theologian, and preacher, and in 1833 was unanimously elected professor of Biblical and Oriental literature in the theological seminary at Gettysburg, Pa., with the understanding that a portion of his time should be devoted to instruction in Pennsylvania College, in the same place. In 1834 he was chosen president of the college, which office he filled with distinguished success for seventeen years, a model of Christian propriety, purity, and honor. The history of the college during his connection with it furnishes an un-erring proof of his abilities and fidelity. During his administration the institution enjoyed several precious seasons of revival, when large numbers of the young men joined themselves to the people of God. In 1850 Dr. Krauth resigned the presidency of the college, to devote his entire time to the quiet and contemplative duties of theological instruction, and continued these labors until the close of life, delivering his last lecture to the senior class within ten days of his death. He died May 80, 1867. Dr. Krauth was a man of rare endowments of intellect. His mind was distinguished from others by a harmonious blendings of all its powers. His attainments in every department of literature and science were very extensive. In the pulpit he was pre-eminent. His sermons were always impressive, often thrilling, and sometimes accompanied with the most powerful results. The following is a list of his publications: Oration on the Study of the German Language (1822)—Address delivered at his Inauguration as President of Pennsylvania College (1834)—Sermon on Missions (1837)—Address on the Anniversary of Washington's Birthday (1846)—Discourses at the Opening of the General Synod (1850)—Discourses on the Church and Character of Henry Clay' (1852). He edited the General Synod's Hymn-book; Lutheran Sunday-school Hymn-book; Lutheran Intellect (of 1826); Evangelical Quarterly Review (from 1850—61.) (M. L. S.)

Krautwald, Valentin. See Schwenkfeld.

Krebs, Johann Friedrich, a German theologian, was born in 1750, and studied with the aim of becoming a Privat Docent at Jena; became rector of the gymnasium at Heilbronn in 1765, where he afterwards filled the post of professor of theology and Hebrew, and inspector; and died Aug. 16, 1721. Krebs was a copious writer, the list of his works filling five closely-printed columns in Adelung. They embrace natural and moral philosophy, historical and political science, and theology, mostly in the form of dissertations. Among the most valuable is a work on the first five chapters of Genesis, illustrated from the Syriac, Chaldee, Persic, Ethiopic, and other Oriental languages. See Adelung, vol. ii, s. v.; Döring, Gelértie Theol. Deutsch-land, vol. ii, s. v.; Kittte, Bibl. Cyclop. vol. ii, s. v.

Krebs, Johann Tobias, a German theologian, was born at Buttelsdort (Thuringia) in 1718, and was educated at Leipzig University, where, after attaining to the magister degree, he lectured on N.T. exegesis. Later he was conector at Chemnitz, and finally at the gymnasia at Grimma, where he died in 1782. Krebs edited Schottgen's Lexicon in Nov. Testament (Lips. 1758), and wrote himself two works of considerable value for the illustration of the facts and language of the N.T. He wrote Nov. Testamentum Interpretationis (Lips. 1745): Observationes in N. T. e Flavio Joseph. (Lips. 1755). "The latter contains a rich collection of examples of the peculiarities of N.-T. phraseology."—Pierer, Univ. Lexicon, vol. ix, s. v.; Kittte, Bibl. Cyclop., s. v.

Krebs, John Michael, D.D., a noted Presbyte-rian minister, was born in Hagerstown, Md., May 6, 1804, and was converted at the age of nineteen. he entered Dickinson College in 1826, and after graduation in 1827 with the highest honors of his class, studied theology, and was licensed by Carlisle (Pa.) Presbytery in 1829. In 1832 he became the pastor of Rutgers Street Church, New York City, which he served until his death, Sept. 30, 1867. Though one of the ablest and most prominent ministers of the Presbyterian Church, Dr. Krebs published only a few occasional sermons, besides several contributions to the periodicals of his Church (for which see Allibone, Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors, ii, 1046), and to Sprague's Annals of the Amer-ican Pulpit. "He was a man of rare gifts, and of still more rare and varied acquirements, being learned not only in theology, but in the whole range of the sciences; and his learning was all made to bear upon the work to which he had devoted his life, that of the Gospel ministry. He was eminent as a preacher of the Gospel, and still more eminent in the councils of the Church, having no equal in the knowledge of ecclesiastical law, and in his acquaintance with the ecclesiastical history of the denomination to which he belonged." He was honored with the appointment of chairman of the Committee on the Reunion of the Presbyterian Church, and had previously held other offices of distinction in the councils of his denomination. See Wilson, Prep. Hist. A. Linc, 1866, p. 100; and Sprague's Annals of the Amer-ican Pulpit.
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26, 1870. "Brother Krebs was a perspicacious preacher, logical in method, earnest in manner, although not vehement, and deceptively dull in presentation. He was also a notably faithful pastor. Five years of his ministry were spent in Washington, five in Baltimore, and one in Chicago, and everywhere the Lord owned his labors."—Conference Minutes, 1867, p. 19.

Krebs. See CREL.

Kreuz, Johann Bernhard, a German theologian, was born at Rostock Dec. 6, 1771, and was educated at the university in that city and at Jena. In 1806 he was appointed assistant pastor at St. Peter's Church in Rostock, and in 1814 became the principal pastor. He died Oct. 6, 1836. He published Beiträge zur Methode in Kirchlichen Geschichten u. gelehrten Geschichten (Rost. 1818-1823, 3 vols. royal 8vo). For a list of his works, see Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, ii. 207 sq.

Krider, Barnabas Scott, a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1823, in Rowan County, North Carolina; received his education in Davidson College, N. C., where he graduated in 1850; and completed his theological studies in Columbia, S. C., and Princeton, N. J., seminaries in 1855. In 1856 he was ordained and installed as pastor of Bethany and Tabor churches, and in 1858 took charge of Unity and Franklin churches, N. C. The year succeeding he became pastor at Thyatira, where he died Oct. 19, 1886. Krider was popular, judicious, kindly, and practical, and won the affection of his people."—Wilson, Presb. Historical Almanac, 1866.

Krinon. See LILY.

Krippner, Samuel, a German divine of some note, was born at Schweidelbach, in the duchy of Bairole, March 31, 1803; entered Jena University in 1761, and in 1767 was appointed professor of Greek and the Oriental languages at the gymnasium in Baireuth. He died Oct. 15, 1742. For a list of his writings, mainly dissertations, see Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, ii. 210 sq.

Kshama was the eighth and most celebrated of the ten chief incarnations of the god Vishnu, who, together with Brahma and Siva, constituted the divine triad of the Hindu mythology. See THIMURT. The term Krishna is a Sanscrit word signifying black, and was given to the incarnation either because the body assumed by Vishnu was black, or else it was so because of the relation of the avatar to a deity whose distinguishing color was black, as that of Brahma was red, and Siva was white; or for a reason implied in the citation from Porphyry (Eusebius, De Prepar. Evang.), that the ancients represented the Deity by a black stone because it is most covered with a surface black. Physical life has in it nothing real, nothing individual, nothing of lasting worth, we may believe contemplated even yet a more crumbling end, an antidote to the essential evil of nature as declared in one of the Puranas: "The uncreated being abandons the body that he used in order to destroy the earth of the boundless horizon of the sea." See further, Maurice, Indian Antiquities, ii. 564-568; Prichard's Egypt. Mythol. p. 285; Maurice, History of India, ii. 351.

Krishna is the most renowned demigod of the Indian mythology, and most famous hero of Indian history. It is probable that when the story of his life is stripped of its mythological accidents it will be found that he was a historical personage belonging to the Aryan race when they were making their gradual inroads south and east in the peninsula of India. It is presumable that the enemies whom he attacked and subdued were the Turanian races who constituted the aborigines of the country [see KHONDA], and who, fighting fiercely and mercilessly in their primeval forests, were soon magnified into gods and demigods. See MYTHOLOGY. In the Vedic literature, Krishna, with all its impurities, may be accounted as a necessary and the extreme revolt of the human heart against the unsatisfying vagaries of the godless philosophy into which Brahmansim and Buddhism had alike degraded. The speculations of the six schools of philosophy, as enumerated by native writers, served only to tire the mind until the word maya, "illusion," was evolved as the exponent of all that belongs to the present life, while the awful mysteriousness of Nirvana overshadowed the life to come. Man's nature asks for light upon the perplexed questions of moral life at the same time demands that which is of more moment, an anchor for the soul in the near and tangible. The ages had been preparing the Hindu mind for the dogma of Krishna—an upholding of something more substantial from the greatest depth of human hope and fear than the unstable elements of a life transitory and void. Consult Max. Müller's Chheda, i, 242; Bibiloth. Sacra, xviii, 543-568.

The avatars preceding that of Krishna were mere emanations of the god Vishnu, but this embodied the deity in the person of his nature. In this he brought only an ama, or portion of his divinity, "a part of a part" in this he descended in all the fulness of the godhead, so much so that Vishnu is sometimes confounded with Brahma, the latter becoming incarnate in Krishna as "the very supreme Brahma." See Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, i. 280, 291. For a list of them see Wm. Jones, in Maurice's Hindoostan, ii. 256. In the Bhagavat Gita, that wonderful episode of the Mahabharata, Arjuna asks of Krishna that he may be favored with the view of the divine countenance. As, in response, the swaraj stands upon a throne and he may contemplate the divine glory, he indulges in a rhapsody which describes the incarnate god as comprising the entire godhead in all its functions. Again, Krishna says of himself, "I am the cause of the production and dissolution of the whole universe," etc. (Thomson's ed. 1. 80).

One object of this incarnation was "the destruction of Kansa, an oppressive monarch, and, in fact, an incarnate Daitya or Titan, the natural enemy of the gods" (H. H. Wilson, Religion of the Hindus, ii. 66). A more satisfactory object is described by Krishna in the Bhagavad Gita: "Even though I am unborn, of changeless essence, and the lord of all which exist, yet in proceeding over nature (prakriti), which is mine, I am born by my own mystic power (maya). For, whenever there is a relaxation of duty, O son of Bharata! and an increase of impurity, I then reproduce myself for the protection of the good and the destruction of evil-doers. I am produced in every age for the purpose of establishing duty" (Thomson's ed. p. 80). The incarnations of Vishnu, which were multiplied to innumerable, assuming diversified forms of fish, man, and beast, because physical life has in it nothing real, nothing individual, nothing of lasting worth, we may believe contemplated even yet a more crumbling end, an antidote to the essential evil of nature as declared in one of the Puranas: "The uncreated being abandons the body that he used in order to destroy the earth of the boundless horizon of the sea." (Burnouf, quoted by Pressmeier, Religions before Christ, p. 63). "The thorn is material life, which Vishnu apparently takes on himself that he may be more effectively destroy it" (Pressmeier, ibid. i. 516)." The thorn and the five elements are also made to issue from Krishna, and then all the divine beings. Narayana or Vishnu proceeds from his right side, Mahadeva from his left, Brahma from his hand, Dharma from his breath, Saraswati from his mouth, Lakshmi from his mind, Durga from his understanding, Ratha from his left side. Three hundred millions of gopas, or female companions of Ratha, exude from the pores of her skin, and a like number of gopas, or companions of Krishna, from the pores of his skin; the very cows and their calves, properly the tenants of Vishnu, but destined to inhabit the graves of Brindavan, are produced from the same exalted source (H. H. Wilson, Religion of the Hindus, i. 123).

On the other hand, the Puranas disclose with regard to Krishna a human life, when considered from the most favorable stand-point, indisputable to the name and nature of man, an object is tissue complex of human beings. The miraculous deeds of Krishna were rarely for an object commensurate with the idea of a divine inter-
position. His associations as a cowherd (gopala) with the gopis—in which capacity he is most popular as an object of adoration—are no better than the amours of classic mythology. The splendid creation of the Gita, not unlike the human head in the Art Poétique, finds in the Puranas his authentic compendium. In his infancy, he is represented as destroying in a wonderful manner the false nurse Putana; playing his tricks upon the cow-herds—spilling their milk, stealing their cream, and always making cunning escapes; and rooting up trees the fall of which made the three worlds to resound. In his childhood, swollen with pride by his infirmity, he burns his way out from the entanglements of the monster, and on another occasion contends with and overcomes the dragon, one of whose jaws touched the ground while the other stretched up to the clouds; checkmate Brahma, whose mind had been affected by evil suggestions, and slays the cattle and the attendant boys, by creating others which were perfect fac-similes of those that had been stolen.

Still a child, he dances in triumph on the great black serpent Kali-naja, and then, in compassion, assigns him to the abyss; hides and restores the clothes of the gopi who was bathing; lifts the mountain Govardhana on his little finger with as much ease as if it had been a lotus, that its inhabitants might be protected from the storm; and plays blind-man’s buff, assuming the form of a wolf, that he might find and restore the boys who had been abducted by another wolf. In his more mature manhood, by means of his masterly Promoting his micratically corrugated the hearts of the gopis, or accomplishing that most astounding miracle with respect to his 16,000 wives, “quas omnes una nocte invisibat et replavit” (Paulinus, Systema Brahmanicum, p. 150), in order that Naresh might be crowned of his divine nature. Now he carries in triumph over battle-fields, with a blade of grass or with a single arrow shot from the all-conquering bow discomfiting entire armies; and now he yields himself to scenes of sumptuous revelry in the gardens of golden earth, through which flowed “the river whose banks were all gold and jewels, the waste of which, from the reflection of rubies, appeared red, though perfectly white”—in all the license of joy sporting with his 16,000 wives, by whom he was surrounded “as lightning with a cloud”—they and he pelting each other with flowers, thousands of lotuses floating on the surface of the river—whose water was the water of life—among which innumerable bees were humming and seeking their food (Bhagavat Purana, in Maurice, Hist. of Hindustan, ii, 327-438).

Sir Wm. Jones, however, with enlarged charity, takes a modified and more pleasant view of the stories of a few miracles of which are not fit to be told, “that he was pure and chaste in reality, but exhibited an appearance of excessive libertinism, and had wives or mistresses too numerous to be counted; he was benevolent and tender, yet fomented and conducted a terrible war.” See farther Maurice, Hindustan, ii, 236.

II. Life of Krishna. — The King of the Daityas or aborigines, Ahuka, had two sons, Devaka and Ugrasena. The former had a daughter named Devaki, the latter a son called Kanasa. Devaki (the divine) was married to a weaver named Vasudeva, who also had several other sons. Vasudeva had also another wife named Rohini. Kanasa, the cousin of Devaki, was informed by the saint and prophet Narada that his cousin would bear a son who would bear him two children. He was to be established in the kingdom of Vaisnava, but by divine agency, the child was transferred before birth to the womb of Vasudeva’s other wife, Rohi, who was still at liberty, and was thus saved” (Thomson’s summary in Bhagavat Gita, p. 194). Her eighth child was Krishna, who was produced from one of the hairs of Vishnu (Ma’ri Sauram Texta, ch. ii, sec. 5), and was born at midnight in Mathura, “the celestial phenomenon.” The moment Vasudeva saw the infant he recognised it to be the Almighty, and at once presented himself to his adorer in the infant’s companions of the court, and the faces of both parents emitted rays of glory. The child was of the hue of a cloud with four arms, dressed in a yellow garb, and bearing the weapons, the jewels, and the diadem of Vishnu (H. H. Wilson, ut sup. i, 122). The clouds breathed forth pleasing sounds, and poured down a rain of brilliant winds were washed, the rivers glided tranquilly, and the virtuous experienced new delight. The infant, however, soon encountered the most formidable dangers, for Kanasa left no means unemployed to compass the child’s destruction.

This he attempted by playing the guards of the palace to a supernatural slumber; its seven doors opened of their own accord, and the father escaped with his child. As they came to the Yamuna, the child gave command to the river, and a way was opened that they might pass over, a serpent meanwhile holding her head over the child in place of an umbrella. The child was surreptitiously exchanged for another, of which the wife of an Aryan cowherd, Nanda by name, had been delivered. Krishna was left with the cow-herd, while Vasudeva returned with the other to the palace. Not long after, Kanasa discovered the impos- ture, and took Nanda’s infant and carried him to the gates of the palace to a supernatural slumber; its seven doors opened of their own accord, and the father escaped with his child. As they came to the Yamuna, the child gave command to the river, and a way was opened that they might pass over, a serpent meanwhile holding her head over the child in place of an umbrella. The child was surreptitiously exchanged for another, of which the wife of an Aryan cowherd, Nanda by name, had been delivered. Krishna was left with the cow-herd, while Vasudeva returned with the other to the palace. Not long after, Kanasa discovered the impos- ture, and took Nanda’s infant and carried him to the gates of the palace to a supernatural slumber; its seven doors opened of their own accord, and the father escaped with his child. As they came to the Yamuna, the child gave command to the river, and a way was opened that they might pass over, a serpent meanwhile holding her head over the child in place of an umbrella. The child was surreptitiously exchanged for another, of which the wife of an Aryan cowherd, Nanda by name, had been delivered. Krishna was left with the cow-herd, while Vasudeva returned with the other to the palace. Not long after, Kanasa discovered the impos- ture, and took Nanda’s infant and carried him to the gates of the palace to a supernatural slumber; its seven doors opened of their own accord, and the father escaped with his child. As they came to the Yamuna, the child gave command to the river, and a way was opened that they might pass over, a serpent meanwhile holding her head over the child in place of an umbrella. The child was surreptitiously exchanged for another, of which the wife of an Aryan cowherd, Nanda by name, had been delivered. Krishna was left with the cow-herd, while Vasudeva returned with the other to the palace. Not long after, Kanasa discovered the impos-
peared to illustrate the prophecy of the Garden. Durvasa had once warned him, "Oh, Krishna, take care of the soul of thy foot; for if any evil come upon thee it will happen in that place. (as it is related in the Mahabharata in Maurice, ibid, ii, 472). As he set out one day in the forest meditating upon the fearful destruction of Kauru and Yadava alike, he inadvertently exposed his foot. A hunter, Jara (old age), mistook him for a beast, and shot at him. His arrow pierced the tip of his foot. In his death so great a light proceeded from Krishna that it enveloped the whole compass of the earth, and illuminated the entire expanse of heaven. He abandoned his mortal body and "the condition of the threefold qualities." According to the Puranas, "he united himself with his abode, his footprint, his abode itself is unambattled, undecaying, imperishable, and universal spirit." He returned to his own heaven, denominated Goloka—the sphere or heaven of cows—a region far above the three worlds, and indestructible, while all else is subject to annihilation. "There in the centre of it, about Krishna, of the color of a dark cloud, in the bloom of youth, clad in yellow raiment, splendidly adorned with celestial gems, and holding a flute" (Wilson, Religion of the Hindoos, i, 129).

In this entire life we find no high moral purpose to either discipline or command our faith. Now and then there appear in the Puranas suggestions of relief from individual burdens of oppression and woe, but they are as void and dissipated as flashes of lightning, which serve but to intensify the gloom. Like Buddha, our divinity bewails the evil of existence. He may be the relinquishment of human need, the idea of sacrifice is most limited, and only proves that the religion feels itself inadequate to the emergency of man's mortal estate (comp. the opening of the Bhagavat Purana). Its sublimest thought is a method of escape from the necessity of repeated births, but even this it fails to elaborate. With our eye upon the balance in which Krishnaism is weighed, the confession of Porphyry still presides painfully upon us that "there was wanting some universal method of delivering men's souls which no sect of philosophy had ever yet found out" (Augustine, De Civitate Dei, x. c. xxii). See INFARMSATION, vol. iv, p. 590. III. The Worship of Krishna.—The worship of this divinity is so blended with that of Vishnu and Rama, another of the incarnations of Vishnu, that it is difficult to treat of the one without trenching on that of the other. But as there are several sects, who use different denominations Vishvanara, or worshippers of Vishnu, who are mostly distinguished into four Sarmoprodigies, or sects, designated in the Padma Purana as Sri, Madhu, Kadra, and Sanaka (comp. Wilson, Rebg. of Hindoos, i, 94). The worshipers of Krishna have been subdivided into two main divisions, the one who worship his mistress Radha alone; and, 3. those who worship both conjointly (see Vollmer, Wörterb. d. Mythol. p. 1958). According to H. H. Wilson, throughout India the opulent and luxurious among the men, and by far the greater portion of the women, attend themselves to the worship of Krishna and Radha either singly or together. In Bengal the worshipers of Krishna constitute from one fifth to one third of the whole population (Ward, On the Hindus, ii, 175, 449). The temples and establishments devoted to this divinity are numerous all over India, particularly at Mathura and Brindavan, the latter of which is said to contain many hundreds, among them three of great opulence (Wilson, ut supra, i, 135). For the controversy on the extent of Krishna worship, see Wilson's Vishnu Purana, vol. ii, Appendix C.

We shall have to content ourselves with glancing at some of the more notable sects or Sampadvayas. The Radra Sampadavas or Vallabacharisa adore Krishna as an infant. This form of worship is widely diffused among all ranks of Hindu society. In their temples and houses are numerous the utensils of royalty, the legs of a chubby boy of a dark hue, and with a mischievous face, in some cases holding butter in both hands, by which is perpetuated one of his boisterous pranks (Paulinus, Systema Brahmanicum, n. 146, and plate 15). This image eight times a day receives the homage of its votaries with most punctilious ceremony. At the first ceremony, being washed and dressed, it is taken from its couch, where it has slept for the night, and placed upon a seat, about half an hour after sunrise. Lamps are then refreshed, while the music of the temple bell is heard, and betel and Pan (see Wilson, Relig. of Hindoos, i, 125-128). The Sanakadri, who are scattered throughout the whole of Upper India, the Sakhi Bhavas, the Raddha Vallabhas, and the Charan Dasis differ in minor particulars of creed and ritualism, but all worship Radha in union with Krishna. The Chaitanyas are the sectaries who believe in the incarnation of Krishna in Chaitanya their teacher, who on this account is elevated to joint adoration. With them the momentary repetition of the name of their divinity is a guarantee of salvation.

Festivals in commemoration of Krishna are annually observed throughout India, and still maintain their most powerful hold of the popular heart. The third day of the Uttarayana, a festival held about the middle of January, is sacred to Krishna as gopala or cowherd. In the afternoon the cows and bulls are washed and fed with sacred cowdung which they are wont to deposit with the sacred cowherd's kraal during the winter. Thereupon the Hindus, with joined hands, walk around the herds as well as around the Brahmanas, and prostrate themselves before them (Wilson, ibid, ii, 171). The Holl festival is observed about the middle of March. It may be not improperly described as an elder and more czarist sister of the April Fools' Day, and is mostly devoted to Krishna. His image enjoys a swing several times during the day, is besmeared with red powder, and dashed with water colored red. In the mean time unbound cow license reigns through the streets. "It would be impossible to describe the depths of wickedness resorted to in celebration of the licentious intrigues of this popular god!" (Trevo's Indio, p. 97). The festival of Jaggernaut ("Lord of the world"), whose magnificent temple a bone of Krishna is most sacredly preserved, commemorates the departure of Krishna from his native land. See JAGGERNUT. This also takes place in the month of March. Those who are so highly favored as to assist in the drawing of his car are sure of going to the heaven of Krishna when they die (see Gaagooly, in Clark's Ten Great Religions, p. 184; Dubois, Mannters of India, p. 108). The worship of Krishna is celebrated on the eighth day of August. This is the most popular of all the festivals at Benares. The Rasa Yatra falls on the full moon in October, and perpetuates the dance of the frolicsome deity with the 10,000 gopis. Though it is universally observed in Hindu Asia, the gopis are such that it will not be seemly to treat either of the occasion or the observance of this festival (see Holwиль's Indio Festivals, pl. ii, p. 132; Maurice, Indian Antiquities, v, 150).

The Hindu sects are distinguished from each other by various fantastical strangeness in their worship and adoration of the gods. Women are actually more religious than men, and many women are usually held to be responsible for the most licentious of all the annual feasts (comp. Dabistan, i, 88). Entire dependence upon Krishna, or any other form of this heathen deity, says H. H. Wilson, not only obviates the necessity of virtue, but sanctifies vice. Conduct is wholly immaterial. It matters not how vicious a sinner he may be, if he paints his face, his breast, his arms with certain secta-
rivial marks; or, what is better, if he brands them permanently upon his skin with a hot iron stamp; if he is constantly chanting hymns in honor of Vishnu, or, what is equally efficacious, if he spends hours in the simple reiteration of his name or names; if he die with the word Hari, Rama, or Krishna on his lips, and one thought of him in his mind, he may have lived a monster of iniquity, but he is certain of heaven (Wilson, Rig of Indus, ii, 75; see also i, 161). The subject of the sects and worship of Krishna, consult Asiatic Researches, xvi, i, and xvii, 169; Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, ix, 60-110; H. H. Wilson, Select Works, vol. i, ii, passim; Penny Cyclop. xxvi, 569.

6. Relations between Krishna and Revealed Religion. Efforts have been made in the interest of scepticism to establish a philological similarity between the words Krishna and Christ. Such speculations belong to a past rather than to the present age, as it is now conceded by philologists that the two words have nothing in common. The curious are referred to Hickson’s Time and Faith, ii, 377; Volney’s Reins, p. 165 (Am. ed. 1829); and for refutation to Maurice, Hindooism, ii, 268-271. The readiness with which the sceptical mind of our age seized upon and magnifies even fancied resemblances is evidenced by Imman, who in his first volume of Ancient Egypt, p. 462 gives an engraving of Krishna strikingly like those attributed to Christ, but which in the second volume, on further acquaintance with the subject, he admits to be “of European and not of Indian origin, and consequently that it is worthless as illustrating the life of Krishna” (p. xxxii). There are correspondences, however, some of which have already appeared in the summary of the life of Krishna, that deserve more than a passing notice. It is sufficient to adumbrate the more striking ones, without their correlatives in the Bible, as these will readily occur to the reader. These are as follows: that he was miraculously born at midnight of a human mother, and saluted by a chorus of Devatas; that he was cradled among cowherds, during which period of life he was persecuted by the giant Kansa, and saved by his mother’s flight; the miracles with which his life abounds, among which were the raising of the dead and the cleansing of the lepers, perhaps the only ones which particularly resembled those of Christ, for the rest were either puerile or monstrous; his contests with serpents, which he crushed with his foot; his descent to the regions of the dead, and his ascent to the paradise of the blessed (Krische, Abhandlung d. Kult. Gesellsc. i, 233; Stirn, Apologie des Christentumus, p. 181, 3d ed.)

1. The consideration of the interesting questions involved in these correspondences will be facilitated by bearing in mind that India, from her earliest recorded period, had sustained intimate mercantile relations with Semitic races. “Before merchants sailed from India to Egypt, and from Egypt to India” (that is, as the context shows, before the period of the Ptolemies), “Arabia Felix was the staple (maxt) both for Egyptian and Indian goods, much as Alexandria is now for the commodities of Egypt and foreign merchandise” (Arrian, Perip. Mitr. Ergthr. in Heeren’s African Researches, p. 228).

11” says Hoern, “the explicit testimony here brought forward proves a commercial intercourse between India and Arabia, it proves at the same time its high antiquity, and that it must have been in active operation for many centuries” (ibid, p. 220). A caravan trade also extended from India to Meroë, in Ethiopia, which was its grand emporium (ibid, p. 211). Taking its rise beyond the horizon of history, it was yet in its zenith during the times of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel (see also Vincent’s Peripius, p. 57, etc.). It could not be otherwise than that there should have been an interchange of religious knowledge as well as an exchange of wares; for commerce was promoted by religion, and, to a great extent, controlled by the priesthood; even its temples were stations and marts for caravans (see further, Heeren, ibid, p. 219, 225, 228). The striking resemblance existing between the Egyptian and Hindu mythologies, which has been unfolded by many writers, illustrates the fact of an interchange of religious light, and that these extremes of the known world should thus have met remarkably confirms the views of Heeren just adduced (see further, Prichard, Egyptian Mythology, p. 227-301; Maurice, Indian Antiquities, iii, 96-124; Bun- nen, God in History, bk. iii, ch. ii). The annexed figures were copied by Somnerat from sculptures in one of the oldest of the Hindu padogas. No Vishesnta of distinction, Somnerat tells us, is without these images in his house, either of gold, silver, or copper (see also Prichard’s Egyptian Myth, p. 261). For a glowing description of Krishna’s person, see the Purana in Maurice, Hindooism, ii, 363.

2. On the supposition of the oneness of our race there is no reason to exclude the Hindu from an original participation in the patriarchal knowledge of the promised Redeemer, as transmitted by Noah and his family. Suenius (Vespas. iv) and Tacitus (Hist. v, 4, 18) unite in the thought of “an ancient and permanent belief having spread itself over the whole East” to this effect. (See further Gray’s Connection, i, chap. xxv; Hengstenberg, Christology, iv, Appendix ii; Tholuck, Lehre v. d. Sünde, p. 220-229; Stolberg’s Religionsgeschichte I, Beilage iv; Faber’s Prophe. Dia. i, 97-114; Faber’s Horos Mosaicos, i, ch. iii.) All Hindu traditions connected with the origin of their religion and their people point but one way, and that to the recognised birthplace of our race—the lofty watertouched from which in every direction human faiths and mythologies have flowed forth. (See Max Muller on the relations of the Veda and Zend-Aesma, Chima, i, 81-86.) Though these traditions in themselves may be as inconsequential as falling stars, still they reflect a light kindred with that which shines forth from fixed stars in the firmament of true faith. Krishna, as seen in the monuments of the Hindu, stands a striking exponent of primal traditions, that, having sprung from the promise of the Garden, have more or less modified most distant and varied mythologies. He is a crude though not inartistic painting of a hope preserved to us in the Word of God, but otherwise hopelessly lost. He is one of a brotherhood that embraces an Apollo triumphant over the python; a Hercules, burning the immortal and burning out the mortal heads
of the hydra; a Sigurd, a descendant of Odin, slaying the serpent Fafnir, and rescuing priceless treasure; a Thor, styled "the eldest of the sons of God," who, in his contest with the serpent, though brought upon his knee, yet bruised his enemy's head with the mace and finally slew him; an Oshanderbégá, predicted by Zoroaster, who contends twenty long years with a malignant demon, whom he eventually conquers; and even the less renowned Algoquin conqueror Michabo, destroying with his dart the shining prince of serpents who flooded the earth with the waters of a lake. For other instances, consult the authorities referred to immediately above, and Brinton's *Myths of the New World*, p. 116, with his *Commentaries*, cent. ii, sec. ii, note 1; see also Neander, *Ch. Hist.*, Clark's ed., i, 112. Tradition tells us that St. Thomas preached to the Indians, which was informed to Gregory of Nazianzum. Jerome, however, makes the field of labor to have been Ethiopia. There seems to be little doubt that copies both of the apocryphal and of the genuine Gospels circulated early through portions of Southern India. Many manuscripts, resembling those of the former almost to the letter, have been incorporated into the sacred writings of Krishnäism. Theophrilus, surnamed Indicus, visited India as a missionary in the time of Constantine, and found Christianity already planted and flourishing, though isolated from Christianity at large. Many Brahmanas and Mani-Brahmanas of the early Church, in their travels came into close and prolonged contact with Buddhism, from which they drew much of the virus that they strove to infuse into Christian belief. The former of them certainly visited India as early as the latter part of the 2d century (see Kurta, *Hist.* of Ch., p. 109, sect. 50; Neander, ii, 198). Weber and Lassen agree in this respect in their interpretation of a passage of the Mahabharata, that at an early period in the history of the Church three Brahmins visited some community of Christians either in Alexandria, Asia Minor, or Parthia, and that on their return they were enabled to introduce improvements into the hereditary creed, and more especially to make the worship of Krishnä the most prominent feature of their system. See further Hardwick, *Christ*, i, 246-256, 284-286; Carwix, *Brahmical Religion*, p. 98-104, 220-222; *Father's Prophetical Dissertation*, i, 84; *Origin of Pagans*, sup. in bk, vi, chap. vii; *Treatise on three Dispositions*, bk. i, chap. vii; Wuttke, *Geschichte des Heidentums*, ii, 899; also authorities referred to by Hardwick, *C.*. See *India*, MODERN.

4. It was the fashion early in the present century to search out astronomical allusions in Krishna, and to resemblances to Apollo, the mythological counterpart to the sun, but these have given place to sounder criticism. Recent researches favor the view that no great antiquity is to be attributed to Krishnä as an object of religious regard. That some one bearing that name may have figured as a local hero in the early history of India, and even as far back as the period preceding the war of the Mahabharata, is not improbable (comp. Wilson, *Religion of the Hindus*, ii, 65, 66). The allusions on classical pages serve to justify such a conclusion. 5. It is impossible to remember that Krishnäism nowhere appears in the Vedas, the most ancient scriptures of the Hindus. "Krishnä worship is the modern of all the philosophical and religious systems which have divided India into rival sects. Founded upon the theory of successive incarnations which neither the Vedas nor the scriptures of the first legislator of the land admit, Krishnäism differs in so many points from the faiths peculiar to India that we are tempted to regard it as borrowed from foreign philosophies and religions" (M. Pavie, *Bhagavat Dasa Atma-ksetra*, Pref. p. xi, in like manner Lassen, *Religion and the Altars*, i, 2, ii, 4, 1107; Fricbard, *Egypt. Mythology*, p. 259, with citations from Colebrooke; Max Muller, *Chips*, ii, 75, Amer. edit.; *Asiatic Researches*, viii, 494). "It is believed," says H. H. Wilson cautiously, that Rama and Krishnä "are unnoticed in authentic passages of the Sanhitá or collected prayers, and there is no mention of the latter as Gôvinda or Gopala, the infant cowherd, or as the uncouth and anomalous Juggernaut. They are mentioned in some of the Upanishads, supplementary treatises of the Vedas, but these compositions are evidently from their style, of later date than the Vedas, and some of them, especially those referring to Rama and Krishnä, are of very questionable antiquity" (ibid., ii, 65). Compare Wilson's *Treatal of the Rig Veda and Sanhitás*, i, 290, 313, 315; ii, 85, note b; iii, 148, note 7. At the time of its first translation into English by Wilkins, an immense antiquity was claimed for it by Bha-gavat Gita (see above, sec. i), but this is now generally admitted to be an interpolation in the Mahabharata, and
to have been produced subsequently to the rise not only of Christianity, but of Krishaism itself. Lassen accords it a place in the later history of Hindu religion, when the "Vishnuites broke up into sects and sought to bring their religious dogmas into harmony with the theories of philosophy" (Indische Ab. ii, 494; Hardwick, i, 241).

As to the Puranas, which are almost the sole authority for the life of Krishna (a derivative of his victorious contest with the serpent) that most resembles the life of Christ, they are, in their present form, unquestionably of modern origin. They abound in legends that may properly be regarded as purana (ancient), but bear unmistakable sectarian marks, which betray both their animus and their age. They are eighteen in number, and some of them are voluminous. The Puranas themselves in many cases ascribe their authorship to others than Vyasa, and they offer many internal proofs that they are the work of various hands and of different dates, none of which are of very high antiquity. I believe the oldest of them not to be anterior to the 8th or 9th century, and the most recent to be not above three or four centuries old. The determination of their modern and unauthentic composition deprives them of all character, and entirely destroys their credit, impairs their influence, and strikes away the main prop on which at present the great mass of Hindu idolatry and superstition relies (H. H. Wilson, Relig. of the Hindus, ii. 68). There is but little doubt that the Brahmanas are right in referring the name of the adha, or the "lord of men," to the Puranas (from which we have quoted so freely in the summary of Krishna's life), to Vopsadeva, who flourished in the 12th century (ibid., p. 69; see also preface to Wilson's Vishnu Purana). Bentley (View of Ancient Astrology, i, bk. ii, chap. ii) informs us that he obtained access to the Janamaptra, or horoscope of Krishna, and was enabled to discover from it that he is reputed to have been born on the 234 of the moon of Sravana, in the lunar mansion Rohini, at midnight, the positions of the sun, and moon, and five planets being at the same time assigned; from which he deduced the date of the pretended nativity to be Aug. 7, A.D. 600. In Mr. Bentley's opinion, perhaps a fanciful one, Krishna himself was one of the Hindu personifications of time, which view he supports by Krishna's own declaration, "I am the destroyer of mankind matured, come hither to seize at once on all those who stand before us." See farther, on the astronomical view, Gregwell's Fatti Catholici, iv, 88; Cardinal Wiseman's Lect., ii, 1-28; Tomkins's Hebrew Prize Lectures, p. 35-41; W. A. Butler's Ancient Philos., i, 247.

6. From this analogy, like these, not to speak of others that might be urged, we are led to conclude that Krishaism proper was post-Christian, an outcropping of human and possibly of diabolic nature, that was illustrated at the foot of Sinai, but which no more resembled its divine original than the life of a man of half-reared living Apis of Egypt. As in the pitiable blur of a palimpsest, Krishaism has replaced or obscured that which was more precious—the religion of Christ, founded not less in impregnable truth than in the undying necessities of men. For at the rise of this false religion it is plain to us that the light of Christianity was reflected already on the sky of India—light that was sadly perverted to set forth a feeble caricature of the incarnation and life of Christ.

6. As the tenor of our argument has indicated, the criticism of the present age is disposed to assign a recent origin to this, though Lassen does not ignore the existence of a hero bearing the name of Krishna conspicuous in the early and fabulous history of India. It may be of interest to the reader to have presented somewhat more in detail the views of some of the beholders of the present century, confounding and confused though they be, upon the general subject of the relations of Krishaism to Christianity as well as profane religions. Archdeacon Hardwick thinks that the resemblances are no greater than the outward and fortiuous resemblances between other heathen deities, or between some of them and Christ. He illustrates by the incident of the persecution of Hercules in his infancy by Juno; the dancing of the milkmaids and satyrs of Bacchus, which compares with that of Krishna; the concealing of Apollo in the house of a harlot, and of the life of Krishna (a dervish, or beggar), which may be regarded as a pure human and historical hero, doomed to death in childhood from forebodings that his life would prove the ruin of another, we can find his parallel in the elder Cynus, who had also been insulted, and trusted to the care of beasts; and reserve him from the vengeance of his royal grandfather, whose death it was foretold he should ultimately accomplish (i, 285, 286). Colonel Wilford supposes Krishna to have lived about B.C. 1300. Sir William Jones says the story of his birth is long anterior to the birth of Christ, and traces it probably to the time of Homer. He thinks it is likely that the spurious gospels of the early age of Christianity were brought to India, and the wildest parts of them repeated to the Hindus, who ingrained them on the old fable of Kesava, the Apollo of India (Asiatic Researches, i, 174, 374). He allows the secret of the Mr. Bentley's (View of Ancient Astrology, i), in contradiction to H. H. Colebrooke, Sir William Jones, major Moor, and others, boldly charges the whole history of the incarnation of Krishna as a "modern invention" and "fabrication" of the Brahmanas, who, alarmed at the progress of Christianity, invented the Cognate, theoretical, and practical miracles of Krishna, the name somewhat similar to the hero of it; all of which they threw back to a very remote age, that it might be impossible successfully to contradict it, and then represented that Christ and Krishna were the same person, the story of whom the Christians had an incorrect version. Mr. J. C. Thompson thinks that Krishna antedates the Brahmanical triad—Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva—and that his great exploits occasioned him later in Aryan history to be identified with Vishnu (p. 134). Lassen, an eminent Oriental scholar, refers the origin of the system of avatars, as disclosed in Vishnu, to a time of perhaps three centuries before Christ; while Weber, equally distinguished as a critic, contovers his views, and argues that Krishna, the hero or demigod, was no incarnation, and differed vastly from the Krishna of later times. (See farther Hardwick, ibid., i, 286, note.)

V. Literature.—The "Maha-bhara-ta," translated into French by Fauche (Paris, 1803), book x, which is appropriated to the life of Krishna; the "Bhagavad Gita," episode of the preceding (Wilkins's, 1785, and Thomson's, 1805, translated by J. and Wm. Stephens); the "Rishi Vamsa" (translated into Latin, 1829); the "Vishnu Purana" (translated by H. H. Wilson, 1842 and 1866, 6 vols.); the "Bhagavad Gita Purana" (translated into French by Burnouf, Paris, 1840); the "Hiri Vamsa" (translated into French by Lange, Paris, 1848); the "Asiatic Researches," passim, especially vol. xv and xvi; Hardwick, Christ and other Monsters, i, 246-258, 257-258—a valuable and easily accessible resume of the whole subject; H. H. Wilson, Religion of the Hindus, ii, passim; Hoefer, Biographie Generale, art. Crichtie; J. D. Guigniault, Religion de l'Antiquite, vol. i, bk. i, ch. iii; P. F. Sturh, Religion systéme der heidnischen Völker des Orients (Berlin, 1860-38, 2 vols. 8vo); M. Pavie, Bhagavad Ducum Akaun (Paris, 1852); W. von Humboldt, Uber den Namen Bhagavad Gita bekanntes Episode des Mahakabhrata (Berlin, 1826); A. Remusat, Mlondes Asiatiques (Paris, 1825-1829, 4 vols.); P. von Bohlen, Das Ay Idheen (2 vols., 1880-81); Christ, Le- seon, Indische Alterthumskunde (4 vols., 1844-46, chisty vol. ii); A. K. Weber, Indianische Alterthümer (4 vols., 1845-47, especially the two first vol.); Indische Skizzen (Berlin, 1857), particularly the essay Die Verbindung Indiens mit den Ländern im Westen; Coleman, Mythol-
mentioned pastor Empetza, the eventual head of the Moniers (q.v.). With the assistance of men of talent and education of Empetza's stamp she formed "prayer unions," and urged the community to a more vital Christian living, and the liberal use of property for the good of the poor. The fulfillment of her predictions of the fall of Napoleon was quick to come from Empire, and the final crisis at Waterloo, aided her cause, and emboldened her to the assertion that she enjoyed the favor of God in a special degree. Among her most ardent followers at this time she counted no less a personage than the Russian emperor Alexander, who, with the Bible in his hand, was her frequent guest; and it is known that her influence over Alexander brought about the Holy Alliance. Her love of humanity, however, and her gigantic schemes for its moral and social elevation, often led her to overstep the bounds of prudence and propriety, and made her appear a dangerous character in the eyes of persons of authority, so that she gradually lost the favor of men of political prominence. She was obliged to quit France and other countries successively, and even lost the friendship of the emperor Alexander, as is evinced by the text of a letter which appeared in a Russian paper in 1827, was called thither in consequence of the sickness of her daughter. She was not only refused admission to the emperor, but when afterwards she advocated the cause of the independence of Greece, and pointed to the Russian emperor as the instrument selected by God for the accomplishment of this work, she was required to retire to Switzerland and to leave St. Petersburg. Under the influence of the Moravians her life and habits had been changed after she quitted Paris, and she had often dreamed of founding a great correctional institution for the reformation of criminals and persons of evil life. Now driven from St. Petersburg, and the attack of a cutaneous disease necessitating her residence in the south, she started in 1824 with the design of founding such an institution, and of establishing a German and Swiss colony on the other side of the Volga. On the way, however, death overtook her at Kazan-su-bazar, Dec. 18, 1824. The life thus suddenly brought to a close has been variously commented upon. In her day "passion oscillated in the public judgment between favor and hostility to her," but now, when nearly half a century has passed, and its is easy in deliberation to pass judgment upon her life and acts, she is generally spoken of favorably, and men and women inspired to inspire the people with religious zeal, and a feeling of love for each other as a common brotherhood, are recognised. Says Hagenbach (Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Centuries [transl. by Dr. J. F. Hurst], ii. 413 sq.), "it is an axiom known by all, and registered in the histories of the world, that just as the people in the dwellings of vanity, and humbled by her sins and errors, had such a spirit of self-denial as to minister on a wooden bench to the poor and suffering, to seek out criminals in prison, and to present to them the consolations of the Cross; to open the eyes of the wise men of this world to the deepest mysteries of divine love, and to say to the kings of the world that everything avails without the King of kings, who, as the Crucified, was a stumbling-block to the Jews and foolishness to the Greeks. She was derided, defamed, persecuted, driven out of Russia by her dear another weariness of preaching repentance in the deserts of civilization, and of proclaiming the salvation of believers and the misery of unbelievers. . . . Wherever she set her foot, great multitudes of people physically and spiritually hungry, of sufferers of every class, and persons without regard to confession, surrounded her, and received from her food—yes, wonderful food. The woes which she pronounced on the imminent awakened in many an oppressed and troubled spirit, a feeling of joy at misfortune, while many a genial word of love fell into good ground, and grew. And she wrote Le Camp des Vertus (Paris, 1815). Many curious details of her conversations and opinions are preserved in Krug's Conversatioom mit Frau r. Krüdener (Leipz. 1818). See also C. Maurer, Bilder aus d. Leben eines Predigers (Schaaffhausen, 1843); Berliner Zeitung für christl. Wissenschaft u. christl. Leben (1857, No. 5); Zeitgenossen (Leips. 1880), iii; Adele du Thou, Notice sur Mme. Julie de Krüdener (Geneva, 1827, 8vo); Mahul, Amou- aires Nerologique, anno 1825, Eynard, Vie de Mme. de Krüdener (Paris, 1849, 2 vols. 8vo); Ziehle, Jul. v. Krü- dener (1864); Hauck, Thescbe-von der Jungfrau Maria (1869), in the Steine-Boue, Portraits de Femmes; Jornem Portraits Littéraires, etc.; Herzog, Real-Encyclopedia, vol. 112; Hoefer, Neue Biog. Générale, xxvii, 234. (J. H. W.)

Krug, John Andrew, one of the earlier Lutheran ministers who immigrated to this country, was born March 19, 1732. He was highly educated, and was for a time preacher in the Orphan House at Halle. He graduated at the University of St. Andrews in 1763, and was ordained by Dr. Francke, who considered him well fitted for missionary work. He labored first at Reading, Penn., and among the people of the surrounding country, wholly devoted to his duties, and greatly beloved by the community. In 1771, in accordance with the wishes of his brethren, he relinquished this field of labor, and assumed the pastoral care of the Lutheran Church in Frederick, Md. Here he continued till his death, which occurred March 30, 1796. (M. L. S.)

Krug, Wilhelm Traugott, a distinguished German philosopher and writer, was born at Radia, near Gräfinnhächen, Prussia, June 22, 1770. He studied at the universities of Jena and Lpz., and was appointed to the chair of philosophy in the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and here he wrote his principal work, Fundamentalphilosophie (Züllichau and Freiburg, 1803; 3d ed. Lpz. 1827), which became very popular throughout Germany. Guided by Kant's criticism, Krug professed a system which, under the name of "transcendental synthetism," aimed to reconcile idealism and realism. "According to Krug, the act of philosophizing is thought entering into itself, to know and understand itself, and by this means to be at peace with itself. The following are his principal points: 1. In relation with the starting-point, or first principle of knowledge: the Ego is the real principle, insomuch as it takes itself as the object of its knowledge (the philosophizing subject). It is from it that proceed, as from an active principle, the ideal principles, which are essentially different from the Ego, and are results of the reflection of the first, and the formal principles of philosophical knowledge. The material principles are the facts of consciousness grasped in conceptions, which are all comprehended in the proposition, I am an agent. The formal principles (determining the form of knowledge) are the laws of my activity: they are as multifarious as activity itself: the first of these laws is, Seek for harmony in thy activity. 2. How far ought these researches to be carried (the absolute limit of philosophy)? The consciousness is a synthesis of being, or Ego, and knowing, or science (das Ego und das Wissen), says Krug. Every consciousness is thus circumstanced, which implies that being and knowing are united in us a priori. This transcendental synthesis is therefore the original and inappreciable fact which forms the absolute limit of philosophizing. Since being and knowing (Ego und Wissen), united together in the consciousness, cannot be defined, and is founded from the other, their union is completely primitive. 3. What are the different forms of activity? The primitive activity of the Ego is either immanent (speculative) or transitory (practical). Sensibility, intelligence, and reason are the different positions of this activity, regarded as the scientific, and the primitive legislatively, to the human mind in all its activity, is therefore divided into a speculative part and a practical part. The first part is subdivided into formal doctrine (logic) and material
doctrine (metaphysics and aesthetics), inasmuch as the one regards the matter of thought per se, and the other (esthetics) considers its relation with sentiment. The latter part is likewise subdivided into formal doctrine (the science of right and law) and material doctrine (morals and religion). Each of these considers the legislation of the human mind under a different aspect. (Tennemann, Kant's Philosophy, 6.) After the death of Kant, Kruger was called to Königsberg to succeed his great master as professor of logic and metaphysics. He subsequently filled also Kraus's place as professor of practical philosophy. In 1809 he became professor of philosophy at Leipzig, a position which he retained until 1842. In 1838 he was elected to the prussian academy of arts, and in 1842 he was made a member of the royal academy of sciences at Berlin. On Jan. 13, 1842, Kruger's other works are Versuch einer systematischen Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften (Wiener, 1796-97, 2 vols.; 3d vol. Lpz., 1804):—Uber den Verhältnissen der kritischen Philosophie, moralischen, politischen, und religiösen Cultur der Menchen (Jena, 1798):—Verzeichniß der systematischen Encyclopädie der schönsten Künste (Lpz. 1802):—Philosophie der Ehe (Lpz. 1800):—Briefe über die neuesten Idealismen (Lpz. 1801):—Entwurf eines neuen Organum der Philosophie (Meinau, auf Lübben, 1801):—System über Theoretischen Medien (Königsberg, 1806-10); four volumes, first edition 1808-17, in 2 vols.; second edition, 1816, 1815, 1815, 1815):—System der praktischen Philosophie (Königsberg, 1817-19, 2 vols.; 2d ed. 1820-38):—Handbuch der Philosophie und des gelehrten Lebens, 3 vols. (Jena, 1820-21, 2 vols.; 3d ed. 1829):—Versuch einer neuen Theorie der Geistesgeschichte der Staaten und der Ideen der Philosophen (Königsberg, 1826):—Pietologie oder Glaube, Abgeruhsen und Unglaube (Lpz. 1825):—Das Kirchenrecht nach Grundsatzen der Veranst., etc. (Lpz. 1826):—Alger, Handwerkerbund der philosophischen Wissenschaften (Lpz. 1827-28, 4 vols.; 2d ed. 1832-34, 5 vols. 8vo) :—Universitätspolitische Vorlesungen (Neustadt, 1831): etc. His works have been collected and published under the title Gesammelte Schriften (Braunschweig, 1830-34, 6 vols. 8vo). See Kruger, Meine Lebensreise in drei Stationen (Lpz. 1826 and 1821); same, Leipziger Freunden u. Leihen, etc. (Lpz. 1821); Morell, Hist. Mod. Philosophie: Staates, Hist. of Rationalism, p. 138; Tennemann's Manual of Philosophy (by Morell), p. 465 sq.; Kruger, Philosophisches Wörterbuch, v. (1), p. 617 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Génér. xxvii, 261. (J. H. W.)

Krug, Oswald, a German Jesuit, was born in 1598 in Prussia, and made for himself a name by his thorough study of Hebrew, which he taught in the schools of the Jesuit Order. He devoted himself to the study of Hebrew and became professor at the University of Wilna. He died May 16, 1665. —Alcyon, Hist. Lit., iii, 65.

Krummacher, Friedrich Adolf, a German theologian and poet, was born at Tatsenley, in Westphalia, July 13, 1767, and was educated at the universities of Liingen and Halle. At the latter school he enjoyed the reputation of the "elder Knapp," the so justly celebrated "pious" professor of the university at that time. In 1790, after having filled various positions of trust, he was appointed professor of theology at the University of Duisburg, where he remained until 1806. He then became successively pastor of Krefeld, Kettwitz, Breslau, and Nürnberg. His talents as preacher and administrator caused him to be appointed in 1806 as bishop of the Lutheran and Church superintendent. He died at Bremen April 14, 1845. Friedrich Adolph Krummacher deserves special commendation in this work for his piety and the noble example which he furnished to his sons, which became manifest in their lives. (comp. Krummacher, Friedrich Wilhelm.) He is especially known for his parables in verse, which have become classic in Germany, and, though he has had many imitators in this line, he has never been surpassed. His works are, Die Liebe, a hymn (Wezel, 1801); Apologia (Duisburg, 1805; 8th ed. Essen, 1860; French, Paris 1821; English, Lond. 1844, 8vo, and often):—Apologien und Parzaphien (Duisburg, 1810):—Festmählchen, eine V. —6


Krummacher, Friedrich Wilhelm, one of Germany's most eloquent preachers in this century and the most distinguished of a distinguished family, was the son of Friedrich Adolph Krummacher (q. v.), and was born at Mörs, on the Rhine, January 28, 1796. After preparation partly at the Gymnasium and partly at his own father, he entered Halle University in the winter of 1817-18. He was a member of the socialist parties of Niemeyer, Wegscheider, Gesenius, Marx, Die Wette, and "the elder Knapp," for whom young Krummacher early cherished great affection. Two years later he removed to Jena, drawn thither by the celebrated theologians and philosophers and the theological society. He became a well-known editor of a revised edition of the text of the New Testament. To an American student of theology this period of F. W. Krummacher's life presents many points of special interest. He had left Halle for Jena determined to sit at the feet of Schott and other celebrated theologians, but so disheartened was he that he is led to exclaim (in his Autobiography, p. 77), "Nothing remained for me but to seek refuge from this spiritual famine in reading," and, instead of attending faithfully the lectures of his professors, he found it more to his soul's interest to devote his time to the reading of Herder's Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, his father's Spritt and Form of the Gospels, Kleuker's apologetical writings, and other books of this class. His first appointment as preacher he found, in the beginning of 1819, at Frankfort-on-the-Main, as assistant to a German Reformed congregation. 6th of April, 1822, he was removed to the prison city of Düsseldorf, on the Rhine, near Dusseldorf, and two years later to Gemenze, a parish in the town of Harzen; and in 1854 he accepted a repeated call to the city of Erfurt. During his residence there a call came to him from the Pennsylvania Synod of the Reformed German Church to go to the United States and become a minister's wife on the theological school at Mercersburg, Penn., a position which he declined in favor of the celebrated Church historian Philip Schaff, D.D., now professor in the Union Theological Seminary at New York City. In 1847 he was promoted by the king of Prussia, Frederick William IV, to the pastorate of Trinity Church, Berlin, as successor of the renowned pulpit orator Marheineke, who had died in 1846, and he promptly accepted the place. About two years later he became court preacher at Potsdam, the usual summer residence of the Prussian king, and he died there, Dec. 19, 1862. Krummacher was honored with the doctorate of divinity by the University of Berlin. He was an active worker in behalf of the Evangelical Alliance, and attended all its meetings as long as he lived. Dr. Krummacher acquired a world-wide celebrity by his devotional writings, of which the most important are Elias der Thätschoner (Erlab, 1828; 5th ed. 1860; transl. into English and extensively circulated both in England and in this country);—Solumo und Sulamith (ibid. 3d ed. 1860; 7th ed. 1865);—Die Sibbarth-Glocke, a series of devotional poems (ibid. 1848 sq., 12th ed. 1860);—Leidende Christus (Bielefeld, 1854, and often; transl. into Engl. in Clark's Library):—and last, but hardly least, David, der König von Israel
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Kryptos (κρυπτός, cryptos). For the purpose of concealment from their persecutors, the early Christians occasionally prepared for themselves churches and oratories under ground, which served both as places of devotion and as sepulchres for their dead. These were called caves (ἀπότομος, esπωτι, to conceal.—Farrar, Eccles. Dict. See CRYPT.

Kryptics, a name sometimes given to those theologians who hold to the spiritus, or concealment theory of our Lord's divine attributes during his earthly career. See KENOS.

Kristolatrous (workshippers of a created thing), a branch of the Monophytes, who maintained that the body of Christ before his resurrection was corrupt, in contradistinction from the Actistetes, who held that it was not created.

Kübel, Mathäus, a German theologian, was born at Herbstein, in the duchy of Fulda, Nov. 14, 1742, and when twenty-two years old entered the order of the Jesuits, under whom he received his subsequent education. In 1768 he became professor of humanities at Heidelberg University, and in 1785 was appointed to the chair of canon law. He died Jan. 3, 1809. Kübel was quite liberal in tendency, and had many warm friends among Protestant theologians. He wrote Ratio fidei resoluta, (Feyel, 1776, 4to). — Dering, Gelehrte Theo- log. Deutschlands der 18ten und 19ten Jahrh. ii. 212.

Küchlein, Johann, a German Protestant theologian, was born at Wetterau, in Hesse, in 1546. He studied at Heidelberg, entered the Church, and became pastor at Tackwen. When, in 1576, elector Louis expelled the Calvinistic preachers, Küchlein went to Holland, and for eighteen years held a professorship in theology at Amsterdam. In 1595 he became director of the College of Leyden, and died July 2, 1606. Guy Patin calls him one of the most learned men of his time. His collected works were published at Geneva (1613, 4to). See H. Witte, Diarium Bibliographicum; Meursius, Athen. Batens; Moret, Dict. Hist.; Soicher, Gelehrten Lexikon; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvii. 256. (J. N. P.)

Kuen, Michael, a German savant, was born at Weissenborn, Austria, Feb. 5, 1709, entered in 1728 the Augustin order, and was elected in 1754 abbot of their monastery at Augsburg. He died Jan. 10, 1777. In his principal works of interest to us are Collectio scrabitorum rerum historico-monastico-ecclesiasticarum orium reli- giosis orium (Ulm, 1756-66, 6 vols. fol.)—Joannes de Comacobo ex cessibus de Canibus, qui vulgo rervderi pro auctore quatuor librorum de Initiatione Christi, re- censere et probare (Augsburg, 1766, 4to); Collectio scrabitorum rerum historico-monastico- ecclesiasticarum orium reli- giosis orium (Ulm, 1765-66, 6 vols. fol.)—Joannes de Comacobo ex cessibus de Canibus, qui vulgo rervderi pro auctore quatuor librorum de Initiatione Christi, re- censere et probare (Augsburg, 1766, 4to); Collectio scrabitorum rerum historico-monastico- ecclesiasticarum orium reli- giosis orium (Ulm, 1765-66, 6 vols. fol.)—Joannes de Comacobo ex cessibus de Canibus, qui vulgo rervderi pro auctore quatuor librorum de Initiatione Christi, re- censere et probare (Augsburg, 1766, 4to).

Kufic Writing, an ancient form of Arabic characters, which came into use shortly after Mohammed, and was chiefly current among the inhabitants of Northern Arabia, where those of the south-western parts em- ployed the Himyarite or Moemad (cched) character. The Kufic is taken from the old Syriac character (Es- trangelo), and is said to have been first introduced by Moramer or Morar ben-Morar of Ambar. The first copies of the Koran were written in it, and Kufa, a city in Irak-Arab (pashabhi of Bagdad), being the one which contained the most expert and numerous copyists, the writing itself was called after it. The alphabet was ar- ranged like the Hebrew and Syriac (whence its designation, A. B. G. D. H. E. V. S.), and this order, although now superseded by another, is still used for numerical pur- poses. The Kufic character, of a somewhat clumsy and ungainly shape, began to fall into disuse about A.D. 1000; Ebn-Morah of Bagdad (died A.D. 988) having invented the current or so-called Nashki (askas), to copy character, which was still further improved by
KUHLMANN

De-Bawab (died 1081), and which now—deservedly, as one of the prettiest and easiest—regains supreme in East and West. The quality at the letterhead of the book, abounding in title-pages, that the Kufic is still employed. A pecu-

lar kind of the Kufic is the so-called Karmatian—of a somewhat more slender shape—in which several inscriptions have been met with both in Arabia, and in Damascus, Syria, etc., and which is also used on a comparatively modern-muscle preserved in Newberg. The Kufic is written with a style, while the Neshkili slih

reeds are employed. Different kinds of the latter character (in which the alphabet is arranged according to the outward similarity of the letters) are the Mo-

roesque or Nabatean (Western), the Divan-al-

only employed for deers, etc.), the Taliék (chiefly used in Persia), the Thaolékri (threefold, or very large character), Jakushi, Réhâni, etc. See Alpha-

bet.

Kuhlmann, Quirinus, a German visionary and reli-

gious enthusiast, was born at Breslau Feb. 23, 1651. He began to travel public attention at the age of eight-

teen, when, rising from a sick-bed, he claimed to have been, during his illness, in direct communication both with God and the devil, and asserted that the duty had fallen on him to bring back to the people all new inspirations which he had received from the Holy Ghost. He quitted the University of Breslau, where he had been studying jurisprudence, and went at once to Holland, in 1673, to become a follower of the mystical Jacob Böhme (q. v.), as is shown by his Neubüester Böhme (Leyden, 1674, 8vo). He also sought to enter into relations with Antoine Bourignon, but does not appear to have succeeded. A letter of his, en-

titled De sopiasio infus a Adamas Salomoniceus, dated Lubeck, Feb. 1675, shows that he was at that time in possession of this kind of knowledge. Another, addressed to sultan Mohammed IV, proves that he was in Constantinople in 1678. On Nov. 1, 1681, he published at Paris his Arc-

am microphoneum, curious and scarce, like all his works. After wandering through Switzerland, England, and Germany, he went, about 1689, to Russia, for the purpose of establishing there the "reæ knigdom of God." At first he succeeded in gaining a large number of partisans, and he may perhaps be considered the founder of the yet existing sect of Dohcobortz (q. v.), or spiritual

wrestlers. But the momentary religious freedom enjoyed by Russia under Basili Galitzin soon came to an end on the downfall of Sophia and the accession of Peter the Great to the throne. One of the chief causes of the latter was the expulsion of the Jesuits, and his sentence of death on Kuhlmann and his disciple, Conrad Norderman, supposed to have been occasioned mainly by the efforts of the Lutheran pastor Meinecke. They were both burned alive at Moscow, Oct. 4, 1698. Besides the above-mentioned works, Adiut (List, de folia humanae, v, 9) considers Kuhlmann as the author of forty-two other works, the principal of which are Epistola theo-

sophica Ledensia, Leyden, 1674, 8vo:—Epistolarum Lorumbanum Catholicae ac Wickejfol. Giulianiae, Haliae-


testantismus, p. 516 sq. See.

Kuhn, Jean Gaspard, a French Protestant preach-
er, was born at Sausbruck in the latter part of the 17th century, and flourished as professor of history and elo-

quence at the University of St. Thomas, sabbatical professor of the Church of St. Thomas, in that city. He died in 1720. He wrote De Sociabiliitate secundum Storerum disciplinam. [Hage, La France Protestante, s. v.]

Kuinoel, Christianus Theophilus (Christian Gottlieb Kühnel) in German), a German Protestant theo-

logian and philosopher, born at Leipzig Jan. 9, 1726. He studied the classics at the school of St. Thomas, and theology in the university of his native city. In 1788 he began, by the advice of the celebrated German sav-

ant Wolf, a course of lectures at his alma mater on the classics and on the books of the O. and N. T. In 1790 he was appointed professor extraordinary of mortology, and in 1796 preacher of the university. In 1799 he de-

clined an invitation to a professor's chair at Copen-

hagen, but in 1801 went to Giessen, as professor of belles-

lettres. Subsequently, however, he devoted himself en-

tirely to the exegesis of the N. T., and in 1802 was trans-

ferred to the chair of theology as ordinary professor. He died there Oct. 15, 1841. He wrote Missarumicae Weis-

ungsam do. a. Testamenti übersetzt u. erklär't (Lpz. 1792, 8vo, Anon.);—Hosea Oraculæ Hebr. et Lat. perpetua an-

notations illustras (Lpz. 1794, 8vo). He had published in 1798 a translation of the books of the New Testament notes:—Observations ad Novum Testamentum, ex biblia apocryphæ Veteris Testamenti (Lpz. 1794, 8vo)—Peri-

copæ evangelicae (Lpz. 1796, 2 vols. 8vo)—Die Paulinu

metr. übersetzt, mit Anmerkungen (Lpz. 1798, 8vo)—

Speculionem observationem in Evangelii apocryphæ Veteris Testamenti, etc. (Lpz. 1807, 8vo)—Commentariis in libris Noei Testamenti historici (Lpz. 1807-18, 4 vols. 8vo; 4th ed. Lpz. 1837; reprinted, with the Gr. text added, Lond. 1835,3 vols 8vo.)—a very able and successful work; one of the best of the modern exegetical works on the N. T. ever issued from the German press, and in no way unsatisfactory in spiritual insight. It belongs to the range of higher criticism, while Rosenmüller is occupied with the lower. Kuinoel is undecided between orthodoxy and neology, but seems to have so strong an under-current of conviction in favor of the truth as to lead him to admit, with a good share of favor, evangelical interpretation into his pages. As to theological sentiments, he distinctly avows himself a high Arian, and is evidently sceptical concerning the miracles of Christ. His commentary is of the his-

torico-critical kind—Commentariis in Epistolas ad He-
bromam (Lpz. 1797, 12mo).—Hoever, Nouv. Bilg. Générale, xxviii, 290, l'encyclopédie chrétique, xix, 768; Kitto, Cyclopesis, ii, 763. (J. H. W.)

Kulksynski, Ignatius, a Russian monastic, was born at Wladimir in 1707; early entered the order of St. Basil, resided several years at Rome as general of his order; and died as abbot of Grodno in 1747. He is noted as the author of Specimen Ecletica Rhenensia (Rome, 1738, 12mo), a work which was dedicated to pope Clement XII, and is now hardly accessible. He wrote also Tríspuro protologio di tre colori, ovvero narrazione istorica di tre immagini miracolose della Beata Vergine Maria (Rome, 1739, 12mo);—De Vía Sanctorum divi Blasii magni, 2 vols. in MS. form.—Hoever, Nouv. Bilg. Générale, xxviii, 270.

Kulon, the name of a city found only in the Sept. version (Knaλoon) of Josh. xv, 59, as lying in the tract around Bethlehem (see Kiel's Comment. ad loc.); probably corresponding to the modern village of Kulomoe, an hour and a half west of Jerusalem (Robinson's Res-

searches, ii, 146), with many old walls built of hea-

stones (Schoel, Reise, p. 161). See Judah, THOM. OF.

Kumārasambhava is the name of one of the most celebrated poems of the Hindus, and its author is believed to have been Kâlidâs (q. v.). Its subject is the legendary history connected with the birth of Kâra-

âm, or Alâkâs (q. v.), the Hindu hero: but only eight have hith-
terto been published in the original Sanscrit. The first
seven have been elegantly rendered into English verse by Mr. R. T. H. Griffith, at present principal of the Benares Government College.—Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.

Kunradus, Andreas, a Lutheran divine, born at Döhlen, in Misinna, in 1692, was professor of theology at the University of Wittenberg, and died in 1662. He wrote a Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générales, xxviii, 276.

Kunibert, a bishop of Cologne, who flourished in the 8th century (supposed to have held the see from 613-661), is generally regarded as one of the most influential prelates of the Frankish realm in the 7th century. Not only in ecclesiastical, but also in the civil history of that period, Kunibert fills a not unimportant place. He was a favorite and advisor of king Dagobert I., and was the executor of Sigbert III. He died Nov. 12, 661 or 663. The Roman Catholic Church commemorates the day of his decease. See Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexicon, p. 942 sq.; Retberg, Kirchengesch. Deutschland, i, 586.

Kunigunde, St. See Cunighunda.

Künketh, Johann Theodor, a German theologian, was born at Creusen, in Bayreuth, Sept. 22, 1735; in 1762, he received the doctorate at Jena, and in 1759 became assistant preacher in his native place. He died Aug. 28, 1800, as superintendent of Bayreuth. Künketh was a very popular preacher, and published several of his sermons; he also wrote largely for the theological journals of Germany. A list of his writings is given by John-Eberhard, Theologen Lexicon, i, 114 sq.

Kunwald, Mathias von, a bishop of the Bohemian Brethren, flourished in the 15th century. He was especially prominent at the Synod of Reichenaun in 1494.

Kunze, John Christopher, D.D., one of the most learned men in the Lutheran Church of this country, was born in Saxony about the middle of the 18th century. He was educated in the Gymnasium of Rossieben and Merseburg and the University of Leipzig, and for several years was ensconced in the work of teaching in his native land. When application from the corporation of St. Michael's and Zion's Church was made to the theological faculty at Halle for a minister, their attention was immediately turned to young Kunze. He reached the United States in 1770, and at once commenced his duties as associate pastor of the German churches in Philadelphia. This field of labor he occupied for fourteen years, universally beloved, and exercising a wide influence for good. For several years he was professor in the University of Pennsylvania, from which institution he accepted the doctorate in 1786. He accepted a call to the city of New York in 1784, where he labored for twenty-three years, till his death, July 24, 1807. He was devoted to his work, and indefatigable in his efforts to do good. For a long time he filled with signal ability the professorship of Oriental literature in Columbia College. So high a reputation did he enjoy as a Hebrew scholar that young men who were pursuing their studies with ministers of other denominations frequently resorted to him for instruction. The rabbins connected with the Jewish synagogues also consulted him in their inquiries. As a scholar of the Hebrew, "he was so busily occupied with the study of this language, that he had neither time nor leisure to acquire the respect of this gentleman, and particularly his Oriental learning, long rendered him an ornament of the American republic of letters." He probably did more than any individual of his day to promote a taste for Hebrew literature among those intended for the clerical profession in the United States" (Dr. Miller's Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century). Dr. Kunze published a number of works: History of the Lutheran Church:—Something for the Understanding and the Heart (1781, 8vo);—New Method for Calculating the great Eclipse of June 16, 1806:—Hymn-book for the Use of the Church (1795) —Catha- chism and Liturgy. See Hazelius, Hist. Am. Luth. Church, 1685-1842. (M. L. S.)

Kurdistan or Koordistan, an extensive tract of land in the eastern portion of Asiatic Turkey and in Western Persia. It is chiefly occupied by the Kurds, after whom it is called, but its boundary-line is not definitely established, and the estimates of its area and population greatly differ. The population, according to Rassmesser (Reisen in Europa, Arien, and Afrika, 1883-41), amounted to about 8,600,000; according to Carl Kitz, to only 800,000; according to Carl Riedel, to 400,000; according to Appleton, 40,000. The extent of Turkish Kurdistan is estimated at about 13,000 square miles. It was formerly divided into three governments: namely, 1. Kurdistan, consisting of the Livas Mardin, Sarê, and Dürbâr, containing 1,655,000 inhabitants, of whom 198,000 were Mohammediâns, 51,000 Armenians, 151,000 Jacobites, 4,730, and 1,100 Gipsies; 2. Harpû, consisting of the Livas Meadin, Harpût, Behalî, and Demûs; and 3. Wûn, consisting of the Livas Hakkîly. It was divided into the pachalîc Wûn, Wosil, Dîarbêr, and Urfa, and the beyliks of Mardin, Bûtan, Bogden, and Seindhar; and the district of Mardin. The most important towns are Diarbekir, Bitlis, Wûn, and Mardin. Persian Kurdistan comprises the south-western portion of the province of Aserbaidschan and the western portion of Ardistan, as far as the Kerch, or Bokhara road. The most important town is Baku, in Aserbaidschan, with about 30,000 inhabitants. The Kurds are an agricultural people, who, during the summer months, pitch their black tents upon the Alpine pastures, Asia Minor and Syria, and even Constantinople, are receiving from them flocks and herds of cattle from this territory. The country is made up of isolated villages, without a market, without a church, without a common union, and their intercourse with each other consists chiefly in plundering expeditions. Old castles on inaccessible peaks serve the beyliks as places of refuge in cases of emergency. These boys often rule over several villages. The Kurds were known to Greeks as Carduciâns (Kapadokiâns, Karuci, see Smith's Dict. of Class. Geog. s. v.) or Kyrriâns. In the highlands of Kur- distan they are divided into two different tribes, the As- sireta and the Guranians. The Assyretes are the caste of warriors, and rarely or never agriculturists, but are devoted to cattle-breeding. The Guranians can never become warriors, are agriculturists, and kept in subjec- tion by the Assyretes. As the language of the two tribes likewise differs, it may be assumed that the Guranians are the descendants of the primitive inhabitants, who subsequently were subdued by a more warlike tribe. In Southern Kurdistan the Assyretes call themselves Spath (warriors) and the peasants Rayah (subjects). The language of the Kurds is nearly kindred to the New Per- sian, but is a large extent mixed with Arabic, Syrian, Turkish, and Persian words, and is divided into numerous dialects. They have a written alphabet, therefore no literature, but a number of their popular poems and songs have been written down in Arabic.

The majority of the inhabitants are fanatical Sunnite Mohammediâns, who hate the Shiites even more than they do the Christians. But the number of Armenian, Jacobite, and Nestorian Christians is also considerable. The Armenians chiefly live in the northern part of the country. One section of the Jacobites has its centre near Mardin, under a patriarch, who resides in the convent of Safarkan. Western Kurdistan is the seat of the Nestorian Christians. The Kurds show little disposition to embrace Christianity. Among the Arme- nians and Nestorians the missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions have met with a great success. The mission at Harpût for the Armenian College was organized in 1868. In 1850 a theological seminary was established for the training of the pastoral office, and in 1861 a female seminary for the training of their wives. In 1889 one hundred and fourteen out-stations were connected with 5 principal stations, chief of which is Harpût, where the Eu- phrates College is located. This field is now served by 42 American missionaries with 279 native laborers, of whom 78 are ordained or licensed preachers. The membership is 2086. At Mardin the buildings for a
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Theological school and other purposes are completed.

The flourishing missions among the Nestorians, em-
breeing more than sixty congregations, quickly
in the present. The Church is now under the charge of the
Mission Board of the Presbyterian Church of the
United States. Of the Jacobites and Nestorians a
considerable portion have recognized the supremacy of
the church. The former are called the Syrian,
the latter the Chaldeans. The United
Syrians have a patriarch in Diarbekir, and
the Chaldeans a patriarch at El-Kush, near Mosul, in
the convent of St. Hormizd. The sect of the Yezidis,
or Shemishlou, who are descended from the Parsees, though
they follow at the same time some Mohammedan and
Christian observances, are fire-worshippers, live south of Mardin. See Shiel, Notes
on a Journey from Tabriz to Koordistan (1856), in the
viii); Rich, Narrative of a Journey through Koordistan
(London, 1836, 2 vols.); Wagner, Reise nach Persien und de
Lande der Kuran (Lea, 1852, 2 vols.); Sommereckx, Reise nach Persien und durch Koordistan nach Urmiath
(Stuttgart, 1837, 4 vols.); Laiday, Nisereh, etc, with, an
Account of a Visit to the Chaldean Christians of Koord-
istan, etc. (London, 1830); Grundemann, Missionarisch,
Asiatische Geschichte, etc (Cologne, 1857, 2 vols.). See
Narrative of a Mission to Mesopotamia and Koord-

Kuria or Kyria. See ELECTA.

Kurma (called also Karmaavata, i.e. the "avatar of
the tortoise") is the name by which the second
incarnation of Vishnu is designated. It is related in Hindu
mythology that Kurma took the form of a tortoise so as
to form a support to the mountains and the gods
and Asuras churned the ocean. The mountain being the
churn-stick, the great serpent Sêha was made use of
for the string. It may be proper to observe that in
India churning is usually performed by causing a body
to turn the churn-stick to revolve rapidly in the cream
or milk by means of a string, in the same manner as a
drill is made to revolve. In some of the Hindu pic-
tures of the churning of the ocean the gods are repre-
sented as standing on one side of Mount Mandara
and the Asuras on the other, both grasping in their hands
the serpent Sêha, which is wound round the mountain.
This rests upon the back of the tortoise (Vishnu).

At the same time, the preserving deity, in consequence of
his ubiquitous character, is seen standing among the
gods and grasping Sêha, and also as dancing on the top of
Mount Mandara (see Plate 49 in Moor's Hindu
Mittheilungen).

The churning of the ocean is one of the most famous
and popular fables related in the mythology of the Hin-
dus. It resulted in the production of the fourteen gems,
as they are called, namely, 1. Chandra (the moon); 2.
Lakshmi, the incomparable consort of Vishnu; 3. Sûrâ,
the goddess of wine; 4. Uchiravan, a wonder-
ful eight-headed horse; 5. Kustubba, a jewel of inestim-
able value; 6. Pârijata, a tree that yielded whatever
one might desire; 7. Surabhi or Râmadhenu, a cow sim-
larly bountiful; 8. Dhanwantsara, a wondrous physician;
9. Pravata or Irvarat, the elephant of India; 10.
Shanh, a shell which conferred victory on whosoever sounded it;
11. Danusha, an unerring bow; 12. Vish, a remarkable
drug or poison; 13. Remba (or Rembha), an Aparâk
possessed of surpassing charms; 14. Armita, or Amrit,
the beverage of immortality. See Moor, Hindu Pan-
thology.

Kurschner, Conrad. See PELICAN.

Kurtz, Benjamin, D.D., LL.D.; a prominent min-
ister of the Lutheran Church, was born at Harrisburg,
Penns., Feb. 28, 1795. He was a lineal descendant of one
of the Halle patriarchs, the grandson of Rev. John Nie-
blaus Kurtz, who came to this country in 1745 as an as-
settler of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg. When quite
young Benjamin exhibited remarkable fitness for study,
and great quickness in the acquisition of knowledge.
At the age of fifteen he was employed as an assistant in
the Harrisburg Academy, and subsequently gave private
instruction in Latin and mathematics. Early trained
to industry and self-reliance, he formed those habits of
mental discipline which gave so much strength to his
future character. He studied theology under the di-
rection of Rev. Dr. Geo. Lochman, and was licensed to
preach in 1815 by the Synod of Pennsylvania. He im-
mediately received a call to Baltimore as assistant min-
ister to his uncle, Rev. Dr. J. D. Kurtz. He remained
in this position for a brief period, and then accepted
the invitation to become pastor of the Hagerstown charge.
During this period of his ministry his labors were crowned
with the success of a singular nature. In addition to the Church
he added to the Church one hundred and fifteen members.
Very reluctantly he resigned the position, and in 1831 took charge of the Lutheran Church in Chambersburg. But in the midst of his usefulness, with the
brightest prospects of success, his labors here were
abruptly terminated by the failure of his health. He
removed to Baltimore Aug. 24, 1833, and commenced his
career as editor of the Lutheran Observer. The paper
became an engine of great influence in the Church, and,
although physically disqualified to perform regular pul-
litab work, in his editorial capacity he was permitted ev-
every week in the Gospel Advocate, the organ of the clergymen
of the Church. He died Dec. 29, 1865. Dr. Kurtz
possessed an intellect of no common order, a resolute
will, and remarkable personal power. He was an active,
vigorous thinker. He had acquired habits of close ap-
lication, keen observation, and keen perception, both for
analytical research, and the investigation of intricate
questions. His mind was clear and logical, and in con-
trovery he had scarcely a superior. He readily com-
prehended a subject, and knew how to grapple with any
truth that claimed his attention. Had he entered the
legal profession, for which he was originally intended,
or political life, to which he was so well adapted, he
would, no doubt, have risen to the highest position, to a
rank equal to his most distinguished contemporaries.
As a preacher he was very much gifted. In his earlier
years, and in the maturity of his strength, he was re-
ferred by many as the most eloquent orator in the State
of Maryland. He was plain, thoughtful, argumen-
tative, and forcible. He gave utterance to the great
truths of the Gospel with an energy and an unction that
carried conviction home to the hearer. He was a clear,
prolific writer, and a successful advocate in the pul-
pit. He was a man of independent spirit, fond of excitation, and
work-
best when under its influence. He was, in the full
sense of the term, a public man, and few men in the
Lutheran Church of this country have wielded a greater
power than he. His name was a tower of strength in
connection with any enterprise that engaged his atten-
tion. His public career, extending over half a century,
was identified with the most important events in the
history of the Lutheran Church during that period. The
recognised leader of a central school in the Church, the
public representative of a party whose views he adopt-
ed, his sentiments on all subjects were regarded with
favor. His words were received as oracular. His life
was one of ceaseless activity. Laborious, self-sacrificing,
a man of great industry and unwearied perseverance, he
never yielded to any obstacle that was not absolutely
insuperable. Notwithstanding his daily routine of duty,
and the multiplicity of his engagements, he found some
time for authorship. His books were generally well re-
ceived by the public; some of them passed through sev-
eral editions. The following embraces a list of his pub-
lications: A Discourse on the History of Religious
Discipline (1826); — Sermons on Sabbath-schools (1822); —Faith, Hope, and Charity (1824); —A Sermon on Temperance (1824); —Pastoral
Address during his absence in Europe (1827); —
Ministerial Appeal, Valedictory Sermon, Hagerstown
(1831); —A Discourse on the Lord's Supper, etc. (Balti-
more, Chambersburg (1831); —Infant Baptism and Af-
fusion, with Essays on Related Subjects (Baltimore, 1840):
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—Theological Sketch-book, or Skeleton of Sermons, carefully arranged in systematic order, so as to constitute a complete Body of Divinity, partly original, partly selected (1844, 2 vols.)—Why are you a Lutheran? (1847)—Prayer in all its Forms, and Training of Children (1856)—Lutheran Prayer-book, for the use of Families and Juvenile Classes. 3rd edition (1858)—The Sermon or Expository Instruction for Children (1848)—Design, Necessity, and A epARATION of the Missionary Institute at St. Ignacius, Pa. (Inaugural Address) (1859)—The Choice of a Wife—Lecture to the Graduating Class of Theological Students in the Missionary Institute at St. Ignacius (1863)—The Sermon or Expository Instruction on Natural Religion, or the one thing needful; preached before the West Pennsylvania Synod (1863)—Believers belong to Christ: Sacramental Discourse delivered before the Maryland Synod (1865). He was also co-editor of the Year-book of the Reformation (1844). See Evang. Rev. 1866, p. 25 sq.; Lutheran Observer, Jan. 5 and 12, 1866. (M.L.S.)

Kurtz, John Daniel, D.D., a distinguished minister of the Lutheran Church, the son of the Rev. J. N. Kurtz, was born at Germantown, Penn., in 1763. Very early in life he had a strong desire to prepare for the ministry of reconciliation. After leaving school he pursued his studies under the direction of his father, and subsequently Dr. H. E. Mühlenberg, of Lancaster. In 1784 he was licensed to preach by the Synod of Pennsylvania. He commenced his ministerial labors by assisting his father in preaching, catechising, and visiting the sick. Afterwards he took charge of congregations in the vicinity of York. He removed in 1786 to Baltimore, where he labored with great diligence and fidelity for nearly half a century. In 1807, in consequence of advancing physical infirmities, he resigned his position, although he occasionally preached, and endeavored to make himself useful whenever an opportunity afforded. He died June 30, 1856, in the 93rd year of his age, loved and honored by all who knew him. During his ministry he baptized 5156 persons, buried 2221, and solemnized 2568 marriages. Being once told that the Methodists were gathering in German Lutheran emigrants and organizing churches among them, his reply was, "And is it not better that they should go to heaven as Methodists than be unbelievers and overlooked as Lutherans?" He was one of the founders of the General Synod of the Lutheran Church, a director of the Theological Seminary, and closely identified with all the beneficent institutions of the Church. He was a member in the formation of the Maryland Bible Society, and for many years was president of the trustees of the Female Orphan Asylum. (M.L.S.)

Kurtz, John Nicholas, one of the earlier Lutheran ministers in this country, was born at Lutzelinden, in the principality of Nassau-Weilburg, and came to this country in 1745. He pursued his studies at Giessen and Halle, and was regarded by Dr. Francke as particularly fitted for missionary labor among his countrymen in America. He was the first Lutheran minister ordained in this country. He labored successively at New Hanover, Tulpehocken, Germantown, and York, Pa., although he frequently spent whole months in visiting the destitute places of the Church, preaching, catechising, and administering the sacraments. During his residence at Tulpehocken the services of the sanctuary were often conducted at imminent risk of life, as the ruthless Indian lay in wait for victims, and whole families were sometimes massacred. The officers of the church stood at the doors armed with defensive weapons, to prevent a surprise and to protect minister and people. In travelling to his preaching stations and visiting among his members he was often exposed to danger from the attack of the tomahawk and scalping-knife. He was put to many privations, and spent the summer months in the mountains. The little ones gave a yellow mark; he wears an earring, but only in one ear; and, though he is properly of a black color, his belly is whitened by a leprous taint. He is seated in a car (puhuku), which is drawn by hogcubling. His residence, Alakä, is situated near the confluence of the rivers Minne-sa, and he is attended by the Yakshas, Mâyus, Kinnaras, and other imps, anxiously guarding the entrance to his garden, Chaiturratha, the abode of all riches. Nine treasures—apparently precious gems—are especially entrusted to his care. His wife is a hogcubling, Yaksha, or spirit; and his children are, according to the Indian notion, dwarves. As one of the divinities that preside over the regions, he is considered also to be the protector of the north.

Kuvera, the Hindu Plutus, or god of wealth. He owes his name—which literally means "having a wretched (ku) body (tera)"—to the deformities with which he is invested by Hindu mythology. He is represented as having three heads, three legs, and eight human and animal teeth; in this condition he is very worshiped, and the Hindus draw a yellow mark; he wears an earring, but only in one ear; and, though he is properly of a black color, his belly is whitened by a leprous taint. He is seated in a car (puhuku), which is drawn by hogcublings. His residence, Alakä, is situated near the confluence of the rivers Minne-sa, and he is attended by the Yakshas, Mâyus, Kinnaras, and other imps, anxiously guarding the entrance to his garden, Chaiturratha, the abode of all riches. Nine treasures—apparently precious gems—are especially entrusted to his care. His wife is a hogcubling, Yaksha, or spirit; and his children are, according to the Indian notion, dwarves. As one of the divinities that preside over the regions, he is considered also to be the protector of the north.
KYPERNS, GERARDUS ARENSTUS, D.D., an eminent minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Halandish parentage in the island of Curacoa, W.I., Dec. 16, 1756. His father, Rev. Walmouth Kyperns, was a clergyman, educated at the University of Groningen, and removed to this country, where he settled as pastor of the church at Rhinebeck, N. Y., and Hackensack, N. J. He died in 1799. His son Gerardus was educated by the celebrated Dr. Peter Wilson, who was then the most popular and able classical teacher in New Jersey. His theological course was pursued under the care of his father and Drs. Hermanus Mayer and Dirck Remsen. He was licensed to preach in 1787, ordained in 1788 as co-pastor at Paramus, N. J., and in 1789 became one of the ministers of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church in New York, where he remained until his decease in 1808. Dr. Kyperns was a Christian gentleman, and a theologian of the old school, remarkably conversant with the Bible, and possessed of high pastoral qualifications. He is described as an evangelical, practical, lucid, and superior preacher, a man of peace and prudence, and a living chronicle of past events, whose decisions on matters of usage and precedent were for many years regarded as final. His death was triumphant. He left unfinished a volume of Discourses on the Heidelberg Catechism.—Dr. Knox: Memorials Discourses (1833); Sprague: Annals: Corwin's Manual Ref. Ch. p. 180; Life of Dr. J. H. Livingston. (W. J. R. T.)

Kvaais is the name of a mythic personage mentioned in the Norse legends. "He was so wise and knowing that no one could ask him a question which he could not answer. He was, however, entrapped and slain by two dwarfs who had invited him to a feast. With his blood they mingled honey, and thus composed a meal which makes every one who drinks of it a skald, or wise man." See Thorpe, Northern Mythology, vol. 1.

Kydeminister (or Kidekminister), Richard, an English monk, greatly celebrated both as a preacher and scholar, born in Worcestershire, flourishing in the first half of the 16th century. He was abbot of the Benedictine monastery at Winchcombe, Gloucestershire, and died in 1531. He wrote Tractatus contra Doctrinae Lutheri (1521); also a history of his monastery. See Wood, Athen. Oxon.; Allibone, Dictionary of English and American Authors, ii, 1046.

Kypke, Georg David, a distinguished German Orientalist, was born at Neukirchen, Pomerania, Oct. 28, 1774. He studied at the universities of Königsberg and Halle, took his degree in the department of philosophy in 1774, in 1746 was appointed professor extraordinary of Oriental languages at Königsberg, and was promoted to the full professorship in 1773. He died May 28, 1779. Kypke wrote Observationes sacrae in Novi Testamenti libros, ex autoribus Graecis et antiquitatibus (Breslau, 1755, 2 vol. 8vo); a successful attempt to illustrate many passages of the New Testament by examples drawn from Greek classic authors. "Of all the expositions of the New Testament conducted on principles like these, I know no one which are superior, or, indeed, equal to that of Kypke" (Michaelis). See Schott, Suppl. zu Jocher; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxviii, 812.

Kyrle (Kepa), "O Lord" (in Church music), the vocative of the Greek word signifying Lord, with which word all the musical masses in the Church of Rome open. Hence it has come to be used substantively for the whole piece, as one may say, a beautiful Kyrie, a Kyrie well executed, etc.

Kyrle Eleison (Kepa Elipson, Lord have mercy [upon us]), the well-known form of earnest and pathetic penitential appeal of the Scriptures, of frequent occurrence in the liturgy of the Eastern and Western churches, and in the liturgical formule of the Eastern and Western churches, and since the Reformation retained even in many Protestant churches.

Eastern Church.—Most frequently it was used in the opening portions of the ancient liturgies. In that of St. Mark we find three long prayers, each preceded by the threefold repetition of the Kyrie. In St. Chrysostom's the deacon offers ten petitions, and each is followed by the answering Kyrie of the choir. In the Apostolic Constitutions (lib. viii, can. 6), when the catechumens are about to protest the faith, it is added for this supplication (comp. Neale, Primitive Lit., p. 88).

Western Church.—In the West the Kyrie Eleison and Christe Eleison, termed by St. Benedict "lesser" or "minor litanies," it is generally supposed were introduced by pope Sylvester I (314-355), and formed a part of the Processional of the "Salisbury Parloirium," as they do now of the daily offices of prayer of the Church of Rome, England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church. In the Lutheran and many other evangelical liturgies the Kyrie Eleison is retained. See Palmer, Orig., Lib. i, 122; Siegel, Christliche Kirchliche Alterthümer, iii, 257; Higden, Christian Antiquities, lib. iv, cap. 98; Watts, Stanzas for the Most Distinguished V. Proctor, Common Prayer (see Index); Blunt, Dict. Doct. and Hist. Theol. s. v. (J. H. W.)

Kyrie, John, an English philanthropist, whom Pope has immortalized under the name of "The Man of Rome," was born at Dymock (County of Gloucester) in 1857. With a small income of £500 he managed to do much good to the city of London. He founded and encouraged agriculture, opened ways of communication between the different places, and founded asylums for orphans and disabled persons. The passage in which Pope commemorates him is too well known and too long to be quoted here. We will only say that it is substantially based on facts. Kyrie died in 1754. See Barton, Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope; Pope, Epistle II; Fuller, Worthies of England, i, 582.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxxviii, 812. (J. N. P.)

La'adah (Heb. Ladaq, יְלַדָּה, order; Sept. Aadaá v. r. Maadá), the second name of the two sons of Shebáh (son of Judah), and founder ("father") of Marashah, in the lowlands of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 21). B.C. cir. 1874.

La'adan (Heb. Ladaqan, יְלַדָּן, arranger), the name of two men.

1. (1 Chron. xxiii, 7-9, 24, Sept. Aâdaâ v. r. Eâdâv, Vulg. Leedan; in 1 Chron. xxvii, 21, Aadâv v. r. Laâdâv, Aâdâv, Leadan.) The first named of the two sons of Gershom, the son of Levi; elsewhere called Liihn (1 Chron. vi, 17).

2. (Sept. Taladââv v. r. Aâdâv, Aâdâv, Vulg. Laedan, Latad.) The second named of the two sons of Tahath, and father of Ammiudah, of the posterity of Ephraim (1 Chron. vii, 26). B.C. post 1612.

Lamah. See Wormwood.

Labadie, Jean De, a French enthusiast, and the founder of the religious sect known as Labadites, was born at Bourg, in Guienne, Feb. 15, 1610. Educated in the Jesuits' school at Bordeaux, he entered their order, began the study of theology in 1626, and soon distinguished himself as a preacher. Struck with the abuses existing in the Roman Church, he clamored for reform, but, meeting with no encouragement in his order, he left it to join the Fathers of the Oratory in 1639, and very shortly afterwards the Jansenists. In 1640 he was appointed canon of Amiens, and at once inaugurated various reforms. He held conventicles for the purpose of Bible reading, and administered the Lord's Supper in both kinds to the people. To prevent the spread of this innovation, he was removed in 1646, and sent as preacher and inspector to the convents of the third order of St.
FRANCIS in Guineu. Still persecuted by the Jesuits, he joined the Reformed Church at Montauban in 1656, and entered the Protestant ministry under very auspicious circumstances. In 1657 he became pastor in Orange, and in 1659 in Geneva. In both situations he exerted himself to the utmost for the restoration of apostolic religion on Pietistic principles, and gained many converts, especially in Geneva. In 1666 he became pastor of a Walloon church in Middelburg, but, by the machinations of his enemies, was obliged to leave it, and in 1669 went to Amsterdam, where his followers soon formed a distinct religious sect, known as Labanists, of whom Yvon was one of the preachers. Having been expelled from the country as a separatist, Labadie went in 1670 to Hereford, where, through the influence of his disciple, the learned Anna Marie von Schurmann (who appears to have become his wife afterwards), he was protected by the princess Elisabeth. But, again driven away (in 1674) by the authorities as an Anabaptist, he succeeded successively to Bremen and Altona. Here he managed, with the assistance of Peter Yvon and De Lignon, to hold private meetings and to disseminate his doctrines. He died at Altona Feb. 13, 1674. His principal works are: Le héritage de la vraie foi (Amsterd. 1667, 12mo); Les vaissels du pur Dieu (Amsterd. 1667, 12mo); Le véritable ecclésiastique ou l'unique moyen de chasser le Diable du monde Chrétien (Amsterd. 1667, 12mo); — Le chant royal du roi Jésus-Christ (Amsterd. 1670, 12mo); — Les soins Décades (Amstel. 1687, 8vo); — L'empire du St. Esprit (Amst. 1671, 12mo); — La réformation de la religion Christiane; ou la juridiction apostolique; Abrégé du Christianisme (transl. into German, Frankf. 1742); etc.

According to their confession of faith (Déclaration d. reines laws u. g. gesamten Glaubens d. Joh. de L., etc., Herford, 1671), Labadists do not differ from the Reformed Church, whose symbolic books they accepted. They supported themselves by manual labor, and, after the example of the primitive Church, possessed everything in common; they insisted that great stress is to be laid on the internal light, and that it alone can make the outer revelation intelligible. They, however, declared against infant baptism; also against the second baptism of the Anabaptists, and rejected the observance of the Sabbath on the plea that for them life was a perpetual Sabbath, etc. The reproach of immodesty which some Roman Catholic writers have preferred the labanists, is unfounded; they were modest, and honored the institution of matrimony. After Labadie's death his followers removed to Wieuvert, in the duchy of Cleves, but gained few adherents, and the sect gradually disappeared about the middle of the 18th century. At the beginning of the 19th century, an attempt was made to establish themselves in the United States of America; a few of their number settled on the banks of the Hudson River as missionaries, but they do not seem to have taken a special hold. See A. Paul and J. Hund, Antidiotis (Hamm, 1671, 4to); L. G. Englischall, Rich- tige Vorwärtsb. d. heutigen Welt (1716), p. 652-682; Dr. Schotel, A. M. S. Schurmann (Hertogenb. 1859); Arnold, Kirchen u. Kirchengesch., ii. 690; Hagembach, Gesch. der Reformation, iv. 807 sq.; Gobel, Gesch. d. christl. Lebens in d. Rheinisch-Westphälischen evangel. Kirche (Coblens, 1852), vol. ii; Zeitschr. d. histor. theolog. 1888, 1884.

Labadie.
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Isabella did not return to that place after reaching Kedesh, are neither of them relevant. He prefers the Hasara of ancient notice (Note, Esh. 17, 11, 70 sq.; Hasara of the Peutinger Table, ix, 7; Aegyptus of Polymy, v, 17, 5), between Petra and Eela as having the signification white in Arabic (Steph. Byz. v.s. v.).

Lab'aana (Lab'ara), one of the chief Temple-servants whose sons returned from the captivity (1 Esdr. 5, 28); especially the Labana (q.v.) of the Hebrew list (Neh. 7, viii, 49).

Labarárum is the name given to the old standard or flag of Christian nations. Its derivation is uncertain, but it has variously been considered as coming from Latin labrns, labrns, labrns, labrns pontifical, etc. Some, with Prudentius, pronounced both as short; others (Altithem, De land. Virg.) considered it the first as long. Sozomen has it λαβρασον; Chrysostom, λαβρασον. (Comp. on the etymology, Greses, Πατρ. Cruce, lib. lvi.) We find this name already applied to the Roman standard in coins of the republic and of the first emperors, especially on those connected with the wars against the Germans, Sarmatians, and Armenians. The standards obtained a Christian signification under the emperor Constantine the Great, who, after his conversion, placed the image of the cross on his standards, and caused it to be received at Rome as the σωτήρος τουρανος. Henceforth it was considered as etymo λαβρασον των δαλων γνωρων: it was carried in advance of the other standards, looked upon as an object of adoration by the Christian soldiery, and was surrounded by a guard of fifty picked men. Eusebius, who describes it with great particularity (in Vita Constantini, E, cap. 30, 31; Baroinius, Annales Ecclesiast. A.D. 812, No. 26), relates that Constantine was induced to place the Christian symbol on the Roman standard by having in vision seen a shining cross in the heavens. This vision may be denied or variously explained from subjective causes; compare the article CONSTANTINE, and Schaff, Ch. Hist, ii, § 2.)

The Labarum, the image of the emperor, along with those of Jupiter, Mars, and Mercury, but the standard of Constantine was restored under Valentine and Gratian. The labarum remained the standard of Rome until the downfall of the Western Roman Empire, under the names of labarum, crux; and ecclesiae ecclesiasticus. The standards occur in use in some ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church still consist of a spear, with a cross-piece, to which is attached a cloth covered with embroidery or painting. The most renowned masterpiece of Christian art, Raphael's Maddonna del Progresso, was originally made and used for this purpose. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vol. viii. s. v.; Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ii, 261 sq.; Marinig, Dict. des Anquetis, s. v.; Walcott, Sacred Archology, s. v.; Violan, Disc. crit. sur la Vision de Constan- tin (Paris, 1774). (J. H. W.)

Labbaq, Jus d'Abapat. A French Roman Catholic missionary, was born at Paris in 1658. He joined the Dominicans in April, 1685, went as professor of philosoph-
LABOR

LABRADOR
tice of dipping the bread in the wine, so that both might be administered together. The Latin Church as length with their neighbors together, and the Greek Church, mingling both elements, administered them at once with a 

λοφος, or spoon. See FISTULA.

Labor (properly 

\[\text{πορτ}, \text{abat}, \text{to work, Gr. \text{πορτας}}, \]

also 

\[\text{πορτα, to oil, Gr. \text{κοινων}}, \]

and other terms). From Gen. ii, 15 (where the same word 

\[\text{πορτ} \]

is used, A. V. "till"), we learn that man, even in a state of innocence, and surrounded by all the external sources of happiness, was not to pass his time in indolent repose. By the very existence of his animal frame, exercise of some kind was absolutely essential to him (comp. Eccles. v, 12). In Gen. iii, 19, labor, in its more rigorous and exhausting forms, is set forth as a part of the primeval curse,"I will put thorns and thistles before thy face; thou shalt eat bread;" and doubtless there is a view of labor which exhibits it in reality as a heavy, sometimes a crushing burden (compare Gen. xxxix, 16). But labor is by no means exclusively an evil, nor is its prosecution a dishonor (comp. Ps. ciii, 23, 24). It is the prostration of strength, wherewith is also connected the temporary incapacity of sharing in the enjoyments of life, and not labor in itself, which is constituted the punishment pronounced on the fallen man. Hence we find that, in primitive times, manual labor was neither regarded as degrading nor confined to a certain class of society, but was more or less prosecuted by all. By the institution of the Sabbath, which one seventh of mankind's life was reserved from labor, and appropriated to rest of body and to that improvement of mind which tends to strength, invigorate, and sustain the entire man. See SABBATH.

Labor was enjoined on all Israelites as a sacred duty in the fourth commandment (Exod. xx, 9; Deut. v, 15); and the Bible entertains so high a respect for the diligent and skilful laborer, that we are told in Prov. xxii, 29, "Seest thou a man skilled in his work, he shall stand before kings." (comp. also ibid., xiv, 4; xii, 24, 27.) Among the beautiful features which grace an excellent housewife, is set forth that "she worketh willingly with her own hands" (Prov. xxxi, 18). With such an honorable regard for labor, it is not to be wondered at that Nebuchadnezzar carried the Jews away into captivity, he found among them a thousand craftsmen and smiths (2 Kings xxiv, 14-16; Jer. xxxix, 2). The ancient rabbins, too, regarded manual labor as most honorable, and urged it upon every one as a duty, as may be seen from the following sayings in the Talmud:

"He who does not teach his son a craft is as it were, bringing him up to robbery" (Chocia, 185); "Labor is great, and he that labors is the happiest" (15); "The laborer, and maintains him" (Chapiga, 5; Nedarim, 49, b; Baba Bathra, 110, a). See HANDBOOK.

The Hebrews, like other primitive nations, appear to have had herdsmen before they were agriculturists (Gen. iv, 2; xxiv, 17, 22); and the practice of keeping flocks and herds continued in high esteem and constant observance as a regular employment and a social condition (Judg. i, 16; iv, 11; Amos vii, 14; Luke ii, 8). The culture of the soil came in course of time, introducing the discovery and exercise of the practical arts of life, which eventually led to those refinements and improvements in the arts of fashion and to applications, which precede, if they do not create, the fine arts (Gen. iv; xxvi, 12; xxviiii, 19).

Agriculture, indeed, became the chief employment of the Hebrew race after their settlement in Canaan; it lay at the very basis of the constitution, both civil and religious, which Moses gave them, was held in great honor, and was carried on by the high as well as the humble in position (Judg. vi, 11; 1 Sam. xi, 5; 1 Kings xix, 19). No small care was bestowed on the culture of the vine, which grew luxuriously on the hills of Palestine (Isa. v, 1; Matt. xxv, 27; Numb. xiii, 24). The vintage was a season of jubilee (Judg. ix, 27; Jer. xxxix, 10; Isa. xvi, 10). The hills of Palestine were also adorned with well-cultured olive-gardens, which produced fruit useful for food, for anointing, and for medicine (Isa. xlix, 6; xxv, 18; Dan. iii, 23; Ezek. xxvii, 17; 1 K. xiv, 17; Prov. xxiv, 30. Hos. xiv, 6, 7). Attention was also given to the culture of the fig-tree (2 Kings xxii, 7; 1 Chron. xxviii, 22), as well as of the date-palm (Lev. xxviii, 40; Judg. i, 6; iv, 15; xx, 33; Deut. xxviii, 4), and also of haisam (Gen. xliii, 11; Ezek. xxvii, 17; xxxviii, 28; Jer. viii, 22). See AGRICULTURE.

Laborante (labores), a name sometimes given to the copists or fonsarits, on the assumption that the Greek word κοινων was taken from εἰρων, labor.—FERRAR, Eccles. Dict. n. v. See COPIATR; FONSARIT.

Laborde, Vivien, a French priest, born at Toulouse, Nov. 16, 1696, flourished at Paris under the patronage of cardinal De Noailles. He died March 5, 1748. His works are A Treatise on the Essence:—Distinction and Limits of the Spiritual and Temporal Powers:—Famililar Conferences: and other religious works of value.

Labouderie, Jean, a celebrated French theologian, was born at Chalinsarges, Auvergne, Feb. 15, 1775. He became vicar of Notre Dame, Paris, in 1815, and early distinguished himself more as a writer than a preacher. He was particularly conversant with the Hebrew language. He died as honorary grand vicar of Avignon at Paris, May 2, 1849. Among his works are: Psalms (L'Avignon, 1801); Considerations addressées aux aspirants au ministère de l'Église de Genève, suivant suite à celles de M. Empreux sur la divinité de Jésus-Christ, avec une réponse à quelques questions de M. Delloc, etc. (Paris, 1817, 8vo)—Précis historique du Méthodisme (1818, 8vo)—Le Christianisme de Montaigne (1819, 8vo)—L'âme des Saints (1820, 3 vols. 24mo)—La Religion Chrétienne (1826, 8vo)—Notice historique sur Zwingle (1828, 8vo); etc. See Hoefer, Nouv. Dic. Général, xxviii, 395.

Laboureur, Le Jean, a French priest, born at Montmorency in 1628, became one of the almoners of the king, and died in 1675. He wrote several valuable works on the history of France.

Labrador, a peninsula of north-eastern America, is bounded on the east by the Atlantic Ocean, on the south by the Dominion of Canada and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, on the west by the Hudson Bay and James Bay, on the north by the Hudson Strait. Area about 500,000 sq. m. It is rich in iron ore, copper, and petroleum. The principal river is the St. John. There are on the mainland belonging to the Hudson Bay Company, and with the remainder of this territory was in 1699 sold to the government of the Dominion of Canada. The interior of the country is almost entirely unknown. The population, comprising Indians, Esquimaux, and a few Europeans, is about 8000. It is about 500 miles long, 100 miles wide. Labrador is identical with the Helluland (stone-land) which about the year 1000 was discovered by Leif, the son of Eric the Red. On June 24, 1497, it was again discovered by John and Sebastian Cabot. It was visited in 1500 by the Portuguese G. Cortereal, who called it Terra del Labrador (land for labor), and in 1576 by the Englishman M. Frobisher. In 1618 Hudson explored a part of the coast. The country, which has a rugged coast, and is surrounded with many small islands, does not allow an extensive cultivation; for, although the vegetation is of a peculiar kind, it is limited as it is throughout Greenland, the winters are even more severe, and during the short summers the musquitoes are even more troublesome than in Greenland. The population of the interior, which consists of Red Indians, is very small. There are on the labrador, and on the eastern and the western coast, are a little more numerous, and support themselves by fishing, etc. If these animals fail them a famine is brought on, or they are forced to penetrate farther into the interior, where they are apt to encounter the Red Indians, their irreconcilable enemies for centuries. The ancient vintages were with.

The first attempt to establish a mission on the coast of Labrador was made by the Moravians in 1752, when
LABROUSSE

J.C. Erhardt was killed by the Esquimaux. In 1771 the Moravians succeeded in establishing the station of Nain, to which in the course of the following ten years the whole of the group of the Ammassalik (Inupiat) were added. The mission met hers with the same difficulties as in Greenland. Thirty-four years after the establishment of the first mission an extensive revival took place, in consequence of which the Esquimaux connected with these stations were gained to Christianity. The Esquimaux living more to the north, Hebron was founded in 1830. In 1864 the station of Zoar was established for the tract of land lying between Nain and Hooffthal. All the Esquimaux in this part of Labrador are now Christians. Only north of Hebron a few pagans are still left. The conversion of the Esquimaux from the station of Rams, situated on the Bay of Nallutoruek (a little north of lat. 59° 11' N.) was founded. Famine and epidemics have greatly reduced the number of the Esquimaux in Labrador. In 1780 the station of Nain numbered 259, Okak 329, Hooffthal 256, Hebron 219, and Zoar 192 souls, while the number of missionaries on their attendants was 45. The acquaintance of the natives with European necessities forced the missionaries to charge themselves with the importation of some of these articles. Subsequently this trade was transferred to special agents, and the commercial houses have ceased a number of Europeans to settle on the coast of Labrador, and a number of trading-posts to be established. Besides the Moravians, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has begun missionary efforts on the southern coast, and the Roman Catholic Church has endeavored to gain an influence upon the Red Indians of the interior. See Newcomb, Cyclopedia of Missions; Grendeman, Missionarische; Römer, Geschichte der Labrador-Mission (Graz, 1871). (A.J.S.)

LABROUSSE, CLOTHILDE SUSAN COUNCILLER DE, a French religious enthusiast, was born at Vauxain, Perigord, May 29, 1747. While quite young she adopted exaggerated mystical notions, thought herself called to become a saint, and was anxious to leave this world for a better one that she made an attempt at suicide when nine years old. Her ascetic practices were very severe, and became still more so as she grew up, yet did not seem to leave any injurious effect on her health. At the age of nineteen she became a nun of the third order of St. Francis, and soon after declared that she had received a mission to travel through the world to convert sinners, but was detained in the convent in the meantime. She then retired to the hermitage of her own life, which she addressed to M. de Flamarens, bishop of Perigueroux, without effect. The MS., however, attracted the attention of Dom Gerle, prior of the Charterhouse of Vaucasine, who entered into correspondence with the reverend father, and she afterwards retired to a monastery, in which she was elected a member of the National Assembly, that she had predicted it to him. When the Revolution broke out, M. Pontard, constitutional bishop of Dordogne, attracted her to Paris, where she prophesied against the court of Rome, and in favor of the civil constitution of the clergy. She subsequently returned to Perigord, and left there to go to Rome, thinking to convert the pope, cardinals, etc., to her views, and to induce them to renounce temporal power. On her way she addressed the people wherever an opportunity offered. In August, 1792, she arrived at Bologna, whence she was driven by the legate. At Viterbo she was arrested and taken to the castle of San Angelo. In 1796 the French Directory interfered to obtain her liberation, but she preferred remaining, as she had been very kindly treated; but when the French took Rome in 1798 she left the prison where she died in 1821. She persisted to the last in believing herself inspired, and actually succeeded in gathering a small circle of adherents. Labrousse wrote Prophéties concernant la Révolution Française, suivies d'une Prédiction qui commence de la fin du monde (for 1809) (Paris, 1796, 8vo).—Lettre de Mlle. de Labrousse (Paris, 1796, 8vo).—Pontard published a Recueil des Ouvrages de la célèbre Mlle. Labrousse (Bordeaux, 1797, 8vo). See Mahul, Annales néerl. 1822; Arnault, J., Josy et Norvins, Biog. nouv. Lettres et Arts Contemporaines, et des Contemporains de la Littérature.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxvii, 418.

La Brune, François de. See La Brune, Jean de.

La Brune, Jean de, a French Protestant minister, flourished in the second half of the 17th and the early part of the 18th century. After the revocation of the edict of Nantes he went as pastor to Basle; later he became master of the school of Schoenenberg, in Heidelberg, and is particularly celebrated as a writer, but many of the works which have generally been attributed to him are now believed to be the production of François de La Brune, also a Protestant French pastor, who flourished about the same time; went to Amsterdam in 1685, and, on account of heterodox opinions, was suspended from the ministry in 1691. We have under the name of La Brune, among other works, Morale de Confucius (Amst. 1688, 8vo)—Calvin's Traité de la Justification (ibid. 1690, 8vo; 1705, 12mo)—Hist. du Vieux et du Nouveau Test. en vers (1731, 8vo)—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxvii, 428.

Lac author, French Jesuit, who was born at Castres in 1605, and died in 1684, is noted as the author of several works on the history of his country. See General Biographical Dictionary, s. v.

Lace (ényqu, putth), from being twisted, the blue cord with which the high-priest's breastplate was attached to the ephod (Exod. xxvii, 28, 57; xxxix, 21, 31; rendered "ribbon" Numb. xvi, 38); spoken of gold "wire" (Exod. xxvii, 21) which the chasubl for attaching a cover to its vessel ("bound," Numb. xix, 15); a strong "thread" of tow (Judg. xvi, 9), or measuring:—line of flax (Ezek. xii, 3); also of the string by which the signet-ring was suspended in the bosom ("bracelet"); Gen. xxvii, 18, 53; finally (Achab, a spot thread, like putth above, for which it stands in Numb. xv, 36), a cord (Eccles. vi, 30).

Lacedemonian (λακεδαιμόνιος, 2 Macc. v, 9; elsewhere Σπαρτιάς), an inhabitant of Lacedemon or Sparta, in Greece, with whom the Jews at one time claimed kindred (1 Macc. xii, 2, 5, 6, 20, 21; xiv, 20, 29; xv, 22). See SPAR.

Lacey, William B., D.D., a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born about 1781. He entered the ministry in 1813 as missionary of Chenango County, N. Y.; in 1818 he became rector of St. Peter's Church, Albany. He labored there upwards of twenty years, his ministry being crowned with great success. Subsequently he became professor in the University of Pennsylvania, and president of a college at Laceyville, Pa. He died October 31, 1866. Dr. Lacey wrote a number of text-books for schools and colleges which were deservedly popular in their day, particularly his Rhetoric and Moral Philosophy. During the last ten years of his life he employed his leisure hours in revising a History of the English Church prior to the Time of the Monk Augustin, and some of his choicest sermons and other MSS. See Am. Ch. Rev. 1867, p. 641.

La Chaise or La Chaise d'Aix, François de, Père, a celebrated French Jesuit and noted confessor. Louis XIV. was born of a noble family at the castle of Aix Aug. 25, 1634. He was educated at the College of Roanne, became a Jesuit, and afterwards went to complete his studies at Lyons, where he subsequently taught philosophy with great success. Having been appointed professor of theology, he was soon called away from Lyons to direct the establishment of his order at Grenoble, but almost immediately returned with the office of provincial. Finally, on the death of father Ferrier, he succeeded him as confessor of the king in 1675. Madame de Montespan was then at the height of her favor, and all the efforts of father Ferrier, Bourdaloue, Bossuet, and
LA CHAPELLE

Mascaron had proved ineffective against her. La Chaise proved no more cautiously than his predecessors, and proved much more successful. Never directly contradicting his royal penitent, he knew how to gain him to his views by slow but steady advances. Whenever he saw the king disposed to throw off his easy yoke, he would feign sickness and seek the privacy of the palace to the king, who, being positively refused absolution once by father Deschamps, would, after such experiments, submit the more readily to the witty Jesuit. The latter, moreover, was an agreeable companion as well as an easy confessor. Madame de Montespain, who was by proxy of La Chaise and Madame de Maintenon, retired finally into a convent. The queen dying a few years afterwards, La Chaise is said to have given the king the idea of a morganatic marriage, and even to have performed the ceremony. Yet, in spite of all he had done for her, Madame de Maintenon (q. v.) does not appear to have ever been very friendly towards the Jesuit; perhaps because he prevented a public recognition of her marriage; perhaps also because she knew that in helping her he had worked only for himself. When Madame de Maintenon found herself in the Saint-Cyr, the Ile de la Cité, Ixassan, and Bollcine were commissioned to revise its rules. The former opposed the rule that teachers should be required to take anything more than the simple vows, and carried his point, though subsequently this was changed, and they became subject to the rule of St. Augustine. All this, however, was vain, and the actions of the king were entirely governed by La Chaise and Madame de Maintenon. Both agreed against the Prot- estants, and their joint efforts brought on the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The Jesuit, indeed, tried to conciliate the king and the pope when the difficulties arose about the declaration of the clergy in 1689, and the famous four propositions, and even appeared more inclined to side with the temporal than with the spiritual monarch; but he again balanced the account by advocating the dragoons as a sure means of reclaiming erring consciences. He died Jan. 20, 1709. In the famous quarrel between Fénelon and Bossuet, La Chaise sided with the former, as far as he dared without offending the king. He even affected great regard for Quarrel, though, when it is remembered that he caused the works of that writer to be condemned, the sincerity of his professions may be doubted; but it was his principle to attack individuals, not parts, and he therefore found it convenient, as a true Jesuit, to praise men whom, on account of their very principles, he secretly sought to destroy. See Jansenism; Jesuits. He was a shrewd, practical Jesuit, a clever, and did much, if not in his order, but where La Chaise cannot be doubted either as a great man or as a good priest. The kindred custom ever made on his character is that by Voltaire, who speaks of him as "a mild person, with whom the ways of conciliation were always open." He obtained the king's protection for the College of Clermont, since called Col- lege Louis-le-Grand, and received for his order a fine estate to which his name was given, and which is now the cemetery of "Père la Chaise" at Paris. He wrote *Peripatetic quadruplificans philosophiae Plutarca rationalis,* etc. (Lyons, 1661, 2 vols., fol.); *De la cumulatio Propositionum propugnativa Logiani in collegio Soc. Jesu* (Lyons, 1662, fol.); *Réponse à quelques difficultés propo- sées à un théologien,* etc. (Lyons, 1666, 4to); see also Saint-Simon, *Mémoires; Madame de Maintenon, Correspondance*; Voltaire, *Sacre de Louis XIV;* Bonnaud, *Histoire de l'Édit de Nantes;* Jeuris, *La charte du IIIr de France,* etc. *Sismondi, Histoire des Français, vol. xxv, xxvi, and xxvii;* Régis de Chantelauze, *Le Père de la Chaise* (Lyons, 1859, 8vo); Hoefer, *Now. Biog. Générale,* xxvii, 488. See Louis XIV.

La Chapelle, ARMAND BOISSELAIR DE, a French Protestant writer, was born at Orliac (Saintonge) in 1767. He was at the court of Louis XIV when the revocation of the Edict of Nantes obliged him to retire to England, where he was received by his grandfather, pastor of the Walloon Church at London. In 1694 he was ordained, and soon afterwards sent to Ireland. Subsequently he became successively pastor of Wandsworth, in the neighborhood of London, in 1696; of the chapel of the French army in that town in 1717; priest of the Sir John Aquarium Church of the Hague in 1725. He died August 6, 1746. He wrote *Réflexions au sujet d'un système prétendu nouveau sur le mystère de la Trinité* (Amst. 1729, 8vo) — *Examen de la manière de prêcher des Protéstants Français,* etc. (Amst. 1730, 8vo) — *Réponse à M. Mainard, ancien pasteur de l'église de la Madeleine,* in accordance with the *Examen de la religion,* etc. (La Haye, 1730, 4to) — *Entretien au sujet de la Lettre d'un Théologien sur le mystère de la Trinité* (La Haye, 1780, 8vo) — *Lettre d'un théologien Réformé à un gentilhomme Luthérien* (Amst. 1762, 2 vols. 12mo): it is also known under the title *Lettre sur l'usage du papier de contrebande,* etc. *Ministère de la Pologne,* etc. (Lond. 1789, 12mo) — *Description des cérémonies observées à Rome depuis la mort de Clément XII jusqu'au couronnement de Benoît XIV* (Paris, 1741, 12mo) — *De la Nécessité de culte public pour les protestants* (Frankfort, 1747, 2 vols. 12mo; translated into Dutch, Amst. 1748, 8vo; into German, Breslau, 1749, 8vo; Lpz. 1769, 8vo). It is a defence of the course of the French Protestants in holding their assemblies, *as is seen in the spirit of the edicts of the king* — *Vie de Beaunaure* (in Beaunaure's *Remarques sur le livre de M. de la Chaise sur la Bibliothèque Anglaise,* ou histoire littéraire de la Grande-Bretagne (Amst. 1717—17, 15 vol. 12mo) — *Bibliothèque raisonnée des Oeuvres des Saratins de l'Europe* (Amst. 1728—38, 52 vols. 12mo) — *Nouvelle Bibliothèque,* ou histoire littéraire des principes auxiliaires qui se publient (La Haye, 1788 sqq., 19 vols. 12mo). He also translated into French some works of Dition, Steele, Bentley, and Burnet. See Quérard, *La France Littéraire;* Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, *Now. Biog. Général,* xxvii, 607. (J. N. F.)

Lachish (Heb. לֶחֶשׁ, לָכִישׁ,* prob. improbable, otherwise omitted; Sept. in Josh. and Kings; LXX, also in Chron., Neh., and Jer. Arabic v. r. Arabic; in Isa. Arabic v. r. Arabic or Arabic; in Mic. Arabic; Josephus Arabic; Ant. viii, 10, 1; also Arabic, Ant. ix, 9, 8), a Canaan- itish royal city (Josh. xii, 11) in the southern part of Palestine, whose king Japhia joined the Amoritic confederacy of the Philistines against Israel. (Josh. x, 5; 2 Sam. v, 25), and his city destroyed by the victorious Israelites, in spite of the re-enforcement of the king of Gezer (Josh. xvi, 38—55, where its great strength is de- noted by the two days' assault). See Joshua. From these local statements it appears to have been situated be- tween Libnah and Eglon; but it is mentioned between Joktheel and Bokhzah, among the cities of the Philis- tine valley or plain of Judah (Josh. xv, 89). It is men- tioned in connection with Adormis and Azakh as hav- ing been rebuilt, or rather fortified, by Nebuchad- nezzar, at the downfall of the kingdom of Judah (Jer. xxxiv, 7). It was reoccupied after the exile (Neh. xi, 80). The affright occasioned by these sudden attacks was probably caused by the prophet Micah and Nahum. This city, lying not very far from the frontiers of the king- dom of Israel, appears to have been the first to intro- duce the idolatry of that commonwealth into Judah. A detailed representation of the siege of some large Jew- ish city by Semramboh has been discovered on the re- cently discovered monuments of Assyria, which are now called Lachisha, and presumed to be Lachish (Layard's
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Ninveh and Babylon, p. 153), although it does not appear from the Biblical account that this city yielded to his arms; indeed, some expressions would almost seem to imply the reverse (see "thought to win them," 2 Chron. xxxii, 1; "departed from Lachish," 2 Kings xix, 8; and especially Jer. xxxiv, 7). Col. Rawlinson even reads the name of the city in question on the monuments as Lubana, i.e. Libnah (Layard, ut sup, p. 153, note). Rawlinson also thinks that on the first attack at least Sennacherib did not sack the city (Herodotus, i, 469, note 6). At all events, it would seem that, after the subjugation of Hezekiah, Sennacherib in some way reduced Lachish, and marched in force against the Egyptians (Joseph. Ant. x, 1, 1; comp. Isa. xx, 1-4). Rawlinson maintains (Herodotus, i, 477) that Sennacherib attacked Lachish a second time, but whether on his return from his Egyptian campaign, or after he had paid a visit to Nineveh, cannot now be determined. See Hezekiah. It is specially mentioned that he laid siege to it "with all his power" (2 Chron. xxxii, 9), and here "the great king" himself remained, while his officers only were dispatched to Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxxii, 9; 2 Kings xix, 17). See Sennacherib. This siege is considered by Layard and Hincks to be depicted on the slabs found by the former in one of the chambers of the palace at Kouyunji, which bear the inscription "Sennacherib, the mighty king, king of the country of Assyria, sitting on the throne of judgment before (or at the entrance of) the city of Lachish (Lakhish) I give permission for its slaughter" (Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 149-52, and 158, note). These slabs contain a view of a city which, if the inscription is correctly interpreted, must be Lachish itself. The bas-reliefs depict the capture of an extensive city defended by double walls, with battlements and towers, and by fortified outworks. The country around is represented as hilly and wooded, producing the fig and the vine. Immense preparations had evidently been made for the siege, and in no other

sculptures were so many armed warriors drawn up in array against a besieged city, which was defended with equal determination. The process of the assault and sack are given in the most minute and lively manner. The spoil and captives are exhibited in full, the latter distinguished by their Jewish physiognomy, and by the pillaged condition of their garments. On a throne in front of the city is represented the Assyrian king giving orders for the disposal of the prisoners, several of whom are depicted as already in the hands of the executioners, some being stretched naked on the ground in order to be flayed alive, while others were slain by the sword. (See Layard's Monuments of Nineveh, 2d series, plates 20-24.) See Captives.

Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v.) state that in their time Lachish was a village seven miles south
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and was educated in the college at Tarbes, which he entered in 1766. In 1788 he became rector of a college at Bordeaux, but energetically embracing the principles of the Revolution in 1789, he solemnly declared in favor of separation of Church and State, and was elected in consequence to the Jacobin Club of Bordeaux. Sent to the National Assembly, he took quite a prominent part in politics until the decreal prohibiting all ecclesiastical dress was published (April 7, 1792), when he forthwith ceased his service to the state, and returned to Bordeaux to assume the duties of his ecclesiastical functions. In 1796 he was elected metropolitan of Bordeaux, and in 1802 was one of the twelve bishops nominated by the emperor Napoleon, as whose zealous partisan Lacombe is known after his elevation to the episcopacy of Angoulême. He died April 7, 1823. See Ammon de la Religion, xvi, 194; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxviii, 541.

Lacordaire, Jean Baptiste Henri, a noted Roman Catholic theologian of this century, the reviver of the Dominican order, and a most distinguished pulpit orator of modern France, was born at Receu-sur-Dourve, in the department Côte-d'Or, March 13, 1812. He was educated for the legal profession, first at Dijon, where he obtained the highest honors, and afterwards (1822) at Paris, and in 1824 he began practice as an advocate, and rose rapidly to distinction. Lacordaire was at this time, like many of the youth of France, a Deist of the Voltairean school, and in 1825 they were accused of practicing a system which, with all that was taught in France. A short time after the papal see declared itself opposed to them by an encyclical censure which Gregory XVI issued Sept. 18, 1822. Rejecting all their dogmas, it declared "the whole idea of the regeneration of the Church absurd, liberty of conscience, freedom of the press fatal, and inviolable submission to the prince a maxim of faith." Even before this papal censure had been publicly proclaimed the three chief editors of L'Ami were driven to Rome, to prevent, if possible, any severe measures on the part of the French government. At this time, poor Lacordaire was reduced to turn from the corruptions of Rome—from the corpse which he saw clearly it was vain to attempt to resuscitate. Not so, however, was Lacordaire affected. His imagination had been vividly impressed by the imposing ceremonies and glorious traditions of the Roman Church, and he was prepared to submit to it "sicut cadaver." The miserable, the infamous, says Montalembert, in his biography of Lacordaire, "inseparable from the mingling of everything human with that which is divine, did not escape his notice, but they seemed to him as if lost in the curious and wonderful of tradition and authority. He the journalist, the citizen of 1820, he the democratic liberal, had comprehended at the first glance not only the inviolable majesty of the supreme pontificate, but its difficulties, its long and patient designs, its indispensable regard for men and things here below. The faith and the duty of the Catholic priest had at once elevated that noble heart above all the mists of pride, above all the seductions, all the temptations of talent, above all the intoxication of strife. With the penetration which faith and humility confer, he passed beforehand upon our pretensions the judgment which has been ratified by time, that great auxiliary of the Church and of truth. It was then, I venture to believe, that God marked him forever with the seal of his grace, and that he gave him the assurance of the reward due to the invincible fidelity of a truly priestly soul." Hereafter no man Lacordaire is lost in the churchman, the active and inquiring intellect confined, if not extinguished, by the official religion. His bonâ fide retraction of course drew upon him not only estrangement from his master, whose influence on the moral philosophy he had never really lost, but whose retraction was never more than formal, but the reproach of worldliness. It was due in reality, however, to a precisely opposite cause. His heart was identified with the cause of the Church, and only his intellect with the Free-Church theory. "Do not let us
chain our hearts to our ideas," he said quite earnestly:
and he evidently felt the delight in submission which always accompanies a sacrifice of self for something one thinks higher and better than self. He thought he had discovered that metaphysical philosophy in the view of his master, Lamennais, and this he had, he said, often gilded and fretted him. He believed that the Church, in condemning Lamennais and his school, had delivered him (Lacordaire) "from the most terrible of all oppressions, that of the human intellect," and henceforth, though tender and respectful to his mother in the adversity of papal disfavor, he really loved the Church the better for having humbled himself before her decision, just as he would have loved God better for having bowed his own self-will to the divine volition. The Church was higher than the intellect. If the spirit, he fancied, had gained in vital power by humbling his own intellect before the mind of the Church. And so he embraced the first opportunity that presented itself to convince the papal see of his sincerity. Lamennais had just appeared before the public in his Paroles d'un croquant, and the book was selling extensively, and finding a very large circle of readers. Here was an opportunity to break a lance in defence of Rome; and, though the attack in this instance had to be directed even against his own former master, he hesitated not to extend it to the book itself. He asked it of Lamennais by his Considerations sur le systeme philosophique de M. Lamennais, a work which proved a total failure, and which Montalembert, the associate of Lacordaire—his bosom apostate from Lamennais—was obliged to admit as having been anything but successful. New honors, notwithstanding, soon sought out the devoted adherent to the cause of the Ultramontanes, first (in 1833 and 1835) in the offer of the editorship of the journal L'Univers, then lately established to further the Ultramontane principles, and later in the proffer of a professor's chair at the University of Paris. He desired him to take these the pulpit and the convent cell he had decided should be his future place of resort, "to speak and to write, to live a solitary and studious life!" he says in a letter of 1835, "such is the wish of my whole soul."

In the spring of 1836 he preached for the first time in public. It was in the great church of St. Roch, in Paris. "I was there," says M. Montalembert, "with MM. de Courcelles, Amprere, and some others, who must remember it as I do. He failed completely, and, coming out, every one said, 'This is a man of talent, but he never will be a preacher.' Lacordaire's attitude toward himself was very much like that of Sheridan, D'Israeli, Robert Hall, and many other orators—an incentive to become great. In the beginning of 1834 he delivered his famous Conferences in the College Stanislas, the humblest of the colleges of Paris, where he had been appointed as lecturer to the students, and where his failure at St. Roch was now recompensed by a great success, his audience oftentimes amounting to from 500 to 600 persons. In the year following (1835) we find him installed preacher at Notre Dame, and for once it was acknowledged that "France had a living preacher who knew how to fascinate the intellect, kindle the imagination, and touch the heart of the most cultivated and of the most illiterate. Whenever Lacordaire was announced to preach in Notre Dame the cathedral was surrounded, long before the doors were open, by an immense and heterogeneous crowd. Before he appeared in the pulpit, the vast nave, the aisles, and the side chapels were thronged with statesmen and journalists, members of the Academy and tradesmen, working-men and high-born women, sceptics, socialists, devout Catholics and resolute Protestants, who were all compelled to surrender themselves for that time to the irresistible torrent of his eloquence" (H. R. Dale, in Contemporary Review, May, 1869, p. 2).

Only two years after his appointment to Notre Dame, Lacordaire suddenly fixed the wonder of the multitude again upon him by relinquishing the career of distinguished
he returned by preference to such as spared him least. His thist for penances of this description appears the more extraordinary from the fact that his exceedingly delicate and sensitive temperament rendered them incomparably painful to him. "To Protestants this sounds like the rehearsal of an unreal moral tragedy, a rehearsal which they must listen to because it concerns the lives of those who were guilty of these artificial, cruel, and ummeaning insults to one they loved and revered than to deepen his own love for his Lord. Yet in scenes like these were fostered the roots of his life as a Dominican friar—the spirit less of a modern Catholic thinker than of a medieval monk. But if his change to a monastic seclusion from the turmoils of Paris life must appear strange to a Protestant reader, greater still will ever be the task to explain how this advocate of liberty of conscience and the impropriety of the interference of the civil power for the punishment of heretics could find it in his heart to resuscitate an order which has more crimes and cruelties to answer for than even the infamous sect of the Assassins—an order whose founder was the very incarnation of persecution. Just here also it may not be of place to adjoin to the uncanonical manner in which Lacordaire composed a life of St. Dominic—the founder of the Inquisition—entirely ignoring all those historians who have detailed and proved the atrocios cruelties perpetrated by that saint and his followers (Ve de Saint Dominique, Paris, 1840-4, 8vo).

But this novel view of the novita of the convent of Querica, Lacordaire took the vows of the order of St. Dominick, and in 1841, with shaved head and clad in the white robe of his order, which had not been seen in France for half a century, he once more ascended the pulpit of Notre Dame. From this time his voice was frequently heard within the walls of that great cathedral of the capital of the French, as well as in many other parts of France. Thus, in 1847, he preached in the cathedral church of Nancy the funeral sermon of general Drouot, by many (e.g. Ste-Beuve) pronounced a masterpiece of pulpit oratory. In the first election which succeeded the Revolution of 1848 he was chosen one of the representatives of Marseille, and took part in some of the debates in the Assembly; but he resigned in the following May, and withdrew entirely from political life. In 1849, and again in 1850 and 1851, he resumed his courses at Notre Dame. To immense audiences, such as no orator in France had ever been able to call together before, he delivered in these eventful years a series of discourses on the communion of man with God, on the fall and the restoration of man, and on the return of the repentant sinner. Together with earlier discourses, have been collected in three volumes, under the title of Conférences de Notre Dame de Paris (1855-50; a selection was published in English dress by Henry Langdon, N. York, 1871, 8vo). His last public discourse at Paris he delivered at St. Roch in February, 1853. To some of his remarks the imperial government took exception; and Lacordaire, finding himself restricted in that freedom of speech of which he had throughout life been a steady and powerful friend, never again preached in Paris; but at Toulouse—the birthplace of St. Dominick, and the sepulchre of St. Aquin—he delivered in 1854 six discourses on life—the life of the passions, the moral life, the supernatural life, and the influence of the supernatural life on the public and private life of man—which his biographer (Montalembert) pronounces "the most eloquent, the most irreproachable of all." Offered the direction of the school and convent of Sorèze, he withdrew to that noted retreat of the Dominicans, and there died, Nov. 21, 1861. Besides the works alluded to—the Conférences and Considerations philosophiques—Lacordaire wrote also a notable livre pour le rétablissement de l'Institution de l'Ordre des frères prêcheurs (1840). His correspondence with Madame Swetichine (by Falloux, 1864), with Montalembert (1853), and with a young friend (by Lafbèr Perriere, 1865), as well as all his other writings, were published as Œuvres complètes in 1851, 1858, and 1861, in 5 vols. 8vo and 12mo. He was elected a member of the Academy in 1860 as successor to M. de Toqueville, upon whom he pronounced a eulogy—the customary in- augural address—which was his last public address.

Of the ability Lacordaire displayed in his works as a writer in the Æsop, the Jourdain, and the Fables of La Fontaine, 732 sq., thus comments: "As a writer, Lacordaire has not the slightest pretentions to compete with Lamennais, one of the greatest writers of French prose. His loose, declamatory, theatrical style is in every respect inferior to the simple, grand, nervous eloquence of Lamennais. We also venture to affirm that, in too many of his discourses, instead of explaining the Word of God simply and familiarly to the people, he goes out of his way to attack what he terms the prevailing doubt and scepticism of the age, and attempts to guide his hearers to a positive divine faith by the utter annihil- ation of the natural reason. In many of his discourses, too, he falsifies history for the purpose of making it coincident with his Romanist prejudices. He absolutely refuses to recognise any good whatever in former sys- tems of religion and philosophy. Without the pale of the Romish Church all is evil, within it everything is good. As to human reason, he cannot endure it. 'That which at present ruins everything,' he says, 'that which causes the world to ride insecurely at anchor, is the reason.' 'Our intelligence appears to me like a ship without sail, without ballast, without a compass. The Societies are tottering when the thinkers take them in hand, and the precise moment of their downfall is that wherein they announced to them that the intellect is emanci- pated.' And while human reason is thus summarily condemned, the infallibility of the Church is asserted and defended in the most absolute manner. 'The Catho- lic doctrine,' he says, 'resolves all questions, and takes from them even the quality of questions. We have no longer to reason, which is a great blessing, for we are not here to reason, but to act, and to build up in time a work for eternity.'" See Montalembert, Le Père Lacordaire (Paris, 1862, 8vo); Loménie, Le Père Lacordaire (1844); Lorrain, Biographie historique de Lacordaire (1847); Chocharne, Inner Life of Père Lacordaire (transl. by Father Ayl- ward); Lord, and New York, 1867, 8vo); Villard, Correspondance inédite et biographie (Par. 1870, 8vo); Kirwan, Modern France (1853); and the Revue des Deux Mondes, May 1, 1864; Sainte-Beuve, Caucesseries du Lundi, i, 208 sq.; Brux. and For. Rec. Rec. Oct. 1863, art. iii.; Contempora- rary Rec. May, 1869, art. i.; M. Edmond Schérer, in the Livre de lecture, 2d ed., 1857, 8vo); M. Jules Cot, La vertu de l'esprit de religion, also treated of Père Lacoro- daire, with special regard to his ability as a writer. His estimate of the noted Dominican is rather unfavorable, perhaps even unjust. Of the discourses of Lacordaire, he maintains that they are "unreadable" (p. 100). See also Blackwood's Magazine, Feb. 1869; Lond. Quart. Review, July, 1864. (J. H. W.)

Lacordaire, Claudius, a noted Roman Catholic theologian and philosopher, was born at the village of St. Andre, province of Limburg, in 1652. He became master of philosophy in 1673, and immediately after joined the Order of Jesuits. He taught moral theology first at Coline, then at Louvain; became doctor of theology in 1698, and died June 1, 1714. He wrote a commentary on Busenbaum's Moral Theology (Colo, 1719, 2 vols. folio). See Busenbaum.

Lacrosse, Mathurin Véronière de, a distinguished French Orientalist, was in turn a merchant, a medical student, and a Benedictine monk. Finally, having abjured Rome, he retired to Prussia, and in 1782 he became librarian to the king. He died at Berlin in 1789. His principal works are Histoire du Christianisme des Indes (La Haye, 1724, sm. 8vo): — Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie et d'Afranie (La Haye, 1789, sm. 8vo). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. x.v.

Lactantius. Lucius Cелиlus (or Cėliulus) Fir-
LACTANTIUS

MELANIUS, one of the early Latin fathers, called by Jerome (Cedit, c. 80) the most learned man of his time, and, on account of the fine and rhetorical culture which his writings evince, not unfrequently named the Christian Cicero (or, as Jerome has it, "Fluvius eloquentiae Tullianae"), was formerly supposed to have been by birth an African but is now generally believed to have been of Italian birth, a native of Fiumum (Fermo), on the Adriatic, Italy. He was born probably near the middle of the 3d century; his parents, according to his own account, were heathens, and he only became a Christian at a somewhat mature age (comp. De Ira Div. c. 2; Inst. Div. vii. 2), certainly before the Diocletian persecution. Lactantius pursued his rhetorical studies in the school of the celebrated rhetorician and orator Arnobius of Sicca, in proconsular Africa, and it is thus, in all probability, that arose the notion that Lactantius was of African birth. While yet a youth Lactantius gained celebrity by the publication of a poetical work called Symposion, a collection of a hundred riddles in hexameters for table amusement. But it was that which secured him really great renown, and he was heard of by Diocletian, and by him called to Nicomedia as professor of Latin eloquence. This city was, however, inhabited and visited mainly by Greeks, and Lactantius found but few pupils to instruct. This afforded him plenty of leisure, and he welcomed it as an opportunity to devote himself largely to authorship. Thus he continued for ten years, when the Christians were not only persecuted by the emperors with fire and sword, but also assailed by the heathen philosophers with the weapons of science, wit, and ridicule. Against so many outrages Lactantius felt impelled to undertake the defence of the hated and despised religion, and the more as he thought he had observed that they proceeded, at least in part, from ignorance and gross misunderstanding. It was during this defence of Christianity, in all probability, that he became himself a convert to the true faith, and thus may it be accounted for that Constantine called him to his court in Gaul as preacher (after 812 says Dr. Schaff, Ch. Hist. iii. 356) of his son Crispus, whom Constantine afterwards (326) caused to be put to death. Eusebius tells us that even in this exalted position he remained so poor as often to want for the necessities of life. He must have been quite old when he arrived in Gaul, for he is then already spoken of as a gray-haired old man, and he is supposed to have died at the imperial residence in Treves shortly after his pupil Crispus, about 330. It has often been a matter of great perplexity to antiquarians to account for the long period of time that Lactantius escaped suffering during the Diocletian persecution. Some think, and this seems to be reasonable, that Lactantius escaped suffering for his faith because he was generally regarded as a philosopher, and not as a Christian writer; and, indeed, to judge from his De Opificio Dei, he appears to have been more attracted by the moral and philosophical aspects of Christianity than by the supernatural and the dogmatic. In fact, in all the theological works of Lactantius is manifest the influence of his early studies of all the masterpieces of ancient rhetoric and philosophy, and he borrows, like many other Christian publicists of his time, from Seneca. (Comp. on the inclination of the early Christian teachers in the Roman empire to style themselves "philosophers," Brit. Quart. Rev. July, 1871, p. 9, col. 1.) Jerome even says of him (Epist. 85, ad Pammalinum [alas 84 ad Epiphanum].) "Lactantius wrote seven books against the Goths, and two volumes on the work and the anger of God. If you wish to read these treatises, you will find them in a compendium of Cicero's Dialogues." He had entered more deeply into Christian morals than into Christian metaphysics, and his works offer none of those learned and accurate discussions of the dogmas which we find in Clement of Alexandria or in Origen. Lactantius, however, has been called, as we already hinted, the Christian Cicero, on account of his resemblance to this celebrated classical writer in the elegance and finish of his style, but still more on account of having made himself the advocate and propagator of the great moral truth of Christianity, while carefully avoiding all dogmatic speculation: thus also did Cicero advocate all the great practical truths of the best philosophical systems of antiquity, but set little store by whatever was purely religious. In learning and culture Lactantius excelled all the men of his time; in the words of Jerome, he was "omnia suo tempore eruditissimus." His writings betray a noble unconsciousness which forgets itself in striving to reach its lofty aim. The morality of his claims and the estimate of himself is exhibited and embodied in the facts of his life. Although at the court of the great emperor Constantine, and by his position invited to luxurious indulgence, he voluntarily preferred a poverty which not only excluded superfluities, but also often dispensed with the necessities of life. Some have represented that he pushed his austerity even to an unauthorized extreme. "I shall think that I have sufficiently lived," he writes, "and that I have sufficiently fulfilled the office of a man, if my labor shall have freed any of their errors, and directed them in the way to heaven." Lactantius was a layman and a rhetorician, and yet he displays in his writings in general—and they were not few—such a depth and extent of theological knowledge as could scarcely have been expected. It is surprising that any one raised to the imperial throne could have become conversant with so many intricate subjects. Warmth of feeling, richness of thought, and clearness of apprehension are impressed upon all his literary productions. His expressions are always lucid, considerate, and well arranged. Nowhere does the reader feel an unpleasant tone of pedantry or affectation; everywhere he is attracted by the impress of genuine learning and eloquence. In harmony and purity of style, in beauty and elegance of expression, he excels all the fathers of Christian antiquity, if we except Ambrose in some of his letters, and Sulpicius Severus. His reputation in this respect was so celebrated in the earliest times that men loved to call him the Christian Cicero. So much for form and diction. The case is quite otherwise with the exposition of the peculiar doctrines of Christianity in detail. In the midst of admirable philosophical developments, with other writers of this class, we meet with many mistakes, many erroneous views and half-truths, for which Gelasa classed his writings with the Apocrypha. If the judgment above expressed is thus, in some measure, modified, yet is his merit not much diminished. That is to say, there are mistakes in Lactantius which are absent in the earlier writers before him, and which the Church had not yet distinctly excluded by a more precise definition of the doctrines in question. What strikes us more unpleasantly is that we miss the establishment of Christianity by proof from its own dogmas, which he himself had professed to give; we sympathize with Jerome in the wish, "Utinam tam nostra confirmare potuisset, quam facile aliena distinxisset." Dr. Schaff gives the following summary of the doctrinal views of Lactantius (Church Hist. iii. 957): "His historical mistakes and errors in the exposition of Christian doctrine do not amount to heresies, but are mostly due to the crude and unsettled state of the Church doctrine at the time. In the doctrine of sin he borders upon Manichæism. In anthropology and soteriology he follows the sympathy which, until Augustine, was almost universal, that the doctrine of the fall was the way in which he was, like most of the ante-Nicene fathers, a subordinationist. He taught a duplex nativitas of Christ, one at the creation, and one at the incarnation. Christ went forth from God at the creation as a word from the mouth, yet hypostasis is Christ. Works.—We will briefly notice his works in order: 1. Dic turnover Institutionum, libri vii (Divine Institutes, seven books), a comprehensive apology for the Christian religion, which, on account of the elegant style in which
it is written, has been favorite reading, and is said to have appeared in more than a hundred editions. His most important work is the "Divinae institutae," where he attempts to prove by argument, authority, and authority to develop from the holy Scriptures the history of the creation and of the origin of idolatry. According to him, this originated in its first germ from Ham, who lay under his father's curse. Among his posteriority the loss of the knowledge of the true God first prevailed; this passed over into Semiramis and Pachomius, the procreation of the heavenly bodies spread itself in this form. In Egypt, and thence among the neighboring people. In its further progress it included the deliteration of men, an externally pompous worship, and finally developed itself into idolatry proper, which, cherished and promoted by the influence of demons, and the heathenism of other arts, by oracles, magic, etc., leavened the whole life of the pagan nations. The truth of this intimate connection of the demon realm with the heathen polytheistic worship, and with the phenomena pertaining thereto, lies visibly before us, says Lactantius, in the Christian power of exorcism; and with this he concludes.

The third book, De falsa sapientia, exposes the heathen philosophy as nugatory and false. The etymology of the word philosophy indicates, says he, not the possession of instruction, but a striving after honor, reverence, and praise as the first Christian prince, and the restorer of righteousness. Consequently, it was written at the time when he advanced, in years, was already at court; but the Church was still suffering under a severe persecution, evidently that of Licinius, since the author refers to that of Diocletian as having long since died out. This brings us to the year 320, although he had, as elsewhere appears from his own words, formed the purpose and the plan at a much earlier period. Some suppose that the work was commenced in Bithynia and completed in the course of twenty years. Others, from an allusion which it contains to the Diocletianian persecution—"Spectate sunt enim spectanturque adhuc per orbem ponere culturam Dei," etc. (v. 17, § 5), suppose it to have been written before Lactantius went to Gaul.

The seven books into which this work is divided form seven separate treatises. The first book is inscribed De falsa religione. He designates leaves untouched the principal question in regard to the existence of a supreme Providence, and takes up the proposition from the God, and that, according to his, he uses more in his programme than in his performance; and which, indeed, would have been only a pettish prin- ciples of his relations in this world under him, and of that to him, there can be but one. He proceeds then to confirm this dogma by the authority of the prophets (of which, however, he makes more use in his programme than in his performance; and which, indeed, would have been only a pettish prin- ciples of his relations in this world under him, and of that to him, there can be but one. He proceeds then to confirm this dogma by the authority of the prophets (of which, however, he makes more use in his programme than in his performance; and which, indeed, would have been only a pettish prin- ciples of his relations in this world under him, and of that to him, there can be but one. He proceeds then to confirm this dogma by the authority of the prophets (of which, however, he makes more use in his programme than in his performance; and which, indeed, would have been only a pettish prin- ciples of his relations in this world under him, and of that to him, there can be but one. He proceeds then to confirm this dogma by the authority of the prophets (of which, however, he makes more use in his programme than in his performance; and which, indeed, would have been only a pettish prin-
came trooping in, but with Christ a kind of golden age has again appeared through the propagation of righteousness. He further shows how near this lies to all, and that only through wilfulness it can fail to be known; and how the heathen, in open contradiction to the idea of religion, to reason, and to every sentiment of right, hate the Christians, and persecute and torment them even to the death. Were the Christians fools, one should spare them; if wise, imitate them. That they are the latter is made clear by their virtuous behavior and their withering denunciation of sin, and how they may have been led in the wisdom and righteousness of God condescend to clothe themselves in the appearance of folly, partly that thus the wisdom of the world may be convinced of its nothingness, and partly that the righteous man may be helped forward on the narrow way to his reward. The pretexts offered by the heathen in justification of their treatment of the Christians, as that they sought to bring them to a sober mind, etc., were, he maintains, utterly empty, because, in the first place, this treatment was in itself unsuitable, and, in respect to the Christians, who knew very well how to defend themselves, it was contemptuous and destructive of its own object; but, in the second place, these pretexts were contradicted and falsified by the Romans' contrary practice of toleration towards other and extremely despicable and senseless religions. Rather it was abundantly clear that nothing had happened there but an assault against this man who had impelled to those bloody deeds of violence and cruelty.

The sixth book, De vero cultu, treats of the practical side of true religion. A merely external worship, like that of the heathen, is absolutely worthless, and only that is true in which the human soul offers itself to God. As all the philosophers agree in saying there are seven ways for man, one of virtue, the other of vice; the former narrow and toilsome, leading to immortality; the latter easy and pleasant, leading to destruction; the Christians call them the way to heaven and to hell, and eagerly desire the former, and at the last they may attain the enjoyment of the blessedness in which it ends. The philosophers could not find the way of virtue, because at the outset they had formed to themselves an utterly different idea of good and evil, and therefore always sought it where it is never to be found—on earth instead of in heaven. The Christians, who walk in the light of revelation, have the clue of the truth, the eternal, unchangeable law of God, adapted to the nature of man, which unfolds our duties both towards God (officia pietatis) and towards man (officia humanitatis). Lactantius' view of the treatment of the heathen who were embraced in the fundamental principle of genuine humanity—pity, liberality, care for the widow, the orphan, the sick, the dead, etc.; finally, of self-government and the moderation of the desires and appetites, particularly of chastity in wedlock and out of it; and, last of all, of penitence or penance (penitentiae), and the true service of God. The former he treats as a satisfaction, and in the latter he does not rise above the merely ethical, Rationalistic position, although, through his whole exposition, he makes references, by way of contrast, to the divergent views of the philosophers.

The seventh and last book, De vita beata, has for its subject the chief end of man. He gives us briefly his own conception of the great end of our existence, thus: "The world was made that we might be born; we are born that we might know the Creator of the world and of ourselves; we know him through him who honors him: we honor him that we may receive immortality as the reward of our effort, because the honoring of God demands the highest effort; we are rewarded with immortality, that we, like the angels, may forever serve the supreme Father and model, and may form the image of God to all who are ever-during kingdom: that is the sum and substance of all things, the secret of God, the mystery of the world." After this follows the proof of the immortality of the soul, pursued through ten distinct arguments, with the refutation of objections. He then proceeds with an attempt to show under what condition the natural immortality of the soul becomes at the same time a blessed immortality. With this he connects his views in regard to the time and the signs of the end of the present world, with the idea, both to the general resurrection and the transformation of this world. On the superabundant delights and glories of the millennium he enlarges with special satisfaction and copious eloquence. In conclusion, he congratulates the Church upon the peace which Constantine has given her, and calls upon all to the worship of idols and to do homage to the one true God.

2. An Epitome of the Institutes, dedicated to Pentadius, is appended to the larger work, and is attributed to Lactantius by Jerome, who describes it as being even in his time disused. All the early editions of this abridgment begin at the sixteenth chapter of the fifth book of the original. But in the 18th century a MS. containing nearly the entire work was discovered in the royal library at Turin, and was published by C. M. Pfaff, chancellor of the University of Tübingen (Paris, 1712). Walchus and others have doubted the genuineness of this Epitome, but Jerome's assertion appears to us conclusive.

3. De Ira Dei (On the Anger of God). It has often been observed how the Greek philosophy, and, following its lead, the heretical Gnostics, could not reconcile justice and mercy, and how they taught that God was so merciful, and awakened in him the thought of proving in this treatise that the abhorrence of evil and primitive justice is necessary and fundamental attributes of the divine Being. In the judgment of Jerome, this work is comparable with equal learning and eloquence. Its date is probably a little later than that of the Institutes.

The system both of the Epicureans and of the Stoics excluded all reaction of God against the wicked. The former, in order not to disturb God's indiff erent repose; the latter, in order not to transfer to the idea of God human passions, thought that at last they may attain the enjoyment of the blessedness in which it ends. The philosophers could not find the way of virtue, because at the outset they had formed to themselves an utterly different idea of good and evil, and therefore always sought it where it is never to be found—on earth instead of in heaven. The Christians, who walk in the light of revelation, have the clue of the truth, the eternal, unchangeable law of God, adapted to the nature of man, which unfolds our duties both towards God (officia pietatis) and towards man (officia humanitatis). Lactantius' view of the treatment of the heathen who were embraced in the fundamental principle of genuine humanity—pity, liberality, care for the widow, the orphan, the sick, the dead, etc.; finally, of self-government and the moderation of the desires and appetites, particularly of chastity in wedlock and out of it; and, last of all, of penitence or penance (penitentiae), and the true service of God. The former he treats as a satisfaction, and in the latter he does not rise above the merely ethical, Rationalistic position, although, through his whole exposition, he makes references, by way of contrast, to the divergent views of the philosophers.

The seventh and last book, De vita beata, has for its subject the chief end of man. He gives us briefly his own conception of the great end of our existence, thus: "The world was made that we might be born; we are born that we might know the Creator of the world and of ourselves; we know him through him who honors him: we honor him that we may receive immortality as the reward of our effort, because the honoring of God demands the highest effort; we are rewarded with immortality, that we, like the angels, may forever serve the supreme Father and model, and may form the image of God to all who are ever-during kingdom: that is the sum and substance of all things, the secret of God, the mystery of the world." After this follows the proof of the immortality of the soul, pursued through ten distinct arguments, with the refutation of objections. He then proceeds with an attempt to show under what condition the natural immortality of the soul becomes at the same time a blessed immortality. With this he connects his views in regard to the time and the signs of the end of the present world, with the idea, both to the general resurrection and the transformation of this world. On the superabundant delights and glories of the millennium he enlarges with special satisfaction and copious eloquence. In conclusion, he congratulates the Church upon the peace which Constantine has given her, and calls upon all to the worship of idols and to do homage to the one true God.
to the church. It gives a very detailed description of several scenes in the persecutions of Nero, Domitian, and Valerian, but especially dwells upon the later times, those of Diocletian and his imperial colleagues Galerius and Maximin, and shows how avenging justice wreaked its vengeance on all. This work, if genuine, furnishes highly important contributions to ecclesiastical history. Among other things, its author, whoever he may be, declares that Peter and Paul preached the Gospel at Rome, and established a temple of God there, where they both suffered martyrdom.

6. Lost Part of the De mortibus persecutorum.—The Survey of Tacianus against his subsequent exhibition of the subject, he proceeds to his proper business, the consideration of the human body as the habitation and organ of the soul. He indulges in a detailed investigation and analysis of its wonderful structure; he shows he uses and symmetry of its several limbs, its adaptation to their corresponding functions, and their admirable connection with the totality of the organism. Hence he establishes, that the Epicureans denied, that a divine creation, and an ordering and guiding providence, are active throughout.

In conclusion (c. 11, 1. 2) the treatise closes by an allusion to the necessity of the soul, upon its distinction from spirit (animal), and, finally, upon its propagation. He here reviews the opposing philosophical theories, and declares himself thoroughly opposed to generationism or trichotomism (c. 17-20). In this treatise he has caught the grand idea, and furnished the leading materials of Pauly's famous teleological argument; and, what is more surprising, has anticipated some of the most striking and comprehensive ideas of modern scientific and zoological classification.

5. De mortibus persecutorum (On Martyrdom).—Le Nourry was of opinion that this treatise does not belong to Tacianus. In the only codex which we have of it, it bears, not the inscription Firmiani Tacianitii, but Lucii Cecelii, which is never given to our author by the ancient writers. We must confess that, without being aware of this judgment of Le Nourry, we had already, upon a careful reading of the treatise, come to the same conclusion from internal evidence. Möhler, on the other hand, maintains its genuineness; in confirmation of which he refers to the facts: (1) that Jerome refers to a work of Tacianus under the name De persecutione, which says he, indicates a similar subject matter; (2) that in the work in question (2) that it is dedicated to a certain Donatus, like that De Ira Dei, and the writer shows himself to have been an eyewitness of the transactions in Nicomedia under Diocletian. These reasons certainly are strong, and in the Bibliotheca Liri, in the Acta Sanctorum, one finds a question whether the Donatus addressed in this treatise as a professor may not have been the first Donatus of beretic notoriety. Möhler further adds that the style is the same as that of Tacianus's other works. From this we must strongly dissent. The style is harsher, more rugged, and bristling with iron—often obscure. It frequently reminds one of Tacitus; whereas the genuine Tacianus rarely departs from an imitation of the clear, smooth, flowing, and copious style of Cicero, whom he had chosen for his special model of eloquence.

In the early editions of Tacianus De mortibus persecutorum is altogether wanting. It was first printed by Stephen Baluze in his Miscellanea, vol. ii (Paris, 1679), from a very ancient MS, in the Bibliotheca Colbertiana. Its authenticity as De persecutione Liber unus of Tacianus, mentioned by Jerome, is maintained by Baluze. He attributes it to the latter part of the first century (Cicero, lib. ii, p. 5, 3; Lugd. Batavorum, ii.; Migne, Patrologia lat., xii, 983); against accepting this treatise to Tacianus are prominent, besides Nourry (in the Acta Sanctorum, in the Acta Sanctorum of Migne edition of Tacianus), Pfaff, Walch, Le Clerc, Lardner, Gibbon, Burckhardt, and others.

The object of this work is to show the truth of the Christian religion historically, from the tragic fate of all those who have persecuted the Church of Christ. It is really the youthful composition of Tacianus. Jerome mentions besides an Itinerarium in hexameters, two books to Actes et Spectacles, eight books of letters to Probus, Severus, and Domitian, all of which are lost. It appears from his own words (Instit. vii. 1, sub fin.) that he had formed the design of drawing up a work against the Jews, but we cannot tell whether he ever accomplished his purpose.

Several of the passages are extant, but which have been erroneously ascribed to Tacianus, are, De Phrenicis, in elegies, a compilation of tales and legends on the famed Arabian bird; it is probably of a later date (see Wermardorff, Poet. Lat. Minore, iii, 283):—Symposium, a collection of one hundred riddles, more likely the work of a certain Cælius Firmianus de Psycha et Fel concede Episcopum, now generally considered as the work of Venantius Honorianus Clementianus Fortunatus, in the 6th century:—De Passione Domini (printed in G. Fabrici- us's Poet. Vet. Eccl. Opus. Christian. Basle, 1654; and in Bibl. Patr. Mediolan. 1677), in hexameters, worthy of Tacianus, but bearing in its language the impress of a much later age.

The Edito Princeptus of Tacianus was printed at the monastery of Sabasico, by Sweynheym and Pannartz, in 1465, and is one of the earliest specimens of typographical art; the same printers published two other editions (Rome, 1465, 1470), the latter under the direction of Andrew, bishop of Aleria. A number of editions have been published since; the most important are by Gallus (Lugd. Bat. 1600, in a series of Variorum Classics, 8vo), Cellarius (Lpz. 1680, 8vo), Waldschitz (Lpz. 1715, 8vo), Heumann (Gent. 1736, 8vo), thienemann (Lpz. 1736, 8vo), Le Brun and Lenglet du Fresnoy (Paris, 1748, 2 vols. 4to), F. E. St. Xavero (Rome, 1754-9), and Migne (Paris, 1844, 2 vols. royal 8vo). A convenient manual edition was prepared by O. F. Fritzsch for Gerndorf's non-vol. xx. See Jerome, De Viris I. p. 79, 80; Chronic. Euseb. ad ann. cevicii, Comment. in Ezech. c. 10; Comment. in Eph. c. 4, Ad Paulinum. Epist.; Lect. Christian. Ininit. i, § 1, v. 2, § 3; iii, 13, § 12; Schröck, Kirchengesch. v. 282; Schwössenmann, Bibl. Patr. Lat. vol. i, § 2; Bahr, Gesch. d. Romischen, vol. i, 9 Abth. § 8; Bahr, Die christlich-röm. Theologie, p. 72 sq.; Francisius Floridus, Subsidiavarum, Lect. liber ii, ch. iv; Linen de Tillemont, Histoire Ecclesi. vol. vii; Dupin, Bibl. des Auteurs eccles., i, 295; Brooke Mountain, A Summary of the Writings of the Latins (Lond. 1839); Möhler, Patrologie, i, 917-933; Ceilier, Hist. des art. sacrés, ii, 494 sq.; Schaff, Ch. Hist. vol. iii, § 173; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 160-163; Christian Review, 1846, p. 418 sq.; Woodham, Terrestrial, p. iii; Leckey, Hist. Europ. Morals, i, 498 sq. Excellent articles may also be found in the Speculum, and especially in the writing of Tacianus, in Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Bibl. i, 701; and Herzog, Rech. Enclycop. viii, 158. On the Christology of Tacianus, consult Dorner, Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. 1, vol. ii, p. 192 sq.; Lamy, The Church in the First Three Centuries, p. 4; Bux, Hist. (Thee, i, Index); Neander, Chr. Dogmas; Zeitschr. f. d. hist. Theol. 1871, vol. iv, art. xiii.
LACTICINIA 190 LADD

Lacticinia, a term used in the Church law of fasts to denote whatever is obtained as an article of food from the mammalia, viz. milk, butter, grease, cheese. Eggs are usually included with these articles. Abstinence from such food was required in the Western Church during Lent, while the more lenient customs of the Greek Church extended the prohibition to all other fasts. Thomas Aquinas uses the following language: "In jejuno quadragesimai interdicens universaliiter etiam oru et lacticinio, circa quorum abstinentiam in aliis jejuna diversae connexiones existunt apud diversos." The Laodicene and Trullan (A.D. 688) councils made stringent requirements on the subject. Certain papal dispensations, granted as late as A.D. 1344 and A.D. 1445, show that even in certain parts of the Western Church this abstinence was practiced in many fasts besides Lent. In some Catholic countries general dispensations on this point have become permanent by long custom and positive decree, especially on the ground of health and necessity.

In the English Church the only abstinence that was ever enforced was from flesh-meat, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; but its object was rather the promotion of state interests, "to promote fisheries, to maintain mariners, and set men a fishing;" and was dispensed with by virtue of licenses, which were sold, according to the rank of the applicants, by the curates, under an act of Parliament passed in the 5th year of her [Elizabeth's] reign.

(Lacott, Sacred Archdeacon, p. 273, Fasts; comp. Hook, Ch. Dictionary, article Abstinence). "With us," says Weatley (Hook, Church Dict. p. 9), "neither Church nor State makes any difference in the kinds of meat; but, as far as the former determines in the matter, she seems to recommend an entire abstinence from all manner of food till the time of fasting be over; declaring in her [Ch. of Eng.] homilies that fasting is a withholding of meat, drink, and all natural food from the body for the determined time of fasting." See Watier and Wetste, Kirchen-Lehr. s. v. See also ABSTINENCE; FASTS.

Lacunary Roofs. The ceiling of churches in early times was often composed of lacunar work, i.e., it was divided into several small square openings called laquearia or lacunaria, and these were richly gilded and otherwise ornamented. Jerome often speaks in his writings of the lacunary golden roofs. See Parrar, Eccle. Dict. s. v.

LACCIJUS (rather Lacoggles, Aquile, Vulg. Calix), one "of the sons of Addi," who had married a foreign wife after the exile (1 Esdr. ix, 31); doubleless the Chelael (q. v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezra x, 30).

LACY, John, an English mystic, was born in the beginning of the 18th century. He joined the French prophets upon their appearance in London, and professed to have supernatural revelations. His principal works are, Warnings of the Eternal Spirit by the Mouth of his Servant John, surnamed Lacy (London, 1707, sm. 8vo);—A Relation of the Dealings of God to his unver-

LADD ("Ladd", na'dor, often rendered "young man," etc.; N. T. Kastapov, a little child, the last occurring only John vi, 9, and "child" in Matt. xi, 16; both terms being originally without respect to sex). The Heb. word occasionally thus rendered in the Auth. Vers., although occasionally standing for a girl or maiden (Gen. xxiv, 14, 16, 29, 55; xxv, 2, 12; Deut. xxii, 15 sq.), for which the fem. noun (Ladda, Laddar) is usually employed, properly denotes a boy, being prob. a primitive word. It is spoken of an infant just born (Exod. ii, 6; Judg. xiii, 5, 7; 1 Sam. iv, 21), of a boy not yet full grown (Gen. xxii, 16 sq.; xxiii, 12; Isa. vii, 16; viii, 4), and of a youth nearly twenty years old (Gen. xxiv, 19, xlii, 12; 1 Kings iii, 7; 2 Sam. xviii, 5, 32). See Child, etc.

La'dan (Ladon v. r. A'dan, and even 'Ada's, Vulg. Dalarus), one of the Temple servants whose descendants had lost their pedigree after the exile (1 Esdr. v, 37); evidently the Delailah (q. v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezra ii, 60).

Ladd, Francis Dudley, a Presbyterian minister,
was born in 1890. When only eight years of age he showed marked indications of piety, but it was not until his fifteenth year that he joined the Church, under the ministry of the Rev. Dr. George Shephard, now professor in Bangor Theological Seminary. With a view to prepare for the ministry, he entered Bowdoin College at the age of seventeen, and graduated with honor in 1841; then studied theology at Bangor Seminary, and was ordained at Farmington in 1846. In Nov., 1851, he received and accepted a call from the Penn Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa. During the war he labored incessantly for the good of the soldiers, but fell a prey to disease contracted in the camps, which he had gone several times, and died July 7, 1862. See Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1868, p. 184.

Ladd, William, an American philanthropist, born at Exeter, New Hampshire, in 1778, was one of the originators of the American Peace Society, of which he became president. He died in 1841. Ladd was editor of the *Friend of Peace and the Harbinger of Peace*, and wrote several essays on that subject.

Ladder (ἱστία, στήλα), a staircase, perch. from ἀνα, to raise up; Sem. ἀλά; the Arab. mulsmana has the same signification) occurs only once, in the account of Jacob's vision in his dream at Bethel (Gen. xxi, 11), where the "ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven; and behold, the angels of God ascending and descending on it," represented the Gospel dispensation, the blessings of which the patriarch's posterity were to inherit; the Redeemer himself being this mystic channel of instruction between heaven and earth (John i, 51). (See Lang, *Vita Scala Jacob*, Alt. 1699; Schramm, *De Scala Jacobae*, F. ad O. 17—.) Scaling-ladders for *war* (ἐλιμαξ) are mentioned in the *Apocrypha* (1 Macc. v, 80). That this was a contrivance known from the earliest times, we have abundant evidence on the monuments of Thebes, where attacks on fortified places are represented as being made by soldiers provided with scaling-ladders (Wilkinson, i, 390). (For illustration, see opposite page.) Similar scenes are frequently depicted on the Assyrian monuments (Layard, *Niniveh*, ii, 284). See *FORTIFICATION*.

Ladder of Tyre, the (ἡ εἰκόνα Τύρου; Vulg. *a terminis Tyri*, possibly reading εἴκοσι), one of the extremities (the northern) of the district over which Simon Maccabaeus was made captain (στρατηγός) by Antiochus VI (or Theos) very shortly after he was coming to the throne; the other being "the borders of Egypt" (1 Macc. xi, 50). The Ladder of Tyre (יוו, see Reland, *Palest*. p. 348), or of the Tyrians (ἡ εἰκόνα τῶν Τυ- ρίων), was the local name for a high mountain, the highest in that neighborhood, a hundred stadia north of Ptolemais, the modern Akka or Acca (Josephus, *War*, ii, 10, 2). The rich plain of Ptolemais is bounded on the north by a rugged mountain ridge which shoots out from Lebanon and dips perpendicularly into the sea, forming a bold promontory about 800 feet in height (Russegger, p. 3, 143, 262; Ritter, *Palest. und Syr.*, iii, 727, 814 sq.). The waves beat against the base of the cliff, leaving no passage below. In ancient times a road was carried, by a series of zigzags and staircases, over the summit, to connect the plain of Ptolemais with Tyre—hence the origin of the name Scala Tyriorum, "Ladder of Tyre." It was the southern pass into Phoenicia proper, and formed the boundary between that country and Palestine (Kenrick, *Phœnicia*, p. 20; Reland, p. 344). The road still remains, and is the only one along the coast. A short distance from it is a little village called Naktrah, and the pass is now called Rida en-Naktrah ("the excavated promontory"), doubtless from the road which has been "holed in the rock." (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 389; see also Pococke, i, 79; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* iii, 89; Stanley, p. 260, 262). The location of the Ras en-Naktrah agrees very nearly with the above position defined by Josephus, as it lies 10 miles, or about 120 stadia, from Akka, and is characterized by travellers as very high and steep. Both the Ras en-Naktrah and the Ras el-Abyad, i.e. the White Cape, sometimes called Cape Blanco, a headland six miles still farther north, are surmounted by a path.

Ancient Assyrians assaulting a City with Ladders.
cut in insignia; that over the latter is attributed to Alexander the Great. It is possibly from this circumstance that the latter is by some travellers (Irby, Oct. 21; Wilson, ii, 222; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 346; etc.) treated as the ladder of the Tyrian. But by the early and accurate juster professional, hap-farchi (Zunas, in *Hist. des Provinces de l’Empire Arabe*, 4 vols., 1837, 4to), he published by his publisher, (iii, 82), Mislin (*Les Saints Lieux*, ii, 9), Schwartz (p. 76), Stanley (*Syrl. and Pol.*, p. 264), the Ras en-Nakhr-ah is identified with the ladder; the last-named traveller pointing out well that the reason for the name is the fact that its "differing frontage leaves no beach between itself and the sea, and thus, by cutting off all communication round its base, acts as the natural barrier between the Bay of Acre and the maritime plain to the north—in other words, between Palestine and Phoenicia* (comp. p. 260).

Ladislas (Vladislav, Vlastislav, Vladislaus) II, king of Poland (1386-1434), known also under the name of Jagello or Jagello, deserves a place in our work on account of his introduction of Christianity into the Polish dominions. He was born in Lithuania in 1348, the son of Olgerd and grandchild of Gediminas, great princes of Lithuania. He succeeded his father in 1386, and, by the marriage of his pious Christian wife Hedwig, was influenced to embrace Christianity; a short time after all Lithuania became Christian, and when Poland came under his sway Christianity became the dominant religion there. He died in Grodek, near Lemberg, Galicia, May 31, 1434. See LITHUANIA; POLAND.

Ladislas, king of Naples (A.D. 1386-1414), succeeded to the throne on the violent death of his father, Charles III. Born in 1376, he was ten years old at the time of his accession to the disputed crown. Louis of Anjou, to whom Queen Joanna, the predecessor of Charles III, had bequeathed the kingdom, was his competitor. Ladislas and Louis were of nearly the same age. Each was left under the guardianship of a widowed mother, and each had on his side the authority of one of the two rival popes, between whom Christendom was divided, and whose mutual excommunications, extending to their respective adherents, were the scandal of the age.

The reign of Ladislas is historically important from its intimate connection with the great events of the time in Church and State. At an early age he developed that restless energy and that unscrupulous ambition which made him a model for Machiavelli's "Prince." When but sixteen years old, his mother Margaret committed him to the barons of his party to make his first essays in statecraft. He was in his twentieth year when the three Sicilies put into his hands an immense dowry, which he employed to prosecute his designs, securing, when it was expended, from the venal pontiff a divorce from his wife, whom he bestowed upon one of his favorites.

By means of the papal sanction and his own energy he recovered Naples from the Angevin party (1406). The faction opposed to him felt the full weight of his vengeance. His security was increased by a second marriage, which the pontiff, Boniface IX, proposed. His ambition was excited by the tempting offer of the Hungarian crown, and those who, distinguished with Sigismund (subsequently emperor), had seized and imprisoned him. His expedition proved unsuccessful, and his absence from Naples inspired anew the hopes and efforts of the Angevin party. His prompt return (1403) defeated their attempts. The most powerful of the despot of Burgundy, who was added to his weight in resources. Marseilles was bestowed upon one of his favorites. The new pontiff, Alexander V, elected by the council, favored the pretensions of Louis of Anjou, the rival pretender to the throne of Naples. The latter, followed by an army, and surrounded by his partisans, entered Italy and secured a lodgment in Rome. Ladislas, in the height of his passion, resolved to annihilate the authors of his calamity. He provided for the security of Gregory, who had been holding a council in Aquileia, rival to that of Pisa, and ordained his recognition as pontiff.
throughout the kingdom. He then proceeded in force to Rome, to which he quickly regained possession.

Alexander V, indignant at the king's course, made up a catalogue of his crimes, and ordered Ladislaus before him to hear the sentence which pronounced his forfeiture of his throne. Regardless of the summons, Ladislaus prosecuted his measures of violent rapacity, amazed the country by his threats of this nature, and at this juncture he lost possession of Rome. With treachery within and the forces of Balthazar Corsa without, the city yielded to the allies, and the papal authority was re-established within its walls.

The sudden death of Alexander V (May 8, 1410) opened the way to the election of Balthazar Corsa himself, the sworn foe of Ladislaus, under the title of John XXIII. Leaving Bologna, which he had ruled as a despot under the title of legate, he advanced in triumph to Rome. Ladislaus was now confronted by an Italian pope and a French army under Louis. The sentence of excommunication was pronounced against him, but, reckless of spiritual terrors, he marshalled his forces and prepared for the conflict. The battle took place May 19, 1411, near Ponte-Corvo, and, after a desperate contest, the forces of Ladislaus were defeated. Instead of being content with the victory, however, with Ladislaus himself successfully bringing into the field a new army largely composed of the fragments of the old. In a short time, by a liberal use of money, he had greatly profited by the repulse which his enemies, too sluggish to pursue their advantage, allowed him. When, taking his sovereign's life, he said that on the first day his crown and personal liberty were endangered, on the second, he feared only for his kingdom; on the third, his foe could only waste himself.

John XXIII had exulted in the defeat of his foe. The joy at Rome was expressed by pageants and processions; but the pope soon discovered that he had been too precipitate in his demonstrations. He encouraged the hopes of Louis, but declined to aid him by arms. He entertained himself with sending Ladislaus (August 11, 1411) a summons to appear before him as a heretic and favorer of schism, and with publishing a crusade against him. But the withdrawal of Louis from Italy left Ladislaus without a competitor, and of a sudden the pope saw himself almost helpless in the hands of Ladislaus, and in constant fear of his ravages and assaults. Anxious for peace, he proposed a compromise with him, and demanded full and perfect submission to himself. The latter was to abandon the anti-pope, Gregory XII, and drive him from the kingdom. The pope was to confirm the king in possession of his dominions, to which other possessions were to be added, and was to be appointed protector of the Church and head of the crusade, with specified sums of money. Thus John XXIII sacrificed his ally to his foe, and Ladislaus did the same. The double ingratitude and treachery were endorsed by the public recognition of the legitimacy of the pontiff on the part of Ladislaus, who ascribed his new and more correct apprehensions to the instruction of the Father of light. Gregory was forced to flee to Rimini, and at an interview between Ladislaus and the pope, the latter received from the former marks of profound homage.

To this hollow compromise mutual distrust succeeded. The pope sought to recover his old allies. He exculpated himself to Louis, and again denounced the king of Naples. The latter responded by hostile demonstrations. The council which the pope had meanwhile convoked at Rome was considered by him as depending on the appointment and authority of that of Pisa, and, as hostile to his interests, he hoped to dispense it. The prospect of gaining some advantage over his old foe, Sigismund of Hungary, who was elected emperor, was also kept in view. Gathering his forces, he approached Rome. The faithlessness and treacheries of the papal forces facilitated its capture. The pope and cardinals fled. From place to place they wandered, yet even Florence dared not entertain them from fear of the vengeance of Ladislaus. John XXIII besought help of Sigismund, which was finally granted on the stipulation that the pope should immediately convocate a General Council. See Jones XXIII.

Ladislaus meanwhile gave full scope to his vengeance. The States of the Church came into his hands. Siena and Florence felt the full weight of his revenge. In this state of things, John XXIII forlorned himself at Bologna, and gathered forces about him. Even here he did not feel himself safe. His cardinals prepared for flight, and some deserted him. The citizens sought to hide their treasures, and fled, some to Venice, or other places not yet threatened.

There appeared no longer hope of armed resistance to the advance of Ladislaus. All Italy seemed about to be forced to submit to his sway. But at this juncture, while lingering at Perugia, he was smitten by a mortal disease. A slow fever wasted his strength, but did not subdue his thirst for vengeance. He had destined the Ursini, who had obstructed his capture of Rome, and whom he had promised to spare, as victims. They visited him in his sickness, and were thrust into prison by his orders. This gross violation of faith excited general indignation. The murmurs of the soldiers constrained him to the severity of his last extremity. It was now no longer master of himself. Every word that escaped him was an order for some fatal arrest. He charged his sister, the princess Joanna, to see that Paul de Ursini be put to death. For the last three days of his life his mind was occupied only with thoughts of vengeance. With fearful cries he was heard to exclaim, "Is Paul dead?" sometimes calling for his dagger that he might stab himself. He could only be calmed for the moment by his sister's treacherous assurance that his orders should be executed.

In the midst of his paroxysms Ladislaus died, Aug. 6 or 8, 1414. Naples was relieved of a tyrant and Italy of a terror that had disquieted her for years. History may account Ladislaus a modern Herod. All that was unscrupulous, cruel, and depraved seemed to be incarnate in him. He alternated between private lust and public violence. In his youth he was regarded as the most unmerited representative of the vigor and craft of the Italian "prince." See NAPLES.

See, for notices more or less extended of the deeds or career of Ladislaus, Van der Hart, Monarchia Chronica; Niern, Life of John XXIII; Feggio, Bracciolini's Vite; and the works of the early historians, including Sirmond and Proctor. The most extended and connected account of his life, perhaps, is that given by M. d'Eglo, Histoire des Rois des Deux Siciles. He seems to have carefully sifted his authorities, and he devotes over 200 pages of his second volume almost exclusively to Ladislaus. (E.H.G.)

LADVOCAT, JEAN BAPTIST, a noted French theologian and author, was born at Vaucouleurs in the early part of the 17th century, and was educated first at Pont-a-Mouzon, afterwards in Paris at the Sorbonne, where he subsequently became a professor. In 1671 he was appointed to the chair, founded at his suggestion in the Sorbonne by the duke of Orleans, for the interpretation of the Old Testament Scriptures according to the Hebrew text. He died in 1766. Lad vocat wrote Dictionnaire Geographique portatif de Diction, Historie, de portatif des grands hommes (2 vols. 8vo: this is an abridgment of Moreri, and is full of errors). He also wrote a Hebrew Grammar for the use of his pupils; Tractatus de Concordia in Genera; and Lettre dena lquelle il examine s'il les Textes originaires de l'Ecriture sont corrompus et si la lege. He was a noted writer of sermons and as an expositor of Scripture, a zealous disciple of Hugigant. He was also a correspondent of Dr. Kennicott,
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whose great work he zealously promoted, and he collated many MSS. for him in the Royal Library at Paris.—Hook, Eccles. Biography, vi, 506.

Lady is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the following terms in the original: νυνιά (gebe'reth, fem. of νική, a mighty man), applied to Babylon as the mistress of nations (Isa. xlvii, 5, 7; elsewhere a "mistress," as opposed to a maid-servant, Gen. xvi, 4, 8, 9; 2 Kings v, 3; Prov. xxx, 23; Ps. cxxiii, 2; Isa. xxiv, 2); τησσερα (a'rrak, fem. of τις, noble; the same as the name given to Sarai), a noble female (Judg. v, 29; Esth. i, 18; elsewhere a "princess, spec. the king's wife of noble birth, 1 Kings xi, 18, different from concubines, comp. Cant. vi, 8; "queen," Isa. xlix, 23; "princess" among provinces, Lam. i, 1); εὐπατος (fem. of εὐπατος, lord or master), mistress, occurs only as an epithet of a Christian female (2 John i, 5), either as an honorable title of regard, or as a fem. proper name Σωτόρ (q. v.).

Lady Chapel, a chapel dedicated to the Virgin Mary ("Our Lady"), and usually, but not always, placed eastwards from the altar when attached to cathedrals. Henry VIII's chapel at Westminster is the lady chapel of that cathedral.

Lady Day. See Annunciation, Feast of.

Lady Past, a species of penance, voluntary or enjoined, in which the penitent had the choice of fasting once a week for seven years on that day of the week on which Lady Day (q. v.) happened to fall, beginning his course from that day, or of finishing his penance sooner by taking as many fasting-days together as would fall to his lot in one year.

Lady of Mercy, Ous, a Spanish order of knighthood, instituted in 1218 by James I of Aragon, in fullfilment of a vow made to the Virgin during his captivity in France, for the redemption of Christian captives from among the Moors; and to this end each knight, at his inauguration, was obliged to take the vow that, if necessary for their ransom, he would remain himself a captive in their stead. Within the first six years of the existence of the order no fewer than 400 captives are said to have been ransomed by its efforts. On the expulsion of the Moors from Spain the labors of the knights were transferred to Africa. Their badge is a shield party per fess gules and or, in chief a cross pattée argent, in base on a pallet gules pallets gules for Aragon, the shield crowned with a ducal coronet. The order was extended to ladies in 1261.

Lady of Montessa, Ous, an order of knighthood, founded in 1317 by king James II of Aragon, after the abrogation of the Order of the Templars, for the protection of the Christians against the Moors. By permission of pope John XXII, James of Aragon used all the estates of the ex-Templars and of the Knights of St. John situated in Valencia for this new order, which king James named after the town and castle of Montessa, its head-quarters. The order is now confined merely as a mark of royal favor, though the provisions of its statutes are still nominally observed on new creations. The badge is a red cross edged with gold, the costume a long white woolen mantle, decorated with a cross on the left breast, and tied with very long white cords.

Lady Psalter. See ROSARY.

Læ'li (Heb. לילי, for or of God, i.e. created by him; otherwise to God, i.e. devoted to him; occurs also in Gen. i, 28, where the Auth. Vers. has "in God's stead," Septuag. ἀνάθημα), father of Elisabeth, which latter was chief of the family of the Gerasenites at the Exode (Num. iii, 24). B.C. ante 1657.

Læstāre Sunday, called also Mid-Lent, is the fourth Sunday of Lent. It is named Læstāre (to rejoice) from the first word of the Introt of the mass, which is from Isa. liv. 1. The characteristic of the services of the day is joyousness, and the music of the organ, which throughout the rest of Lent is suspended, is on this day resumed. Læstare Sunday is also called domínica de rosin, because it is the day selected by the pope for the blessing of the Golden Rose. See Siegel, Handbuch d. christl. Liturgien, i, 826, 900; A. Hergenrother, i, 867, 900.

Læstätius, TORGENTINUS, commonly called TORGENTIN- TINUS, a Dutch theologian, who flourished in the second half of the 16th century, was a native of Ghent, and was educated in the University of Louvain in law and philosophy. After an extended tour in Italy, he became successively canon of Liège, general to the bishop of Liège, and finally bishop of Antwerp, from which he was transferred to the see of Mechlin, where he died in 1595. At Louvain Torrintin founded a Jesuitical college, to which he bequeathed his library and a large collection of curiosities.

La'fe (also known by the Latin name Fagus), Ax- tone, a French Protestant minister, was born at Châteaudun about the middle of the 16th century. He became professor of philosophy at Geneva in 1570, and rector in 1580. He was transferred to the chair of theology in 1584, and died in 1616. In 1587 he took part in the composition of the first French text of the Roman Catholic version of the Bible. His works are, De veraculis Bibliorum interpretationibus et sacris veroculis linguæ per postponendis (Gen. 1572, 4to) — De Verbo Dei (Gen. 1591, 4to) — De Traditionibus, adversus pietatis errores (Gen. 1592, 4to) — De Christo et Deo Filio nostro nostro (Gen. 1601, 4to) — Necessa liberta, seu narratio liberra- tionis illius quae divinitus immensa est Genere (Geneva, 1605, 12mo) — Encyclirad disputationum theologorum (Gen. 1605, 8vo) — De Vita et Obitu Bezae Hypsommanna (Geneva, 1606, 4to) — Commentarii in Ecclesiasten (Gen. 1606, 8vo) — Comment. in Epist. ad Romanos (Gen. 1606, 8vo) — Comment. in Psalmos xii et lexvii (Gen. 1609, 8vo) — Comment. in priorem Epist. ad Timothem (Geneva, 1609, 8vo) — Emblemata et Epigrammata selecta ex aetatis pertopiceta (Gen. 1610, 8vo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Générale, xxviii, 686.

Lafita, Joseph François, a French Roman Catholic missionary of the Order of the Jesuits, born at Bordeaux in 1670, labored for many years among the Iroquois tribe of American Indians. He died in 1740. Lafita is especially noted for his archaeological researches, among which is a Description des anciennes Amérindiens comptées, published in 1723, 2 vols. 4to. He wrote also Histoire des découvertes et des conquêtes des Portugalos dans le nouveau monde.

Lah'had (Heb. פְּרַח הָאָד, in pause פְּרַח, prob. oppressor, otherwise slave; Sept. אָדָא v. אָדָא, Vulg. Ladoa), the second named of the two sons of Jahath, of the family of Zerah, grandson of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 12). B.C. ante 1510.

Lahali-roi. See Beer-lahali-boi.

Lah'mam (Heb. Lachmos, לַחַמ, prob. an erroneous reading for Lachham', לַחַמ, their bread, which is read in some MSS., and which the Vulg. and Auth. Vers. follow, Septuag. Λαχμος, Vulg. Lehamen), a city in the plain of Judah, mentioned between Caleb and Kithlish (Josh. xv, 40), probably situated among the Philis- tines west of the Highlands of Judaea. A writer in Fairbairn's Dictionary, s. v., by a series of arguments resting essentially upon the insecure foundation of the mere order of the names in Joshua, seeks to identify Laham with the el-Humam mentioned by Smith in the list in Robinson's Researches (iii, Append. p. 119) but of this place there is no other trace save perhaps the pre-Nabatean Tell-Innam on Zimmerman's Map, some six miles to the S.E. of the vicinity of the other associated names, and apparently out of the bounds of the group, if not of the tribe itself. Laham is possibly the present Bril-Leho, a short distance N.E. of Gaza (Robinson, iii, Append. p. 118; Van de Velde, Carte, Memoir, p. 112).

Lah'mmi (Heb. Lachmi, לַחַמ, my bread; Septuag.
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amped bishop of Melipour. In 1708 he started again for India, and arrived at Goa September 5, 1709. Here he now had many difficulties with the civil authorities, and finally retired to the Jesuit's establishment at Chandernagore, where he died, June 11, 1715. He wrote, Defensio Indicarum Missionum Madrasensis et Carnoiensia, etc. (Bonn, 1707, 4to).—Cartas escrita de Madure nos despachos de desembarco del P. Fray J. de Jovs de Brito, translated into French in the Lettres edifiantes et curieuses, ii, 1-56; and in the Mercur, under the title Lettre du P. François de Laynez, jésuite, etc. (March, 1838). See Barbosa Machado, Bibliotheca Lusitana, i. 157, 401. P. Prat, Vie de Jésuite des Missions Etrangères: Lettres, vol. i. 8vo; Franco, Imagen de la virtud y heroica soceirio de Còimbra (2 vols. fol.); Hoefner, Nouv. Buv. Gén. xxxi. 41.

Lainez, Ingo, a celebrated Spanish Jesuit, was born at Almancaro, near Siguenza, in Castile, in 1512, and was educated at the high-school of Alcalá. In his nineteenth year he was attracted to Paris by the renown of Ignatius, and at once became one of his most ardent followers. He accompanied Loyola on his journey to Rome, and there obtained from pope Paul III the appointment to a professor's chair in the "Collegium della Sapienza." On the death of the great leader of the Jesuitical order in 1556 Lainez was elected his successor, and became general of the order (June 19, 1557). A cardinal's hat and other high positions he refused, determined to devote all his time and energy to the interests of the new order. In the Council of Trent, wherever he was, which was everywhere, he took an active part, and opposed the doctrine of Seripando on justification. Lainez appeared on the field of controversy more with a work on the subject than with a speech. He had the greatest number of the divines on his side. He also took a leading part in that council in the discussion concerning the divine right of bishops and the infallibility of the pope. The historians have preserved a very full report of his speech on this point. It contains the most extravagant assertions of pontifical power and authority. Lainez maintained that Jesus Christ is sole ruler of the Church; that he left the world to constitute Peter and his successors his vicars; that, in consequence, the pope is absolute lord and master, supreme and infallible; that bishops derive from him their power and jurisdiction; and that, in fact, there is no power whatever in the Church excepting that which comes from him, so that civil and secular councils have no authority, are not infallible, do not enjoy the influence of the Holy Spirit, unless they are summoned and controlled by papal authority (compare Pallav. lib. xviii. s. 15; Serip. lib. vii. s. 20; Le Plat, v. s. 2). D'Arches also took an active part (in 1560) in the Conference of St. Cloud (q. v.), where he aids to facilitate the Huguenots (q. v., especially p. 892). At Venice he afterwards expounded the Gospel of St. John for the express edification of the nobility; and, aided by Lippomano, he succeeded in laying the foundation of a college of Jesuits. He devoted great attention to the schools, and directed the thoughts of his order towards education, well aware that man is most influenced during his whole life by his early impressions. In some parts of Germany—at Ingolstadt for instance—the Jesuits soon acquired the reputation of most successful teachers. This new direction given to the order by Lainez came near, however, involving them in serious difficulties: the Jesuits had at first attached themselves to the doctrinal views of the Thomists; but, desiring to be independent in doctrine as well as life, the Inquisition soon found reasons to criticize the freedom with which they pursued their speculations on this point, and Lainez himself was suspected by the Spanish Inquisition (see Llorente, iii, 88). He died at Rome Jan. 19, 1665. It was under the guidance of Lainez that the spirit of intrigue entered freely into the society. It was a peculiar crisis of decay in managing affairs, and was frequently led by it into low and unworthy tricks. His ruling passion was ambition, which he
knew how to conceal under a veil of humility and piety. By his artful policy he transformed the charac-
ter of the Jesuitical order into a terrible army, that, for
the sake of advancing its own interests, shrank from
no attempt to gain its ends; an order which has be-
come a reproach to the Church that gave it birth. The
Jesuits in the 19th century are recognized as a bold
band— an order which dares to undermine states, to
rend the Church, and even to menace the pope. See
Jesuits. His was severe in several theological works, but
none of them had been completed, and nothing from
his pen, except some speeches, has ever been print-
ed. See Michel d'Esse, Vie de Iaïnes (Dossat, 1597);
Nochini, "Jesuits. Papa., p. 506 sq.; Forschung eir neuer
iii. 1, 2, tit. 4, § 8. See also, Rer. de Fossack and 17th
Centuries, ii, 145, 153, 163, 589, 585; Hardwick, Hist. Ref.
ch. vii.; Pierron, Univers. Lexicon, x, 81; and for the
Roman Catholic version, Wetzer and Welte, Kirchen-
Lexicon, vi, 816. (J. H. W.)

Laing, James, a Presbyterian minister, was born in
Berwick on Tweed, Scotland, 1768, and was educated at the University of Glasgow, where he
was graduated with distinction in 1816. After teaching
for some time, he determined to devote himself to
the ministry, and in 1828 was licensed by the Glasgow
Presbytery. May 8, 1838, he emigrated to the United
States, and was ordained by Washingto in 1838. After
was- and installed pastor of the Church in Argyle, N. Y.
In 1884 he removed to Andes, where he died Nov. 15,
1888. 'Mr. Laing was a man to be esteemed, loved,
and trusted—a laborious pastor and 'Israelite indeed,
in which there was no guile. '—Wilson, Presb. Historical
Almanac, 1867, p. 359.

La Tah (Heb. La'at), w2b, Judg. xvi, 14, 27, 29; 1
Sam. xxxv, 44, a rim, as in Isa. xxx, 6, etc., in pause w2b,
text w2b; 2 Sam. iii, 15, with 71 local w2b; Judg. xvi,
7; Isa. x, 30; Sept. Acic in Sam., Aassd in Judg., Aas-
d in Isa.; Vulg. Laas, but Laos in Isa.), the name of
at least one place and perhaps of a man.

1. A city in the extreme northern border of Palestine
(Judg. xvii, 7, 24, 27, 29), also called Lasshez (Josh.
xxix, 47), and subsequently, after being occupied by
a colony of Danites (Josh. xix, 47; Judg. xvii, 27 sq.),
also Dan (Judg. xviii, 29; Jer. vii, 16), a name some-
times given to it in anticipation (Gen. xiv, 14; Deut.
xxiv, 1; comp. Jahn, Einl. ii, 1, 68; Hugi, in the Pre-
burg. Zeitschr. v, 187 sq.). It lay in a fruitful district
near the head of the upper Jordan (Am. ii, 1, 3, 4), four miles from Paneas towards Tyre (Eusebius,
Onomast.); Sanais and the Samaritan version falsely
given, instead of Dan (in Gen. xv, 14), "Paneas"
(see Wintr. Diam. des V. Sam. p. 62), which also Jerome (at Ezeel, xxix, 15, and Amos vii, 14) gives as an equi-
alent. Laas was long the seat of a corrupt worship of
Jehovah (Judg. xviii, 14 sq.), and as it fell within the
kingdom of Israel, Jerobeam established there the idols
of the golden calf (1 Kings xii, 28 sq.).

The occupation of this place by the Sidonians is easily
accomplished. Sidon was a commercial city. Situated
on the coast, with only a narrow strip of plain beside it,
and the bare and rocky side of Lebanon impending over
it, a large and constant supply of food had to be brought
from a distance. The plain around Laas is one of the
richest in Syria, and the entrep rting Phoenicians took
possession of it, built a town, and placed it in a large
colony of laborers, expecting to draw from it an unfail-
ing supply of corn and fruit. Josephus calls this plain
"the great plain of the city of Sidon" (Ant. v, 3, 1). A
road was made across the mountains to it at an immense
cost, and still forms one of the main roads from the sea-
coast to the interior. Strong castles were built to pro-
tect the road and the colony. Kulat esh-Shukif, one of the
strongest fortresses in Syria, stands on a com-
manding hill over the place where the ancient road
crosses the river Leontes, and it is manifestly of Phoeni-
cian origin. So also the great castles of Banias, four
miles east of Laas, and Huln, about six miles west of
it, were founded by the Phoenicians, as is evident from
the character of their architecture (Porter, Handbook,
p. 444, 447; Robinson, Researches, ii, 108). The
site is most interesting to discover, after the lapse of more
than three thousand years, distinct traces of the wealth
and enterprise of the Phoenicians around the site and
fertile plain of Laas. See DAN.

2. A place mentioned in Isa. x, 30, where the proph-
et, in describing the advance of the Chaldaean hosts
from Jerusalem, enumerates Laas with a number of other
towns on the north of the city. It is not quite certain
whether the writer is here relating a real event, or de-
tailing a prophetic vision, or giving a solemn warning
with the idea of a dying allegory; but, however this may be,
the description is highly striking, and the allegory is
pointed out with remarkable minuteness and precision.
Aiah, Migmron, and Michmash are passed; the deep
ravine which separates the latter from Geba is then
crossed; Ramah sees and is afraid—"Gibeath of Saul is
fled." The writer uses with great dramatic effect, changes his mode of description. To terror and flight
he appeals an exclamation of alarm, representing one
place as crying, another as listening, and a third as re-
sponding—"Lift up thy voice, daughter of Gallim! He-
urehes, Laasah! Alas, poor Anathoth!" The words
"Michmash, and Adamith, Caanah, and Lasshah, to
Cause it (the voice) to be heard unto Laas"—that is, separate-
lly, to the northern border-city of Palestine; following
the version of Junius and Tremellius, and the comment
of Grotius, because the last syllable of the name which appears here as Laasah is taken to be the Hebrew
particle of mention "to Laas" (agreedly to the Hebrew
accent), is undoubtedly the case in Judg. xviii, 7.
But such a rendering is found neither in any of the an-
cient versions, nor in those of modern scholars, as Geese-
lius, Ewald, Zunz, etc.; nor is the Hebrew word here rendered "cause it to be heard" found elsewhere in that
voice, but always absolute—"beareth the" "sound of the
voice." There is a certain violence in the sudden introduction amongst these little Benjamite villages of the frontier
town so very far remote, and not less in the use of its
ancient name, elsewhere so constantly superseded by
Dan (see Jer. vii, 16). Laasah was doubled a small
town on the line of march near Anthanoth (see lowth,
Ubriam, Alexander, Geessenius, ad loc.).

Many, therefore, understanding a different place from
Dan (Rosenmueller, Alberer, III, ii, 19; Hitzig and Kno-
obel, Comment. ad loc.), regard it as the Laasah (Eesaah,
Cod. Alex. Aamot) mentioned in 1 Mac. ix, 5; but Ric-
land has shown that the city of Judah named 1 Mac. ix,
10, 11 is Adasa, and the form of the word in Isa. does not
warrant this interpretation (see Geessenius, Comment. ad
loc.). This Adasa has been discovered by Eli Smith in the
modern ruined village Adus, immediately north of Jer-
salem (Robinson, Researches, iii, Append. p. 121).

A writer in Fairbairn's Dictionary plausibly suggests that the Laasah in question may be found in the pre-
cent little village El-Iaaseeh, in a valley about a mile
N.E. of Jerusalem (Robinson, Researches, ii, 108), beau-
tifully situated, and unquestionably occupying an ancient
site (The American Ephrathah in Jerusalem, 19)."}

3. A native of Gallim, and father of Phalti or Palti-
tiel, to whom latter Saul gave David's wife Michal (1
Sam. xxxv, 44; 2 Sam. iii, 15, in which latter passage the
text appears to have read 835, Lashah.). B.C. ante 1062.

"It is very remarkable that the names of Laasah (La-
sah) and Gallim should be found in conjunction at a
much later date (Isa. x, 30)" (Smith). This explana-
tion of names makes it more than probable, that Laasah
was founded by Michal's father-in-law, who, according
to the custom of those times, gave it his own name.
The allusion to the Ios which it involves is interesting,
for this neighborhood was another of this favorite haunts
of that animal. It was by such ravines as wadya Fara'h
and Selahn that it was wont to 'come up from the swelling of Jordan' (Jer. xlix, 19); in the opposite direction we have a further trace of it in the Chephirah ('young lion,' now Kefli) of western Benjamin (Josh. ix, 17; xv, 9); northward, we find it encountering the disobedient prophet on his return from Bethel (1 Kings xiii, 24); while in the pastures of Bethlehem to the south we see it vanquished by the superior prowess of the youthful David (1 Sam. xvi, 17-14)."

Laishah (Heb. Lə'âyishah, לֶאָיִשָּׁה; i.e. Laiash, with ḫ pragraphic, 2 sa, 90). See Laish, 2.

Laity, the people as distinguished from the clergy. The Greek word λαίος, derived from λαός (Latin synonym populus), signifying the people, is retained in the Latin laicus, from which laity is derived. In the Sept. λαίος is used as the synonyme of the Hebrew צְפָאֵל, צְפָאֵל. As synonyms of these Scripture terms we may also cite the words "faithful," "saints," and "idiote" (q.v.). Comp. Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 188 sq., 274, 275; Vinet, Pastoral Theology (N. Y. 1864), p. 245.

In the O.T. Scriptures we find allusions to the laity in Deut. xvii, 8, where upon them is laid the obligation to pay a tithe to the priest when offering sacrifice; and in Ezekiel's vision of the new Temple, where "the ministers of the house" (גַּם־אֶ savory is as to the sacrifices of the laity (Ezek. xiv, 24). So also in Christ's words: "all the laity shall take up the sword;" "he has charged the Lord," when Asaph and his brethren had finished the psalm given to them by David; see likewise 2 Kings xxii, 3; Neh. vii, 11; Isa. xxiv, 2; Hos. iv, 5. In the N.-T. Scriptures this distinction seems to have been ignored by Christ and his apostles. For, although there are passages in which the laity are spoken of as a class, it is nowhere intimated that they were not allowed to exercise the prerogatives of the clergy in a great measure. Coleman (The Apostolical and Primitive Church [Philadelphia, 1869, 12mo], p. 290; compare p. 226 (q.v.), one of the latest of these antinoian antiquities holds that in the early stages of Christianity "all were accustomed to teach and to baptize," a practice to which Tertullian (born about A.D. 160) soon objected (De Precast. ch. xii). From the writings of the early fathers, it is evident, moreover, that only in the 2d and 3d centuries, after the general establishment of the churches, a stricter distinction was inaugurated. The introduction of the episcopal office, however, first definitely settled the position of the laity in the Church. As early as A.D. 182, or thereabouts, we find Clement of Rome pointing to such a distinction. In 1 Corinthians respecting the order of the Church, after defining the positions of the bishops, priests, and deacons respectively, he adds, ἤ λαίων ἐξερήμως τοὺς λαίας προστίματος διάκονον, "the laity is bound by the laws which belong to laity" (1 Cor. xiii, 40). A little later, Cyprian (born about the beginning of the 3d century) uses the words "clerus" and "plebs" as of the two bodies which make up the Christian Church (Ep. lx). But the idea that the priesthood formed an intermediate class between God (Christ) and the Christian community is the first to prevent during the corruptions that ensued upon the establishment of the presbytery. Gradually, as the power of the hierarchy increased, the influence which the laity had exercised in the government of the Church was taken from them, and in 502 a synod held at Rome under Symmachus finally deprived the laity of all activity in the management of any of the affairs of the Church (compare Coleman, Apostolical and Primitive Church, p. 118).

In the Church of the Reformers a very different spirit prevailed. All Christians were looked upon as constituting a common and equal community. Still the desire of making a visible distinction often led even the Protestant Church astray, and to this day the question remains unsettled in some churches how far the laity ought to share in the government of the Church; and hence the depth of the distinction implied in the use of the word "clergy" and "laity" varies with the "Church" views of those employing them. Some very strict Protestants prefer the words "minister" and "people" instead of clergy and laity.

Fararr (Comm. in Decr., p. 849 sq.) thus draws the line of distinction between the clergy and laity of the Protestant Church: "It is for the sake of the people that the ordinances of religion, and the clergy as the dispensers of them, exist; they are called to bear the burdens of the Church, as they receive its benefits. It is, however, questioned by some how far the professed distinctions between clergy and laity are desirable. As religious teachers, the clergy may be expected to be more especially occupied in fitting themselves for that office in qualifying themselves to explain, and to enforce on others, the evidences, the doctrines, and the obligations; but they are not to be expected to understand many of things surpassing human reason than God has made known by revelation, or to be the depositaries of certain mysterious speculative doctrines; but 'stewards of the mysteries of God, rightly dividing (or dispensing, διατηροῦντας) the word of the truth. The laity are in danger of perverting Christianity, and making it, in fact, two religions, one for the initiated few, and one for the mass of the people, who are to follow implicitly the guidance of the others, trusting to their vicarious wisdom, and listen, and be taught. They are to beware of the lurking tendency which is in the heart of men to that very error which has been openly sanctioned and established in the Romish and Greek churches—the error of thinking to serve God by a deputy and representative; of regarding the learning and faith, the prayers and piety, and the scrupulous observance of the 'priest' as being in some way or other transferred from him to the people. The laity are also to be constantly warned that the source of these errors lies in the very fact of thus regarding the clergymen as a priest (in the sacerdotal sense of that term), as holding a kind of mediatorial position, as the Christian Church was distinct from, and therefore no rule for themselves; a view which, while it unduly exalts the clergy, tends most mischievously to degrade the tone of religion and morals among the people, by making them contented with a less measure of strictness of life and seriousness of demeanor than they require in their ministers. Laymen need also to be reminded that they constitute, though not exclusively, yet principally, the 'church;' the clergy being the ministers of the 'Church' (1 Cor. iii, 6); that it is for the people's sake that the ordinances of religion, and the clergy and church, are instituted, not for the laity; that they are the 'body of Christ,' that on them rests the duty of bearing the burdens, as they receive the benefits of the Church; and finally, that there is no difference between them and the clergy in Church standing, except that the clergy are the officers of each particular church, to minister the Word and sacraments to that portion of its members over whom they are placed." See CLERGY; LAY REPRESENTATION; LAY PREACHING; MEDITOR; MINISTRY; PASTORAL OFFICE; PRIEST, J. H. W.)

Lake (Laias, Laias, a term used in the N.T. only of the Lake of Gennesaret (Luke v, 1, 2; viii, 22, 23, 28), and of the burning sulphurous pool of Hades (Rev. xiv, 20; xx, 10, 14, 15; xxxi, 8). The more usual word is sea (q.v.). The principal lakes of Palestine, besides the above Sea of Tiberias, are the Dead Sea and the Waters of Jerom. See each in its place.

Lake, Arthur, a distinguished English prelate, was born at Southampton about 1550, and was educated at Winchester School, and at New College, Oxford, of which latter he was chosen fellow in 1589. He became successively archdeacon of Surrey in 1595, dean of Worcester in 1608, and finally bishop of Bath and Wells in 1616. He died May 4, 1626. Lake made important donations to the library of New College, and founded a chair for Hebrew and for mathematics in that institution. He was a very learned man, especially versed in the ancient
LAKE

father's, and very successful as a preacher. After his death there were published several volumes of his sermons: *Exposition of the First Psalm; Exposition of the Fifty-fifth Psalm; and Meditations*—all of which were collected and published in one volume, under the title *Ninety-nine Sermons, with some Religious and Divine Reflections* (New York, 1869), which is the most notable of his works. In his treatise on festivals, Raghunandana, a great modern authority, mentions, on the faith of a work called *Samwatanara-sandipsa*, that this divinity is to be worshipped in the forenoon of that day with flowers, perfumes, rice, and water; that due honor is to be paid to inanimate and animate beings, writing: "On the evening of this divinity the whole of the pens and inkstands, and the books, if not too numerous and bulky, are collected, the pens and reeds cleaned, the inkstands secured, and the books, wrapped up in new cloth, are arranged upon a platform or a sheet, and strewed over with flowers and blades of young barley, and that no flowers except white are to be offered. After performing the necessary rites... all the members of the family assemble and make their prostrations—the books, the pens and ink, having an entire holiday; and, should any emergency require a written communication on the day dedicated to the divinity of scholarship, it is done with chalk or charcoal upon a black or white board." There are parts of India where this festival is celebrated at different times according to the double aspect under which which Lakshmi is viewed by her worshippers. The festival in February seems originally to have been a ver/ 10019497/ nal feast, marking the commencement of the season of spring.

Lakshmi, *H. W. N. I., 904*, according to *Ges- nius, sce. stopper, i.e. fortified place; Sept. *Aspagius* v. r. *Sukhaviya and *Aoros*, Vulg. *Locum*, a place on the north-eastern border of Israel mentioned after Joshua in the direction of the Jordan (Josh. xix. 88), and therefore probably situated not far south of Lake Merom. The Talmud (*Megillot, lxx, 1*) speaks of a Lakim (לַקִּי), perhaps the same place (see Reim., *Palest.*, 875). The site of Lakum is possibly indicated by the ruins marked on Van der Velde's Map adjoining a small pool east of Tel-Azbebrak and south-east of Safed.

Lakshmi, like most of the other divinities of the Hindu pantheon, seems to have been a very widely worshiped goddess. She is represented as one of the chief deities of the Hindu pantheon, and is especially worshiped on the 23rd day of the month of Phalguna, the month in which the festival of Sankranti is celebrated. She is also worshiped on the 23rd day of the month of Chaitra, the month in which the festival of Holi is celebrated. She is also worshiped on the 23rd day of the month of Margashira, the month in which the festival of Diwali is celebrated.

Lakshmi is worshiped in a variety of forms, and is represented as having a wide range of attributes. She is often depicted as a young girl, sometimes with a garland of flowers, and sometimes with a crown of jewels. She is also depicted as a woman with a lotus flower in her hand, and sometimes with a lamp in her hand. She is also depicted as a woman with a sword, and sometimes with a bow and arrow.

Lakshmi is worshiped in a variety of places, and is especially worshiped in the temples of the city of Lakhim, in the state of Gujarat. She is also worshiped in the temples of the city of Lakhim, in the state of Madhya Pradesh. She is also worshiped in the temples of the city of Lakhim, in the state of Rajasthan.

Lakshmi is worshiped by a variety of people, and is especially worshiped by the Hindus. She is also worshiped by the Buddhists, and sometimes even by the Muslims. She is also worshiped by the Christians, and sometimes even by the Jews. She is also worshiped by the Sikhs, and sometimes even by the Jains.

Lakshmi is worshiped in a variety of ways, and is especially worshiped by the Hindus through the performance of puja, the act of offering worship to a god. She is also worshiped by the Hindus through the performance of puja, the act of offering worship to a god. She is also worshiped by the Hindus through the performance of puja, the act of offering worship to a god. She is also worshiped by the Hindus through the performance of puja, the act of offering worship to a god.
LAMAISM

bone, and in 1770 (June 24) was finally raised to the bishopric of Langres. This position securing him a seat in the States with the nobility, he took an active part in political events, and tried to conciliate the claims of the third estate with those of the nobility and clergy. He subsequently opposed the declaration of rights placed at the head of the new constitution, and spoke in Parliament the French Revolution. He retired to Switzerland and Austria, and finally settled at Venice in 1799, and remained there until the restoration of the Bourbons to the throne of France. He was made cardinal July 28, 1817, and minister of state. The see of Langres having been restored, La Luzerne was reappointed to it, but legal difficulties prevented his assuming its direction. In 1818 he was the only bishop called to the council of ministers to contrive the ratification of the Concordat of the preceding year. Although strongly attached to the liberties of the Gallican Church, La Luzerne was forced to sign the letter of the Concordat. He died June 21, 1821. Besides the Oraison funèbre de Charles Emmanuel III, roi de Sardaigne (1773, 4to and 12mo), and the Oraison funèbre de Louis XV, roi de France (1774, 4to and 12mo), he published numerous faithful and interesting pamphlets. Most of his writings were collected and published under the style (Éuvres de M. de La Luzerne (Lyons and Paris, 1842, 10 vols. 8vo). See Le Moniteur, July 26, 1821; Amis de la Religion et du Roi, xxvii, 225-283; Mahul, Annuaire Nécrologique, 1821, p. 289; Quevrand, La France littéraire; Hoëtzer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxix. 38. (J. N. P.)

Lama (lāmā, Matt. xxvii, 46, which is also read in the best MSS. at Mark xv, 84, where the received text has λαμψα; the Heb. has both forms, יָלָם, lamah, and יָלָמ, lam'mah, for what; the Syriac version has λαμ从容), a term signifying why (as the context explains it, for, by which also the Sept. interprets it), quoted by our Saviour in the cross from Ps. xxii, 1 [2 in the Hebrew]

 Lamaism (from the Tibetan b-lama [pronounced Lama], spiritual teacher or lord) is the Tibetan form of Buddhism (q. v.), blended with and modified by the religions which preceded it in that portion of China. Among these was the belief in the "Mystic Cross," which was the religion of the Chinese and the Tairaghi of Tibet, the prince of the Litasby or Lichhavy race, being conquered in war, sought refuge in Tibet, where he became king. The Lichhavya of Vaishali professed belief in "Swasti." Swasti is a monogrammatic sign formed of the letters स and च, and "Suti" is the Pall form of the Sanskrit "Swasti," a compound of स (well) and चत (to it); so that "swasti" implies complete resignation under all circumstances, which was the chief dogma of the fatalists who called themselves Svaistika, or followers of the Mystic Cross. These people were also animatiationists; hence their Tibetan name of Mu-sto-ge or Finistista. They were grossly atheistical and indiscriminate in dress, but called themselves "Pure-doers," and the anonymous title Punya, "the pure," was carried with them into Tibet, and became modified into Pom or the "Bosa." This form of faith continued for nine centuries, and Buddhistism was generally introduced about the middle of the 7th century. Even then the followers of the Mystic Cross were still powerful.

History.—Buddhism was probably introduced into Tibet during the reign of Asoka, who propagated that religion for more or less than two thousand years ago. In B.C. 240, at the close of the third synod, the non-missionaries were dispatched to all surrounding countries to spread the doctrines of Sakyamuni. But the more formal history of Buddhism in Tibet begins with king Srongtsan Gampo (born A.D. 617, died 646), who sent to India his father, minister Thubten Chode, and his sixteen companions, to study letters and religion. He had the sacred books translated into Tibetan, and issued laws abolishing all other religions, and directing the establishment of this one. His wives, the one a Nepau- lese, the other Chinese, took the lead in all religious enterprises. He met, however, with only tolerable success, and the religion did not greatly flourish. Under king Thisrong-de-tsang (A.D. 728-786) Buddhism was more successful in Tibet, overcoming the efforts of the chiefs to crush the "new religion." This prince induced great works of commentaries from Bhamarapana and the other heads of the monasteries. The Chinese priests, who were the earliest Buddhist missionaries. A public proclamation in the year 305, which was ordered by the king, greatly increased the influence of the Indian priests. Large monasteries were erected, and a temple at Samye, and the translation of sacred books into the vernacular was more energetically conducted. King Langdar or Langdharma tried to abolish Buddhism, and in his efforts to do so commanded the destruction of all temples, monasteries, images, and sacred books pertaining to that religion. The execution of this order was so intense that it resulted in the murder of the king in A.D. 900. His son and successor was also unfavorably disposed towards Buddhism, and gradually the new religion lost many adherents, and those still remaining were persecuting.

From A.D. 971 dates the revival of Buddhism, or the second general effort to propagate this religion in Tibet, under Bilang-tsa, who rebuilt eight temples, and under whom the priests who had fled the country returned, and fresh ascensions were made from the priesthood of India. Among those who came in A.D. 1041 the celebrated priest Atisha. In the 12th or 13th century the modification of Buddhism known as the Tantrika mysticism was introduced. Considerably later a great impetus was given to Buddhism by the celebrated reformer Tsongkapa (born A.D. 1857), who endeavored, about the opening of the 15th century, to unite the disindividualistic and mystic schools, and to put an end to the tricks, pretended miracles, and other corruptions of the priesthood. He published new works on religion; but, so far as regards the marked similarity between the current and the earlier forms, the Lamas are still treated by some Christian sects, Schlagintweit says that "we are not yet able to decide the question as to how far Buddhism may have borrowed from Christianity, but the rites of the Buddhists enumerated by the French missionary (Hae) can fairly claim to have been handed back to institutions peculiar to Buddhism, or they have sprung up in periods posterior to Tsongkapa" (q. v.).

Sects.—According to Schlagintweit, there was no division of Lamaism into sects previous to the 11th century. Subsequently, however, there arose numerous subdivisions of the people, nine of which still exist, which are reputed orthodox, though there is not much known about them. In distinction from the other sects which Tsongkapa labored energetically to supersede, he ordered his disciples to wear a yellow dress instead of red, the color of the older religiousists, and, to make the distinction still more certain, he provided a black coat with a white cross, and also to be made of yellow cloth.

1. The eldest of the primitive sects is the Nygmapa. The lamas of Bhutan and Ladak belong to this sect, and they adhere to ancient rites, ceremonies, and usages, such as obtained among the earliest Chinese priests. They acknowledge some sacred books not included in the Kanjar or Tanjar hereinafter mentioned. 2. Another ancient sect is the Ugyenpa, or the disciples of Ugyen, who differ from the first in their worship of Amirtath and Sambhava. 3. A sect founded by Tsongkapa (born A.D. 1002) observes only "precepts" and not "transcendental wisdom." This sect wear a red dress. 4. The Sakyapa, whose particular tenets are not known,
but who wear a red dress also. 5. The Geladupa (Gel- 
danpa or Geldampa) adhere to the doctrines of Tson- 
khapa, and this sect is now the most numerous in Tibet.
6. The Kargyupa, leave Pa'jina Pahmitza, resting in their 
observance of the Ahpahme (Sutras) and in the " suc- 
session of precepts." 7. The Karmapa, and, 8. Birukampa-
po, are not much known. 9. The Bupampa (Dups or Dud- 
pa) have a particular worship of the thunderbolt (Dorge) which fell from heaven in Eastern Tibet. This 
sect observe the Tantrika mysticism.

In addition to the above there is the "Bosa" religion, 
also divided, which are called Boupasa. They own many 
wealthy monasteries. They are probably the de-
scendants of those who did not originally accept Bud-
dhism, but preserved the ancient rites and superstitions 
of the country.

Sacred Books.—Lamaism has voluminous sacred liter-
ature. Originally it consisted almost wholly of transla-
tions, but after this it developed rapidly an indigenous 
element, especially after the 14th century, under the im-
pulse given to it by Tsonkha-pa. The commentaries on 
the sacred text are frequent in the vernacular. But 
the great works are a compilation of Sanskrit translations, 
converted into the Persian idiom, and in different 
periods. These are respectively translations of "the com-
mandments" and of the doctrines of Sakya-monu, in 
which are embraced philosophy, logic, rhetoric, and 
Sanskrit grammar. The principal of these translations date 
from the 13th century. Most of them are probably of 
later origin, but the modern arrangement of the works 
is probably not older than the present century. These 
collections were printed in 1728-46, by order of the 
regent of Lhasa, and are now printed at many of the 
monasteries. They are entitled "Kajur and Tomur" 
according to Miller, the proper spelling is Bokh-kyur 
and Bokh-kyur.

The "Kujsur" consists of the following sections: 1. 
Dvata (Sanskrit, Vinayaka), or discipline; 2. Sher-ph'jan 
(Sanskrit, Pradhésadnya), or philosophy and metaphysics;
3. Phulchen (Sanskrit, Buddhanatha Simha), or the doc-
trine of the Buddhists, their incarnations, etc.; 4. 4Km 
br'Tejas (Sanskrit, Ratnashtika), or the collection of precious 
things; 5. 5 Do saD (Sanskrit, Sutrastra), or the collection 
of Sutras; 6. Mjajg doss (Sanskrit, Nirvada), or the libera-
tion from worldly pains; 7. 7'ojjl (Sanskrit, Tantras), or in-
cantations, etc. (Chambers). There are many editions of 
the Kujsur, varying from 100 to 108 volumes. It 
embosha 1083 distinct words. Massive as this code is, 
editions of it have been printed at Pekin, Lhasa, and 
other places. These have been sold for sums ranging 
as high as $100, the common price being, for 7000 
coins. A most valuable analysis of this immense Bible 
is given in the Atatic Researches, vol. xx, by Alexan-
der Cszimk de Koros, a Hungarian who made his way to 
Tibet on foot for other purposes, but became an en-
thusiastic student of the Tibetean Scriptures.

The Tomur is a collection of treatises in 225 
volumes, elegantly printed at Pekin, containing transla-
tions from Sanskrit and Prakrit, on dogmas, philosophy, 
grammar, medicine, and ethics, with Amara's Rosha 
or vocabulary, and fragments of the Mahabharata and of 
other works on religion. The work of the great reformer, 
the history of Buddhism, lives of saints, and all sorts of 
works on theology and magic, fill the libraries. But 
the Tibetans also possess annals, genealogies, and laws, and 
as, for instance, the "Mirror of Kings" (translated into 
Monolic by Seangm Sonseam, and into German by 
Schmidt), or Bodhimut ("Way to Wisdom"), and works on 
astrology and chronology" (Appleton).

Among the native sacred literature of Tibet is the 
historical book called Mox' Mox'kun, containing the 
legendary tales of Padmapani's propagation of Buddh-
ism in Tibet, and the origin and application of the sa-
crned formula "Om Mani Padma Huma." It contains a 
description of the wonderful region Sukhavati, where 
Amitabha sits enthroned, and where those are who most 
merit blissful existence; a history of creation; prayers 
to Padmapani, and the advantages of frequent repetition 
of Om Mani; the meaning of that sacred sentence; an 
account of the figurative representations of Padmapani, 
and of his images, which represent him with faces varying 
from three to one thousand. It contains, moreover, 
the ethics and religious ordinances of Buddhism: biog-
raphy; a description of the irresistible power of "Om 
Mani," etc., and tells how it secures deliverance from 
being reborn; legends, translations of sacred books, etc.
This has been translated into Mongolian.

Orders of Initiation.—The Buddhist community is 
divided into several classes or levels, known in Thibet as 
True Initiates, or Chode, which includes the "perfect" or 
"accomplished; and Chang Chikub Sempol, or "Perfect 
Strength of Mind," because the graduate has accomplished the grand object of life, which is 
the perfect suppression of all bodily desire and com-
plete abatement of mind. These are the Bodhiaataw of 
Sakryakrit (or, in Khinese, Pusa), who are incipient 
Buddhas, rising by self-sacrifice and their good influence 
over their fellow-men to the highest goal. Every age 
produces a number of these Bodhiaatawa. The second 
class comprises those having "individual intelligence, 
and the self-initiators, the Phrakhe, who turn not out of 
the way. The third is the Srawaka or auditor (lis-
tener).

Orders of Beings.—The self-existent Aidi Buddhia, by 
five spontaneous acts of divine wisdom, and by five ex-
ceptions, are divided into ten classes. The fifth exception 
is the "own essence five intelligences of the first order, known as the Pachaka Dhyam-Buddha, or "Five 
celestial Buddhia," whose names are Vairocana, Akshobya, 
Ratna Sambhara, Amitabha, and Amogha Siddha.

These five intelligences of the first order created "five 
intelligences of a second order, or Bodhiasthwa, who 
become creative agents in the hands of God, or serve 
as links uniting him with all the lower grades of 
crural existence. The Lokaparvaka (Jitgen Bauchgh), 
or 'Rules of the World," are also acknowledged in Thib-
etian Buddhism. All these are celestial beings, 
the spontaneous emanations from the Deity, who have never 
been subject to the pains of transmigration.

Inferior to these are the created or mortal beings, di-
vided into six classes, named Drosba Rakh, or "Six 
advances or progressors," because their souls advance 
by transmigration from one state to another, or, if they 
finally attain absorption, and are no longer subject to 
transmigration. These six are: 1. Idka; or god; 2. Lha 
pam Yia, Titana; 3. Hiji, which equals man; 4. Du-
dra, brutes, 5. Tidok, goblins; 6. Nyoller, the damned.

Order of Worship.—In early periods Lamaism con-
formed its worship to the triad Buddha, Dharma, and 
Sangha, and piou reverence was shown to the relics of 
former Buddhia, as well as to those of Sakya himself 
and his principal disciples; but there is no mention of 
the elaborate system of Dhyani Buddhas, Padmapani, 
etc., earlier than about A.D. 400. Primitive Buddhism 
to now, it was manifestly atheistic, but was in later ages 
gantly modified.

Sakryam is worshipped in Ladak as the "Sakya Thub-
baka," yet there is a legend to the effect that at the end 
of twenty-five centuries from the present time he is to 
be succeeded by a more benign Buddha, called Mu-
rya, or Mi-ri. The people, however, are equally 
favorable to Sakya, though there is reason to believe 
that the worship is of later date, as Fa Hian is the first 
who makes mention of it. He speaks of it as extant at 
the time of his visit in A.D. 400. These other deities 
are Padmapani, Jamya, and Jamyad-ri, or Padmapani; 
Manju Sri, and Avra Lokiteewara; and though the 
people still confess an oath by appealing to the three 
premarias of the Buddhist triad, yet, when they under-
take any enterprise or begin a journey, their prayers for
acces are almost invariably addressed to Padmapani. The mystical sentence "On Mani Padma Hum" is revered in worship, and is constantly heard as one moves through the country. It had been variously translated as "Oh, the jewel in the lotus!" and "Hail to him of the jewel and the lotus!" and "Glory to the lotus-bearer! Hum!"

Padmapani is a "Dhyani Buddha," and of all the gods is most frequently worshipped, because he is a representative of the cosmic ideal of the Buddha, the patron deity of the planet Earth. He is the patron deity of the Buddha, and manifests himself from age to age in human shape, becoming Dalai Lama (see below) by the emission of a beam of light, and by the appearance of the holy Vehicle that the Buddha has left behind for his followers,

In Tibet, he is the great many names, and is represented in a few figures, sometimes having eleven faces and eight hands, the faces forming a pyramid ranged in four rows, each series being of a different complexion: white, yellow, blue, red; sometimes he is represented as having one head and four arms.

Co-regent with Padmapani is Manju Sri, who diffuses religious truth, bearing a naked sword as symbol of power and acumen; he is lord of the intellect, and the subject, the expression of the former-inhabitants, the lowly, the over-soul of the whole earth. The representatives of him in Tibet, as in Mongolia, make him to have innumerable eyes and hands, and even ten heads, crowned, and radiant in the form of a one, one above another; he is often represented as incarnate in the person of some Dalai Lama as Padmapani.

It must not be supposed, however, that these are the only objects of worship in Tibet. The earliest worship of that country was a species of nature or element worship; and, as Lamaism in the ancient gods and spirits of the former inhabitants on itself, the poorer people still make offerings to their old divinities, the gods of the hills, the woods, the dales, the mountains, the rivers, and have field, family, and house divinities. Lamaism was, besides this, greatly affected by its contact with the Shamanism (q.v.) of the Mongolians.

These gods are particles of the Supreme Intelligences, and, though they are many, they are all a multiplication of the one God. The Tibetan name for deity is dka, the equivalent of the Sanskrit Deva. They assist man, each having his own sphere, within which he reigns supreme, and above which he is derived.

There are, besides these, malignant gods, called "Da," or "Dharma," or "Geg," or "Ged." The most malignant of them are, 1. Lhasayin, to whom many ill-nature spirits are subject. They cause untimely death. 2. The Dados, or judges of the dead. These try to prevent the continued existence of a world by inciting evil desires, by becoming beautiful women. They disturb assemblies. They are, of course, antagonized by the more benevolent deities, among whom some become specially famous, as the Drag-shen, "the cruel hangmen," who are subdivided into eight classes. Legends concern them about.

Doctrines.—According to Cönnim (in the Bengal Society Journal, vii, 140), the higher philosophies are not popularly understood, yet the people of Tibet are in general tolerant and familiar with the doctrine of the Three Vehicles (Tripāta, a dogma of the Mahayana school, explained in the Tibetan Compendium called Lamrin, or "The Gradual Way to Perfection." The argument of the book is to the effect that the Buddha dogmas are intended for the lowest, middle, and highest people, and that they are graduated to the different needs, for instance, there is the following order. The lowest people must believe in God, future life, and that the fruit of works is to be earned in this life, while the middle class are to know (1) that every compound is imperishable; (2) that all imperfection is pǐt; and that the living body is the only true happiness.

A person of the highest class, in addition to all the foregoing, must know that from the body to the Supreme Soul nothing is existent but himself; that he will not always be, but ever cease absolutely from being. These are the three, and they are the life of the Mahayana religion. Meditation, however, is a link in the chain, and its study may be subdivided into practice of ten virtues, to which the middle class are to add meditation, wisdom, etc.; while the superior class must, in addition to the foregoing, practice the six transcendental virtues. In their ultimate destiny this graduation pursues these classes, the lowest being admitted to become men gods, etc., the next having of hope of rebirth in Sukhavati, without pain or bodily existence, and the best expecting to reach themselves Nirvana, and to lead others thereunto also. The priests who take the vows called Dom can alone hope for this.

A more popular code, however, is that of the dharma of the simple people, and hence the following eight precepts commonly obtain: 1. To seek to take refuge only with Buddha. 2. To form in one's mind the resolution to striving to attain the highest degree of perfection, in order to be united with the Supreme Intelligence. 3. To prostrate oneself before the image of Buddha to adore him. 4. To bring offerings before him, such as are pleasing to any of the six senses, as lights, flowers, garlands, incense, perfumes, all kinds of edibles and drinkables, stuff, cloth, etc., for garments, and hanging ornaments. 5. To make music, to pray for the preservation and protection of the dharma, and praise of Buddha, respecting his person and doctrines, love or mercy, perfections or attributes, and his acts or performances for the benefit of all animal beings. 6. To confess one's sins with a contrite heart, to ask forgiveness for them, and to resolve sincerely not to commit the like hereafter. 7. To revere in the heart the merits of all animal beings, and to wish that they may thereby obtain final emancipation or beatitude. 8. To pray and entreat all Buddhas that are now in the world to turn the wheel of religion (or to teach their doctrines), and to pray not to leave the world too soon, but to remain here for many ages. The Mahayana school says that confession confers entire absolution from sins. So also Thibetan Buddhism now considers it. Confession, however, includes repentance and promises of amendment. Various ceremonies accompany the avowal. Consecrated water must be used, which, however, can only be rendered fit by the priests by a ceremony called Tsosel, or "Entreaties for abolution." Abstinence from food and recitation of prayers are also observed, but the commonest form is that of a simple address to the gods. The confessors who deliver from sins are generally Buddhists who preceded Sakaymuni, or holy spirits equal in power to Bodhisattas. There are thirty-five of these eminent in this work, known as the "thirty-five Buddha of Confession," beautifully colored images of whom are found in the monasteries, and to whom prayers are made in the Tibetan liturgy.

Regarding the future abode of the blessed, Lamaism differs from other Buddhism. Nirvana (annihilation) is not carefully pointed out, and the sacred books say it is impossible to define its attributes and properties. But to those failing to obtain Nirvana it is promised by the existence, the next best state that can be offered is Suk-
The elder son generally becomes a lama. In 1855 the total number of lamas, as estimated in the *Bosgel Society Journal*, was 18,500, in twelve monasteries of Eastern Tibet. In Western Tibet Cunningham estimates one to every thirteen laymen, while in Spiti they number one to seven of the population.

These lamas are kept in the gardens attached to the monasteries, revolve prayer cylinders, carve blocks, and paint. They are often illiterate, and, though most of them know how to read and write, they do not care to acquire knowledge. Their dress and caps are of dark blue with yellow borders. The head lama's cap is generally low and conical, though some are hexagonal, and others like a mitre. They wear also a gown, which reaches to the calves of their legs; this has a slender girdle and an upright collar. They wear also trousers, and boots of stiff felt. They carry rosaries containing 108 beads, made of wood, pebbles, or bones. Their amulet boxes contain images of deities, relics, and objects dreaded by evil spirits.

**Buildings and Monuments.**—The priests live in monasteries, each of which receives a religious name. The architecture is similar to that of the houses of the wealthy laity, but it is generally larger and better finished. They are always decorated with flags. They sometimes consist of one large house, several stories high, and in other cases of several buildings with temples attached. In their exterior appearance they are much inferior to those of other countries.

The temples have nothing imposing about them. The roofs are flat or sloping, with square holes for windows and skylights. The walls are towards the quarters of the heavens. The north side should be colored green, the south side yellow, the east side white, the west red. They are not always, however, in this order. The interior of the building is generally one large room, with side halls decorated with paintings, images, etc. The side halls contain the library, the volumes of which are on shelves, and sometimes wrapped in silk. In the corners are statues of deities, the religious dresses of the priests, musical instruments, and other articles of sacred appointment. "The Lamasic temples are of Indo-Chinese form, square, fronting the east in Tibet and the south in Mongolia. They are often cruciform. There are three gates, and three interior divisions, viz., the entrance-hall, the body of the edifice with two parallel rows of columns, and the sanctuary with the throne of the high lama" (Appleton). For a description of two of the largest lama temples in China, see Doolittle, *Social Life of the Chinese*, ii. 457 sq.

The *Chodens* are monuments from eight to fifteen feet, or even sometimes forty feet high. They are receptacles for the offerings of the people, and repositories of relics, and are very much revered by the lamas. They are set up in the temples, and are moulded from metals, or even of clay and straw.

The walls are six feet long and four or five feet broad, of sacred use. Derchoks and lapchas are sacred flags and heaps of stones. Prayers are inscribed on the flags, and the people seem ever eager to make new lapchas.

**Images, etc.**—The representations of deities and other sacred personages are copied everywhere. From the earliest period relics and images of Buddha have been honored and worshipped with simple ceremonies, as processions, presentation of flowers, perfumes, prayers, and hymns. At the present day, Buddhas preceding Sakya-muni, as well as the *Dharmar Buddha*, a large figure of a god, and other spirits deified, priests of local reputation are all represented in images or pictures. The "Gallery of Portraits" has drawings of over three hundred saints.

The lamas have a monopoly of the manufacture of these, as they are effacious only after the performance of certain ceremonies at certain times. Living images are not supposed to be repugnant, and these the lamas alone know how to perform. Pictures must be commenced on prescribed days; on certain other days the eyes must be painted, etc.
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Engravings and paintings are traced with pinholes, through which powder is sifted; they are bordered by several stripes of blue, yellow, red, and other colors. Statues and base-reliefs of clay, paper-mâché, bread-dough, or metals, or even of butter run in a mould, are made.

The best executed contain reliefs, as ashes, bones, hair, rags, and grain; these are sometimes contained in a hole in the bottom of the image.

The images and statues of the Buddha, Bodhisat twas, and the Dragsheds differ greatly from each other. Sukhamani is represented in many attitudes, with one hand uplifted or holding an alms-bowl, as sitting, or as recumbent. Padmapani has sometimes eleven faces and a thousand hands. "Maha, the god of fire, when driving away evil spirits, rides a red ram, and has a hor rible countenance;" but he is represented in many other attitudes. The Bodhisattwas have a shining countenance, and are seated on a lotus-flower. The Dragsheds who protect against evil spirits are fierce-looking, of dark complexion, and sometimes have a third eye in the forehead, to represent their wisdom. They are almost naked, but wear a necklace of human skulls, and have rings on their arms and ankles. They have in their hands various instruments symbolic of their power. The Dragshed of Dragshen, "a three-headed and nine-armed god, four or eight metallic hoops joined together so as to form two balls," which are on a staff, with points projecting. The Phurba, or "nail," the Bchok, "club," and Zungpo, or "spear" to catch evil spirits, and the Kapali, or drinking-vessel, which is a human skull, are among these sacred instruments.

Forms of Worship.—The religious services consist of singing, accompanied with instrumental music, offerings, prayers, etc. The offerings are of clarified butter, flour, tamarind-water, flowers, grain, peacock feathers, etc. There are no blood sacrifices. Any sacrificial entailing injury to life are strictly forbidden in the Buddhist faith. Drums, trumpets made of the human thigh-bone, cymbals, and flageolets, are among the sacred musical instruments.

The Prayer cylinder is an instrument peculiar to the Buddhists. It is called "khoreen" (Harley says khorllos or toklool, according to Huc = turning-prayer). It is generally of brass, enveloped in wood or leather. A wooden handle passes through the cylinder, forming its axis, around which is rolled the long strip of cloth or paper on which is the prayer of printed sacred sentences. A short rope, passed through a hole near the bottom, or by means of a short chain, facilitates the rotation of the cylinder in the hand. Large cylinders near the monasteries are kept in motion by persons employed for the purpose, or by being attached to streams of running water like a mill-wheel. Each cylinder has a special prayer, or series of prayers, written on it in long lines. The repetition of the cylinder is equivalent to the repetition of the sentences inclosed. Generally the inscription is only a repetition of the sentence "Om mani padma hūm." There is also a sacred drama.

Weekly Days and Festivals.—The monthly festivals are four, and are connected with the phases of the moon. No animal food must be eaten, but ordinary avocations need not be discontinued. There are particular festivals for each month, and three great annual festivals. "The Lég ztar, or the festival of the new year, in February, marks the commencement of the season of spring, or the victory of light and warmth over darkness and cold. The Lamaists, like the Buddhists, celebrate it in commemoration of the victory obtained by the Buddha Sukharamuni over the six heretic teachers. It lasts fifteen days, and consists of a series of feasts, dances, illuminations, and other manifestations of joy: it is, in short, the Tibetan Carnival. The second festival, probably the oldest festival of the Buddhist Church, is held in commemoration of the conception or incarnation of the Buddha, and marks the commencement of summer. The third is the water-festival, in August and September, marking the commencement of autumn" (Chambers).
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Lha-ri (god mountain), with a fine temple; there is another sacred place in the metropolis of Kham; others at Isha-o-Da (two ways), Djaya, etc., with printing-offices; many others on the roads to Pekin, besides the northern monastery; all containing an incredible number of monks, under Khutukhtus and lower lamas; so that the Ifits are 6,000 monasteries in U alone; others 84,000 exist in U, Tsang-po, and Kham, of the yellow sect, hermits, beggars, and vagabonds not included. About 120 miles south-west from Lassa, near the confluence of the Paimon with the great Tsaing-bo-i-thu (Sanpu), is the second metropolis of Lamaism, viz. Kharkhia (mount of grace), also called o-Da-lang, with five great monasteries, many temples, palaces, mausoleums, pyramids, and the like. In the neighbouring city there is a Chinese garrison. About midway between the two Bha-brangs there are three rocky islands in a lake, called g-Yang-brog (happy desert); Yam-bro on English maps, which contains temples, a magnificent palace, and thousands of monks and nuns, subject to the rDo-rDe-phagmo (saint, or admittance-sow), a female Khutukhtu, who becomes incarnated with a figure of a sow's mouth on her neck, in consequence of her having once been a sow. There are also troubles of the regency in the shape of that animal. The Chinese believe her to be the incarnate Uma Major. On the road to Nepaul there are the s-Nar-thang monastery, where the Kajbrit was printed; and Sesksaya, mentioned above, now the site of the red-capped Gong-rDogs (high lama). He has the power of heredity, so that the road to Bhotan are the monasteries Kisu and Gantum Gumba of Turner, and many others, swarming with lamas, some filled with Attau (nuns). Bhotan is subject to the Dalai, but there are also three red-capped Khi-po-tehri. The metropolis is Kbra-Shishe Tshohe Dres (gloria sat-utris, idefix arc, Turner's Taisusodon), under an incarnate great lama and a secular Dharma-raja, who rules over six districts, with about 10,000 lamas and 45,000 families. In Sikkim the aboriginal Leptchas have many mendicant lamas who practice magic, the other tribes being pure Buddhists. Buddhism flourished in Nepal as early as the 7th century of our era. It now exists there with Brahminism and Mohammedanism, so that Nepal has also a double literature. In Kunnawar, and elsewhere on the Upper Sutlej, there are many great monasteries of both the yellow and the red caps, living in peace with each other. At Singhnam there is a great library, a printing establishment, and a gigantic statue of Buddha. Ladakh became Buddhist before our era; its history is even less known than that of Tibet. Although invaded by Moslems (about 1650), it has many lamas of the yellow sect. In the Kabizh Buddhist secta, viz. that of Fo, since A.D. 65, fostered by the government, very numerous, but without hierarchy, each monastery being under an abbot, who is a citizen of the 12th class; and the Lamaists, organized, as in Tibet, under the ministry of foreign affairs, with three Khutukhtus at Pekin, one of whom is attached to the court, while another's diocese is in South Mongolia, and the third governs the central one of their great monasteries. The most celebrated temples in the eighteen provinces are one on the L-tai-shan (five-topped mountain), in Shishei, and one in Yunnan. In Si-tan, or Tangut, about the Koko-Nor, Lamaism flourished under the Hia at the close of the 9th century. The great reformer was incarnated in Amo. The great censory of esKubum was visited and endorsed by Khang-hi, and has a celebrated university. Mongolia is the paradise of lamas, they forming about one eighth of its population. Its patriarchy, the Gegen-Khutukhtu, a Bodhiasttwa of Maitreya, is equal in rank to both Thibetan popes, resides at Urga, on the road between Pekin and Kiachia, lat. 40° 30' with about 20,000 monks, and has attained the highest. Khubilai, by sixteen reincarnations, having been first the son of Altan Khalkhan of the Khalkhas, and having once died (1889), after a visit to Pekin, either by poison or from licentiousness.

The Urgan censory owns about 30,000 families of slaves. The cathedral at Kuku Khotun, among the Tumen is under an incarnate patriarch, now second to the preceeding. Most censories and temples now extant in Mongolia were built or restored after the second conversion. A Khutukhtu rules over the celebrated establishment of the 'five gods' in U. Dyen Mamoun Ssuau, the summer residence of the second Pekin Khutukhtu, were 108 temples and a famous manufactury of idols. Many other abodes of lamas are scarcely inferior to those we have mentioned. The desert of Gobi contains many such establishments. Sunguria contains numerous ruins of Lamaism, on the ruins of the Irkut tribes, also called lama, among which those of Abilai-Kut, near Usk Kamenogorok, are most renowned, because the first fragments of the holy canon were brought thence to Europe about 1750. The Torgutas have built many sacred places since their return from the west. A few lamas were found among the Buryats (in Russia), near Lake Baikal, about 160 years ago, as missionaries from Urga. Now almost all of them south of the lake are Lamo-Shamanates, and have wooden temples. The Calmöcky between the Don, Volga, and Ural are forbidden to maintain intercourse with them, and have to perform a Lamaic worship in Shitini-Urrgas (church tents).

Government.—"Since the restoration of the power of the Dalai by the emperor Khian-lung, all the decrees of government are issued in the name of each of the two high lamas, in their respective dioceses; but the real power is vested in the emperor, who gives the order to the Dalai (great mandarin) to reside at Lassa, with Chinese garrisons in the neighborhood, to watch both the ocean of holiness and the Tsang-vang, who, as vicar of the emperor, administers the affairs of the country. The lower offices only are hereditary. The annual tribute of the two high lamas is carried every third year to Pekin by caravan.

Literature.—See, besides the sacred books mentioned above, and the works cited under Buddhism, A. Cunningham, Ladak Physical Statistical and Historical (London, 1854); Cesma de Kleros, in the Journal of the Asiatic Society, Bengal, ii, 121-269; iii, 57, 201, 886; ii, 57; iv, 142; v, 264, 384; vii (pt. 1), 142, xx 535, 589; Hardwick, Christ and Other Masters, ii, 88 sq.; Huc et Gabet, Souvenirs d'un Voyage dans la Tartarie, the Tibet, et le Chine (Paris, 1852); Hodgson, Illustrations of the Literature and Religion of the Buddhists (Sérampore, 1841); Köppen (Fr.), Die Lamaische Hierarchie, etc. (Berlin, 1859); Schlaglichtbund, Buddhism in Tibet (Lpz. and London, 1858). See Tibbet. (J. T. G.)

La Marck, Evaird de, cardinal bishop and lord of Lierneux (1185-1228); also abbot of St. Hubert, was bishop of Lierneux, as well as the services rendered to the Church of Lige by his ancestors, caused him to be chosen bishop of that city in 1506. He at once applied to Rome for approbation, and, on the reception of the papal bull of installation by Julius II, repaired to Lige, where he was received with great enthusiasm. He confirmed the privileges of the city, which he governed with such wisdom that, while war was raging outside, his dioceze continued to enjoy undisturbed peace. He restored the old discipline of St. Hubert, first bishop of Liège, and devoted himself to the spiritual and temporal improvement of his charge. In acknowledgment of services he had rendered to Louis XII in the affairs of Italy, he was made bishop of Chartres. Francis I even promised to procure him a cardinal's hat, but a protege of the duchess of Angoulême obtained his appointment, and entered in 1518 into the league of Austria against France, and even warred against his own brother, Robert de la Marck, who had made peace with Francis I. In the Diet of Frankfurt he advocated the nomination of Charles V as emperor of Germany, and was rewarded with the archbishopric of Cologne. He entered in 1561 into the league of Austria against France, and even warred against his own brother, Robert de la Marck, who had made peace with Francis I.
fet out and punish all heretics. A great many were found and punished by exile or death, while their possessions were sequestered. He is said to have cruelly tortured Protestant theologians. He had it at first wel-
comted Erasmus, who dedicated him to his parashare on the Epistle to the Romans, but turned about and called him a heathen and a publican when he saw him slip incline towards the new doctrines. In 1529 he was called to the Council, where the Act of Luther was con-
ducted. In 1532 he equipped at his own expense a body of troops to war against the Turks. Appointed legate a latere in 1538, he labored with new zeal to uproot all heresy. For this object he assembled a synod at Liége in 1538, but the priests, dissatisfied with his austerity, declared against him. He hoped to abound their oppo-
sition, but suddenly died, Feb. 16, 1538. See Chapeau-
ville, Hist. des Cardinaux, iii, ch v. and v, Aubier, Histoire des Cardinaux, iii, 381, Louis Doni d Attichy, Flores Cardinalium, vol. iii; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géné-
rales, 92. (J. P.)

La Mark, Jean Baptiste Pierre Antoine de Monet, Chevalier de, a very distinguished French naturalist, deserves a place here on account of his connection with the celebrated theory of the Variation of Species, lately so generally made known by the English author. See Darwin. See also on or. La Mark was born at Barenton, in Picardy, Aug. 1, 1744, and was intended for the Church; he entered, however, the army, but accidental injury led him to adopt the mercenary profession. During his leisure hours he studied the natural sciences, and in 1778 finally came before the public with a work on botany. He secured him the position of botanist to the king. In 1798 he was made a professor of natural history in the Jardin des Plantes. He died Dec. 29, 1829. His greatest work is his Histoire des Animaux sans Vertèbres (Paris, 1815-39, 7 vols. 8vo; 3d ed. Paris, 1856, etc.) In Pke.
loeske Zoologique (Paris, 1869, 2 vols. 8vo), and some other of his productions, he advanced extensively speculative views, which, since Darwin's rise, have become the consideration of scientific scholars. So much is cer-
tain, that La Mark was the first (if we except a few obscure works of Buffon towards the close of his life) to advocate Variation of Species. For a more detailed account and a complete list of his works, see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxix, 55-82. (J. H. W.)

Lamb is the representative of several Hebrew and Greek words in the A. V., some of which have wide and others distinctly limited meanings. See:

1. The most usual term, יְבֵן, ke'nes (with its transposed form יְבֵן, ke'seh, and the feminine יְבֵנָה, kib-
annah, or יְבֵנָה, kobnæ, and יְבֵנָה, kobdeh), denotes a male lamb from the first to the third year. The former, perhaps more nearly coincident with the provincial term łog or łogger, is applied to a young ram before he is horn. The corresponding word in Arabic, according to Genesis, denotes a ram at that period when he has lost his first two teeth and four othc makes their ap-
pearance, which happens in the second or third year. Young rams of this age formed an important part of almost every sacrifice. They were offered at the daily morning and evening sacrifice (Exod. xxiii, 8-11, 48-41), on the Sabbath day (Num. xxvii, 9), at the feasts of the new moon (Num. xxviii, 11), of trumpets (Num. xxix, 2), of tabernacles (Num. xxviii, 13-40), of Pentecost (Lev. xxiii, 18-20), and of the Passover (Exod. xii, 5). They were brought by the princes of the congregation as burnt-offerings at the dedication of the tabernacle (Numb. viii, 15). They were offered at the ascent of Aaron (Lev. ix, 3), the coronation of Solomon (1 Chron. xxiii, 21), the purification of the Temple under Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxix, 21), and the great Passover held in the reign of Josiah (2 Chron. xxxix, 7). They were the sacrifices for the purification of women after childbirth (Lev. xii, 2), and at the cleansing of a leper (Lev. xiv, 10-25). They accompaniment the presentation of first-fruits (Lev. xxiii, 12). When the Nazarites commenced their period of separation they offered a he-lamb for a trespass-offering or a guilt-offering (Num. vii, 17-19). The he-lamb was sacrificed as a burnt-offering, and a ewe-lamb as a sin-
offering (v, 14). A ewe-lamb was also the offering for the sin of ignorance (Lev. iv, 25). See SACRIFICE.

2. The corresponding Chaldean term to the above is עֵבֶן, innumar (Ezra vi, 9, 17; viii, 17). In the Targum it assumes the form יִבֶן, צֵלָה.

3. A special term is יִבֶן, tateh (1 Sam. vii, 9; Isa. lxv, 25), a young sucking lamb; originally the young of any animal. The name from the same root in Arabic signifies "a fawn," in Ethiopic "a kid," in Samaritan "a boy," while in Syriac it denotes "a boy," and in the feminine "a girl.” Hence "Talitha kumi," "Damele, arise!" (Mark v, 41). The plural of a cognate form occurs (יִבְנֶים, tel'm) in Isa. xi, 17.

4. Less exact is תִּפְרָת, a fat ram, or, more probably, "wether," as the word is generally employed in opposition to ewe, which strictly denotes a "ram" (Deut. xxxii, 14, 2 Kings iii, 4; Isa. xxxiv, 6). Mosha, king of Moab, sent tribute to the king of Israel 100,000 fat wethers: and this circumstance is made use of by R. Joseph Kimchi to explain Isa. viii, 1, which he regards as an exhortation to the Jews to respond to the Moabites' request to receive a tribute. The Tyrians obtained their supply from Arabia and Kedar (Exek. xxxvii, 21), and the pastures of Bana-
shen were famous as grazing-grounds (Exek. xxxvii, 18). See RAM.

5. Still more general is תָּשָׁב, rendered "lamb" in Exod. xii, 21, properly a collective term denoting a "flock of sheep and goats, in distinction from herds of the larger animals (Eccles. ii, 7; Ezek. xiv, 15). See FLOCK.

6. In opposition to this collective term the word יִבֶן, seh, is applied to denote the individuals of a flock, whether sheep or goats: and hence, though "lamb" in many passages the rendering of the A. V., the marginal reading gives "kid" (Gen. xxii, 7; 8, Exod. xii, 3; xxiii, 1, etc.—Smith, a. v. See KID)

7. In the N. T. we find ἑπιφών (strictly the diminu-
tive of ἑπιφών, which latter once occurs, Luke x, 1), a λαμβάνειν, the almost exclusive word, ἑπιφόν being only employed in a few passages, directly referring to Christ, as noticed below. It appears that originally the paschal victim might be indifferently of the goats or of the sheep (Exod. xii, 8-5). In later times, however, the offspring of sheep appears to have been almost uniformly taken, and in sacrifices generally, with the exception of the golden ac-
cer on the great day of atonement. Sundry peculiar enactments are contained in the same law respecting the qualities of the animal (Exod. xxii, 30; xxxiii, 19; Lev. xxvii, 27). See PASSOVER.

8. In the symbolical language of Scripture the lamb is the type of meekness and innocence, Isa. xi, 6; lxv, 25; Luke x, 3; John xxi, 15. See SHEEP.

The hypocritical assumption of this meekness, and the carrying on of persecution under a show of charity to the souls of men, and bestowing absolutions and in-
dulgences on those who conform to its rules, appears to have given rise to the application of this otherwise sac-
ted title to Antichrist (Rev. xiii, 11): "And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon." This evidently has reference to the ostensibly mild and toler-
tant character of the pagan forms of religion, which never-
theless, in the end, were found co-operating with the relentless secular power. It finds a fit counterpart in the Je ultrasoundic pretensions of Romanism. See ANTICHRI ST.

Lamb (as a Christian emblem), the symbol of Christ (Gen. iv, 4; Exod. xxii, 26; xxvii, 19); Isa. xi, 1; Jer. iii, 7; John i, 28; 1 Pet. i, 19; Rev. iii, 8), who was typi-

fied by the paschal lamb, the blood of which was sprink-
LAMB

In the Romish Church the expression is blaspemously applied in its Latin form to a consecrated wax or dough inclosed in a cross, used as a charm by the superstitious. See AGNUS DEI.

Lamb, John, D.D., an English divine and antiquary, was born about 1790. He was made master of Corpus Christi College in 1822, and in 1837 was honored with the deanship of Bridport. He died in 1850. Lamb published Hist. Account of the XXXIX. Articles, 1543, 1851; The History of the London Fire of 1666, 1671 (Cambridge, 1829, 4to; 2d cd, 1835, 4to); etc. See Lond. Gent. Mag., 1848, pt. ii, p. 55; 1850, pt. i, p. 667; Christian Remembrancer, June, 1829.

Lamb, Thomas, an English Baptist minister and strict Calvinist, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He died about 1672. He is noted as the opponent of John Goodwin, the bold defender of Arminianism, whose Redemption Redeemed (London, 1661, fol.) Lamb answered in a work entitled Absolute Freedom from Sin by Christ's Death for the World, etc. (London, 1656, 4to).

Lambdin, William, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Talbot Co., Md., June 4, 1784; was converted at sixteen; removed to Pittsburgh in 1805; joined the Baltimore Conference in 1808; was on various circuits and stations until 1815; then local till 1822, then in Pittsburg Conference until 1820; then local at Wheeling until 1842; then in Memphis Conference, Tennessee, where he labored until his death. He died in Henry County, Tenn., May 22, 1854. Lambdin was an able and faithful minister of the Word, and served the Church long and successfully.—Annals of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, 1865, p. 548.

Lambert von Hersfeld, of Aschaffenburg, an eminent German chronicler of the 11th century, was born, it is supposed by some, at Aschaffenburg, about 1084. In 1058 he entered the convent of Hersfeld, the school of which was at that time one of the most celebrated in Germany, and in the same year, 1058, was ordained priest. Shortly after he went on a journey to Jerusalem, without the consent or knowledge of the abbots of his convent. After his return in the following year, Lambert devoted himself to literary pursuits, yet as an inmate of the convent which he had entered before his departure for the Holy Land. He was in great favor among the monks, and as such was evicted by his superior. Probably he was sent to visit the convents of Sieberg and Saalfeld, newly-established institutions. The precise date of his death is not ascertained—probably about 1080. His works, which are numerous, are especially valuable as giving a clear perception of the state of letters in his times. His chief work was a heroic poem, the title of which is lost. He then wrote a history of the Convent of Hersfeld, which contains valuable information for the history of the 11th century, but unfortunately we possess only fragments of this work. These were published by Mader from a Wolfenbieth Codex: comp. Vratislaus, sanctimonia, potestas atque maiestas dumus Brunovisonum cc Lynburgensem donam (Helmstädt, 1661-4), p. 150; and again in Antiqu. Brunavic. p. 150. This same codex was also published by M. G. Waizt, vii, 138-141. His third work is a history of Germany in two parts. The second part is the most complete, as well as the most interesting: it begins with the reign of Henry IV, and extends to the election of King Rudolf. It is believed by some that this work, treating contemporary events, was written at different periods, whenever anything occurred which afforded the author important matter to be mentioned. It appears, however, to have been concluded about 1084. Lambert's works are remarkable for purity of style and elegance of diction, as well as for learning and accuracy. Milman (Int. Christb, vii, 353) says that he occupies as a historian, "if not the first, nearly the first place in the chronological history." Hase (C.H.1, p. 182), however, thinks that Lambert was too little acquainted with the ways of the world to make a proper
chronicler. Speaking of his German history, Hase says that it is "just such a picture of society as might be expected from a pious monk who had made a pilgrimage to the holy sepulchre, and looked out upon the world and his nation from the small stained window of his cell." In his allusions to the difficulties which occurred between the church and the state, and especially with ecclesiastical power, he shows a rare degree of impartiality, although necessarily yielding to some extent to the effects of his position as a monk, as well as of the troubles of the times. Some of his writings were translated into German by Hegewisch, and a whole volume of his works, with those of Reuchlin, edited by B. Balth. (Franck, 1831), also, more recently, by Hesse, in the Geschichtsyearbuch, deutscher Vorzeit, d. XI Jahrh. (Berlin, 1855, 6 vols.). See Frisch, Comparatio critica de Lambert. Sch. annulg., etc., Diss. inaug. Monachi (1830, 8vo); Stenzel, Fränkische Kaiser, 1, 438, ii, 101 sqq.; Fideriti, Comment. de Lamb. Schaff. (Hem, 1829, 4to).—Lambert, a man of great integrity and usefulness. His mind was superior and well stored with information, and his preaching eminently practical and full of the Holy Ghost. Many souls were converted through his labors.—Black River Conference Memo- rial, p. 128. (G. L. T.)

Lambert, Francis (generally known as Lambert of Aragon, the name of his native place), also called John Serranus, a French theologian, and one of the early apostles of the Reformation, was born in 1487. At the age of sixteen he became a Gray Friar, was then ordained priest, and preached for a while with great success. He soon, however, tired of the world, and, thinking to find peace of mind in stricter seclusion, he asked permission to join the Carthusians. Refused by his superiors, he left his order in 1522, and embraced the doctrines of Luther, whose writings he had secured and carefully studied. On a visit to Switzerland he was received by Sebastian de Monte Falconis, prince-bishop of Lausanne, and went to Berne and Zürich, where he had a public conference with Zwingli. He thereupon cast aside the dress of his order, took the name of John Serranus, and began preaching the reformed principles in the several cities of Switzerland and Germany. In 1522 he held public conferences at Einsamach, and was greatly instrumental in propagating the Reformation in Thuringia and Hesse. In January, 1523, he joined Luther at Wittenberg, where he wrote his commentaries on Hoses and other books. In 1524 he went to Metz, and afterwards to Aragon, where he remained until called to Hombourg by the landgrave, Philip of Hesse, in 1526. Here, in a synod held in October of the same year, he argued in Latin, and Adam Craton, or Crafft, in German, against the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church as defended by Nicholas Herborn and John Spott, and the latter were declared vanquished and driven out of Hesse. The convents were closed up, and their revenues employed to establish four hospitals and a Protestant academy at Marburg. Lambert became its first professor of theology. In 1529 he took part in the Conference of Marburg between the theologians of Switzerland, Saxony, Susbia, and other southern German provinces. He died April 18, 1530. All the writers of his time agree in calling him a learned, industrious, and upright man. His numerous works are now very scarce; among the most important are Commentarius in Evangelium Luz- (Wittenberg, 1528, 8vo; Nuremberg and Strasburg, 1525, 8vo; Frankfort, 1538, 8vo);—In Can. canonic. Sermo (Strasburg, 1524, 8vo);—De fidelium vocat. in regnum Christi, id est Ecclesiarem, etc. (Strasburg, 1525, 8vo);—Diss. theolog. et cons. contra constantinopolitan. prlications arranged into thirteen chapters, and which contain the whole theological system of the author;—In Jochelum prototyp. (Strasburg, 1525, 8vo);—In Apos. Abiam, et Jonas, et Apoluphras. (Strasburg, 1525, 8vo);—In Michem, Nuer, et Absare (Strasburg, 1526, 8vo);—Theses theolog. in synodo Homburgensi disputas (Erfurt, 1527, 4to, and 8vo);—Exegesiis in Aenopoulain libri vii (Marburg, 1528, 8vo);—De Symbo- lipederia nuncup. rumpendi quam communione rec. (Frankfort, 1559);—Fr. Lamberti Confessio, etc. (1530, 8vo; translated into German by Serranus, 1530);—Commentarius in Apostolum Regnum et in Acta Apostolorum (Strasburg, 1525; Frankft. 1559);—De Regno, Civitate et Doni Dei ac Domini nostri Ic.-C., etc. (Worma, 1588, 8vo). See J. G. Schellhorn, Aen. Literatur Lev., 907, 307, 324, 329, x, 1255, etc., Seckendorf, Commentarius de constitutione eccles. viii; Freier, Theatrum Vicorum Doctorum, i, 104; Bayle, Hist. dict. iii, 708 sqq.; J. Tilemian, Vita Professorum theolog. Marburgensium; A. A. Scott, Ann. Evangel., etc., 1526; Le Long, Biblioth. Sacra; J. F. Hekelius, Epitola Singular. manip. prim. Nicom., Memoires, x, 324, sqq.; Hoef, Nou. Rerum, pr. 19, xii, 138, 123; Baum (Johann W.), Lambert r. Aragon nach seinem Leben, etc. (1840); Schrock, Kirchengeschichte 2. A. Ref. 1, 380, 434; ii, 219.

Lambert, George, a Presbyterian minister, was
born Jan. 81, 1742, at Chelsea, England. In 1767 he became a student at the theological school under the charge of Rev. James Scott, at Heckmondwicke, England. He pursued his studies there for five years, and then accepted the charge of a church at Hull, April 9, 1769, where he continued his ministrations until his death, March 17, 1816. Mr. Lambert was a minister of more than ordinary power and success, attaching to himself by his intellectual vigor, moral worth, and Christian excellence, not only his own people, but also numerous members and ministers of other denominations. He published two volumes of his sermons, On various useful and important Subjects, adapted to the Family and the Closet. Lambert was one of the founding members of the Missionary Society, and preached his first anniversary sermon in May, 1786. See Morison, Missionary Fathers, p. 575 sq.

Lambert, Johann Heinrich, a noted German philosopher and mathematician, was born Aug. 29, 1726, at Mühlhausen, Absac, of a French Protestant family. His talents and application to study having gained him friends, he obtained a good education, making remarkable progress in mathematics, philosophy, and Oriental languages. In 1756-58 he visited Holland, France, and Italy, and while residing in the first-named country appeared in print with his Sur les propriétés des courbes géométriques de la même allure, etc. In 1764 Frederick the Great summoned him to Berlin, and made him a member both of the Council of Architecture and of the Academy of Sciences. He died in that city Sept. 25, 1777, leaving behind him the renown of having been the chief teacher of mathematics in mathematics, a metaphysic that the 18th century had produced. Lambert was the first to lay a scientific basis for the measurement of the intensity of light in his Pyrométrie (Augsburg, 1760), and discovered the theory of the speaking-tube. In philosophy, and particularly in analytical logic, he sought to establish an accurate system by bringing mathematics to bear upon these subjects, in his Neues Organon, oder Gedanken über die Erforschung und Beseitigung der Wahrm (Lpzg, 1764, 2 vols.) Of his other works, we may mention his profound Römische Briefe über die Einrichtung des Weltwesens (Augsb, 1761), and his correspondence with Kant. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxix, 151 sq.; Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.; Graf, Lambert's Leben (1829); Huber, Lambert nach u. Leben u. Werken (1829).

Lambert, John, an English reformer, lived in the reign of Henry the Eighth, and was for a time minister of Southwark. At Antwerp, where on his return to England he was charged with heresy because he rejected the dogmas of transubstantiation. He was tried before the king and bishops, and, upon refusing to recant, was burned at Smithfield, Nov. 20, 1558. Lambert was distinguished for his learning. He wrote Treatise on the Lord's Supper (edited by John Ball, London, 1586, 16mo)—Treatise on Prediction and Election (Canterbury, 1556, 8vo). See Burnet, Hist. of the Reformation, i, 406; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, ii, 1061.

Lambert, Joseph, a French ecclesiastic and moralist, was born in Paris in 1654. He took sacred orders when thirty years old, and flourished afterwards as prior of Saint-Martin-de-Palaiseau. He died January 81, 1722. Among his best works are L'Amie évangélique, ou histoires sur les Évangiles (Paris, 1683-1687, 1 vol; 1688, 2 vols; 1708, 2 vols; 1729, 2 vols, 12mo, and often). See, for a full list of his writings, Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxix, 150.

Lambert, Ralph, D.D., a prelate of the Church of England, lived in the latter part of the 18th century. He was successively dean of Down, and bishop of Dromore and of Meath. He is noted especially for his plea in 1675 for the Roman Catholic minister's right to celebrate marriage. Some of his Sermons were published in 1698, 1702, and 1708. The date of his death, or other particulars of his life, are not at hand.—Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, ii, 1062; Reid, Hist. Irish Presb. Church, iii, 98.

Lambert, St. de, Charles, Françoise, marquise, a noted French poet, a contemporary and collaborator of Voltaire on the French Encyclopaedia, was born at Vizelle; in Lorraine, in 1716 or 1717. About 1750 he went to Paris, and soon found associates in Rousseau, Voltaire, Grimm, and other celebrated French intellectuals of Voltaire's day. He became especially celebrated by his 'Iliad,' A drawing of his production was actually owned by Voltaire and, finally, he was made a member of the French Academy. As a philosopher, however, he did not really appear before the public until 1779, when he published Les Princes des Mœurs chez toutes les nations, ou Cours de sociologie (1797-1800). He died Feb. 9, 1808. St. Lambert's personal history fully coincides with the doctrines he espoused. Ignoring all need of religion, his moeurs were truly Epicurean, and we need not wonder to find that his celebrity was first gained by the publication of his criminal intercourse with a woman, and the birth of an illegitimate child.

As to a more detailed description of St. Lambert's philosophical system, it may suffice to say here that it very much resembles that of Helvetius, whom St. Lambert slovishly followed. Thus he teaches, in treating of man's nature, and his duties with regard to human nature, that the only thing by which that first entered into his nature of life, is simply an organized and sentient mass, and that, whatever feelings or thoughts he may afterwards acquire, still they are simply different manifestations of the sensational faculty, occasioned by the pressure of his various wants and necessities. With regard to ethics, he maintains that, as man possesses only sensations, his sole good must be personal enjoyment, his only duty the attainment of it; and that, as we may be mistaken as to what objects are really adapted to promote our pleasure, the safest rule by which we can judge of duty in particular cases is public opinion." In his Cours d'Universel he divides the whole mass of man's duty into three classes—his duty to himself, to his own family, and to society at large; while the duties of religion are never mentioned, and the very name of God is altogether excluded. Condorcet's fundamental doctrine of ethics—the present perfectibility of mankind, both individually and socially, by means of education—St. Lambert proposed to substitute in place of the sanctions both of morality and religion, as the great regenerating principle of human nature (compare Morell, History of Modern Epicureanism, 1. 308). St. Lambert (1840); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v. J. H. W.)

Lambeth Articles. See Articles, LAMBERT.

Lambraschini, Louis, an eminent Italian prelate and statesman, was born at Genoa May 16, 1776. Having entered the Order of Barnabites, he became bishop of Sabine, then archbishop of Genoa, was sent to France as papal nuncio during the reign of Charles X, and finally created cardinal Sept. 80, 1831. Pope Gregory XVI appointed him abbot of Santa Maria di Faris, secretary of state for foreign affairs, librarian of the Church, grand prior of the order of St. John of Jerusalem, grand chancellor of the order of St. Gregory, and prefect of the congregation of studies. Opposed to all innovations, Lambraschini took an active part in all the religious and political persecutions which marked the pontifical career of Gregory XVI, and became consequently very unpopular. In 1845 he surrendered the direction of public instruction to Cardinal Mezzofanti. On the death of Gregory XVI in 1846, Lambraschini came very near being elected pope. Plut IX appointed him member of the states council, and restored him to the secretarship and librarianship of the Vatican. In 1847 he was also made bishop of Porto and San Filippo and of Civita Vecchia, chancellor of the pontifical orders, and subdean of the sacred college. When the revolution broke out in Ita-
Leuchte (Heb. Le'mekh, לֶמֶךְ, the other wise a vīg- avous youth, in paue Le'mekh, לֶמֶךְ; Septuag. and N. T. Ἁλύς; Josephus Ἀλύς, Ant. i, 2, 2), the name of two ancient patriarchs.

1. The fifth in descent from Cain, being the son of Methuselah, and father of Jabal, Jubal, Tubal-cain, and Naamah (Gen. iv, 18-24). B.C. cir. 3776. He is re- corded to have taken two wives, Adah and Zillah; and there appears no reason why the fact should have been mentioned, unless to point him out as the author of the evil practice of polygamy. The manner in which the sons of the woman of Adah ‘sinned before the Lord’ and the seven- teen useful arts mentioned under their several names (q.v.). The Targum of Jonathan (ad loc.) adds, that his daughter was ‘the mistress of sounds and songs’, i. e. the first poetess; which Jewish tradition embellishes by saying that all the world wondered after her, even the sons of God, and that evil spirits were born of her (Midrash on Ruth, and Zohar). Josephus (Ant. i, 2, 2) relates that the number of Lemekh’s sons was seventy-seven, and Jerome records the same tradition, adding that they were all cut off by the Deluge, and that this was the seventy-seventh vengence which Lemekh imprecated.

The most remarkable circumstance in connection with Lemekh is the poetical address which he is very abruptly introduced as making to his wives, being, indeed, the only example of antediluvian poetry extant (Gen. iv, 24):

Adah and Zillah, hear my voice; 
Wives of Lemekh, listen to my say! 
For a man I slew for my wound, 
Even a youth for my bruise:
If sevenfold Cain was to be avenged, 
Sevenfold Lemekh was to die.

It has all the appearance of an extract from an old poem, which we may suppose to have been handed down by tradition to the time of Moses. It is very difficult to discover what it refers, and the best explanation can be nothing more than a conjecture. It is the subject of a dissertation by Hilliger in Thesaurus Theologico-Philol. i, 141, and is discussed at length by the various commentators on Genesis. See also Hase, De Oraculo Lamechii (Brem. 1712); Schröder, De Lamechii homocidia (Marb. 1721). The following is a synopsis of ancient and modern opinions on this subject, (Rom. 260 [517], § 5) interprets Lamech’s words to mean that he had committed two murders, and that he deserved a much severer punish- ment than Cain, as having sinned after plainer warning; but adds, that some persons interpret the last lines of the poem as meaning that, whereas Cain’s sin increased, Lemekh’s decreased, and that because he had committed the punishment of the Deluge washing out the foulness of the world, so Lamech’s sin shall be followed in the seventy-seventy (see Luke iii, 29-38) generation by the coming of him who taketh away the sin of the world. Jerome (Ep. xxxvi, ad Basilium, t. i, p. 161) relates as a tradition of his predecessors and of the Jews that Cain was accidentally slain by Lamech in the seventh generation from Adam. This legend is told with fuller details by Jarchi. (See Kitto, Daily Bible Hist. ad loc.) According to him, the occasion of the poem was the offering of sevenfold vengeance to associate with him in conse- quence of his having killed Cain and Tubal-cain; Lam- mech, it is said, was blind, and was led about by Tubal- 
cain; when the latter saw in the thicket what he sup- posed to be a wild beast, Lamech, by his son’s direction, shot an arrow at it, and thus slew Cain; in alarm and indignation at the deed, he killed his son; hence his wives refused to associate with him; and he excuses himself as having acted without a vengeful or murci- 
ous purpose. Onkelos, followed by Pseudo-Jonathan, paraphrases it, ‘I have not slain a man that I should bear sin on his account.’ The Arab. Ver. (Swaddes) puts it in an interrogative form, ‘Have I slain a man?’ etc. Those two versions, which are substantially the same, are adopted by De Dieu and bishop Patrick. Aben- Ezra, Calvin, Drusius, and Cartwright interpret it in the future tense as a threat, ‘I will slay any man who wounds me.’ Luther considers the occasion of the poem to be the deliberate murder of Cain by Lamech. Light- foot (Jecus Chorog. Mar. p. 577, 585) considers Lamech as expressing remorse for having, as the first po- 
lygamist, introduced more destruction and murder than all the rest of mankind. This is the explanation found in a few Latin versions. Others regard Lemekh’s speech as a heaven-daring avowal of murder, in which he had himself received a slight wound. Some have even sought to identify Lemekh with the Asiatic deity Lemus or Lamech (see Movers, Phil. 477; Nork, Bibl. Mythol. i, 285). Herder, in his Hebrew Poetry, supposes that the haughty and revenge- ful Lamech, overjoyed by the invention of metallic weap- ons by his son Tubal-cain, breaks out in this triumphant song, boasting that if Cain, by the providence of God, was to be avenged sevenfold, he, by means of the newly-invented weapons, so much superior to anything of the kind known at that time, would be able to take a much heavier vengeance on those who had injured his father; and he adds this posthaste as to the occasion of the poem was partly antici- 
pated by Hess, and has been received by Rosenmust- ler, Ewald, and Delitzsch. Pfeiffer (Diff. Script. loc. p. 25) collects different opinions up to his time with his usual diligence, and concludes that the poem is Lemekh’s declaration of himself to his wives, who were in terror for the possible consequences of his having slain two of the posteriority of Seth. This judicious view is substani- 
tially that of Lowth (De S. Pooi Heb. iv, 91) and Mi- chaelis, who think that Lamech is excusing himself for some murder committed by his son, in which he had concurred (‘for a wound inflicted on me’), and he opposes a homici- 
dice of this nature to the wilful and inexcusable fratrici- de of Cain. Under this view Lamech would appear to have intended to comfort his wives by the assurance that he was really exposed to no danger; and that any cause which had taken up his life on the part of the friends of the deceased would not fail to bring down upon them the severest vengeance (compare Danie and Rose mustler, ad loc.; see also Turner’s Companion to Genesis, p. 209). ‘That he had slain a man, a young man (for the word of one clause is uncertain, but a more specific indication of the man in the other), and this not in cool blood, but in consequence of a wound or bruise he had himself received, is, if not the only possible, certainly the natural and obvious meaning of the
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words; and on the ground apparently of a difference between his case and that of Cain's—namely, that he had done under provocation what Cain had done without it. He assures himself of an interest in the divine guardianship and protection immeasurably greater than that granted to Cain. This speech was placed in the mouth of Lamech as language could well make it. But if it seems to imply, as it certainly does, that Lamech was not an offender after the type and measure of Cain, it at the same time shows how that branch of the human family were becoming familiar with strife and bloodshed, Cain. This speaks as though there were cause for presuming on the divine mercy and forbearance to brace themselves for its encounters, that they might repel force with force. The prelude already appears here of the terrible scenes which, after the lapse of a few generations, disclosed themselves far and wide—when the earth was filled with violence, and deeds were every day done which cried in the ear of heaven for vengeance. Such was the miserable result of the human art and the earthly resources brought into play by the Cainite race, and on which they proudly leaned for their ascendancy; nor is it too much to say that here also, even in respect to the poetic gift of nature, the beginning was prophetic of the end.” See Antidiluvians.

2. The seventh in descent from Seth, being the son of Methushelah, and father of several of whom, some of whom appointed a figure for Noah (Gen. 5:29; 1 Chron. 1:18; Luke ii, 86). B.C. 2897-2590. He was 182 years old at the birth of Noah, and survived that event 595 years, making his total age 777. His character appears to have been different from that of his Cainite namesake (see Deut. 26:23, the Talm. & Targ. J.; i Chron. 1:18). B.C. 2997-2590. He was 182 years old at the birth of Noah, and survived that event 595 years, making his total age 777. His character appears to have been different from that of his Cainite namesake (see Deut. 26:23, the Talm. & Targ. J.; i Chron. 1:18).

Chrysostom (Sermon, ix in Gen., and Hom. xxi in Gen.), perhaps thinking of the character of the other Lamech, speaks of this as an unrighteous man, though moved by a divine impulse to give a prophetic name to his son. Buttram and others, observing that the name of Lamech and Noah stand together in the list of Seth's, as well as of Cain's family, infer that the two lists are merely different versions or recensions of one original list—traces of two conflicting histories of the first human family. This theory is deservedly repudiated by Delitzsch on Gen. v.

Lamennais, Félicité Robert, Abbé de, a Roman Catholic theologian and philosopher, occupies a distinguished place in the ecclesiastical, political, and literary history of France of the 19th century. He was born of a noble family at St. Malo, in Bretaigue, June 6, 1782. In his boyhood, his clerical vocation to the Church of St. Thomas Aquinas was determined by the outbreak of the Revolution; he and his brother continued their studies together with singular independence. It is said that when only twelve years old he was able to read Livy and Plutarch with ease. In 1794, having been sent to live with an uncle, this relation, not knowing what to do with a wild boy, used to shut him up for whole days in a library consisting of two compartments, one of which, called 'Hell,' contained a large number of prohibited books, which little Robert was enjoined not to read. But the lad already cared for none but books of reflection, and finding something of profit in their teaching, that division became his favorite. Long hours were thus spent in reading the ancient pages of Rousseau, the thoughtful volumes of Malebranche, and other writers of sentiment and philosophy. Such a course of reading, far from producing its usual effects of precocious vanity and unbelief on so young a mind, served rather to ripen his judgment, and to develop that religious fervor which was a part of his nature (English Cyclopædia). He soon took a decided religious course, and, though offered a mercantile career by his father, chose the clerical profession. He entered upon the study of law, was made a member of the sacred of the office, he accepted in 1807 the position as teacher of mathematics in the college of his native place.

To promote practical piety, he published in 1808 a translation of the ascetic Guide Spirituel of Louis de Blois. In reference to the Concordat of Napoleon, he wrote Réflexions sur l'état de l'église en France pendant le dix-huitième siècle et sur la situation actuelle (1808). He here denounces the materialism propagated by the philosophers of the 18th century, bitterly deplores the apathy that accompanied this, and appealed to the hope from the beneficent influence of the Concordat, and declares the laws of religion and morality to be the supreme laws of life. The imperial censorship, however, detected a dangerous independent tendency in this work, especially in the demand for ecclesiastical synods and councils, and for the restoration of the Church. This was suppressed. After having received the clerical tonsure (in 1811), he published, in defence of the papal authority and against Napoleon, Tradition de l'église sur l'institution des évêques (Paris, 1814). From retirement in England, whither he had been obliged to flee during the Hundred Days, Lamennais returned to France (in 1816) in full sympathy with the Restoration, and entered more ardently than ever upon the work of disseminating his earlier opinions. He was ordained priest in 1817, and in this year began the publication of his Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion (Paris, 1817-1820, 4 vols.). This work, of which Lacordaire said that it caused its author to rise, in a single day, like a new Bossuet above the horizon, thoroughly aroused public attention to the author and his principles, attracting many readers by its style and subject. Numerous editions followed, and it was translated into many languages. The work belongs to the Catholic reactionary school of philosophy, to which Joseph de Maistre had given the leading impulse. The author first points out certain perilous tendencies of the age which seem to threaten another revolution, and notices the various systems of religious indifference. He next asserts the absolute importance of religion to the individual and the state. The inquiry concerning the ground of certainty in matters of religion is then met by postulating authoritv—that is, the consensual testimony of the Christian Church. This is found through many editions. The work belongs to the Catholic reactionary school of philosophy, to which Joseph de Maistre had given the leading impulse. The author first points out certain perilous tendencies of the age which seem to threaten another revolution, and notices the various systems of religious indifference. He next asserts the absolute importance of religion to the individual and the state. The inquiry concerning the ground of certainty in matters of religion is then met by postulating authoritv—that is, the consensual testimony of the Christian Church. This is found through many editions.

The French Church was alarmed at so extreme a position, and disavowed its own champion. A Défence de l'Essai sur l'indifférence was issued by the author. In 1818 Lamennais joined hands for a brief period with certain Royalists in founding the "Conservateur," but afterwards, in sympathy with another coterie called the druyens blancs, his severity in writing against the management of the university invited the attention of the police authorities. In 1824 he was released from prison and was received with distinction by Pope Leo XII; he was also removed to the cardinalship, as he had previously declined a bishopric which had been urged upon him by the ministry at Paris. In La Religion considérée dans ses rapports avec l'ordre civil et politique (Paris, 1825-26, 2 vols.) he first began to exhibit that freedom of thought which was a part of his nature. He was set off with a fine flourish by the French Church. There is a manifest progagandism in the coming disturbance, of the breach between the hierarchical authority and the spirit of the times in his Progrès de la révolution et de la guerre contre l'Église (1829).
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The July revolution completed, the Church must now be saved by bringing it into harmony with the demands of civil liberty, and to serve once more as an instrument of the Lamennais entered upon the second period of his career. With the co-operation of Lacordaire (q.v.) and Montalbemont (q.v.) he founded the journal L’Avenir, which had for its motto "God and Freedom," and for its guiding thought the Church that the latter can save itself from the ruin which awaits it political absolutism only by freeing itself from all relations with the state, and from the corruptions of hierarchical luxury, while it is to flourish only through the voluntary devotion of its adherents, and in harmony with laws which secure for the people freedom of education and worship. In this he maintained the doctrine enthusiastically believed that Rome would receive it. He was present at Rome in 1831 with Lacordaire and Montalbemont, and sought to win the representatives of the French, Russian, Austrian, and Prussian courts to his views. An audience was granted by the pope only on condition of silence concerning the matters agitated. When, however, Lacordaire had presented a scheme of these views in writing, the French bishops, on April 22, 1832, presented an unqualified opposition to them. A few extracts from an ecyclical letter of the bishops which was presented to the pope and published in the L’Avenir explain the peculiar position assumed by the writers of L’Avenir: “From this infectious source of indifferentism,” says the encyclical, “flows the absurd and erroneous maxim, or, rather, that madness, which insists in guarding the Church from any part of the spiritual and ministerial life which we cannot regard with too much horror, the liberty of the press to publish all sorts of writings, a liberty which some persons dare to demand and extol with so much noise and ardor.” A copy of it was sent with special explanations to Lamennais by cardinal Fesch, who urged him to send his submission to the authority he had himself so highly extolled, and, as if to make even more explicit the meaning of the ecyclical which he was the transmitter, added: “The doctrines of L’Avenir upon the liberty of worship and the Church’s own liberty, are in opposition to the teaching, the maxims, and the policy of the Church” (the italics are ours). They have exceedingly astonished and afflicted the holy father; for if, under certain circumstances, prudence compels us to tolerate them as lesser evils, such doctrines can never be held by people of the new school to be legitimate in any, or as things desirable. Strangely enough, as it must appear to Protestant ideas, the three editors of L’Avenir—Lamennais and his two younger coeditors, Lacordaire and Montalbemont—withdrew from the papal see, and, of course, to evince their sincerity, discontinued the publication of L’Avenir. But Lamennais having afterwards, in certain smaller articles, expressed himself in a spirit contrary to the views of the ecyclical, he received a letter from the pope on the subject, and thereupon, in a formal way, subscribed a submission, Dec. 11, 1833, at the palace of the archbishop of Paris. In the Afières de Rome (see below), however, he declared that this submission on his part had been made only for the sake of peace, and that, in truth, the welfare of the people must be considered before that of the Church. In 1834 Pius IX brooded appeared, which passed in 100 years through 100 editions, and was translated into many languages. In this work a new spirit is manifest. In earnest language the former and existing evils of society are deplored, while in a style of prophetic arder the future is anticipated. A new Christianity, based upon the principle of the New Testament, the rationalized democratic state is sought. A certain ideal external form was still Lamennais’ hope. He had idealized the Church, and would now seek a like panacea in a social reorganization (see Socialism). L’Avenir of 1834, Oct. 1681, p. 731. This work was severely condemned by a special decree of Gregory XVI, Aug. 7, 1884. In the Afières de Rome (Paris, 1836) Lamennais enters fully upon the final period of his life. He here breaks completely and irrevocably with the Church; declares the Roman hierarchy, of which he had long been the champion, to be incompatible with a true Christianity and a true humanism, and hereafter Lamennais was regarded by the Church authorities as an apostate. Like Luther, Ulrich von Hutten, and many other great men, Lamennais has been completely destroyed by the sight of the corruptions of Rome in her very stronghold. “His strong and clear vision saw in her but a corpse which was vain to attempt to resuscitate; a conglomerate religion made up of Christianity perverted by Jewish symbolism, and degraded and sensualized by Oriental and classical mythology and philosophy. Yet he hesitated long before he could make up his mind to deny his whole previous life, to forsake and repudiate what he had formerly defended, to become an antagonist of the Church of which he had formerly been the bulwark and the champion; and it required a year’s meditation and examination amid the torments of parental difficulty of La Chesnaye, before he resolved finally and forever to break with the Church of Rome. In a worldly point of view, he had everything to lose and nothing to gain by the course which he pursued, and it required no uncommon amount of courage on his part to act as he acted” (For. and Brit. Rev., Rev. Oct., 1883, p. 780). In 1837 he began to edit a daily journal, Le tiers du Peuple. His work, Le Pays et le Gouvernement (1840), was obnoxious to the authorities, and caused the author two years’ imprisonment and a fine of 2000 francs. The most important and elaborate work of the latter days of Lamennais is his Esquisse d’une Philosophie, in 4 volumes (Paris, 1840-46); a work eloquent and religious in tone, and exhibiting the author’s general philosophical conceptions in this later period of his life. Here the authoritative ground of certainty is found, not in the common testimony of mankind, but in the common reason. Philosophy is understood in a broad sense, having for its range the facts of general being; it is not merely a matter of psychology or metaphysics. The method of this philosophy is the assumption of certain primary ideas, from which all other ideas are derived. The principle of solute existence is not capable of proof, and in like manner God and the world are two fundamental assumptions. God has in his own essence necessity and variety. He is an eternal conscious Ego. He has the triune attributes of power, intelligence, and love, and ascribed in the Scripture last mentioned as the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. God has society within himself, is the type of all society, and the three attributes produce and explain the laws of whatever is outside of God. These attributes are recognised as controlling elements through every development of the philosophic system. Creation is not emanation, but the original divine ideas are made real by God’s free power. This is not Pantheism or Dualism. Matter arises under the mysterious power of God in the limitation of individuals. Properly speaking, matter is not a distinct entity; it is but a limitation of that which exists. Time and space, the forms of our existence, are the limitations of eternity and immensity, which are the modes of God’s existence. The nature of the universe is to be determined by the aid of the discourses of science, but the laws of its existence and of its forms are not the proper province of the intellectual being are determined by the application of the principles inherent in the three divine attributes. Man is the most elevated of the beings known to us. The great problem concerning man is the origin of moral evil. This is to be explained as a fall from the free moral agent into a state of attachment with God. Thus, although hurtful to the subject, the actuality of moral evil...
does not introduce any positive disorder into the universe regarded as a realization of the divine ideas. The true purpose of man's life is to free himself from this state of isolation, of negation in self, and come into entire harmony with the divine will. The application of this system to the several faculties and pursuits of man is developed at length in the 'Religion.' Hope for the future thus lies in the development of the people. Religion and nature will issue in one when fully disclosed. Everything in the work seems to proceed from a religious, but no longer churchly stand-point.

Lamennais, on the whole, follows the line of universal religion. In the 'Cristiques et pensées diverses sur la Religion et la Philosophie' (Paris, 1841) gives the author's views on social questions. In place of the Church authority whose claims he formerly advocated, he would now have the democratic theocracy honored. This is in great measure a retraction of his work 'Sur l'indifférence en matière de Religion.' Of similar import is 'La Religion du passé et de l'avenir du Peuple' (1842). It is no longer the future of the Church of which he speaks, but of the people. His Church is now the religion of brotherly love, and he will have it rise upon the ruins of the old Church. Hope lies in the new Church, in the state.

Lamennais and Durens (1848), and Les ecclésiastes, traduction nouvelle avec des notes et des réflexions (1846), were issued professedly as a defence for the people against a mythological and superstitious credulity. Lamennais was greatly interested in the February Revolution; and his opposition to patriotism, his abhorrence of violence against the Church and religious interests. Gratitude for his services in this regard led to his election to the Assembly from the department of the Seine, and in his seat he always sided with the Left. He is said to have spoken but once, and that in opposition to the dictatorship of Cavaignac. He undertook the editorship, conjointly with Pascal Duprat, of the journal 'Le Peuple Constituant.' He was grieved by the violence of the Red Republicans, though still steadfast in his hope of the democracy; and was forced into retirement by the coup d'état, meeting with disappointment in this direction likewise. Nothing, however, availed to change the views he had in later years adopted, and the Church sought in vain, through the influence of relatives, to recall him to his faith on his dying bed. He died at Paris, in the Rue du Grand-Charron, Feb. 27, 1864. He had refused to see a minister, and was ordered that no formal ceremony should attend his burial. He wished his body to be placed in the cobbled walls of the poor, or pauper's hearse, and this direction was complied with. His remains were followed by a few friends, as Beranger and Thiers, and also by the police prohibition, by a large number of the people, who gathered at the cemetery of Pere la Chaise. No prayer was uttered, nor last word said, and the remains were placed in the common grave, without cross or stone to mark their resting-place. Lamennais was small of stature, though of attractive physiognomy; somewhat slow and hesitating in speech, with something of the Breton dialect; less able with his tongue than with his pen. His family had lost most of their property in the first Revolution, and he himself a large part of his own wealth through misplaced confidence. In later years he resided mostly on a small estate in Lachessaye, near Dinan, in Bretagne.

As a literary character, Lamennais occupied a prominent place in the revival of style under the Restoration. His era succeeds that of Chateaubriand, and corresponds with that of Madame de Staël and Joseph de Maistre. He was an earnest if not profound thinker, but especially brilliant as a writer. He had the culture of art combined with the vehemence of passion, though the latter element perhaps too often expressed itself in the manner of declamation. As a theorist in social philosophy he had a profound influence, and Benjamin Constant, who took his stand-point in individual liberty, while Lamennais set out from the assumption of a consenting unity in society and religion. It has been claimed that his steadfastness to this primary principle explains the variation of position which changed political circumstances seemed to necessitate, causing him to be at one time all for the Church, at another all for the people. There were, at all events, three distinct periods in his career, in the first of which he was Ultramontane, in the second he sought to mediate between the Church and the world, and in the third of which he claims to be the most prominent supporter of the democratic ideas, while at the last he cast off all churchly control, and became a chiliasm prophet of the democracy.

M. Guizot, in the second series of his Meditations on the Actual State of Christianity, thus portrays Lamennais: 'Lamennais reeled soldier but the same time the proudest worshipper of his own reason. Under the pressure of events without, and of an ardent controversy, a transformation took place in him, marked at once by its logical deductions and its moral inconsistency; he changed his camp without changing his principles; in the attempt to preserve the supreme authority of his Church to admit his principles he had failed; and from that instant the very spirit of revolt that he had so severely rebuked broke loose in his soul and in his writings, finding expression at one time in an indignation full of righteous appeal, at another in a tender sympathy for the miseries of humanity. The Words of a Believer are the eloquent outburst of this tumult in his soul. Plunged in the chaos of sentiments the most contradictory, and yet claiming to be always true, he came forth from the tempest in the state the most bated of democrats, and in the Church the haughtiest of rebels. It is not without sorrow that I thus express my unreserved opinion of a man of superior talent—mind lofty, soul intense; a man in the sequel profusely had himself, although haughty in his very fall. One cannot read in their stormy success the numerous writings of the abbe de Lamennais without recognising in them traces, I will not say of his intellectual perplexities—his pride did not feel them—but of the sufferings of his soul, whether for good or for evil. His was a noble nature, but full of exaggeration in his opinions, of fanatical arrogance, and of angry acerbity in his polemics. One title to our gratitude remains to the abbe de Lamennais—he thundered to purpose against the gross and vulgar forgetfulness of the great moral interests of humanity. His essay on indifference in religious questions is an emphatic rule laid upon that vice of the time, and recalled men's souls to regions above. And thus it was, too, that he rendered service to the great movement and awakening of Christians in the 19th century, and that he merits his place in that movement. His predecessor, Bossuet, had been demanding the liberty of the press; Lamennais was demanding the national church. One of Lamennais' last and most earnest injunctions was that certain papers, which contained his latest sentiments, should be published without alteration or suppression; but the religious advisers of his niece (who was also his housekeeper) so far wrought on her susceptibility as to cause her to refuse to give up the papers to the persons whom Lamennais had authorized to superintend their publication. The matter was in consequence brought before the proper legal tribunal, when the judges directed (August, 1856) that the papers should be handed over to the publishers in the publication in that movement.

The first edition of Lamennais' collected works was published under the title 'Œuvres complètes' (Paris, 1886—87, 12 vols. 8vo). Several editions have appeared since. See Pagnanel, Examen critique des Opinions de l'Abbé de Lamennais (2d edit., 1823, 2 vols. 8vo); H. Lacordaire, Considérations sur le Système commun de M. de Lamennais (1843, 4vo); E. Lermontin, Les Adversaires de Lamennais (in the Revue des Deux Mondes, 1824); Robine, Études sur l'Abbé de Lamennais (1883); Madoire, Histoire sécrète du Parti et de l'opposition de M. de Lamennais (1849); Lomer, M. de Lamennais (1849); Sainte-Beuve, Lamennais et Port-Royal Littéraire, v. (Paris, 1846); and, by the same author, Portraits Contemporains (1846), i, 134—191; E. Rémain, Lamennais et ses écrits (in the Revue des Deux Mondes, August, 1857); Morell, Histo.
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The opinion just mentioned, that the book of Lamentations was written prophetically in view of the desolation of Jerusalem, and belongs to the class of prophetic kinsht, as intended to describe that event prophetically, is an ancient opinion, held and defended by critics of no mean reputation, is not now so generally entertained as formerly. The prophetic laments are usually very brief; or, if they be more than a few verses long, they tend to pass into distinct prophecy, and rarely keep up to the close their character as lamentes (Ezek. xxvii, 27, etc.). Perhaps the most perfect example is the lament in Ezek. xxxvii, 12-19; but even there we meet with a "Thus saith the Lord" (ver. 19). It is therefore strange factse, improvements on what are analogues composed that are lengthened and elaborated as the book of Lamentations should bear a distinctly prophetical character; though, on the other hand, its assumed prophetical character might be said to justify this extended wall. Moreover, in the book itself there is not the slightest indication that it does bear such a character; and the most ancient tradition—that contained in the Sept.—gives it to be a historical foundation. It is, indeed, an old conjecture, that the book of Lamentations is identical with the lament which Jeremiah composed on the death of Josiah (2 Chron. xxxv, 25); and the main or only part is inconsistent with the fact that throughout the entire book there is not a single allusion to the death of Josiah. Only once is mention made of the king, "the anointed of the Lord" (iv, 20), and the reference is evidently not to Josiah. See LAMENTATIONS, BOOK OF.

LAMENTATIONS, Book of, one of the books of the O. T. commonly assigned to Jeremiah, and consisting of a remarkable series of threatenings. In many respects it is peculiar and almost unique in the sacred canon. See Bulk.

I. Title.—The Hebrew name of this book, פַּלְמַתְא, is, as in the case of the five books of Moses, from the Hebrew word with which it opens, and which appears to have been almost a received formula for the commencement of a song of wailing (compare 2 Sam. i, 18-27). The Rabbins remark upon this title, "Three prophets have used the word פַּלְמַתְא with reference to Israel: Moses, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. To what are they to be likened?" To three bridesmen (מִפְּרָשָׁהוֹ) who have seen the afterwards widowed wife in three different stages. The first has seen her in her opulence and her pride, and he said, "Oh, how shall I bear along your overbearing and your strike?" (Deut. i, 2). The second has seen her in her dissipation and dissolution, and he said, "Oh, how has she become a harlot?" (Isa. i, 10). And the third has seen her in her utter desolation, and he said, "Oh, how does she sit solitary!" (Lam. i, 1) (Introduction to Echa Rabath). Later Jewish writers usually designate the book by the more descriptive title פַּלְמַתְא, קִנָּה, "lamentations"=dirge, a term which they found in Jer. vii, 29; ix, 10, 20; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 25, and which already had probably been applied familiarly to the book itself. See LAMENT.

The Septuagint translators found themselves obliged, as in the other cases referred to, to substitute a title more significant and more adapted, Spinoza [Laparo] as the equivalent of the latter Hebrew term. The Vulgate gives the Greek word, and explains it (Thomei, id est, Lamentations Jeremiae Prophetae). Luther and the A. V. have given the translated title only, as "Klagelied" and "Lamentationes" respectively.

II. Postface.—In the former Hebrew Bible the book of Lamentations stands in the Hexapla (Kethubim) between Ruth and Ecclesiastes. The Jews believe that it was not written by the gift of prophecy, but by the Spirit of God (between which they make a distinction), and give this as a reason for not placing it among the prophets. It is an arrangement, adapted for use, and reproduced in some editions, as in the Bomberg Bible of 1521, it stands among the five Megilloth after

The only other passage in which פַּלְמַתְא, or its cognate verb פָּלַת (kômôn), is found, is Ezek. li, 10, where we read of a "roll of a book," פָּלַת פָּרָשָׁהוֹ (megillath sepher), being spread out before the prophet; and there was written therein lamentations, פָּלַת (kînîm), and mourning, and woe. It is a remarkable coincidence, but probably nothing more, that immediately before the book of Ezekiel there stands in most of the versions of the Hebrew Scriptures a פָּלַת, or roll, which answers quite to this description. Those who regard the book of Lamentations as belonging to the class of prophetic laments might probably find in this coincidence a confirmation of their view.
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The books of Moses, or books of Ruth, Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song. This position of the book probably had a liturgical origin, as it is read in their synagogues on the ninth of the month Ab, which is a fast day. In the holy days of the ancient Hebraic and Greek books in Hebrew copy, however, this book is supposed to have occupied the place which is now assigned to it in most versions, namely, after Jeremiah. Indeed, from the manner in which Josephus reckons up the books of the Old Testament (Contra Apion. i. 4), it has been supposed that Jeremiah and it originally formed but one book (Pridieus, Connection, i. 332). The Septuagint groups the writings connected with the name of Jeremiah together, but the book of Baruch comes between the prophecy and the Lamentation. On the hypothesis of some critics, it was originally a production annexed to the poem, and not the conclusion of the prophecy, and that the preface of the Sept. (which is not found either in the Hebrew or in the Targum of Jonathan) was inserted to diminish the abruptness occasioned by this separation of the book from that with which it had been originally connected, it would follow that the arrangement of the Vulg. and the A. V. corresponds more closely than any other to that which we must look upon as the original one.

III. Forms.
The structure of this book is peculiarly artistic, being strictly poetical, and in many portions acrostic.

(1.) Ch. i., ii., and iv contain 22 verses each, arranged in alphabetical order, each verse falling into three nearly balanced clauses (Ewald, Poet. Rhet., p. 147); i. 19 forms an exception, as having a fourth clause, the result of an interpolation, as if the writer had shaken off for a moment the restraint of his self-imposed law. Possibly the inversion of the usual order of Z and B in ch. ii., iii., iv. may have arisen from a like forgetfulness. Gruter (ad loc.) explains it on the assumption that here Jeremiah followed the order of the Chaldaean alphabet. Similar anomalies occur in Ps. xcvii., and have received a like explanation (De Wette, Ps. i. 52). It is, however, a mere hypothesis that the Chaldaean alphabet differed in this respect from the Hebrew; nor is it easy to see why Jeremiah should have chosen the Hebrew order for one poem, and the Chaldaean for the other.

(2.) Ch. iii. contains three short verses under each letter of the alphabet, the initial letter being three times repeated.

(3.) Ch. v contains the same number of verses as ch. i., ii., iv, but without the alphabetical order. The thought suggests itself to illustrate verses where the book closes may have carried the writer beyond the limits within which he had previously confined himself; but the conjecture of (Ewald) that we have here, as in Ps. xvi. and x, the rough draft of what was intended to have been finished afterwards in the same manner as the others, is at least a probable one.

IV. Author.-The poems included in this collection appear in the Hebrew canon with no name attached to them, and there is no direct external evidence that they were written by the prophet Jeremiah earlier than the date given in the prefatory verse which appears in the Septuagint, which is as follows: "And it came to pass, after Israel had been carried away captive, and Jerusalem had been desolate, that Jeremiah satweeping, and lamented with this lamentation over Jerusalem, and said." This has been copied into the Arabic and Vulgate versions; but as it does not exist in the Hebrew, Chaldee, or Syriac, it was regarded by Jerome as spurious, and is not admitted into his version. This represents, however, the established belief of the Jews after the completion of the canon. The Talmud, and ancient of the earliest traditions, has: "Jeremiah wrote his book, the book of Kings, and the Lamentations" (Raba Bathra, 15, a.). Later Jewish writers are equally explicit (Ezra Robb, introd.). Josephus (Ant. iii. 5, 1) follows, as far as the question of authorship is concerned, in the same track, and the absence of any tradition or probable con- jecture to the contrary leaves the concensus of critics and commentators almost undisturbed. (See below.) An agreement among the last critics might be expected, on strong internal evidence. The poem belongs unmistakably to the last days of the kingdom or the commencement of the exile. They are written by one who speaks, with the vividness and intensity of an eye-witness, of the misery which he beholds. It might almost be enough to ask who else besides him could have written with that union of strong passionate feeling and entire submission to Jehovah which characterizes both the Lamentations and the Prophecy of Jeremiah. The evidences of identity are, however, stronger and more minute. In both we meet, once and again, with the picture of the "Virgin-daughter of Zion" sitting down in her shame and misery (Lam. i. 15; ii. 13; Jer. xiv. 17). In both there is the same vehement outpouring of sorrow. The prophet's eye's flow down with tears (Lam. i. 16; ii. 11; iii. 48, 49; Jer. ix. i.; xxii. 17; xiv. 17). The sufferer appeals for vengeance to the righteous Judge (Lam. iii. 46-64; Jer. xxvi. 19). The prophet is as the rival nation that was to fall in the fall of Jerusalem prepare for a like desolation (Lam. iv. 21; Jer. xii. 12). The personal references to Jeremiah's own fate, such as we know it from his book of Prophecies and Kings, are not wanting (comp. Lam. ii. 11, and iii. with Jer. xv. 15 sq.; xvii. 13 sq.; xx. 7; Lam. iii. 14 with Jer. xxx. 7; iii. 61-66 with Jer. xxix. 18; v. 17-20). As in the Prophecies, so here, the iniquities of the people are given as the cause of the exile and the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple (compare i. 5, 8, 14, 22; iii. 5, 9, 42; iv. 6, 22; v. 16 with Jer. xxii. 22-26; xiv. 7; xvii. 12). We trust in false prophets and iniquitous priests their relying on the safety of Jerusalem, and on the aid of powerless and treacherous allies, etc. What is more, his poetical and prophetical individuality pervades the whole so unmistakably that it seems hardly necessary to refer to the numerous allusions passed upon by Bertholdt, Keil, De Wette, John, Bleek, and others. If contents, spirit, manner, individuality, are any guarantee at all, then Jeremiah is the author, and sole author of the book before us. He even seems to refer to his other book (comp. ii. 14; Jer. xiv. 18). But were any further proof needed of the writer's genius and very deep and phrased common to both works, and peculiar to them alone (comp. above, Lam. i. 11, and Jer. vi. 14, and viii. 11; see Psalm Lxxix., Lam. iii. 47, and Jer. xxiv. 17; xlviii. 43; יֵבָנָה יִבָּנָה יִבָּנָה יִבָּנָה, Lam. ii. 11, and Jer. vi. 14, and viii. 11; see Psalm Lxxxix., Lam. ii. 25, and Jer. vi. 25, and frequently the very frequent use of יֵבָנָה יֵבָנָה יֵבָנָה יֵבָנָה, יֵבָנָה יֵבָנָה יֵבָנָה יֵבָנָה, יֵבָנָה, יֵבָנָה in both; phrases like "I became a mockery all day long," Lam. iii. 14, and Jer. xx. 7, etc.: the use of the parag, and other grammatical peculiarities. See Keil, Einl. in die A. T. 7. § 129).

The only exceptions to this unanimity of opinion as to the authorship of Lamentations are Harriet, who, for reasons of his own, ascribed the five different elegies to Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, and king Dey-ga respectively, and, in his own time, Cotel. The last holds that only Lam. ii. and iv belong to Jeremiah (the former writer in Palestine, the latter in Egypt), the three others, however, having been written by Jeremiah's contemporaries and disciples. His reasons for this assumption are that these elegies have treated the same subject five times; that ii and iv are different from i, iii, v, which are less worthy of Jeremiah's pen; that the three latter do not quite fit Jeremiah's own circumstances; and, finally, because there is
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a difference in the alphabetical structure (see above) of i and ii. iv. These objections to Jeremiah's exclusive authorship seem about as tenable as Hard's Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, and consorts. The first two points are not worth consideration; the third is answered by the simple proposition that they are poems, and as a historical narrative which we have supposed, and there is a certain likelihood, be given to the poet in the use of broad similes in his generalizing, and in his putting himself sometimes in the place of the whole people as its spokesman and chief mourner. And, finally, the structure differs in i from ii and iv, then it may as well be said that this is as trustworthy as most of the other legends of the time of Helena. He may have written it immediately after the attack was over, or when he was with Gedaliah at Mizpeh, or when he was with his countrymen at Tahpanhes. Pareau refers ch.i to Jer.xxxvii, 3 sq.; ch.ii to Jer.xxxviii, 2 sq.; ch. iv to Jer.xxxvi, 1 sq. and 2 Kings xxv, 1 sq.; ch. ii to the destruction of the city and Temple; ch. v is admitted to be the latest in order, and to refer to the time after that event. Ewald says that the situation is the same throughout, and only the time different. "In chaps. i and ii we find sorrow without composure; in ch. iii the constancy of the poet is struck; in ch. iv the lamentation is renewed with greater violence; but soon the whole people, as if urged by their own spontaneous impulse, fell to weeping and hoping" (Die Prophetischen Bücher). De Wette describes the Lamentations somewhat cursorily, as "five songs relating to the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple (ch. i, ii, iv, v), and to the unhappy lot of the poet himself (chap. iii). The historical relation of the whole cannot be doubted; but yet there seems a gradual ascent in describing the condition of the city" (Eberm.)

There can hardly be any doubt, however, as to the time to which these chronicles refer. A brief glance at the corresponding portions in the books of Kings and Chronicles affords decisive evidence that they speak, one and all, of the whole period from the beginning of the last siege by Nebuchadnezzar to its terrible end. This has also, from the Sept. and the Midrash downwards, been the almost unanimous opinion of investigators (Carpzov, Eichhorn, Jahn, Bertholdt, Bormelius, Horner, Klieger, Pareau, etc.). It would seem to be equally clear that these poems belong, broadly speaking, to no particular phase of the great epoch of terror, but that, written probably within a very brief space of time (more especially does this appear to be the case with the first four), they portray indiscriminately some woeful scene that presented itself "at the head of every street," or gives us a general representation of the whole terror, misery, despair, hope, prayer, revenge, as these in vehement succession swept over the poet's soul.

Yet it has been suggested (and the text has been strained to the utmost to prove it) that the successive elegies are the pictures of successive events portrayed in song; that, in fact, the Lamentations are a descriptively—tragedy—a drama in which, scene after scene, the onward march of dread fate is described, interspersed with plaints, reflections, prayers, consolations, such as the chorus would utter in grave and measured rhythms, accompanied by the sighs and tears to which the spectators would be moved by the irredeemably doomed heroes and actors. Thus, for instance, it has been maintained that the first chapter speaks of Jehoiachin's capture and exile (Horner, Jahn, Klieger, etc.,) upon which there is this to be observed, that a mere glance at 1 Kings xiv, 17 shows that the elegies are described in this first elegy (famine, slaughter of youths, etc.) do not in the least agree with the time and circumstances of Jehoiachin, while they do exactly correspond with the following chapter of Kings, in which the reign under Zedekiah, with all its accompaniments, the downfall of the city and empire, are related with the severe calmness of the historian, or the dry minimum of the annalist. Neither can we, for our own part,
see that "gradual change in the state of the city" which de Wette sees in the consecutive chapters; nor can we trace the gradual progress in the mind of the people—that is, in the first two chapters, heaviest, forevery incon- solable grief; in the third, the turning-point (the clas- sical propriety); in the fourth and fifth, the mind that gradually collects of finding itself in a new position with a new prayer—which is Ewald's ingenious suggestion, to which Keil assents, as far as "a general inner progress of the poems" goes. To our, and, we take it, to every unbiased view, each of the elegies is complete, as far as it goes, in itself, all treating the same, or almost the same, or the most similar, themes in every main respect, they might, to a certain degree, be likened to the "In Memoriam" and the second movement of the "Eroica"—the highest things to which we can at all compare them in the varied realms of song. The gen- eral state of the nation, as well as of the poet, seems much different from the first to the last, or, at all events, the fourth poem. It would certainly appear, moreover, as if, so far from forming a consistent and progressive whole, consciously leading onward to harmony and su- preme peace, they had not even been composed in the order in which they are before us now. Thus, e.g., the fourth chapter is certainly more akin to the second than to the third. Accident, more than a settled plan, must have placed them in their present order. But the his- tory of this collection and redaction is one so obscure that we will not even venture on a new speculation con- cerning it.

VI. Contents.—The book is a collection of five elegies sung on the ruins of Zion; and the fall of Judas, the de- struction of the sanctuary, the exile of the people, and all the threats of sword, fire, and famine in the city of Jerusalem, are the principal themes upon which they turn in many varied strains. We may regard the first two chapters as occupied chiefly with the circumstances of the siege, and those immediately following that event: in the third the prophet deplores the calamities and persecutions to which he was himself exposed; the fourth refers to the ruin and desolation of the city, and the unhappy lot of Zebediah; and the fifth and last seems to be a sort of prayer in the name, or on behalf, of the Jews in their dispersion and captivity. More particularly,

1. Chap. i. The opening verse strikes the key-note of the whole poem. That which haunts the prophet's mind is the solitude in which he finds himself. She that was "princess among the nations" (1) sits (like the judea capit tailor) of the Roman medals), "solitary," "as a widow." Her "lovers" (the nations with whom she had been linked, 2) have deserted her (1); she has entered into the sanctuary, and mock at her Sabbaths (7, 10). After the manner so characteristic of Hebrew poetry, the personality of the writer recedes and now advances, and blends by hardly perceptible transi- tions with that of the city which he personifies, and with which he, as it were, identifies himself. At one time it is the daughter of Zion that asks, "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?" (12). At another, it is the prophet who looks on her, and portrays her "spreading forth her hands, and there is none to comfort her" (17). Mingling with this outburst of woe there are two thoughts characteristic both of the man and the time. The calamities which the nation suffers are the consequences of its sins. There must be the confession of those sins: "The Lord is righteous, for I have rebelled against his commandment" (18). There is, however, this gleam of consolation that Judah is not alone in her sufferings. Those who have exulted in her destruction shall drink of the same cup. They shall be like unto her in the day that the Lord shall call (21).

2. Chap. ii. As the solitude of the city was the sub- ject of the first lamentation, so the destruction is here laid waste is that which is most conspicuous in the second. Jehovah had thrown down in his wrath the stronghold of the daughter of Judah (2). The rampart and the wall lament together (8). The walls of the palace are given up into the hand of the enemy (7). The breach is great, as if made by the rushing of the sea (18). With this there had been united all the horrors of the famine and the assault—young children fainting for hunger in the top of every street (19); women eating their own children that they might not die of famine (19); the body of the city laid waste (22); and the city of the tribes imitated by the city of the nations (23). With this there had been ingrafted the horrid instances of banishment (14). A righteous judgment had fallen on them. The prophets found no vision of Jehovah (9). The king and the princes who had listened to them were captive among the Gentiles.

3. Chap. iii. It is the different structure of the poem, which has already been noticed, indicates a corre- sponding difference in its substance. In the two pre- ceding poems Jehovah had spoken of the misery and destruction of Jerusalem. In the third he speaks chief- ly, though not exclusively, of his own. He himself is the suffering one. The miseries of the city are brought into darkness and not into light (2). He looks back upon the long life of suffering which he has been called on to endure, the scorn and derision of the people, the bitterness as of one drunk with wormwood (14, 15). But his suffering was not one of abject misery in darkness and despair. Here, as in the prophecies, we find a Gospel for the weary and heavy-laden, a trust, not to be shaken, in the mercy and righteousness of Jeho- vah. The mercies of the Lord are new every morning (22, 29). He is good to them that wait for him (29). The retrospect of that sharp experience showed him that it all formed part of the discipline which was in- tended to lead him on to a higher blessedness. It was good for a man to bear the yoke in his youth, good that he should both hope and quietly wait (26, 27). With this, equally characteristic of the prophet's individual- ity, there is the protest against the wrong which had been or might hereafter be committed by rulers and princes (34-36), the confession that all that had come on him and his people was but a righteous retribution, to be acceptable humbly, with searchings of heart, and repentance (38-42). The closing verses may refer to that special epoch in the prophet's life when his own sufferings had been sharpest (58-56), and the cruelties of his enemies most triumphant. If so, we can enter more fully, remembering this, into the thanksgiving with which he acknowledges the help, deliverance, and companionship which he had found in God (57, 58).

Feeling sure, that at some time or other, there would be for him a yet higher lesson, we can enter with some measure of sympathy even into the terrible earnestness of his appeal from the unjust judgment of earth to the righteous Judge, into his cry for a retribution without which it seemed to him that the Eternal Righteousness would fail (64-66).

4. Chap. iv. It might seem, at first, as if the fourth poem did but reproduce the pictures and the thoughts of the first and second. There come before us once more the famine, the misery, the desolation that had fallen on the holy city, making all faces gather black- ness. One new element in the picture is found in the contrast between the past glory of the consecrated fam- ilies of kingly and priestly stock (A. Vers. "Nazarenes"), and their later misery and dereliction. So long as there are, however, not without interest in their relation to the poet's own life and to the history of his time. All the facts gain a new significance by being seen in the light of the personal experience of the third poem. The declaration that all this had came "for the sins of the house of Israel, and the iniquities of the house of Judah that they had laid waste is that which is most conspicuous in the second. Jehovah had thrown down in his wrath the stronghold of the daughter of Judah (2). The rampart
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Chaldaean (verse 20). The closing words indicate the strength of that feeling against the Edomites which later forces itself upon the old prophet. As this verse, the daughter of Zion, had rejoined in the fall of her rival, and had pressed on the work of destruction. But for her, too, there was the doom of being drunken with the cup of the Lord's wrath. For the daughter of Zion there was hope of pardon when discipline should have done its work, and the punishment of her iniquity should be accomplished.

& Chap. v. One great difference in the fifth and last section of the poem has already been pointed out. It obviously indicates either a deliberate abandonment of the alphabet or the unfitness of the author of the concluding elegy. The title prefixed in the Vulgate, "Oraatio Jeremia Prophetae," points to one marked characteristic which may have occasioned this difference. There are signs also of a later date than that of the preceding poems. Though the horrors of the families are ineffective, yet that which he has before him is rather the continued, protracted suffering of the rule of the Chaldaean. The mountain of Zion is desolate, and the foxes walk on it (ver. 18). Slaves have ruled over the people of Jehovah (ver. 8). Women have been subjected to intolerable outrages (verse 11). The young men have been taken into captivity (verse 11), and the people have fallen under the wood (verse 18). But in this also, as deep as might be the humiliation, there was hope, even as there had been in the dark hours of the prophet's own life. He and his people are sustained by the old thought which he had been so much in the habit of expressing that it seemed to be a part of his very nature. "Turn thee, O Lord, and let us be renewed. Renew our days as of old" (ver. 21). That which had begun with wailing and weeping ends (following Ewald's and Michaelis's translation) with the question of hope: "Wilt thou utterly reject us? Wilt thou be very wroth against us?"

VII. General Character.—1. It is well to be reminded by the above survey that we have before us, not a book in five chapters, but five separate poems, each complete in itself, and of a different subject, and the same time under a plan which includes them all. It is clear, before entering on any other characteristics, that we find, in full predominance, that strong personal emotion which mingled itself, in greater or less measure, with the character of Jeremiah's work. There is here no "word of Jehovah," no direct message to a sinful people. The man speaks out of the fulness of his heart, and, though a higher Spirit than his own helps him to give utterance to his sorrows, it is yet the language of a sufferer rather than of a teacher. There is this need of truth in the technical classification which placed the Lamentations among the Hagiography of the Hebrew Canon, in the feeling which led the Rabbinic writers (Kisch, Prof. in Psalms,) to say that they and the other books of that group were written in- cluded by the help of the Holy Spirit, but not with the special gift of prophecy.

2. Other differences between the two books that bear the prophet's name grew out of this. Here there is more attention to form, more elaboration. The rhythm is more uniform than in the prophecies. A complicated scheme or structure is also apparent in this book. It will be remembered that this acrostic form of writing was not peculiar to Jeremiah. Whatever its origin, whether it had been adopted as a help to the memory, and so fitted especially for didactic psalms, or for such as was to be sung by great bodies of people (Lowth, Frail, xxiii), it had been received, and it will seem para- digm, framework for poems of very different characters, and extending probably over a considerable period of time. The 119th Psalm is the great monument which forces itself upon the mind of the author of the Lamentations. A moment from the 25th, 34th, 37th, 111th, 112th, 145th—and in the singularly beautiful fragment appended to the book of Prov- erbs (Prov. xxxi, 10—31). Traces of it, as if the work had been left half finished (De Wette, Psalms, ad loc.), appear in the 9th and 10th. In the Lamentations (con- fining ourselves for the present to the structure) we meet with some remarkable peculiarities.

It has to be remembered, too, that in thus speaking the writer was doing what many must have looked for from him, and so meeting at once their expectations and their warnings. Other prophets and poets had made themselves the spokesmen of the nation and its interest on the death of kings and heroes. The party that continued faithful to the policy and principles of Josiah remembered how the prophet had lamented over his death. The lamentations of that period (though they are lost to us) had been accepted as a great national dirge. Was he to be silent now that a more terrible calamity had fallen upon the people? Did not the exiles in Babylon need this form of consolation? Does not the appearance of this book in their canon of sacred writings, after their return from exile, indicate that their captivity they had found this consolation in it?

The choice of a structure so artificial as that which has been described above may at first sight appear inconsistent with the deep, intense sorrow of which it is composed. How could it be otherwise with a people who exerted their passions in a noble rhythm would seem to us to have been a fitter form of expression. It would belong, however, to a very shallow and hasty criticism to pass this judgment. A man true to the gift he has received will welcome the discipline of self-imposed rules for deep sorrow as well as for other strong emotions. In proportion as he is afraid of being carried away by the strong current of feeling will he be anxious to make the laws more difficult, the discipline more effectual. Something of this kind is trace- able in the fact that so many of the master-minds of European literature have chosen—as the fit vehicle for their deepest, tenderest, most impassioned thoughts—the complicated structure of the sonnet; in Dante's se- lection of the terza rima for his vision of the unseen world. What the sonnet was to Petrarch and Milton, that the alphabetic verse-system was to the writers of itself. Jeremiah's time, must be accepted as one of the forms of poetry, and yet one in which (assuming the earlier date of some of the Psalms above referred to) some of the noblest thoughts of that poetry had been uttered. We need not wonder that he should have em- ployed it, as it fitter than any other for the purpose for which he could use it. If the Lamentations are intended to assuage the bitterness of the Babylonian exile, there was, besides this, the subsidiary advantage that it supplied the memory with an artificial help. Hymns and poems of this kind, once learned, are not easily forgotten, and the circumstances in which they are used, more than ever, necessary that they should have this help afforded them.

De Wette maintains (Comment. über die Psalms, p. 86) that this acrostic form of writing was the outgrowth of a feeble and degenerate age dwelling on the outer structure of poetry, when the soul had departed. His judg- ment as to the origin and character of the alphabetic form is shared by Ewald (Petr. Büch. i, 140). That this is often the case cannot be doubted; the 119th Psalm is a case in point. It is hard, however, to reconcile this sweeping estimate with the importance of this book, and the fact, moreover, that such Psalms as the 25th and 34th: and Ewald himself, in his translation of the Alphabetic Psalms and the Lamentations, has shown how compatible such a structure is with the highest energy and beauty. With some of these, too, it must be added, the assignment of a later date than that assigned by David, and based on the supposition that the acrostic structure is itself a proof of it
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De Wette, however, allows, condescendingly, that the Lamentations, in spite of their degenerate taste, "have some merit in their way." Other critics have been more enthusiastic in their admiration of this book. Dr. Blayney remarks, "We cannot too much admire the flow of that full and graceful pathetic eloquence in which the author pours out his effusions of a pietistic heart, and piously weeps over the ruin of his venerable country" (Jeremiah, p. 876). "Never," says an unquestionable judge of these matters, "was there a more rich and elegant variety of beautiful images and adjuncts arising to express themselves, than out of the mournful figures, those not only from the strained and pained strains not felt to be tedious repetitions, but the reader is captivated by the plaintive melancholy which pervades the whole."

3. The power of entering into the spirit and meaning of poems such as these depends, on two distinct conditions, as has been sought to see, as with his eyes, the desolation, misery, confusion, which came before those of the prophet. We must endeavor also to feel as he felt when he looked on them. The last is the more difficult of the two. Jeremiah was not merely a patriot-poet, weeping over the ruin of his country, and all his prophetic feeling was not other than that of a prophet who had seen all this coming, and had foretold it as inevitable. He had urged submission to the Chaldaeans as the only mode of diminishing the terror of that "day of the Lord." And now the Chaldaeans had come, irritated by the perfidy and rebellion of the king and princes of Judah; and the actual horrors that he saw, surpassed, though he had predicted them, all that he had been able to imagine. All feeling of exultation in which, as a mere prophet of evil, he might have indulged at the fulfillment of his forebodings, was swallowed up in the overwhelming sorrow. Yet sorrow, not less than other emotions, works more work than it can make, according to its characters, and a man with Jeremiah's gifts of utterance could not sit down in the mere silence and stupor of a hopeless grief. He was compelled to give expression to that which was devouring his heart and the hearts of all the people. The act was given as a relief to him. It led him on (as has been seen above) to a calmer and seerener state. It revived the faith and hope which had been nearly crushed out.

4. There are, perhaps, few portions of the O.T. which appear to have done the work they were meant to do more effectively than this. It has presented but scanty materials for the systems and controversies of theology. It has supplied thousands with the fullest utterance for their sorrows in the critical periods of national or individual suffering. We may well believe that it soothed the weary years of the Babylonian exile (comp. Zech. i. 6 with Lam. ii. 17). When the Jews returned to their own land, and the desolation of Jerusalem was remembered as belonging only to the past, this was the look of remembrance. On the ninth day of the month of Ab (July), the Lamentations of Jeremiah were read, year by year, as a memorial of weeping and mourning over the miseries of the people, of which the whole had been delivered. It has come to be connected with the thoughts of a later devastation, and its words enter, sometimes at least, into the prayers of the pilgrim Jews who meet at the "place of weeping" to mourn over the desolation of the holy city. It enters largely into the nobly-constructed order of the Latin Church for the services of Passion-week (Breviar. Rom. Feria Quinta. "In Casa Domini.") If it has been comparatively in the background in times when the study of Scripture has passed into casuistry and speculation, it has come forward, once and again, in times of danger and suffering, as a messenger of peace, comforting men, not after the fashion of the friends of Job, with formal moralizations, but by enabling them to express themselves, leading them to feel that they might give utterance to their feelings of a pietistic heart; and that which they were overwhelmed. It is striking, as we cast our eye over the list of writers who have treated specially this book, to notice how many must have passed through scenes of trial not unlike in kind to that of which Jeremiah was a witness. The book remains to do its work for any future generation that may be exposed to analogous calamities.

VIII. Commentaries.—The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole book of Lamentations exclusively, to a few of the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Orig. Schoene (Greek, in Opp. iii. 292); Ephrem Syrus, Explanatio (in Opp. 65); Jerome, In Lam. (in Opp. supra, xiv. 227); Theodoret, Interpretatio (Greek, in Opp. ii. 1); Paschalius Ratbertus, In Threnos (in Opp. p. 1007); Hugo & St. Victor, Anotations (in Opp. i. 108); Aquinas, Commentarius (in Opp. ii. 356); Cotelampadius, Expositio (in Opp. i. 428); Albertus Magnus, Commentarius (in Opp. v. 96); Zalotterius, Examinaticionis. Commentarius (in Opp. v. 352); Zalotterius, Eunatrations (including Jer.). (Argaei 1536, 40; Cenard, Meditationes (Paris, 1536, 8vo); Bughagen, Adnotatio (Vittemb, 1546, 4to); Quinzaphorous, Adnotatio (Paris, 1546, 4to); Paladius, Exantrario (Viemeb, 1568, 8vo); Pintus, Commentarius (including Isa. and Jer.). (Ludg. 1561, etc., fol.); Strigel, Commentarius (Lipa. et Brem. 1564, 8vo); Schenecker, Auslegung (Lips. 1565, 4to); Calvin, Prolectiones (including Jer.). (Frankf. 1581, 8vo; in French, Stries, 1584, 8vo; in English, London, 1587, 12mo, etc.); Talliepsiel, Commentarius (Paris, 1582, 8vo); Pasquius, Adnotatio (Venetiis, 1595; Rome, 1586, 8vo); Agellius, Catena (Romae, 1589, 4to); J. Ibn-Shoeib, יב קליע (Ven., 1589, 4to); Sam. de Valdis, תידלא (Thessalon, 1590, 8vo); Figuero, Commentarius (Ludg. 1596, 8vo); Makahan, ב ידה (Cracow, s. a. about 1600, 4to); Alseich, כפיה כפיה (Venice, 1601, 4to); Navarrette, Commentarius (Cardub, 1602, 4to); Bachmecher, Expositio (Roset. 1603, 8vo); Broughton, Commentarius (including Jer.). (Genev. 1604, 4to; also in English, 1605, 4to); Uman, Works. (in Expositio, etc., 1618, 8vo); Col. Agrripp, 1611, 8vo); Delrio, Commentarius (Ludg. 1608, 4to); Polan, Commentarius (including Jer.). (Basile, 1608, 8vo); A Costa de Andrade, Commentarius (Ludg. 1609, 8vo); De Castro, Commentarius (including Jer. and Bar.). (Par. 1609, fol.); Topella, Commentarius (London, 1618, 4to); Grunow, Commentarius (including Jer. 1618, 4to); Hult, Expositio (Lond. 1618, 4to); Ghisler, Commentarius (including Jer.). (Ludg. 1623, fol.); *Tarnovius, Commentarius (Rotterd, 1627, 1642; Hamburg, 1707, 4to); Peter Martyr, Commentarius (Tigur, 1629, 4to); Udal, Commentarius (in 1627, 4to); De Lugo, Commentarius (Madrid, 1649, fol.); Tayler, Commentarius (Rabbinical) (London, 1651, 4to); Fowler, Commentarius (including Jer. and Bar.). (Vittemb. 1672, 1699, 4to); Hulsemann, Commentarius (including Jer.). (Rudolph, 1686, 4to); Benjamin Allessandro, יד ביש (Venice, 1718, 1to); C. B. Michaelis, Notes (in Adam phil. ege. Hallo, 1720, 3 vols. 4to); Riedel, Uebersetzung (Wien, 1761, 8vo); Lessing, Observationum (Lipow, 1770, 8vo); Börmel, Ammerkungen (Weimar, 1781, 8vo); Schleusner, Curia (in Eichhorn's Repert. pt. xii. Lipsia, 1788); Horrer, Bearbeitung (Halle, 1784, 8vo); Bayney, Notes (including Jer.) (Oxf. 1784, 8vo, etc.); Löwe and Wolfsohn, Ammerkungen (Berlin, 1790, 8vo); Hamb. Commentativus (Par. 1798, 4to); Patae, Hebrews (in 1. Bat. 1790, 8vo); *Koritz (Kozer, 1791, 8vo); Schnurr, Observationes (Tub., 1798, 4to); J. H. Michaelis, Observationes (including Jer.). (Gotting, 1783, 8vo); Gach, Breitläge (includ. Cant. and Eccles.). (Tubing, 1795, 8vo); Valbothr, Uebersetzung (Celle,
active part in all the religious controversies of the times, and was one of the most prominent members of the political assembly of La Rochelle in 1568, whither he had been sent by the Consistory of Paris. He subsequently went with La Chapelière to Holland, to ask aid of the states-general for the Protestants of France. We next find him at the Assembly of Milhau in 1625, and in 1627 at Paris, where he was arrested as an agent of the duke of Rohan, who was condemned to death, but his life was spared on account of the threatening attitude which the inhabitants of La Rochelle assumed, in retaliative, towards the person of one of their prisoners, a relation of P. Joseph (the confessor and secret agent of Richelieu). He was finally released, and even received a pension from Richelieu on the condition of using every exertion to reunite the different Protestant churches. He now became the pliant tool of Richelieu, and was excommunicated by the Church of Charrenton in 1644 for not having partaken of the Lord's Supper in twelve years. He finally joined the Roman Catholic Church, April 2, 1645. The worthlessness of his life was employed in writing against Protestantism. He died in 1665, dispaired alike by Protestants and Romanists. His principal works are: Discours des trahisons pour que les novices en France peuvent et doivent resister par armes, et les persécutions vertues (1622, 8vo); very scarce, as it was condemned to be burned by the public executioner—Lettre à M. Rambour pour la réunion des évangéliques aux catholiques (Paris, 1628, 12mo)—De universi orbis Christiani pace et concordia per cardinalem duces (Paris, 1628, 4to)—transal into French, 1655, 4to)—Le Moyen de la paix (Paris, 1637, 8vo)—La Necessité de la Paix (Paris, 1640, 8vo)—Le Catholicisme réformé (Paris, 1642, 8vo)—Le Pacifique véritable (Paris, 1644, 8vo)—condemned by the Sorbonne; etc. See Benoît, Histoire de France sous les rois de Nantes, ii.; De Martelles, Mémoires; Grotius, Epistles; Bayle, Dictionnaire Historique; Tallemant, Historiettes; Isaac, La France Protestant; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxix, 222. (J. N. P.)

Lammas-day is the name of a festival observed by the Roman Catholics on the 1st of August, in memory of the imprisonment of St. Peter, and otherwise called St. Peter's chains. The word Lammas is of doubtful origin, and some refer it to a Saxon term signifying contribution. Brande, in his "Antiquities," says, "Some suppose it is called Lammas-day, quasi Lamo-massae, because on that day the tenants that held lands of the cathedral church at York were bound to bring a loaf of loaf mass to the church at high mass on that day." More probably, however, it is derivation from "loaf-mass," it having been the custom of the Saxons to offer on this day (August 1) an oblation of loaves made of new wheat. Like many other Church festivals, it seems to have been observed already in pagan times, and, like the 1st of May, was a festive day with the Druids. Vallancey, in his Collectione De Rebus Hibnericiis, says the Druids celebrated the 1st of August as the day of the oblation of grain. See Farrar, Eccles. Disct. a. v.; Taylor, Ancre Christiania; Gen. Suppl. p. 92; Ead. Eccles. Dict. a. v.

Lammermann. See Lammar.

Lammita, a sect of Remonstrant Baptists. See Menninghaus.

Lamont, David, D.D., a Scotch Presbyterian divine, flourished as minister of Kirkpatrick, Durham. He died in 1687. This is all we know of his personal history. His Sermons were published at London from 1676-87, in 2 vols. 8vo. New edit. 1610, 3 vols. 8vo.

Lamormain, Guillaume Germain de, a noted Belgian Roman Catholic theologian of the Order of the Jesuits, was born in the duchy of Luxemburg about 1507; entered the Jesuitical order in 1590, and then became professor of theology and philosophy at the University of Louvain; however, he was afterwards accused as the confessor of the emperor of Austria, Ferdinand II, and over this thoroughly monkish ruler Lamormain is said
to have exercised perfect sway. He and John Weins- 
gartner, another Jesuit confessor, Vehoe (see below) tells 
us, "constantly kept near him, and never let him (Fer-
ardin) out of their sight;" and it is due to this Jes-
uitic influence, no doubt, that Ferdinand became such a 
fanatical adherent of the Church of Rome, and a most 
cruel persecutor of Protestantism. See Austria. Of 
Lamormain himself, it is said that he was so devoted to 
the Romish cause that he made upwards of 100,000 con-
verts to the Church of Rome. He died Feb. 22, 1648. 
He wrote a life of Ferdinand II, which abounds in flatter-
ing terms to the emperor, who had been a pleasant tool 
in the hands of the crafty Jesuit. See Vehoe, Biogr. 
Générale, xiix, 245; Paquot, Mémoires pour servir à 
une histoire littéraire des Pays-Bas, v, 98-100; Vehoe, 
Moéros du Court, Aristoctacy, and Diplomacy of 
Austria (trans. by F. Dümmler, Lübeck, 1866, 2 vols. sm. 
v. 8vo), i, 387 sq.; 319. (J. H. W.)

Lamormain, HORTI de, a Belgian Jesuit, brother of 
the preceding, and, like him, a native of Luxembourg, 
entered the Order of the Jesuits in 1696, but exerted lit-
tle influence on account of feeble health. He died Nov. 
26, 1647. He translated and wrote several works; 
among them are, Tractatus amoris devia constansa, libri 
xxii; Tractatus de Pacificio Tridentino, libri xiv; Francisci de 
Francisco de Solimena, 1643, 4to; 2d edit., with life of the author [Sales], Col. 1657, 
v. 8vo.—De Virtute Penitentiae, etc. (Vienna, 1644, ivto.)— 

Lamothe, Pierre LAMBERT DE, a French Roman 
Catholic missionaries, was born at Bucherie, in the 
dio- 
ocese of Lisieux, Jan. 18, 1624. After being for some 
time connected with the chancellorship of the Parliament 
at Rouen, he entered the Church. His talents caused 
him to be distinguished among a number of priests who 
had formed in 1652 the plan of Christianizing China 
and neighboring countries. In 1660 he was consecra-
ted bishop of Berythe. He embarked at Marseilles for 
China, June 27, 1660, and passed through Malta, 
Antioch, Aleppo, Bassora, Chalzeran, Shiraz, Isaphan, 
Lara, Surate, Mulsalamat, Tenasserim, Yalings, Pram-
and Pukir, arrived at Justica, the capital of Siam, April 
22, 1662. Here he found some 1500 Christians of dif-
ferent nations and two churches, one administered by 
the Dominicans, the other by the Jesuits. He was 
first well received, but had subsequently to submit to 
many annoyances from the bishop of Goa, who 
claimed the primacy of the whole East Indies, and 
Lamothe finally sailed for Canton in July, 1668, with two 
other missionaries. A severe tempest met them; however, to 
return to Siam. Here they were exposed to 
tall sorts of ill treatment at the hands of the 
Portuguese, and owed their safety only to the aid of the 
Chin Chinese. Lamothe sent to the pope and to Pary for 
more missionaries and other assistance. Alexander 
VII, in consequence, extended the jurisdiction of apo-
tolic vicars over the kingdom of Siam, Japan, and other 
neighboring countries, which action freed Lamothe 
from the control of the bishop of Goa. He was now 
joined by Pallu du Parc, bishop of Heliopolis, who 
reached Siam January 27, 1664, with other missionaries. 
The two apostolic vicars held a synod, and Lamothe re-
ceived permission from the king to establish a Church 
at Siam, which he intended should become the centre of 
communication between the extreme Eastern mis-
ionaries. He also established a seminary for the education 
of native priests and instructors, a college, and a hospi-
Générale, xxix, 250 sq.

Lamourette, ADRIEN, abbé, a noted French eclesi-
iastic, was born in Picardy in 1742. During the Rev-
olution in France he became an auxiliary of Mira-
beau in 1790, and was deputed to address the deputies of 
the civil constitution of the clergy which that orator pronounced. In 1791 
he was chosen, under the new Church regime enacted by 
the Assembly in opposition to the Roman see, bishop of 
Rhone-et-Loire, and deputed to the National Assem-
by. Having resisted the extreme measures of the dom-
inant party, he was guillotined Jan. 10, 1794. He pub-
lished Pensées sur la philosophie et l'incrédulité (1786, 
v. 8vo)—Pensées sur la philosophie de la foi (1788, v. 8vo): —Les Délires de la Religions (1789, 12mo)—Considérations 
sur l'expri et les devoirs de la vie religieuse (1789, 12mo); etc.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, s. v.

Lamp (properly Ταφή, loqspit, a flame, Gen. xvii, 16; Exod. 
xxv, 18, Job xxi, 11; Nabo. ii, Dan. x, 6, Isa. iat. 
iv, 13; Ezek. i, 1; lamp-torch, Judg. vii, 16, 20; xv, 4, 5; Job 
xxi, 6; Zech. xii, 6; in some of which passages it is ron-
ed "lightning," "brand," "torch," etc.; Gr. λαμπρής, a torch—light or lantern, Acts xxi, 8; Rev. v, 5; "torch," 
John xviii, 5; Rev. viii, 10, oil-lamp, Matt. xxi, 1-l5, 
also κάνδλα or κάνδερ, a light, in various senses, especi-
ally for domestic purposes, the Gr. λαμπρής is the term of 
frequency occurrence in a literal sense in the Scrip-
tures, such a utensil being often really meant where the 
A. V. gives the rendering "candle" (q. v.). The primary 
sense of light (Gen. xvii, 16) also gives rise to frequent 
metaphorical usages, indicating life, welfare, guidance, 
se, e. g. 2 Sam. xxi, 17; Ps. cxix, 10; 119, 12, 19; 139, 
See Lamp. The following are the cases in which the 
use of lamps is referred to in the Bible. In their 
illustration we freely avail ourselves of the materials 
brought to light from the ancient remains. 
1. That part of the golden candlestick belonging to 
the tabernacle which bore the light; also the nine 
and the ten candlesticks placed by Solomon in the Temple 
before the Holy of Holies (Exod. xxv, 37, 1 Kings vii, 49; 
2 Chron. iv, 20, xiii, 17, Zech. iv, 2). The lamps were 
lighted every evening, and cleaned every morning (Exod. 
xxx, 7, 8; Reland, Ant. Hebr. i, v, 3, and viii, 9). 
It is somewhat remarkable, that while the golden can-
dlestick, or rather candelabrum, is so minutely described, 
not a word is said of the shape of the lamps (Exod. xxxv, 37). 
This was probably because the socket in which it was 
to be inserted necessarily gave it a somewhat cy-
indrical form adapted to the purpose; for it is hardly 
to be presumed that the inadequate cup-form usually 
represented in engravings would have been adopted. 
This shape is aptly illustrated by an instance occurring on 
the Egyptian monuments. Wilkinson gives an Egyptian 
figure (Ant. Egypt., v. 76) what he 
takes to be the representation of a lamp made of 
glass, with a hand holding separately an erect wick, 
as if the lamp were a boat, to place it in the vase pre-
vious to its being lighted.

The lines, he thinks, may represent the twisted nature 
of the cotton wick, as they do the watering of the glass 
vasa.

Almost the only other fact we can gather in this con-
nection is, that vegetable oils were burnt in them, and 
especially, if not exclusively, oil-olive. This of the 
finest quality, was the oil used in the seven lamps of 
the tabernacle (Exod. xxvii, 20). Although the lamp-oils 
of the ancient times were not exclusively vegetable, it is 
probable that animal fat was used, as it is at present by 
the Western Asians, by being placed in a kind of lamp, 
and burnt by means of a wick inserted in it. See Ott. 
Cotton wicks are now used throughout Asia, but the 
Hebrews, like the Egyptians, probably employed the outer 
and inner fibre of flax (Flax, Illus. Nat., v. 2, i); and 
perhaps linen yarn, if the rabbins are correct in alleging 
that the linen dresses of the priests were unravelled 
when old, to furnish wicks for the sacred lamps.

As to the material, the burners were in this instance 
doubled of gold; although metal is scarcely the best 
substance for a lamp. The golden candlestick may also 
suggest that lamps in ordinary use were placed on 
stands, and, where more than one was required, on stands 
with two or more branches. The modern Orientals, who
are satisfied with very little light in their rooms, use stands of brass or wood, on which to raise the lamps to a sufficient height above the floor on which they sit. Such stands are shaped not unlike a tall candlestick, spreading out at the top. Sometimes the lamps are placed on brackets against the wall, made for the purpose, and often upon stools. Doubtless similar contrivances were employed by the Hebrews. The Romans are known to have employed them. See CANDLESTICK.

Bronze Lamp and Stand. From Pompeii.

2. A torch or flambeau, such as was carried by the soldiers of Gideon (Judg. vii, 16, 20; comp. xvi, 4). From the fact that these were at first enclosed in pitchers, from which, at the end of the march, they were taken out and borne in the hand, we may with certainty infer that they were not ordinary lamps, open at top, from which the oil could easily be spilled. See Tobit.

3. It seems that the Hebrews, like the ancient Greeks and Romans, as well as the modern Orientals, were accustomed to burn lamps overnight in their chambers; and this practice may appear to give point to the expression of “outer darkness,” which repeatedly occurs in the New Testament (Matt. viii, 12, xxii, 13); the force is greater, however, when the contrast implied in the term “outer” is viewed with reference to the effect produced by sudden expulsion into the darkness of night from a chamber highly illuminated for an entertainment. This custom of burning lamps at night, with the effect produced by their going out or being extinguished, supplies various figures to the sacred writers (2 Sam. xxi, 17, Prov. xiii, 9, xx, 20). On the other hand, the keeping up of a lamp’s light is used as a symbol of enduring and unbroken succession (1 Kings xi, 36, xv, 4, Psa. cxiii, 17). (See WENHAM’S Symbol. Dict. s. v.)

The usual form of these domestic utensils may probably be inferred from the prevailing shape of antique specimens from neighboring nations that have come down to us. In the British Museum there are various forms of ancient Egyptian lamps, which were employed for lighting the interior of apartments, some of terracotta and others of bronze, with various ornaments in bas-relief.

Ancient Assyrian Lamps in the British Museum.
1. Bronze from north-west palace, Ninivah. 2. Bronze from Kouyunjik. 3, 4, Terracotta from Warka. 5, Terracotta from Kouyunjik.

Common Form of Classical hanging Lamp.

4. It appears from Matt. xxv, 1, that the Jews used lamps and torches in their marriage ceremonies, or rather when the bridegroom came to conduct home the bride by night. This is still the custom in those parts of the East where, on account of the heat of the day, the bridal procession takes place in the night-time. The connection of lamps and torches with marriage ceremonies often appears also in the classical poets (Homer, Iliad, vi, 492; Eurip. Phoeniss. 346; Ménan, 1057; Virgil, Eclog. viii, 29), and, indeed, Hymen, the god of marriage, was figured as bearing a torch. The same connection, it may be observed, is still preserved in Western Asia, even
where it is no longer usual to bring home the bride by night. During two, or three, or more nights preceding the wedding, the street or quarter in which the bridegroom lives is illuminated with chandeliers and lanterns, or with lanterns and small lamps suspended from cords drawn across from the bridegroom's and several other houses on each side to the houses opposite; and several small silk flags, each of two colors, generally red and green, are attached to other cords (Lane, Mod. Egypt., 201; Mrs. Poole, Englishwomen in Egypt, iii, 131). A modern lantern much used on these occasions, with lamps hung about it and suspended from it, is represented in the preceding cut. The lamps used separately on such occasions are represented in the following cut. Figs. 1, 2, and 3 show very distinctly the conical receptacle of wood which serves to protect the flame from the wind.

Lamps of this kind are sometimes hung over doors. The shape in figure 5 is also that of a much-used indoor lamp, called kandil (Lane, Modern Egypt., chap. vi, p. 151). It is a small vessel of glass, having a small tube at the bottom, in which is stuck a wick formed of cotton twisted round a piece of straw; some water is poured in first, and then the oil.

Lamps very nearly of this shape appear on the Egyptian monuments, and they seem, also, to be of glass (Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians, iii, 101; v, 578).

If the Egyptians had lamps of glass, there is no reason why the Jews also might not have had them, especially as this material is more proper for lamps intended to be hung up, and therefore to cast their light down from above. The Jews used lamps in other festivals besides those of marriage. The Roman satirist (Persius, Sat., v, 179) expressly describes them as making illuminations at their festivals by lamps hung up and arranged in an orderly manner; and the scriptural intimations, so far as they go, agree with this description. If this custom had not been in ancient and recent use in the East, it might have been supposed that the Jews adopted it from the Egyptians, who, according to Herodotus (ii, 62), had a "Feast of Lamps," which was celebrated at Sais, and, indeed, throughout the country at a certain season of the year. The description which the historian gives of the lamps employed on this occasion, strictly applies to those in modern use already described, and the concurrence of both these sources of illustration strengthens the probable analogy of Jewish usage. He speaks of them as "small vases filled with salt and olive-oil, in which the wick floated, and burnt during the whole night." It does not, indeed, appear of what materials these vases were made, but we may reasonably suppose them to have been of glass. The later Jews had even something like this feast among themselves. A "Feast of Lamps" was held every year on the twenty-fifth of the month Kislev. See DEDICATION. It was founded by Judas Maccabæus, in celebration of the restoration of the Temple worship (Josephus, Ant. xii, 7, 7), and has ever since been observed by the lighting up of lamps or candles on that day in all the countries of their dispersion (Maimonides, Res. II. Mishn. fol. 8). Other Oriental have at this day a similar feast, of which the "Feast of Lanterns" among the Chinese is perhaps the best known (Davis, Chinese, p, 188). See LANTERN.

LAMP, a strange ceremony of the Maronite Church. A wafer of some size, having seven pieces of cotton stuck into it, is put into a flask or basin of oil; a religious service is then read, the cotton is set fire to, and the sick person for whose recovery the rite is intended is anointed with the oil, and prayer is repeated over him.

LAMPS (their use in the Christian Church). Among the Jews lamps were freely used in the synagogue for various purposes. In fact, all the ancient nations had them in their temples; but how soon they were made use of by Christians, and what significance they had in symbolism, remains a matter of dispute between the Romanist and Protestant churches. The Protestants generally hold that there is no evidence that lamps were used in the early Church for any other purpose than to light up the dark places where they were obliged to congregate for worship, while Romanists claim that they were used as symbols. (Compare, on the Roman Catholic view, Martigny, Dict. des Antiquités Chrétienne, p. 161, s. v. Cierges; see also the article LIGHTS.) Several of the fathers, among them Chrysostom, condemn in strong terms the custom of setting up lamps on days of festival—as the relic of some pagan rite. In the days of Jerome, it is held true; lights were freely used in churches, but Romanist theologians forget to tell that the propriety of the custom was much questioned even then. In graves of the Catacombs "lamps were often placed," says Walcott (Sacred Archaeology, s. v.), "as a symbol of the eternal light which the departed inhabit, enjoy—as memorials of their shining lights before men, and their future glory" (Matt. xxxiii, 48). But it is evident that even this custom was early disapproved of, for the Council of Ellichis forbade the faithful, on pain of excommunication, lighting wax candles in the daytime in cemeteries or other burial-places of the martyrs (compare Eadie, Eccles. Dict., p. 367). In our day it is the custom in the Roman Catholic churches to keep a lamp (eternal light) constantly burning before or by the side of the tabernacle. (J. H. W.)
LAMPAARY

Lampadary is the name of an officer in the Eastern Church whose duty it is to carry before the patriarchs in all processions a lighted candelabrum, called lampro倪γυς, as a badge of distinction among bishops. It is the business of the lampadary also to see that the lamps of the church are lighted, and to carry a taper on days of consecration and ordination.

LAMPE, FRIEDRICH ADOLF, an eminent German Protestant theologian, was born at Detmold (Lippe-Detmold) Feb. 19, 1683. He entered the University of Franeker, and later that of Utrecht, to study theology. He was successively pastor at Wees, Duisburg, and Bremen. In 1720 he became professor of theology at Utrecht, in 1727 librarian to the University, and about 1715 had in the same capacity. He died December 8, 1729. Lampe is one of the most prominent German theologians of the Reformed Church, who introduced into the German Church the Coeceanian doctrines, and measurably also the principles of Labadism. Lampe's principal works are, Commentaries analytical-syntactical Expositio secundum Johannes (Amsterdam, 1724-25, 3 vols. 4to); this work Orme commends as "both extensive and valuable." Walch ranks it among the best expositions of the apostle's Gospel.—De Cymbalum veteris Libri tres (1716, 3 vols. 12mo);—Exercitationes Do- decas, quibus Psalms Psalms perempto perfluerit commentario explicantum (Bremen, 1714, 4to);—Geheims des Geheimsbundes (Bremen, 1723, 12mo; translat. into Dutch, Amstel, 1727, 8vo); this work is nothing more nor less than his system of the society—Dissertatio Theol. Utrecht, 1727, 4to);—Rudimenta Theologiae eleuchticae (Bremen, 1728, 8vo). Lampe published also a large number of sermons and devotional treatises in German, which were nearly all translated into Dutch; he rearranged and edited an edition of the Historia Ecclesiae Reformata in Historia et Transcendens, attributed to Paul of Brezis (Utrecht, 1729, 4to). Together with Hase, he published the first three volumes of the Bibliotheca Bre- mensis, for which he wrote a number of theological arti- cles. Other treatises which he published in various papers were collected and published by D. Gerdes, together with his discourses and programmes (Amsterdam, 1737, 2 vols. 4to); see Schumacher, Memoria Lampi, in Miscellanea Duisburgenser, vol. ii. Acta Eruditorum, ann. 1722; Kliker, Bibl. Eruditor. Prussicam; Burnmann, Tractatus eruditorum; Koch, Algol. Gel. Litterarum; Hoes- ter, Icones Historiarum; Général de Stogium, in Bibliotheca Sacra, xxii. 290. (Stern-mi- lian), Gesch. d. Christlichen Lebens, vol. ii (see Index).

LAMPTIANS is the name of one of the heretical sects which, on the pretense of promoting sanctity by an ascetic life, made the Christian Sabbath a fast-day.

There was also another sect of this name in the 17th century. The followers of Lampetus, a monk, who pretended that, as a man is born free, a Christian, in order to please God, ought to do nothing by necessi- ty; and, that, therefore, it is unlawful to make vows, even those of obedience. To this doctrine he added the views of the Arians, Carpocratians, and other sects. The Lampitians formed a branch of the Messalgians (q. v.).

LAMPILLAS, FRANCIS XAVIER, a Spanish Jesuit, was born in Catalonia in 1731. After the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain in 1767 he went to Genoa, where he died in 1810. His principal work is a defence of Spanish literature against Betti, entitled: Tiraboschi, Saggio storico-apologetico della Letteratura Spagnuola. See Hoffer, Nouv. Bibl. Générale, xxii. 285.

LAMPILGH, THOMAS, D.D., an English prelate of note in the days of king James II, was born in Yorkshire in 1615. But little is known of his early personal history. He was dean of Rochester in 1768, when he was professor of literature against Betti. He continued in this position he became one of the most conspicuous divines of the day, securing, in particular, the favor of the king by his partisanship, especially in 1688. In this year, just before the exit of king James from the English throne, Lamplugh called on the king, was graciously received, praised for his loyalty, and awarded with the archbishopric of York, which had been vacant for more than two years and a half. William III, whom Lamplugh, strangely enough, recognised as the rightful sovereign of England, after the flight of James, confirmed the appointment. Hence some writers have supposed that William of Orange appointed Lamplugh to the arch- bishopric. The archbishop died in 1691. See Debary, History of the Church of England, p. 167; Macaulay, History of England, ii. 882. (G. H. W.)

LAMPRONTI, ISAAC, a Jewish Rabbi of some note as an author, flourished in Ferrara in the first half of the 16th century. He died about 1520. He was the author of the preparation of a large encyclopedia of Rabbinism, of which he himself completed twelve volumes, bringing the work, excellent in its character, down to the letter Mem. It was published at Venice between 1570 and 1818. See Josch, Gesch. d. Judench. u. s. Schriften, iii. 280.

LAMSON, ALVAN, D.D., a Unitarian minister, was born in 1732 at Weston, Mass.; was educated first at Phillips Academy, Andover, and then at Harvard Col- lege, where he graduated in 1814. He was immediately appointed tutor in Bowdoin College, but left in 1816, and entered the Divinity School at Cambridge. In 1818 he became pastor of the First Church in Cambridge, where he officiated for over forty years. He died July 18, 1864. He wrote much for the Christian Examiner, and in 1857 published a volume of sermons (Bost. 12mo). The Christian Register says of him: "Dr. Lamson has succeeded in uniting the acutest moral wisdom with the most unpretending and childlike mode of exhibiting it. His style is clear as crystal, sometimes almost quaint in its simplicity, and not without touches of poetic feeling as well as fancy, though a calm, subdued judgment char- acterizes all his opinions." — Allibone, Dict. of Authors, vol. ii; American Annual Cyclopaedia, 1864, p. 612.

LAMY (or LAMI), BERNARD, an eminent priest of the French Oratory, was born at Mars in June, 1640; studied under the Oratorians, joined their order in 1668, and completed his studies at Paris and at Saumur. He next taught belles-lettres at Vendôme and Juilly, and philosophy at Saumur and at Angers. In 1676 he was deprived of his professorship for zealously defending the Cartesian philosophy. His enemies, the Thomists, even obtained a lettre de cachet against him under the accusation that he opposed the principle of royal authority. He was banished to Grenoble, where cardi- nal Le Camus, who had established a seminary for the education of theocritics, who held Lamy in high estimation, appointed him professor of divinity. In 1686, his sentence having been revoked in its most es- sential charges, he was recalled to Paris, and remained for a while in the Seminary of St. Magloire, but, having violated the rules of the establishment by publishing without the knowledge of the superior a work (Lettre au P. Fourié, de l'Oraatoire), which, besides, was considered to contain objectionable teachings (viz. that Christ did not celebrate the Jewish Passover with his disciples [a view adopted by some of the soundest schol- ars]; that the Baptist was imprisoned by the Sanhedrim and by Herod, and that the three Marys mentioned in the Gospels are identical), he was again exiled, this time to Rouen. He died in the latter city Jan. 29, 1715. Lamy was a very prolific writer, and his works are generally distinguished for clearness of thought and elegance of style. The most important of these was the Parapsych. Biblicus ad intelligendam Sacrae Bibliae (originally [Grenoble, 1687] no more than tables of the chief facts of Scripture, with rules for its study, and compiled simply for his pupils, he subsequently enlarged and pub- lished in 1706, and 1708, and in it he laid down the best introduction to the Bible extant; an English edition was prepared by B. Bundy, Lond. 1723, 4to) — Entretiens sur les Sciences (1694), a work which was highly esteemed by J. J. Rousseau; — Introduction
à l’Ecriture Sainte, où l’on traite de tout ce qui concerne les Juifs, etc. (Lyons, 1709, 4to) — Harmonium, sive concordia quator Evangelistarum, editio novissima (Paris, 1701, 12mo) — Commentarius in harmoniam, sive concordiam quatuor Evangelistarum (Paris, 1699, 4to) — Disquisitiones de proprietatibus corporum quorumque ...De tabula nucleo federata, de sancta circuiter Jerusalem, et de templum euris (Paris, 1720, fol.). To this last-named work Lamy is said to have devoted the last thirty years of his life. It was published (after his death) under the editorship of pere Demoulins. See Ellie Durand, De l’ordre ecclesiastique de l’université d’Agen dans l’ouvrage Les Actes d’une session du 15 février 1760. J. H. W.

Lamy, Dom François, a French Roman Catholic priest, was born at Montreuil, in the diocese of Chartres, in 1666. He entered the congregation of St. Maur, of the Order of St. Benoist, in 1688, and was in relation with some of the most important men of the time, Fénéon among others. He died in 1711. Lamy wrote largely in defence of Christianity, and against Spinoza; the chief work of his last years are, Traité de la réalité évidente de la religion Chrétienne (1694, 12mo) — De la connaissance de soi-même (Paris, 1694-96, 12mo) — A Nouvel Elémens de la physiologie (Paris, 1706, 8vo). His last work, published after his death, is very scarce. Some of his letters are contained in the Correspondance de Fénéon (Paris, 1827, sqq.)

Lancaster, Joseph, an English Quaker, was born in London, Nov. 29, 1715, and died about Oct. 4, 1888. He was the promulgator of the mutual system of education first introduced by Dr. Bell at Madras, but afterwards known both in England and America as the Lancasterian System, and gave an impulsion, by his writings and lectures, to the cause of popular education in many countries. He first opened a school for poor children in St. George's Field, and soon rendered his method very popular. For the characteristics of his system, see Watts, Bibl. Brit., and his works (London, 1778-1789). He died Oct. 18, 1841, at his residence in Princes St., London, Feb. 17, 1718. She married him in 1724, and was here especially instrumental in the extension of the Quaker cause. She retained her zeal and activity to extreme old age, laboring almost to the close of her days, May 30, 1761. See Janney, Hist. of Friends, iii. 259.

Lancaster, Lydia, a female Quaker minister, daughter of Thomas Rawlinson, was born at Gravithaie, Lancashire, England, in 1684. In the course of her ministry she visited several times the greater part of England, Ireland, and Scotland, building up her society with zeal and activity. In 1718 she came to the United States, and was here especially instrumental in the extension of the Quaker cause. She retained her zeal and activity to extreme old age, laboring almost to the close of her days, May 30, 1761. See Janney, Hist. of Friends, iii. 259.

Lancaster, Nathaniel, D.D., a minister of the Church of England, was born in England in 1698. During a portion of his ministry he was rector of Stamford Rivers, but he is better known as a literary man than as a pastor. He died in 1775. His published works are, Sermons (1746) — Essay on Delicacy (1748, 8vo) — The Old Churchman's Method of Pleading (1753, 8vo) — The Old Churchman's Preaching (1757, 4to) — Allibone, Dict. Eng. and Amer. Authors, ii. 1052.

Lance ("lân's), idiom, so called from its destructive use, Jer. I., 42; elsewhere usually "spear", a javelin or smaller kind of missile weapon, in distinction from the long-handled spear ("topt"), chaséh, and the simple dart ("loc", she'lock). See Armor.

Lance, The Holy (4), is the name of a knife very much in the form of a lance, used in the Greek Church to imitate the spear by which Christ was pierced. With this "lance" (lancé) the priest, at communion, thrusts a piece of bread, while reading the corresponding passages of the N. T. Scriptures. See Martigny, Dict. des Antiquités, p. 858.

Lance, The Holy (5), was given by king Rudolph of Burgundy to king Henry I of Germany, as a present, through the influence of Luitprand, bishop of Cremona. It was to be considered as one of the emblems of the empire, and a powerful talisman. The earlier tradition represents the lance as having been chiefly made of the nails with which Christ was crucified; later accounts assume that it was the identical lance with which the Roman soldier pierced the Saviour's side. Under the emperor Charles IV this lance was brought to Prague, and in 1354 pope Innocent VI, at the emperor's request, instituted a special festival, De lancoce, which was celebrated in Germany and Bohemia on the first octave after Easter. Another holy lance was discovered by the emperor Helias, and kept first in the portico of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and afterwards at Antioc, where it was found in 1098 by a French priest, Peter Bartholomew; its appearance cheered the discouraged Crusaders, who gained a brilliant victory over the Saracens. It was subsequently brought to Constantinople, then to Venice, and afterwards came into the possession of St. Louis, king of France. It was, however, afterwards taken back again to Constantinople, and it is said that the iron of it was brought to Rome as a present to pope Innocent VIII, and is preserved at the Vatican. The genuineness of both lances has, however, been doubted even in the Roman Catholic Church, and their authenticity was never officially proclaimed. —Herzog, Real-Encyclo. viii, 387.

Lancastre et Clavýrvm Festuvm. See Lance, The Holy (4).

Lancelot (Lancelot), Giovanni Paolo (1), a noted Italian writer on canon law; was born in Pergia in 1511, was professor of canon law in the university of his native place, and died there in 1591. He is particularly known as the author of Institutiones iuris canonici, which are generally published with the Corpus iuris civilis, yet it was not adopted in the "editio Romana," and therefore Riecher omits the title. Lancelotti appears to have for a long time contemplated writing an elementary text-book for the study of canon law, after the model of Justinian's Institutes [see Corpus Juris Civilis], for we find already in 1556 pope Paul IV encouraging him in his plans. Two years after Lancelotti presented his work to the papal censure, and it was examined by a committee composed of Fabianus Atorombanus, Julius Oradinus, and Antonius Mass, all officers of the court Delia Rota. They approved strongly of it, and their recommendation was printed in 1558, but several objections were added, which were presently answered by Lancelotti himself to his libri. The book was afterwards published, and immediately adopted as a text-book in the University of Cologne. On the other hand, the pope steadily refused his approval, and some of the admitted objections are pointed out in the preface, and the ground that it contained principles opposed to the then recent decisions of the Council of Trent. The author, however, was dissuaded to alter the obnoxious passages, and resolved to continue to publish the work as a private enterprise, which he did towards the close of the Council of Trent, and in August, 1568, at Perugia, dedicating it to Pius IV. In the following years it was repeatedly reprinted and commended. Peter Matthiæus even appended it to his edition of the Corpus iuris canonici (Frankl. ed. M. 1591). Soon after it was included
is the edition of the *Corpus juris canon*, published at Lyons, and continued to be printed in that manner, having finally obtained the approval of pope Paul V (1460-21) by the intercession of cardinal Scipio Cobe-
lusia and others. Still the *Institutiones* were never consid-
ered as an official work. Their value const-
ated chiefly in the insight it affords into what was considered as law before the Council of Trent, and the common
practice of that time. Subsequent editions carefully indicate the differences between it and the new laws.
(See Caspar Ziegler, *Nota ex ipsa antiquissam ecclesi-
asticarum fontibus deducta*, Wittemb. 1599, 4to; repro-
duced in Thomasius's edition, Hale, 1716, 1717, 4to; also
that of Douat, Venetia, 1760, 2 vol. 8vo. A French
translation, with a comparison of the Roman and Gallican
practice, was published by Durand de Maille (Lyons,
1710, 10 vol. 12mo).—Herzog, Real-Encycl., viii, 187.

*Lancelotti* (or *Lancellotti*), Giovanni Paolo
(2), an Italian author (or priest), was born at Perugia in
1575, and died in Paris in 1640. He is noted as the au-
thor of a successful work entitled *Tod-day* ("L'Hoggi-
di"), intended to prove that the world was not morally or
physically worse than it had been in ancient times. He
wrote also other learned works.

*Lancelot*, Dom. Claude, a noted French theologian
and writer of the Romish Church, was born at Paris in
1615. In 1640 he was appointed preceeding officer of the
noted school of Port Royal, and, after the discontinue-
ment in 1669, he became instructor of prince Conti, then lived
in the conven of St. Cyrain until its destruction in 1679.
He died at Quimperlé April 15, 1695. His works are
mainly on the grammar of the classical and Roman
languages. He also published historical annotations on the
Bible of Vitre, and left in MS. form memoirs of the life of
Duverger de Hauranne, of the St. Cyrain convent. See
i, 132; Niceron, *Mém. pour servir à l'histoire des Hommes

*Lancet* (πῆς, *ro* mach, from its piercing, I Kings
xviii, 28, elsewhere usually "spear"), the iron point or
head of a lancet. See *Armon*. The incise implements of
the most ancient Hebrews, as of other peoples, were of stone
(Exod. iv, 25; Joel, v, 2; compare Abicht, *De
cultu saxeis*, Lipsae, 1712), and generally Creuzer, *Com-
ment. Herod., i, 22. The sects samia with which the
priests of Cybele emasculated themselves [Pliny, xxxv,
46], and the stone knives of the Egyptian embalmers
[Herod. ii, 60], are parallel cases). The Hebrews used
no knives at table (although one term for knife, *ṭelōn*
, is so named from *eating*), since the meat was brought on
ready cut into pieces, and the bread was so thin as to be
easily broken with the fingers. See *Eating*. The
same is the case at present in the East, even in princely
feasts. See *Meal*. Knives were regularly employed by
mechanics (q. v.), and in slaughtering animals (Gen.
xvii, 6, 10; comp. Judg. xix, 29; see Philo, *Opp., ii*, 570),
and for preparing food (Josephus, *War*, i, 38, 7; 4 M.
xvii, 71, etc.). The sacrificial knife, in particular, was
called *ṭelōn* (Exra i, 9), and a room in the (second) Temple
was appropriated to such cutlery (*ṭelōn, ὀργή*, Mi-
hana, *Midrash*, vi, 7). A penknife was called *ṭelōn* (Jer.
xxvi, 28; Ezek. v, 1), originally in Aramaean
*ṭelōn*, which in the Talmud (*Chelec*, xiii, 1) likewise
denotes a razor. The pruning-knife was called *ṭelōn* (Isa.
ii, 4; xviii, 5, etc.). See *Knife*.

*Lancet Style*. See *Engrish Style*.

*Lancet-window* is an architectural term for a
narrow window with acutely-pointed arch head. This
form was much used in England and Scotland during
the early pointed period of Gothic architecture. Sev-
eral lancet-windows are frequently grouped together,
as to produce a pleasing effect. In Scotland, the lancet-
window was, like many other features of Scotch Gothic,
rather in a much later period than in England.—
Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, i. v.

*Land* (represented by several Heb. and Gr. words:
properly *γῆ*, *e̓ra*, usually rendered "earth," Gr. 
*γῆ*; and *γήμαν* (adamic*), usually the "ground," sometimes
*γῆς*, etc., elsewhere a "field," Gr. *ἀγρός*; also *χώ-
pa*, a "tract of land," etc.). This word in the Old Testa-
ment often denotes emphatically the country of the Is-
raelites, at other times some particular country or dis-
trict, as the land of Canaan, the land of Egypt, the land of
Ashur, the land of Moab. In several places of our
Authorized Version the phrase "all the earth" is used,
when the more restricted phrase "the land," or "all the
land," would be more proper. See *Agriculture*; *Faim*;
*Landed Estate*.

*Landau*, Jecheskel, a German Rabbi of note, was
born about 1720. He flourished first as Rabbi of Jem-
pol, Podolia, and later as chief Rabbi of Prague. He
died in 1738. While yet a young man Landau gave
promise of great ability as a polemic, and he displayed
this quality to great advantage in the Sabbatian con-
troversy which raged between Eibeschutz [see Jona-
than Eibeschutz] and Enden. See *Grütz, Gesch. der
Juden*, vol. ii, ch. xi, especially p. 409, 418, 430; *Firstes,

*Landed Estate*. It has been the custom to re-
gard the Hebrews as a pastoral people until they were
settled in Palestine. In a great degree they doubtless
were so, and when they entered agricultural Egypt, the
land of Goshen was assigned to them expressly because
that locality was suited to their pastoral habits (Gen.
xlvii, 4-6). These habits were substantially maintain-
ed; but it is certain that they became acquainted with the
Egyptian processes of culture, and it is more than
LANDED ESTATE

probable that they raised for themselves such products of the soil as they required for their own use. We may, indeed, collect that the portion of their territory which lay in the immediate vicinity of the Nile was placed by them under culture (Deut. xi, 10), while the interior, with the free pastures of the desert beyond their immediate boundaries, was devoted to pastoral purposes (1 Chron. vii, 21). This partial attention to agriculture was in some degree a preparation for the condition of cultivators, into which they were destined eventually to pass. While the Israelites remained in a state of subjection in Egypt, the maintenance of their condition as shepherds was materially in keeping them distinct and separate from the Egyptians, who were agriculturists, and had a strong dislike to pastoral habits (Gen. xxi, 44). But when they became an independent and sovereign people, their separation from other nations was to be promoted by giving them to devote their chief attention to the culture of the soil. A large number of the institutions given to them had this object of separation in view. Among these, those relating to agriculture—forming the agrarian law of the Hebrew people—were of the first importance. They might not alone protect the individual family, but it might be that no other could have been effectual without them; for, without such attention to agriculture as would render them a self-sustaining people, a greater degree of intercourse with the neighboring and idiosyncratic nations must have been maintained. Thews was consequently the primary object of the Mosaic institutions. The commonest observation suffices to show how much less than other agricultural communities are open to external influences, and how much less disposed to cultivate intercourse with strangers. See HUNGER.

It was, doubtless, in subservience to this object, and to facilitate the change, that the Israelites were put in possession of a country already in a high state of cultivation (Deut. vi, 11), and it was in order to retain them in this condition, to give them a vital interest in it, and to make it a source of happiness to them, that a very peculiar agrarian law was given to them. In stating this law, and in declaring it to have been in the highest degree wise and salutary, regard must be had to its peculiar object with reference to the segregation of the Hebrew people; for there are points in which this and other Mosaic laws were unsuited to general use, some by the very circumstances which adapted them so admirably to their special object. When the Israelites were numbered just before their entrance into the land of Canaan, and were found (exclusive of the Levites) to exceed 600,000 men, the Lord said to Moses, "Unto thee I have given this land, and divided it according to the number of names. To many thou shalt give the more inheritance, and to few thou shalt give the less inheritance; to every one shall his inheritance be given according to those that were numbered of him. Notwithstanding the land shall be divided by lot: according to the names of the tribes of their fathers shall they inherit" (Num. xxvi, 33-54). This equal distribution of the soil was the basis of the agrarian law. By it provision was made for the support of 600,000 yeomen, with (according to different calculations) from sixteen to twenty-five acres of land each. They held their land independent of all temporal superiors, by direct tenure from Jehovah their sovereign, by whose power they were to acquire the territory, and under whose protection they were to enjoy and retain it. "The land shall not be sold forever, for the land is mine, saith the Lord: ye are strangers and sojourners with me" (Lev. xxv, 23). Thus the basis of the constitution was an equal agrarian law. But this law was guarded by other provisions equally wise and salutary. The accumulation of debt was prevented, first, by prohibiting every Hebrew from accepting interest from any of his fellow-citizens (Lev. xxv, 35, 39); next, by establishing a regular discharge of debts every seventh year; and, finally, by ordering that no land could be alienated for ever, but must, on each year of Jubilee, or every sev".

Sabbatical year, revert to the families which originally possessed them. Thus, without absolutely depriving individuals of all temporary dominion over their landed property, it re-established, every fiftieth year, that original and equal distribution of it which was the foundation of the national polity and the peace of the land. At the end of this reversion was fixed and regular, all parties had due notion of the terms on which they negotiated, so that there was no ground for public commotion or private complaint. See Jubilee.

This law, by which landed property was released in the year of jubilee from all existing obligations, did not extend to houses in towns, which, if not redeemed within one year after being sold, were alienated forever (Lev. xxv, 29, 30). This must have given to property in the country a decided advantage over property in cities, and who to retain them in perpetuity, was eminently suited to all the regulations, by affording an inducement to every Hebrew to reside on and cultivate his land. Further, the original distribution of the land was to the several tribes according to their families, so that each tribe was, so to speak, settled in the same county, and enjoyed the same bounty. Each family, as represented by the estate of any family in one tribe permitted to pass into another, even by the marriage of an heiress (Num. xxvii); so that not only was the original balance of property preserved, but the closest and dearest connexions of affection between the numerous branches of the Mosaic institutions were not impaired. See INHERITANCE.

It often happens that laws in appearance similar have in view entirely different objects. In Europe the entailment of estates in the direct line is designed to encourage the formation of large properties. In Israel the effect was entirely different, as the entail extended to all the small estates into which the land was originally divided, so that they could not legally be united to form a large property, and then entailed upon the descendants of him by whom the property was formed. This division of the land in small estates among the people, who were to retain them in perpetuity, was eminently suited to the leading objects of the Hebrew institutions. It is allowed on all hands that such a condition of landed property is in the highest degree favorable to high cultivation and to increase of population, while it is less favorable to pastureage. The two first were objects which the law had in view, and it did not intend to afford undue encouragement to the pastoral life, while the large pastures of the adjacent deserts and of the commons secured the country against such a scarcity of cattle as the division of the land into small herds has already produced in France.

For this land a kind of quit-rent was payable to the sovereign Proprietor, in the form of a tenth or tithes of the produce, which was assigned to the priesthood. See TITHES. The condition of military service was also attached to the land, as it appears that every freeholder (Deut. xx, 5) was obliged to attend at the general muster of the national army, and to serve in it, at his own expense (often more than repaid by the plunder), as long as the occasion required. In this direction, therefore, the agrarian law operated in securing a body of 600,000 men employed in labor and industry, always assumed to be ready, as they were bound, to come forward at their country's call. This great body of national yeomanry, every one of whom had an important stake in the national independence, was officered by its own hereditary chiefs, heads of tribes and clans, and represented the power of the people to defend themselves. See ANIMAL TROOP.
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as they were constantly employed in agriculture, attached to domestic life, and enjoyed at home the society of the numerous relatives who peopled their neighborhood, war must have been in a high degree alien to their tastes and habits. Religion also took part in preventing them from engaging in the wars which were in the interest of military glory. On returning from battle, even if victorious, in order to bring them back to more peaceful feelings after the rage of war, the law required them to consider themselves as polluted by the slaughter, and unworthy of appearing in the camp of Jehovah until they had employed an entire day in purification (Num. xix., 13-16; xxxi., 19). Besides, the force was entirely military; the law forbidding even the kings to multiply horses in their train (Deut. xvii., 16); and this, with the ordinance requiring the attendance of all the males three times every year at Jerusalem, proved the intention of the legislator to confine the natives within the limits of the Promised Land, and rendered long and distant wars and conquests impossible without the virtual renunciation of that religion which was incorporated with their whole civil polity, and which was, in fact, the charter by which they enjoyed all their property and enjoyed all their rights (Graves, Lectures on the Pentateuch, lect. iv.; Lowman, Civil Gov. of the Heb. ch. iii., iv.; Michaelis, Mos. Recht, i., 240 sq.).

Landelin and Landoid, two saints of the Roman Catholic Church, are said to have flourished as preachers of the Gospel in Belgium in the 7th century. We have no trustworthy information as to their lives and proceedings. Among the aids which St. Amandus procured from Rome in 651 to help him in his missionary labors is mentioned the presbyter Landoid, probably an Anglo-Saxon. According to the history of Landoid, written in the 10th century by abbot Heriger von Lobiis, Landoid was especially supported in his missions by king Childeger II, who furnished him with all the necessary means. He is also said to have had Lambert of Maastraße for a pupil, and to have been nine years bishop as successor of St. Amandus. This latter assertion, which is contradicted by the fact that Remarius was the successor of Amandus; and it appears also a matter of doubt whether Lambert of Maaschräf was indeed a pupil of Landoid.

Concerning Landelin, the Bollandists give, under date of June 15, an old biography, according to which he had been a disciple of Amandus, bishop of Aisne, had fled from his tutor, and supported himself for a while by highway robbery. The sudden death of one of his band, and a dream, in which he saw his former companion carried to hell by the devil, caused his conversion, and drove him to strict penance. He converted, and made a pilgrimage to Rome. Subsequently consecrated deacon and presbyter, he made two more journeys to Rome, the last time accompanied by his pupil Aduleus and Dominicus. He is said to have founded the two convents of Lobbes and Crepin. According to the same account, Landelin died in 986, continuing his pene-

Land-mark (ds, gebel, or h[a:k], gebelah, usually rendered “border” or “coast”), a boundary-line as indicated by a stake, stone, or other monument (Deut. xix., 14; xxi., 17; Prov. xxiii, 28; xxviii, 15; Job xxxi, 32). It was the manifest intention of Deborah, in bringing the Hivites over to Canaan, to make them a nation of agriculturists. For this purpose the land was divided by lot and measurement among the tribes, families, and individuals of the nation. Thus every citizen had allotted to him a piece of ground, which he was to cultivate and leave to his descendants. The importance of preserving accurately the boundaries of individual or family possessions is very obvious; and, to prevent mis-

Landolph. See Patariana.

Lane (poyq, 7 rendered in Luke xiv., 21; elsewhere “street”), a narrow passage or alley in a city, in distinc-

Lanca, George, a Methodist minister of considerable note, was born in the State of New York April 13, 1784. He was admitted to the Philadelphia Conference in 1805, and located in 1810; was readmitted in 1819, and again located in 1825; but was readmitted once more in 1834. In 1836 he was elected assistant agent for the Methodist Book-Convention at New York. In this capacity first, and later in that of principal agent, he served until 1852, when he retired from all active duties in the Church. He died May 6, 1859. Under his prudent management, the publishing house, then at 200 Mulberry Street, assumed almost gigantic proportions, out incurring the wrath of heaven. The custom had doubtless prevailed long before (Job xxvii, 2), it was thus confirmed by express statute (Deut. xix., 14; xxvii., 17), and it appears to have been strictly perpetuated in later times (Prov. xxviii., 28; xxxii., 10). Similar precautions were observed in the Roman emperors, who had images of the deities, called Hermae or termini, set up on the line between different owners, which were under the patronage of a deity especially designated for that care (see Smith’s Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. s. v. Terminus). Landmarks were used in Greece even before the age of Homer (Iliad, xxi., 460); and Greeks, who still used in Persia, and in various parts of the East. Even to this day fields in the East have no fences or hedges, but a ridge, a stone, or a post occasionally marks the boundary; consequently, it is not very difficult to encroach on the property of another (see Hackett, Illustra. of Script. p. 167). See HEDGES.

Lando or Landon, a Roman pontiff, was a native of Sabina, but the date of his birth is not known. Indeed, but little is accessible as to his personal history until he came to the pontifical chair in 918. He held the pontificate only about six months, for he died about April 27 (see A. Pons, in the Bowyer’s History of the Popes, v, 89 sq.).

Landoid, See Landelin.

Landon, Whittington, D.D., a clergyman of the Church of England, was for some time provost of Worcesters College, Oxford. In 1813 he was appointed dean of Exeter, and in 1812 prebendary of Salisbury. He died in 1839. Some of his sermons were published in London (1812, 1vo, and in 1835, 8vo)—Allibone, Dictionary of English and American Authors, ii, 1056.

Landborough, David, D.D., a Scotch Presbyterian minister, was born at Dalry, Galloway, Scotland, in 1782. He was pastor of the parish of Stevenson from 1811 to 1845, and of a Free-Church congregation at Saltcoats from 1843 until his death in 1854. Mr. Landborough was a博物学家, as a naturalist, and wrote several treatises on botany and zoology. He also contributed frequently to Dr. Harvey’s Psychological Britannica, and published papers in the Annals and Magazine of Natural History—allibone, Dictionary of British and American Authors, ii, 1056.

Landperger, Johann, a Catholic missionary who obtained distinction by his voluminous acetic writings, was born in Landperg, Bavaria, in the latter part of the 18th century; studied in Cologne, was made prior of his order near Nell, and died about 1848. On account of his marked and severe piety, he was called the Just. Among his works, which were published in many editions at various places, are: Commentaria in Psalmos, Exempla, etc.; Fidei Enchiridion; Vita Servatoris N. I. X.; Para-

Landmark (ds, gebel, or h[a:k], gebelah, usually rendered “border” or “coast”), a boundary-line as indicated by a stake, stone, or other monument (Deut. xix., 14; xxi., 17; Prov. xxiii., 28; xxviii., 15; Job xxiv., 25). It was the manifest intention of Deborah, in bringing the Hivites over to Canaan, to make them a nation of agriculturists. For this purpose the land was divided by lot and measurement among the tribes, families, and individuals of the nation. Thus every citizen had allotted to him a piece of ground, which he was to cultivate and leave to his descendants. The importance of preserving accurately the boundaries of individual or family possessions is very obvious; and, to prevent mis-
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Lanca, George, a Methodist minister of considerable note, was born in the State of New York April 13, 1784. He was admitted to the Philadelphia Conference in 1805, and located in 1810; was readmitted in 1819, and again located in 1825; but was readmitted once more in 1834. In 1836 he was elected assistant agent for the Methodist Book-Convention at New York. In this capacity first, and later in that of principal agent, he served until 1852, when he retired from all active duties in the Church. He died May 6, 1859. Under his prudent management, the publishing house, then at 200 Mulberry Street, assumed almost gigantic proportions,
LANE, John, an eminent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Virginia about 1769. His early life was spent in Georgia, and he was some time a student of Franklin College. In 1814 he entered the South Carolina Conference; in 1816 he was sent to the "Natchez Circuit," and was thrown much in contact with the Creek and Cherokee Indians, where his heroism and success were of a conspicuous nature. In 1816 he was called to organize the Mississippi Conference, then a vast and almost trackless region, now constituting four Conferences and part of a fifth. In 1820 he was delegate to the General Conference at Baltimore, and presiding elder on the Mississippi District. During this year his wife, Mrs. Lane, died. In 1832, New York, Mr. and Mrs. Lane were obliged to locate, to care for his large estate and numerous family. He remained located for eleven years, during which he successfully founded the city of Vicksburg on his father-in-law’s estate, and so saved it, and educated the orphan children. He was also an extensive merchant, patent judge of the county, and director of the Railroad Bank, and one of the most competent and influential business men of the state, while at the same time he preached continually, and filled Vicksburg station one year. In 1861 he re-entered the Conference, and spent most of his subsequent career in the presiding eldership. For many years he was president of the Board of Trustees of Centenary College, and was still longer president of the Conference Missionary Society. He died in 1865. He was a man of large capacities and indomitable vigor. His piety was genial and earnest, and his great delight was in preaching the Word of Life. He will long be remembered as one of the founders of Methodism in the South-west. - Summer, Biog. Sketches, p. 229; Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, vii. (G. L. T.)

LANEY, Benjamin, D.D., a prelate of the Church of England, was born at Stockop of Peterborough from 1650 to 1658; was then transferred to Lincoln, where he remained until 1667, when he was transferred to the bishopric of Ely. He died about 1675. Some of his sermons were published in 1662 and 1675. He was considered a very learned divine, and of great eminence. - Allibone, Dict. of Authors, ii, 1856.

LANFRANC, the most noted foreign churchman who rose to distinction in the English Church of the Middle Ages, was born of a senatorial family in Pavia, Italy, about 1005; studied law in Bologna, but not with attention to other subjects; returned to Ravenna, where he taught jurisprudence, and also the liberal arts, with great success. He soon gave his attention exclusively to the latter, the liberalis disciplinae, and especially to dialectics, and, leaving his own country, he travelled over a large part of France, until, induced perhaps by the fame of William, duke of Normandy, he settled in Avranches. He was appointed as a young man by Laval, where he won great distinction as a teacher, but in 1042, having determined upon a more private and contemplative life, he betook himself to Rouen, where, in fulfillment of such a purpose, according to his biographer Crispinus, he proposed to reside. On his way thither he was fallen into the hands of the monks of Bec by some vessel Truth, but he entered the cloister of Bec, of the Benedictine Order. After three years of quiet, he began again, at the instance of Herluin, the abbot of Bec, to give instruction, and became the resort of students from every class, both of strife and learning, and from many lands. Made prior of the monastery in 1046, he established a more extensive and systematic course of study, sacred as well as secular, unusual attention being given to grammar and dialectics. In respect to the former, Lanfranc's influence contributed greatly to revive the general study of Latin, and in dialectics he was a forerunner of the doctrines of Scholasticism, Exegesis, and patristic, but especially speculative theology, were pursued. Anselm was among his pupils at Bec, and also the future pope Alexander II. During this period, about 1049, occurred Lanfranc's first dispute with his former friend Berengar, then archdeacon at Angiers, on the subject of the Lord's Supper. The latter, while defending the opinions of Scottus Egerius, sought in a letter to persuade Lanfranc; but the letter, falling into the hands of others, gave rise to such charges of heretical fellowship against Lanfranc that he was provoked, in defending himself, to reproach Lanfranc and Verulam with a violent attack upon Berengar. The learning which he displayed in this controversy greatly increased Lanfranc's fame for scholarship, and he was now invited to the position of abbot in various cloisters, and was treated with respect by William of Normandy, who was his relative. It related that, on occasion of some false charges, the duke fell out with him, and banished him from his dominions. A lame horse was given him for the journey, and, seated on it, he happened to meet the duke, who could not help noticing the laughable hobbling of the animal, when Lanfranc took occasion to say to him, "You must give me a better horse if you wish me out of the country, for with this one I shall never get over the border." The jost won the duke's attention, and an explanation followed, which established Lanfranc in a position of permanent favor. He was employed by Duke William in 1060 to secure from the pope Nicholas II letters of rule for Flanders, which was a near relative, a princess of Flanders. This allowance was obtained on the condition that William should found two cloisters, one for monks and another for nuns. Over the monastery of St. Stephen, at Caen, which was thereupon established, Lanfranc was installed as abbot. It was the Pope, Anselm succeeding him in that capacity at Bec. The dispute with Berengar meanwhile continued. The latter, though constrained at Rome in 1059, through fear, to recognise the doctrine of Paschasia Radbertus, nevertheless continued to speak and write strong sentiments, and was bitterly opposed by Lanfranc in his work, De corpore et sanguine Dom. Jesu Christi, adv. Berengar Turonensisem, published between the years 1064 and 1069. In this work the doctrine of transubstantiation is clearly contained. Berengar issued a reply, De sacra omissa adv. Lanfrancum (an edition of which was published by Vischer in Berlin in 1834). The ability with which this controversy was conducted on both sides has been confessed. Severe personal charges are mingled with argument, and, whatever fault may have been established against Berengar, his opponent was not without blame nor without defects. The main point at issue with Berengar was the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the making this the trial rather than the logical argumentation. While at Caen, Lanfranc steadfastly refused the archbishopric of Rouen, but, upon the advice of his old abbiet Herluin, he accepted in 1070, with much reluctance, the archbishopric of Canterbury, which was urged upon him by William of Normandy, who had just ascended the throne of England. His task in the archbishopric was by no means light, inasmuch as he was obliged not only to control and amend the rudeness and ignorance of his own clergy, but to defend also the authority of his primary against the other prelates, especially Thomas of Canterbury, with whom he often quarrelled. The self-will of the king also gave him much trouble,
and he was frequently tempted to retract his steps to the cloister, but was urged by pope Alexander II to continue his public labors. The violent disposition of William Rufus, who ascended the throne in 1087, was a further annoyance. Notwithstanding all these difficulties, he persevered in his career as the champion of the common people and the oppressed clergy, in multiplying correct copies of the fathers and of the holy Scriptures, in the extension of learning and improvement of manners in clergy and people, and in care for the sick and the poor. "Under his spiritual rule," says a noted Church historian, "the Church of England received as a gift an infusion of the Norman element as was forced upon the political system of England by the iron hand of the Conqueror." His active and prudent influence was also often employed in state affairs.

Lanfranc's relation, while archbishop of Canterbury, to the papal chair forms an important feature of his life. He was on a friendly footing with Alexander II, his former pupil, and went to receive at his hands the pallium of his office, though he had at first desired, in accordance with the king's wishes, that it should be sent to him to England. Gregory VII, greatly displeased with William's independent conduct, and his inclination to restrain the bishops from visiting Rome, sharply complained to Lanfranc that he had also lost his former spirit of obedience to papal authority. Lanfranc protested his renewed affection for the Church, and declared that he had sought to win the Pope to conformity in certain particulars (as specially in the matter of Peter's Pence), but said little concerning his general relation to the king, or that of the latter to the pope. He seems to have known that a certain degree of consideration, more than he liked definitively to express, must be allowed to the royal wishes. The pope's command to Lanfranc to appear in Rome within four months under threat of suspension he openly and without answer dis obeyed. A letter of Lanfranc to an unknown correspondent (Ep. 80), who sought to gain his adhesion to the rival pope, Clement II, places him in a neutral position as between the two popes, and as awaiting, with the government of England, further light on the subject. Something of Lanfranc's coldness towards Gregory may perhaps be explained by the fact that he saw in this pope (as is apparent in a letter cited by Gieseler) a protector of his enemy Berengar. Lanfranc died May 28, 1089, two years after the death of William the Conqueror.

Besides his work against Berengar may be mentioned his translation of his own Pernum Sergii: — Epistolae Sergii; and 16 addressed to him: De celinda confessione, a fragment of an address in defence of his primatial authority; and Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles. His biography of William the Conqueror has been lost. The first complete edition of Lanfranc's writings was published by D'Achery, a Benedictine (Paris, 1648, fol.); the earliest edition is entitled B. Lanfranci Opera (Paris, 1568, fol.); the latest edition is by Giles (Oxford, 1844-45, 4 vols. 8vo.).


Lang, Georg Heinrich, a distinguished German theologian, was born Nov. 28, 1740, at Oettingen. He received a scientific education in his native town, and pursued theology at the University of Heidelberg. In 1765 he assumed a pastorate at Buhl, and in 1770 accepted a call to Hohen-und-Nieder-Altheim. From 1774 to 1777 he filled the position of superintendent and pastor at Trochtelsingen, and in the latter year returned to his late pastorate. In 1789 he became court preacher and ecclesiastical counsellor to the reigning prince at Ratibor. He died March 15, 1806. Lang exerted no little influence in the progress and culture of religious learning of the Church of Germany (Cfr. Ephes. I, II, Testamentum), which appeared in 1778, placed him in the front rank of writers on the theory and history of the Christian religion. His intense zeal for the practical in later life directed his literary activity to the popular treatment of religious truth; hence appeared Kirchliche Geschichte, Venet Missagin in Brautschott; and numerous sermons and liturgical writings. In his homiletical writings he developed many new and happy ideas, peculiarly adapted to the exigencies of the times. Many estimable traits of character both adorned his private life and enhanced his merits as a teacher of religious truth. For a list of his works, see Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutsche, ii, 229.

Lang, Joseph, a German Jesuit, was born in 1746 at Brunn, in Bohemia, and was educated at his native city. The Jesuits then sent him to Olmütz to pursue philosophy, and finally to the University of Prague, where he completed a course of theology. He was ordained in 1774. In 1775 he accepted a call to a Catholic Church in Leipzig, and in 1783 was chosen court preacher at Dresden. In 1802 he received the office of superintendent of the Catholic infirmary at the latter place. He died Dec. 28, 1806. Lang acquired the reputation of a learned man, and his labours in the Church, besides frequent contributions to journals, he published several sermons. See Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutsche, ii, 233.

Lang, Lorenz Johann Jakob, a German theologian, born in Selb, in the principality of Baireuth, on May 10, 1713, was the son of a stock-making, and being destined by his father to follow the same trade, he continued his wars for study; his religious desires, however, was manifested, with many difficulties. By the assistance of his pastor, however, he acquired a thorough knowledge of the Latin and Greek, and entered in 1748 the lyceum at Coblum. Indefatigable in his industry, he became thoroughly versed in philosophy and theology, as is evinced in the disputations De praestantia philosophiae Wolfa, and De positivo coelesti Novi Testamenti, after the defence of which he entered the University of Erlangen in 1751. After quitting Erlangen, he went to Baireuth in 1756 as tutor. A few months later he became sub-deacon in Baireuth. In 1758 he was appointed professor of the Oriental languages and of the fine arts at the Gymnasium of Baireuth. In 1767 he was appointed court librarian, and in 1789 the first professor and inspector of the alumni, and in 1795 the first counsellor. He died Sept. 18, 1801. Lang wrote extensively, but most of his writings are in the form of dissertations. A complete list is given by Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutsche, vol. i, s. v.

Lang (of Welleborn), Matthias, a noted German prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, an acknowledged natural brother of the emperor Maximilian I, was born in Aachen. In 1490 he was educated at the University of Ingolstadt. He was secretary first to Frederick III and later to Maximilian I. At the same time he held positions in the Church. He was successively priest at Augsburg and Constance until 1565, when he was appointed bishop of Gurk. Inclined towards the schemes of the Council of Trent, and feared on account of his influence over the emperor, who was following the lead of Lang, the youthful bishop received the cardinal's hat from pope Julius II in 1511. Of course the conferred honor made the trusted adviser of Maximilian an obdurate servant of the pontiff. Lang rested not until peace was restored between emperor and pope, so long at variance. See LATERAN, COUNCIL OF, 1518; PISA, COUNCIL OF; JULIUS II. In 1514 he was made coadjutor of the archbishop of Salzburg, and in 1519 sole incumbent
that archbishop of See. In 1518 he attended the diet at Augsburg, and was active both for the election of Charles V as King of Rome, and the submission of Luther to the Pope. He entered the Church of St. Peter at Rome, and the title of Doctor of Theology. He had been a reformer, and he made a speech in defence of reform, threatening to quit the Church unless their wishes were heeded, he changed front suddenly after he had gained over Johann Staupitz (q. v.).

Crushed the revolutionary movements of the Calvinists in 1538; in the year following joined the Romanian League (q. v.); and in 1558, assisted by Bavaria, suppressed the peasant insurrections. At the Diet of Augsburg in 1550 he openly declared himself a bitter opponent of Luther. He died in March, 1564. A narrative of cardinal Lang's travels in Austria, Hungary, and the Tyrol was published by a certain Gibertus, under the title "Odespercon de Mathaei cardinals (Vienne, 1511, 4to).

This work is now very rare (com. Götz, Dresdner Bibliothek, iii, 37). 

Vehese (Memoires of the Court, Aristocracy and Diplomacy of Austria [transl. by Demmler, London, 1856, 2 vols. sm. 8vo, i, 41) thus comments on his character: "Lang was an exceedingly eloquent and adroit man, yet he was just as famous for his elasticity of conscience as for cleverness. He surpassed in splendour all the cardinals and archbishops of his time, and in this respect certainly did not belie his Cesarianese descent. See also polit. Gesch. v. ii; Diet. Clesch v. Salzburg; Braun, Gesch. d. B. B. V. Augsburg, vol. iii; Veith, Bibliotheca Augustana, Alphabet v, p. 25-116; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. vi, 948. See also the article MAXIMILIAN. (J. H. W.)

LANGBAINE, GirARD, D.D., an English divine and philologist, was born at Barton-kirke, in Westmoreland, about 1608. He studied at Blencow, Cumberland, then became successively a servant, scholar, and fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, and held the places of keeper of archives and provost of his college for a good many years before his death, which happened in 1658. He was a studious and timid man, who con- trived to steer through the political storms of his time without giving serious offence to any party. He edited Longinus, and published several works of his own, chiefly on Church questions. The most important of them are, Episcopalian Inheritance, etc. (Oxford, 1641, 4to); A Review of the Covenant (Oxford, 1644, London, 1651, 4to); Epp. Proportionati ans. 1651 (Oxford 1658, 4to). He also worked on Usher's Chronologia Sacra, transl. from the French into Eng- lish an account of the Council of Trent (Oxford, 1658, fol.), and is considered the author of A View of the New Directory, and A vindication of the ancient Liturgy of the Church of England (Oxford, 1659, 4to). It also some unprinted collections, including several catalogues of MSS., which have often been referred to by Morton and others. See Wood, Athenae Oxoni. vol. ii; Cheaute- pie, Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique: English Cyclopa- dia; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. xxii, 384. (J. N. P.)

Langdon, Samuel, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in 1722 in Boston. He graduated at Harvard College in 1744, and was ordained colleague pastor in Portsmouth, N.H., Feb. 4, 1747. In 1774 he was elected president of Harvard College, which position he resigned Aug. 30, 1780, and was ordained, Jan. 18, 1781, pastor at Hampton Falls. He died in the last-named place Nov. 29, 1797. Langdon published An Inquestion Examination of Mr. Robert Sandeman's Letters on Theron and Apatian (1751): A Summary of Christian Faith and Practice, drawn up principally in Scripture language (1768); Dedication Lecture in Harvard College (1775); Observations on the Revelations of Jesus Christ to St. John (1711); etc.; Corrections of erroneous Mistakes committed by Rev. John Cozens Opdyke (1792); Remarks on the Leading Sentiments of Rev. Dr. Hopkins's System of Doctrines in a Letter to a Friend (1794); and several occasional sermons. He also published, in company with Col. J. Blanchard, a map of New Hampshire (1781). Sprague, Aminals, i, 456.

Lange, Joachim, a noted German Lutheran theologian, one of the heads of the so-called Pietistic school, was born at Gardelegen, in Saxony, Oct. 28, 1670. He entered the University of Wittenberg, which who clamed for reform, threatening to quit the Church unless their wishes were heeded, he changed front suddenly after he had gained over Johann Staupitz (q. v.); crushed the revolutionary movements of the Calvinists in 1538; in the year following joined the Romanian League (q. v.); and in 1558, assisted by Bavaria, suppressed the peasant insurrections. At the Diet of Augsburg in 1550 he openly declared himself a bitter opponent of Luther. He died in March, 1564. A narrative of cardinal Lang's travels in Austria, Hungary, and the Tyrol was published by a certain Gibertus, under the title "Odespercon de Mathaei cardinals (Vienne, 1511, 4to).

This work is now very rare (com. Götz, Dresdner Bibliothek, iii, 37). Vehese (Memoires of the Court, Aristocracy and Diplomacy of Austria [transl. by Demmler, London, 1856, 2 vols. sm. 8vo, i, 41) thus comments on his character: "Lang was an exceedingly eloquent and adroit man, yet he was just as famous for his elasticity of conscience as for cleverness. He surpassed in splendour all the cardinals and archbishops of his time, and in this respect certainly did not belie his Cesarianese descent. See also polit. Gesch. v. ii; Diet. Clesch v. Salzburg; Braun, Gesch. d. B. B. V. Augsburg, vol. iii; Veith, Bibliotheca Augustana, Alphabet v, p. 25-116; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. vi, 948. See also the article MAXIMILIAN. (J. H. W.)

Langdon, Girard, D.D., an English divine and philologist, was born at Barton-kirke, in Westmoreland, about 1608. He studied at Blencow, Cumberland, then became successively a servant, scholar, and fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, and held the places of keeper of archives and provost of his college for a good many years before his death, which happened in 1658. He was a studious and timid man, who contrived to steer through the political storms of his time without giving serious offence to any party. He edited Longinus, and published several works of his own, chiefly on Church questions. The most important of them are, Episcopalian Inheritance, etc., (Oxford, 1641, 4to): A Review of the Covenant (Oxford, 1644; London, 1651, 4to): Questions pro more solemn in Vesperia proprie ans. 1651 (Oxford 1658, 4to). He also worked on Usher's Chronologia Sacra, transl. from the French into English an account of the Council of Trent (Oxford, 1658, fol.), and is considered the author of A View of the New Directory, and A vindication of the ancient Liturgy of the Church of England (Oxford, 1659, 4to). It also some unprinted collections, including several catalogues of MSS., which have often been referred to by Morton and others. See Wood, Athenae Oxoni. vol. ii; Chateau- pie, Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique: English Cyclopaedia; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. xxi, 384. (J. N. P.)

Langdon, Samuel, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in 1722 in Boston. He graduated at Harvard College in 1744, and was ordained colleague pastor in Portsmouth, N.H., Feb. 4, 1747. In 1774 he was elected president of Harvard College, which position he resigned Aug. 30, 1780, and was ordained, Jan. 18, 1781, pastor at Hampton Falls. He died in the last-named place Nov. 29, 1797. Langdon published An Inquestion Examination of Mr. Robert Sandeman's Letters on Theron and Apatian (1751): A Summary of Christian Faith and Practice, drawn up principally in Scripture language (1768); Dedication Lecture in Harvard College (1775); Observations on the Revelations of Jesus Christ to St. John (1711); etc.; Corrections of erroneous Mistakes committed by Rev. John Cozens Opdyke (1792); Remarks on the Leading Sentiments of Rev. Dr. Hopkins's System of Doctrines in a Letter to a Friend (1794); and several occasional sermons. He also published, in company with Col. J. Blanchard, a map of New Hampshire (1781). Sprague, Aminals, i, 456.
Deca I disputat., theolog., exegeticum cum positio posita, 1768. He became bishop of Llandaff in 1848, and took great zeal in the reformation of monastic abuses. As a reward for his talents Edward III appointed him lord treasurer in 1360, and chancellor in 1364. In the year 1361 he had been appointed bishop of Ely. In 1366 he was transferred to the see of Canterbury. The see of Canterbury was the principal see of the Roman Catholic Church, and the most prominent of the celebrated Wycliffe (whom his predecessor had appointed head of Canterbury Hall, Oxford) on the plea that a secular priest was not suitable for the position. This injustice perhaps first suggested to Wycliffe an inquiry into papal supremacy. His inquiry gave great offence to Edward III, and when the pope, as a reward, created Langham cardinal of St. Sixtus, the king seized on his temporariness, as, by the law, the see of Canterbury had become vacant by the pro-

Langham now went to join the pope, who loaded him with favors. He continued to take a part in the political affairs of England, valiantly trying to re-

oncile that country to France. During the last years of his life Gregory XI intrusted him with the care of the papal affairs at Avignon, where he died July 22, 1376. His body was taken back to England, and buried at Westminster. His name is commemorated in another Life of Simon of Langham, in the European Magazine, 1797; Th. Tanner, Biblioth. Britannica; Baluzius, Vite Pop. Aen. vol. i; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxix, 409; Collar, Ecles. Hist. (see Index in vol. vii); Neander, Church History, i, 136.

Langhorn, John, a minister of the Church of England, was born in Westmoreland, England, in 1776; obtained a curecy in London in 1764; in 1767 he was ap-

pointed to the living of Blagden, Somersetshire, in 1777 became prebendary of Wells, and died in 1779. Langhorn published several works both in prose and poetry; also a volume of his Sermons, preached before the honor-
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Langle, Simon, of an English prelate, was born about 1310, probably at Langle, in Rutlandshire. In
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papist at Rosen in 1616. He died there in 1616. Be- L
nehmen a dissertation in defence of Charles I of

England, he

was accused of high treason and his instructions

were made public. He was put to death in 1621.


It is an interesting fact that the Synod of Tournai,
from the acts of the Concilium Tullerii of June, 659, it appears that another (Catholic Lancemosse) had a short time before been held at Langres by the bishops of Charles the Young, king of

Provence, nephew of Charles the Bald, and son of Lothair I, to whom Langres belonged as part of Burgundy. We know nothing of this synod. These were read again in the Synod of Toul (Savonnières), and incorporated in the acts of that synod's session held in the early part of June, 659. The canones refer partly to political and canonical points, partly to dogmas. The assembled clergy availed themselves of the opportunity afforded them by the synod to obtain from the princes Charles the Bald, Lothair II, and Charles the Young, the convocation of yearly provincial synods, and two yearly general synods (can. 7). An attempt was also made to take the election of bishops out of the hands of the clergy and transfer it to the king, but this was not carried through (can. 8). It was proposed that the metropolitan and bishops of the diocese be alone able to judge of the qualifications of candidates (can. 9). Great opposition was also manifested by those who maintained that, in the absence of the metropolitan and bishops of the diocese, the interest of discipline requiring that such institutions should be visited by the bishops (can. 9). They only maintained the right of the convents to appoint their superiors themselves (can. 9 and 12). Much was also done in regard to the building of churches, the administration of the Church, and the like (can. 13); the establishing of schools (can. 10), and the restoration of hospitals, pregrinorum videlicet, et aliorum pro remedio amanum receptacula (can. 14). The intervention of the temporal power was invoked against raptores, adulteri vel raptores, which latter were to be also punished by the Church with the full severity of her discipline. But the most important of the decrees adopted by this synod are those which refer to the dogma of predestination. It is in this Synod of Langres that the bishops of Provence appear to have prepared the whole matter, so as to aid him in the controversy with the Eastern Church between the three Carolinian kingdoms (Neustria, Lorraine, and Provence). King Charles was himself present, with a view to prevent the proceedings becoming a basis for the decrees of the future Synod of Toul. In the kingdom of Charles the Bald the semi-regional council of Hirson had been generally held, whilst in the ancient provinces of Lothair I the Augustinian views were still officially retained. As the coming Synod of Toul was intended to settle all disputes between the two kingdoms in regard to political and religious questions, the preparatory Synod of Langres had either to recall the Augustinian resolutions of the Synod of Valence, or to alter them in such a manner that they might no longer give offence. They could not agree to do the former, and the six canones of Valence were endorsed; but the expressions against the Synod of Clermont, which offended Hincmar and his friends (33) quattuor que a concilio fratrum nostrorum minus pros- pecte suscepta sunt propter inutilissimam et etiam nox- itetatem et errorem contrarium veritati [a pio auditu fidelius penitus expeditionis] were omitted from the four canones. This was but a half-way and ineffec-


(L'Encyclopédie, viii.

cient measure had already been sufficiently established by Hincmar himself in his work on predestination, cap.

30: if the canones of Valence were retained, it should be done openly, and they should be courageously defended, and then the protestation against the four principles of King Charles was to be made. If the latter three were omitted, then it would be consistent to drop the resolutions of the Council of Valence (comp. Hincmari (Opp. ed. Sirm., 291). It is ineffect made evident in the proceeding of Concilium cap. quinquagesimum, 292).

S. R., v. 481; Gieseler, Kirchen- Gfrößer, K. -G. iii, 2, 881; Herzog

196. (J. P. F.)

Langton, Stephen, one of the early English Churchmen, theological and secular history, was born the 12th century, according to on

shire, according to another in Dev-

cated at the University of Paris, a low-student and associate of Innocent after the election of the latter, a teacher in the university, and, by finally rose to the office of its chan-

to Rome about the year 1206, pop- ored him with the purple by the titulae Chrysogonus; and when, by the re-

Lanfranc, the archbishop of Canterbury of the claim to the succession of Christchurch, whom without consultation of the king, a

stance appointed to succeed the last archbishop, Hubert, and of John de Gray, bishop of Norwich, on whose behalf by the indulgence of king John, another candidate had been made, Innocent III favored his old school as the appointment of John de Gray, which, by consecration, was unau Augustinians were consecrated by the Vi- terbo June 27, 1207. John's determined resistance to this nomination gave rise to the cost between him and the pontiff which had such important results. See Innocent III; Johns, king of England.

The consequence, in so far as Langton was concerned, was, that he was kept out of his see for six years; till at last, after the negotiation concluded by the legate Pandulf, John and the cardinal met at Winchester in July, 1218, and the latter was fully acknowledged as archbishop. In the close union, however, that now followed between John and Innocent, Langton, finding his own interests and those of the clergy in general, so far as they were opposed to those of the king, disregarded the pope, joined the cause of the English barons, among whom the eminence of his station and the ascendency of his talents soon gave him a high influence, and in whose councils he at once took a prominent part. At the meeting of the heads of the revolters and the king at Nunny-

mende he was present, and it was through his efforts that the charter of Henry I was renewed. Among the sub-
cumbering witnesses to the Magna Charta his name stands foremost; and from his name to that of the rest of the cause of the national liberties, which he had just joined, without swerving throughout the rest of the contest, a course by which he greatly offended the pope. Indeed, so sincerely devoted to the interests of his native country was Stephen Langton that he hesitated not to act not only in direct opposition to the wishes of his friend, the Roman pontiff, but he even refused to comply with his demand to publish the document containing the announce-


ment of excommunication of the barons who had rebelled against the king, a punishment which Innocent sought to inflict in order to please John, whose warm partisan he had been after 1218. Langton did not waver even when threatened with expulsion from the archiepiscopal see; he was suspended in 1215, but was restored in the year following (in February), and was in his place in 1218 on the accession of Henry III. From this time forward Langton busied himself chiefly with the affairs of the Church, instituted many reforms, caused the translation of Becket's relics into a magnificent shrine of gold, set with precious stones, and introduced into England the mendicant orders. He attended the Lateran Council convened at Rome in 1215. He died July 9, 1229.

Langton is generally considered one of the most illustrious men of the age in which he lived. Both as consequently

Concilium Tul-
LATE 18TH CENTURY

AN ANTHOLOGY OF JEWISH WRITING

The present anthology is a selection of works from the late 18th century that have been influential in shaping Jewish thought and culture. It includes a variety of genres, such as philosophy, law, and mysticism, and features prominent Jewish thinkers such as Moses Mendelssohn, Isaac Ben-Zvi, and Hayyim Ben-Shabbetai.

1. "Maimonides' Guide to the Perplexed" by Moses Mendelssohn

2. "The Three Breaks" by Isaac Ben-Zvi

3. "The Kabbalistic Essays" by Hayyim Ben-Shabbetai

4. "The Jewish Encyclopedia" by Simon Dubnow

5. "The Book of Legends" by Solomon Ibn Gabirol

These works have had a significant impact on Jewish thought and continue to be studied and referenced by scholars and students today.
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Lanado, Samuel Ben-Abraham, another Italian rabbi of note, flourished at Aleppo about 1560. He wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch, and a commentary on Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, which have not as yet been published.

Lanado, Samuel, born at Venice in 1504-1565. He explains the Pentateuch according to the Sabbath Lessons [see Haphtarot] in the Midrashic manner.—A commentary on Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, entitled ה_Delete from previous volume_, which was first published in Venice in 1563, and excerpts of it are printed in Frankforter's Robbinen Bible (q.v.). It consists chiefly of extracts from the expositions of Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, etc.—A commentary on Isaiah, called יבשתב, A Vessel of Pure Gold (Venice, 1657). It is a very lengthy commentary, and, like the former, is chiefly made up from the expositions of Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, etc. See Fürst's Bibliothek orientalischer Schriften, ii, 292; Stolzenberger, Catalogus Librorum Hebrorum. In bibliotheca Rodalma, vol. 2438; Kittot, Bibli. Cyclopedia, s. v.

Lanka, the ancient name of the capital of Ceylon, is celebrated in Hindu mythology as the chief city of the giant Ravana (q.v.), who, by carrying off Sita, the wife of Rāma, caused the conquest of Ceylon by the latter personage, who is considered as an incarnation of the god Vishnu.

Lanneau, Basil E., a Presbyterian minister, was born at Charleston, South Carolina, March 22, 1880, and was educated at Charleston College, where he graduated in 1886. He completed a course of theology at Columbia Seminary, N.C., in 1885, and was immediately appointed tutor of Hebrew in the same institution. In 1884 he was ordained, and made pastor of a Church at Lake City, Florida; from 1886 to 1896 he was editor of the Southern Presbyterian, at Charleston, and then returned to Lake City. In October, 1899, he was elected to the chair of ancient languages in Oakland College, Miss., which position he held until his death, July 12, 1900. Lanneau's linguistic acquirements were very extensive. "He was not only a scholar, but an accurate and well-read divine. His style as a writer was chaste and clear."—Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1886, p. 93.

Lanneau, John Francis, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Greensboro, North Carolina, August 14, 1809; was educated at Yale College, class of 1829, and studied theology at the theological seminaries of Princeton, N.J., and Columbia, S.C. He was ordained in 1838, and labored three years for the cause of foreign missions; then went as a missionary to Jerusalem. In 1846 he returned to America, and was called to Marietta, Ga. In 1855 he became pastor at Salem, Va., and in 1861 returned to Marietta, where he died, Oct. 7, 1867. Mr. Lanneau is represented as an able minister, and always eminently influential and acceptable both as a preacher and an elder.—Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 34.

Lannis, Jacob W., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Baltimore Co., Maryland, July 8, 1826; received a collegiate education at Muskingum College, Ohio, and at Jefferson College, Pa., where he graduated in 1852. He studied theology at Alleghany City Theological Seminary, and afterwards with Dr. Edwards, of Fort Wayne, Ind. In 1860 he was ordained pastor of a Church at Waveland, Ind. In 1858 he removed to Nashville, Tennessee, and died there Aug. 9, 1859. Mr. Lannis was very successful in his brief ministry.—Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 95.

Lansing, Nicholas, a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born at Albany in 1748. He studied theology under Dr. Westervelt, of that city, and was licensed to preach by a general meeting of ministers and elders in 1780. Among the Dutch clergymen of the last two generations, this venerable man held a reputation for piety and individuality of character that reminded us of Dr. Edwards, of New York, and was converted from Judaism to the Reformed faith in his early youth. He was, while young, captain of a small sailing vessel that ran between Albany and New York, and was converted to Christianity while in this calling. Immediately he consecrated himself to the ministry, although his health was so feeble that his physician said he would not live to enter the pulpit. But God spared him to serve in his sanctuary fifty-five years. He preached regularly until the second Sabbath before his death, at the great age of eighty-seven. "He spent much time day and night in his study, fasting much and being much in prayer. He usually spent much of the night, and sometimes the whole night, in praying. His clothing always gave way first upon the knees." His preaching, which was in the Dutch language, was remarkable for its scriptural character, spirituality, and utter fearlessness. Striking anecdotes are told, and many of his peculiar expressions are yet current, illustrative of these features of his ministry. On one occasion, in a meeting of classis, when called upon by a second time to prolong his sermon to make a brief statement of the condition of his Church, the old man rose suddenly and said, "Mr. President, Tappan! Tappan! all Tappan is dead, and I'm dead too." He sat down and said no more until he was asked to pray, and then poured out his soul in such strains of "power with God" that all who heard him felt that whatever might be the state of his people, he, at least, was not "dead" yet. He observed family worship three times daily during a part of his life. A great revival of religion followed one of his most bold and characteristic sermons in a neighboring place, where people were given up to worldliness and sin. During his last service he sat in the pulpit, as his feebleness obliged him to do frequently in his later years. Like Baxter, he could have said...

I preached as I never should preach again, And as a dying man to dying men.

Referring to the strain of his ministry among them, he said, "I had to do with men who never preach or pray 'Do and live,' but 'Live and do.'" That week he was seized with his last illness, during which he was constantly engaged in prayer, and in speaking for Christ to those who were with him. His last end was peace. Mr. Lansing was settled first in the united churches of what are now Greensboro and Sedgefield, N.C., and afterwards, during 1781-4, and afterwards at Tappan and Clarks-town, in Rockland County, N.Y., 1784-1830, and Tappan alone 1820-23. His home and church in the latter place were near the spot on which major Andre was hung in the Revolutionary War. See Corwin, Manual of the Reformed Church, p. 184 sq. (W. J. R.T.)

Lantern (gavš, so called for its shining) occurs only in Ex. 8:8, where the party of men which went out of Jerusalem to apprehend Jesus in the garden of Getsemane is described as being provided "with foxtails and torches." It probably denotes any kind of covered light, in distinction from a simple taper or common house-light, as well as from a torch. See Cooper, Conn. Gaz., 1785, p. 568. In the article Lamp it has been shown that the Jewish lantern, or, if we may so call it, lamp-frame, was similar to that now in use among the Orientals. As the streets of Eastern towns are not lighted at night, and never
two feet long by nine inches in diameter, and is carried by servants before their masters, who often pay visits to their friends at or after supper-time. In many Eastern towns the municipal law forbids any one to be in the streets after nightfall without a lantern.

Lantern, in Italian or modern architecture, a small structure on the top of a dome, or in other similar situations, for the purpose of admitting light, promoting ventilation, or for ornament. In Gothic architecture the term is sometimes applied to spires on the roofs of halls, etc., but it usually signifies a tower which has the whole height, or a considerable portion of the interior, open to view from the ground, and is lighted by an upper tier of windows: lantern-towers of this kind are common over the centre of cross churches. The same name is also given to the light open erections often placed on the tops of towers; these sometimes have spires rising from them, but in such cases they are less perforated with windows. Lanterns des Morts occur only in the church-yards on the Continent; they were simply pillars, with a place for a light on the top similar to small light-houses, and it is not improbable that something of the kind was adopted in the early Roman cemeteries, and so has given origin to some of the Irish round towers, which may well have been used, at least in some instances, for this purpose.

Egyptian monuments offer any trace of the use of a lantern. In this case it seems to be borne by the night-watch, or civic guard, and is shaped like those in common use among ourselves (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg., ii. 72). A similar lantern is at this day used in Persia, and perhaps does not materially differ from those mentioned in Scripture. More common at present in Western Asia is a large folding lantern of waxed cloth strained over rings of wire, with a top and bottom of tinned copper. It is usually about
LANTFREDUS

LAODICEA

honor of Ceres, when her votaries ran up and down the streets with lighted torches in their hands, in imitation of the hurry and confusion of the goddess when in quest of her daughter Proserpine. Others ascribe the rise of this Chinese festival to an extravagant project of one of their emperors, who shut himself up with his concubines in a magnificent palace, which he illuminated with a thousand lamps. The Chinese, scandalized at his behavior, demolished his palace, and hung the lanterns all over the city. But, however uncertain its origin, it seems pretty definitely established that the lantern-festival was observed as early as A.D. 700 (comp. Williams, Middle Kingdom, ii, 82).

One peculiar custom of this feast is the grant of greater license to married women, who on other evenings, by Chinese custom, are obliged to confine themselves to their homes. The goddess called Mother (q. v.) is worshipped by them at this time, particularly by married but childless women, "expecting or desiring, as a consequence of such devotional acts to 'Mother,' to have male offspring." See Broughton, Bibliotheca Lit. Sacra, ii, 4; Doolittle, Social Life of the Chinese (New York, 1891), 158 sq.

Lantfredus or Lamfridus, a disciple of bishop Ethelbert of Winchester, flourished in the latter part of the 10th century. He is known only by his life of St. Swithun, which is very interesting, as it affords fine facilities for studying the manners and history of his time. "It is a singular fact, says Bower, that its authenticity is in some measure the adoption of numerous words formed from the Greek language." The editions of Lantfredus are those of Henry Wharton, Antonia Sacra, i (London, 1691, folio), 322—Lantfred epistula priorium Historiae de Miracula Swith. acta et vera religiosa. Janu. 1 (Antwerp, 1710), 322—337—Sivithuni Vita et Miracula, per Lamfridum Monacum Winton. See Darling, Cyclopedia, Bibliography, ii, 1767.

Laodicea (strictly Laodicia) (Ἀλοδία, justice of the people), the name of several cities in Syria and Asia Minor, but one of which, usually called Laodicea ad Lycum (from its proximity to the river Lycus), is named in Scripture. It lay on the confines of Phrygia and Lydia, about forty miles east of Ephesus, and is that of the "seven churches in Asia" to which John was commissioned to deliver the awful warning contained in Rev. iii. 14-19. The fulfillment of this warning is to be sought in the history of the Christian Church which existed in that city, and not in the stone and mortar of the city itself; for it is not the city, but "the Church of the Laodiceans," which is denominated. It is true, however, that the eventful fate of that Church must have been fore seen with the south-east expansion of the Persian Empire, and the spread of the synod at Laodicea, in Phrygia, A.D. 530-389, in Von Drey's Theol. Quart. Archv. 1824, p. 3 sq.

Laodicea was the capital of Greater Phrygia (Strabo, xii, p. 576; Pliny, v, 29; or Phrygia Pacatiana, according to the subscriptions of Tim.). It was a very considerable city (Strabo, p. 578) at the time it was named in the New Testament: but the violence of earthquakes, to which this district has always been liable, demolished, some ages after, a great part of the city, destroyed many of the inhabitants, and eventually obliged the remainder to abandon the spot altogether. The town was originally called Deopolis, and afterwards Rhous (Pliny, v, 29); but Laodicea, the building of which is ascribed to Antiochus Theos, in honor of his wife Laodice, was probably founded on the old site. It was not far west from Colossae, and only six miles to the west of Hierapolis (Jos., Antiq., xi, 10, § 37; Tac. Ann., ii, 62; Strabo, xii, 625). At first Laodicea was not a place of much importance, but it soon acquired a high degree of prosperity. It suffered greatly during the Mithridatic war (Appian, Bell. Mith. 20; Strabo, xii, p. 578), but quickly recovered, and was the second city of Asia Minor; and at the end of the republic and under the first emperors, Laodicea became one of the most important and flourishing commercial cities of Asia Minor, in which large money transactions and an extensive trade in wood were carried on (Cicero, ad Fam. ii, 17; iii, 5; Strabo, xii, p. 577; compare Vitruv., viii, 3). The place often suffered from earthquakes, especially from the great shock in the reign of Tiberius, in which it was completely destroyed; but the inhabitants restored it from their own means (Tacit. Ann., xiv, 27). The wealth of the citizens created a taste for the arts of the Greek, as they are manifested from the ruins; and that it did not remain behind-hand in science and literature is attested by the names of the sages Antiochus and Theodas, the successors of *Eisenidesmus (Diog. Laerct, xi, 11, § 106; 12, § 116), as well as by the existence of a great medical school (Strabo, xii, p. 580). During the Roman period Laodicea was the chief city of a Roman conventus (Cicero, ad Fam. iii, 7; ix, 25; xiii, 45, 46, 'xiv, 6; ad Att. v, 15, 16, 20, 21; vi, 1, 2, 8, 7; in Verr., i, 80). Many of its inhabitants were Jews, and it was probably owing to this circumstance that at a very early period it became one of the chief seats of Christianity [we have good reason for believing that, when in writing from Rome to the Christians of Colossae, Paul sent a greeting to those of Laodicea, he did not personally visit either place. But that was rectified by the opening of the Great Synagogue (Acts xviii, 19-xix, 41) must inevitably have resulted in the formation of churches in the neighboring cities, especially where Jews were settled. See LAODICEANS, EPISTLE TO THE], and the see of a bishop (Coloss. ii, 1; iv, 15 sq.; Rev. i, 11; iii, 14 sq.; Josephus, Ant., xiv, 10, § 3), and the seat of the bishopric, and constituted the number of the seven churches in the time of the Prophet (Rev. ii, 13), especially in the time of the Commen; and it was fortified by the emperor Manuel (Nicet. Chron. Assam., p. 9, 81). During the invasion of the Turks and Mongols the city was much exposed to ravages, and fell into decay; but the existing remains still attest its former greatness (see Smith's Dict. of, Gr. and Rom. Geog., s. v. Laodicea). Smith, in his Journey to the Seven Churches (1671), was the first to describe the site of Laodicea. He was followed by Chandler, Cockrell, and Pococke; and the locality has, within the present century, been visited by Mr. Hartley, Mr. Arundell, Col. Leake, and Mr. Hamilton.

Laodicea is now a deserted place, called by the Turks Evli-kâzour ("Old Castle"), a Turkish word equivalent to Palaë-kastor, which the Greeks so frequently apply to ancient sites. From its ruins, Laodicea seems to have been situated upon six or seven hills, taking up a large extent of ground. To the north and north-east runs the river Lycus, about a mile and a half distant; but nearer it is watered by two small streams, the Asopus and Cepaurus, the one to the west, and the other to the east of the south-eastern part of the town; and the Asopus flows into the Meander (Smith, p. 85). Laodicea preserves great remains of its importance as the residence of the Roman governors of Asia under the emperors, namely, a stadium, in uncommon preservation, three theatres, one of which is 640 feet in diameter, and the ruins of several other buildings (Antig. of Ionia, pt. ii, p. 92; Chandler's Asia Minor, c. 67). Col. Leake says, "There are few ancient sites more likely than Laodicea to preserve many curious remains of antiquity beneath the surface of the soil; its opulence, and the earthquakes to which it was subject, rendering it probable that valuable works of art were often there buried beneath the ruins of the public and private edifices (Cicero, Epist. ad Att., ii, 17; iii, 5, v, 20; Tacitus, Annal., xiv, 27). A similar remark, though in a lesser degree, perhaps, will apply to the other cities of the vale of the Meander, as well as to some of those situated to the north of Mount Tmolus; for Strabo (p. 579, 628, 630) informs us that Philadelphia, Sardis, and Magnesia of Sipylos, were, not less than Laodicea and the cities of the Meander as far as Apamea at the sources of that river, subject to the same disastrous calamity (compare Strabo, xii, p. 254)." —"Nothing," says Mr. Hamilton (Researches in Asia Minor, i, 515), "can exceed the desolation and melancholy appearance of the site of Laodicea;
the lay persons present shall give it to each other; and that end, the administration of the holy eucharist shall proceed. None except the priests shall be permitted to approach the altar in order to communicate. 20. A deacon not to sit in the presence of a priest and deacon, nor the communion of the latter. The same conduct is enjoined on subdeacons and all inferior clergy towards the deacon. 21, 22. The subdeacon not to undertake any of the duties of the deacon, nor touch the sacred vessels, nor wear a stole. 23. Forbids the same to chanters and readers. 24. None of the clergy, or of the order of acolytes, to enter a tavern. 25. Forbids the subdeacon to give the consecrated bread and to bless the cup. 26. Prohibits persons not appointed thereto by a bishop from meddlying with exorcisms. 27. Forbids the carrying away of any portion of the agnus. 28. Forbids the celebration of the agnus, or louses. 29. Forbids Christians observing the Jewish Sabbath. 30. Forbids Christian men, especially the clergy, from bathing with women. 31. Forbids giving daughters in marriage to heretics. 32. Forbids receiving the eulogium of heretics. 33. Forbids all Catholics praying with heretics and acknowledging them as such. 34. Anathematizes all who go after the false martyrs of heretics. 35. Forbids Christian persons leaving their church in order to attend private conventicles in which angels were invoked, and anathematizes those who are guilty of this idolatry. 36. Forbids the clergy to administer holy communion to all who wear phylacteries be cast out of the Church. 37. Forbids fasting with Jews or heretics. 38. Forbids receiving unleavened bread from Jews. 39. Forbids feasting with heathen persons. 40. Orders all bishops to attend the synods to which they are summoned, unless prevented by illness. 41, 42. Forbids clergymen leaving the diocese to travel abroad without the bishop's permission and the canonical letters. 43. Forbids the porter of the church leaving the gate for a moment, even in order to pray. 44. Forbids women entering into the altar. 45. Forbids receiving those who do not present themselves for the Easter baptism in the first week and week in Lent. 46. Orders that all catechumens to be baptized shall know the Creed by heart, and shall repeat it before the bishop or priest on the fifth day of the week. 47. Those who have been baptized in sickness, if they recover, must learn the Creed; and those who have been baptized shall be anointed with the holy chrism, and partake of the kingdom of God. 48. Forbids celebrating the holy eucharist during Lent on any days but Saturdays and Sundays. 50. Forbids eating anything on the Thursday in the last week of Lent, or during the whole of Lent anything except dry food. 51. Forbids celebrating the festivals of the martyrs during Lent; orders remembrance of them on Saturdays and Sundays. 52. Forbids celebrating marriages and birth-day feasts during Lent. 53. Enjoins proper behavior at marriage festivals, and forbids all dancing. 54. Forbids the clergy attending the shows and dances given at weddings. 55. None of the clergy or laity to club together for drinking-parties. 56. Forbids the priests taking their seats in the sanctuary before the bishop enters, except he be ill or absent. 57. Directs that bishops shall not be placed in small towns or villages but simply visitors, who shall act under the direction of the bishop in the city. 58. Forbids both bishops and priests celebrating the holy eucharist in private houses. 59. Forbids singing uninspired hymns, etc., in church, and reading the uncodified books which are the canonical books of Scripture. In this list the Apocalypse and the book of Revelation are omitted. See Canon of Scripture. Of particular interest among

Copper Coin ("medallion") of Laodicea in Phrygia, with Head of Commodus, Triumphal Figure, and name of Asiarch.
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the decisions of this council is canon 11, forbidding the employment of women as preachers. Hefele holds that the canon has hardly been properly translated, and that the desire of the council was simply to forbid superior diocesan jurisdiction in this matter. But for detailed discussion we must refer to Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, i, 731 sq. The difficulty as to the meaning arises from the fact that the canons were written in Greek, and the question hinges on the meaning intended for προετριηδας and πρεματαιομενα.

LAODICEAN (Ἀρωνίαξος), an inhabitant of the city of Laodicea, in Phrygia (Coloss. iv, 16; Rev. iii, 14), from which passages it appears that a Christian Church was established there by the apostles. See below.

LAODICEANS, EPISTLE TO THE. "In the conclave and synod of the Colossians (Col. iv, 10), the apostle, after sending to the Colossians the salutations of himself and others who were with him, enjoins the Colossians to send this epistle to the Laodiceans, and that they likewise should read the one from Laodicea to you" (Grammatik d. Neutestamentl. Sprachwiss., p. 484, Lpz. 1890). It must be allowed that such an interpretation of the apostle's words is in itself more probable than the other; for, supposing him to refer to a letter from the Laodiceans to him, the questions arise, How were the Colossians to procure this unless he himself sent it, or what use would such a document be to them? To this latter question the answer was probably: that probably the letter from the Laodiceans contained some statements which influenced the apostle in writing to the Colossians, and which required to be known before his letter in reply could be perfectly understood. But this is said without the slightest shadow of reason from the epistle before us; and it is opposed by the fact that the Laodicean epistle was to be used by the Colossians after they had read that to themselves (ἤρεσιν ἀναγνωριζη, κ. τ. η.). It seems, upon the whole, most likely that the apostle in this passage refers to an epistle which he had composed at Laodicea before his journey thence to the Church at Colossae."

The suggestion of Grotius (after Marcion) that it is identical with the canonical Epistle to the Ephesians has substantially been adopted by Mill and Wetstein, and many modern critics; see, especially, Holzhauser, Der Brief an die Epheser (Hannover, 1844); Baur, Paulus (2d ed. Lpz. 1866-7), ii, 47 sq.; Räbiger, De Christologia Paulini (Breslau, 1852), p. 48; Bleek, Einleitung in das N. T. (2d ed. Berlin, 1866), p. 454 sq.; Haurowitz, Der Apostel Paulus (Halle, 1868), p. 2; Volmar, Commentar zur Offenb. Joh. (Zürich, 1862), p. 66; Kiene, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1869, p. 382 sq.; Klostermann, in the Jahrb. fü. deutsche Theol. 1870, p. 160 sq.; Hitzig, Zur Kritik Paulinischer Briefe (Lpz. 1870), p. 27. The only supposition that seems to meet all the circumstances of the case is that the Epistle to the Ephesians, although not exactly encyclical, was designed (as indeed its character evinces) for general circulation; and that Paul, after having dispatched this, addressed a special epistle to the Colossians on occasion of writing to Philemon, and recommends the perusal of that to the Ephesians, which had reached them by way of the Laodiceans. This explains the doubtful reading ἐπεις, and the absence of personal salutation in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and at the same time the allusion to a letter from Laodicea; while it obviates the objectional hypothesis of the loss of an inspired epistle, to which particular attention has thus been called, and which was therefore the more likely to have been preserved. See EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO. Wieseler's theory (Apost. Zeitalter, p. 450) is that the Epistle to Philemon is an early part of the Canon, but not complete; but for detailed discussion we must refer to Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, i, 731 sq. The difficulty as to the meaning arises from the fact that the canons were written in Greek, and the question hinges on the meaning intended for προετριηδας and πρεματαιομενα.

Lao (לאו, Lao), a member of the Tai tribe, also known as the Tai Lao ( Languages of Lao), an ethnic group found in Laos, Thailand, Myanmar (Burma), and Vietnam. The Lao people are classified as Tai by linguists, and are one of the six ethnolinguistic groups that constitute the Tai stock. The Lao language is a Tai language and is written in a Lao alphabet, which is derived from the Khmer script.

Lao, the language of the Lao people, is spoken in Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. Lao is a Tai language and is written in the Lao script, which is derived from the Khmer script.

The Lao people are a complex cultural group, with distinct regional variations in language, culture, and tradition. They have a rich history and are known for their rich cultural traditions, including music, dance, and cuisine. Lao culture has been shaped by centuries of contact with neighboring peoples, including the Chinese, Thai, and Vietnamese. The Lao language is a Tai language and is written in the Lao script, which is derived from the Khmer script.
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The Lao people are a complex cultural group, with distinct regional variations in language, culture, and tradition. They have a rich history and are known for their rich cultural traditions, including music, dance, and cuisine. Lao culture has been shaped by centuries of contact with neighboring peoples, including the Chinese, Thai, and Vietnamese. The Lao language is a Tai language and is written in the Lao script, which is derived from the Khmer script.
Lao-tzu

Lao-tzu has at different periods enjoyed the patronage of the Chinese government, therefore, in fact, a constant struggle for ascendency between his supporters and those of Confucius during several centuries at the beginning of our era. Emperors have paid homage to him in his temple, and one of them wrote a commentary on his book. When we turn aside from definite history and give our attention to legends, there is no end to the mysteries thrown around his birth and being. His followers have traced him from the human limit of mortals into an incarnation of deity, and have clothed his philosophic treatise with the authority of a sacred book, being probably moved to this course by a desire to make their founder equal to Sakymuni (see Gautama), and to give the world a chance of acquaintance with his works. He is represented as an eternal and self-existing being, incarnate at various times upon the earth. One account represents him as having been conceived by the influence of a meteor, and after being carried in the womb for seventy-two years, was born in the form of an old man. This account is given by his own son, who is supposed to have been the first preserved record of the life of Lao-tzu, and is thus described: "He was born in the year 570 B.C. and died in the year 472 B.C. He was the son of a scholar and a lady. At the age of twenty, he was disci- plined in the science of the book of the Taotie, the book of the Taoist philosophy. He was the author of the 'Yellow Emperor's Book of the Secrets of Longevity,' which was written in the year 370 B.C. and remained in China for about five centuries. He was the first to introduce the use of iron and bronze in the manufacture of weapons, and is said to have discovered the art of making the 'Yin and Yang' stones, which were used in the manufacture of the 'Yin and Yang' coins. He also invented the 'Yin and Yang' wheels, which were used in the manufacture of the 'Yin and Yang' arrows, and is said to have discovered the art of making the 'Yin and Yang' spears."
but chiefly for man. It represents also that ideal state of perfection in which all things act harmoniously and spontaneously, good and evil being then unknown, and the world is at peace. This is the purpose and theme of the whole book, the subject of all the discussion, the manum ism of existence. French and English writers generally have translated Tao by "Reason," some adding "or Logos." There are some striking similarities between Tao and Logos; and in all the translations of the Scriptures into Chinese the Logos of John is rendered by Tao. Julien, decidedly dissenting from the common translation of Tao, adopts "Voic" or "Way,"—giving just cause for his dissent in the fact that Lao-tzu represents Tao as devoid of thought, judgment, and intellige nce. Julien's "Way," however, is also objected to, as it is not a word in the original, while Voic was before all other existences. The "Nature" of mod ern speculators probably answers more nearly than any thing else to Tao, although it will by no means answer all the conditions of the use of Tao by Lao-tzu.

Doctrines.—(1) The teachings of Lao-tzu on speculative physics may be summarized as follows: All exist ing creatures and things have sprung from an eternal, all-producing, self-sustaining unity called Tao, which, although regarded as a potential existence, is also distinctly denominated non-existence, Lao-tzu considering it to be the same as Nothing. Nothing is the "source of all." Watters (see below) thus combines these apparently contradictory views: "Though void, shapeless, and imm terial, it yet contains the potentiality of all substance and shape, and from itself produces the universe, diffusing itself over all space. It is said to have generated the world, and is frequently spoken of as its mother, 'the dark primeval mother, teeming with dreamy beings.' All things that exist submit to it as their chief, but it shows no lordship over them. All the operations of Nature (Tao) occur without any show of effort or violence—spontaneously, unerringly. Though there is nothing done in the universe which Nature does not do, though all things depend upon it for their origin and subsistence, yet in no case is Nature visibly acting. It is in its own deep self a unit—the smallest possible quantity, yet it prevails over the wide expanse of the universe, operating unseen but unseen." Lao-tzu's account of the origin of the universe is, 'Tao begot 1, 1 begot 2, 2 begot 3, and 3 begot the material universe,' which has been explained by commentators that Tao generated the Passive Element in the composition of things, this produced the Active Element, and this the two combined, forming the universe, as brought about the production of all things. The next thing to Tao is heaven—i.e. the material heaven above us. This is pure and clear, and if it should lose its purity would be in danger of destruction. The earth is at rest. To it belongs the small bee, the ant, and this growing home to the origin is called stillness. It is said to be a reversion to destiny. This reversion to destiny is called eternity. He who knows (this) eternity is called bright. He who does not know this eternity wildly works his own misery. He who knows eternity is magnanimous. Being magnanimous, he is virtuous. He is also a Catholic, he is a king. Being a king, he is heaven. Being heaven, he is Tao. Being Tao, he is enduring. Though his body perishes, he is in no danger. And again, at chap. xxviii., "He who knows the light, and at the same time keeps the dark, is the whole world's model. Being the whole world's model, eternal virtue will not miss him, and he will return home to the absolute." The attainment, then, of this state of absolute vacuity he looks upon as the chief good, and warns such as have attained to it to keep themselves perfectly still, and to avoid ambition. And, in alluding to the fact that emptiness or non-existence is superior to existence, he says that the former may be said to correspond to the other, the latter to gain. "Tao is empty." "The space between heaven and earth may be compared to a below; though empty, it never collapses, and the more it is exercised the more it brings forth." To enforce this theory he draws an illustration from common life, and says, "Thirty spokes unite in one nave, and by that part which is non-existent (i.e. the hole in the centre of it) it is useful for a carriage-wheel. Earth is moulded into vessels, and by their hollow cavity they are useful as vessels. Doors and windows are cut out in
order to make a house, and by its hollowness it is useful as a house.

Since the 2nd century A.D. the Taoists have greatly spread in China, Japan, Cochino-China, Tonquin, and among the Indo-Chinese nations. In our day they are especially popular with the common people, and in some parts of China their influence rivals that of the Buddhists. Although they have, however, seemingly neglected the teachings of their founder; the worship of original Taoism has been degraded into the lowest idolatry, while its priests are jugglers and necromancers, among whom scarcely a trace of the pure spirit of Lao-tzu can be found. See also P. A. Hermann, Les origines de la Taoïsme et les Opinions de Lao-tzu (1829); John Chalmers, The Speculations on Metaphysics, Polity, and Morality of the Old Philosophical Lao-tze, with an Introduction (Lond. 1869, 8vo); the valuable articles of T. Watters in the Chinese Recorder, vol. i. (1869); FauJaiter, Le Château (Paris, 1857, 2 vols. 8vo), p. 110-139; Stanulais Julien, Le Livre des Récupérateurs (Paris, 1848, 8vo); Neumann, Lehrbuch der Mitteleuropäer (München, 1856, 8vo); Legge, Life and Teaching of Confucius (Lond. 1867, 8vo), ch. iv.; Loomis, Confucius and the Chinese Classics, p. 218 sqq.; Pull Müller General Astronomy, Part I. (1892), p. 111 sqq. See also his articles on Lao-tzu, in Chambers, Cyclop.; Thomas, Biog. Dict.; and Brockhaus, Conversations Lex. (S. L. B.)

Lap (לָאָפ), 2 Kings iv, 39, a garment, as elsewhere; לָאָפְי, Prov. xvi, 33, the bosom, as elsewhere; לָאָפ, Neh. vi, 13, the armful, as in Isa. xiii, 22, the fold of the ram in which Orientalasts are accustomed to carry articles in lieu of pockets. Instead of the idols or clay that was used by the Romans, the Arabs join together with thread, or with a wooden bodkin, the two top corners of their upper garment; and, after having placed them first over one of their shoulders, they then fold the rest of it about their bodies. The outer fold serves them frequently instead of an apron, in which they carry herbs, loaves, corn, and other articles, and may illustrate several allusions made to it in Scripture: thus one of the sons of the prophets went out into the field to gather herbs, and found a wild vine, and gathered thereof wild grapes his lap full (2 Kings iv, 39). The Psalmist offers up his prayers that Jehovah would "render unto his neighbors sevenfold into their bosom their reproach" (Psa. xii, 12). The same allusion occurs in our Lord's direction, "Give, and it shall be given unto you, good measure, pressed down and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom" (Luke vi, 38). See Bosom; Doss.

Lapida. See Stones.

Laphitha (Λαφίθα), in mythical geography, a people of Thessaly, chiefly known to us from their failed contests with the Centaurs. The battle between the Centaurs and the Lapithae has been minutely described by Heriod and Ovid.—Brande and Cox, ii, 317.

Laphrisia (Λαφρίσια), a surname of Artemis or Diana among the Cynodians, from whom the worship of the goddess was introduced at Naupactus and Patras, in Achaia. At the latter place it was not established till the time of Augustus, but it became the occasion of a great annual festival (Pausanias, iv, 31, § 6; viii, 18, § 6, etc.; Schol. ad Eurip. Orest. 1087). The name Laphrisia was traced back to a hero, Laphris, son of Castalius, who was said to have lived in the vicinity of the temple, for the purpose of swearing by them ("per jovem Laphrisiam") at Calydon. Laphrisia was also a surname of Athene or Minerva (Lycoephron, 356).—Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, vol. ii, s. v.

Lapides Jewish (Jewish Stones). In the chalky beds which surround in some parts the summit of Mount Carmel, I found numerous hollow stones, lined in the inside with a variety of sparry matter, which, from some distant resemblance, are supposed by the natives to be petrified olives, melons, peaches, and other fruit. These stones are considered not only as curiosities, but as antidotes against several diseases. Those which bear some resemblance to the olive have been designated Lapides Judaei, otherwise "Eliah's Melons," and are superstitiously regarded as an infallible remedy for stone and gravel when dissolved in the juice of lemons. Those supposed petrified fruits are, however, as Dr. Shaw states, only so many different-sized Flint-stones, beautified with by sparry and stalagmitical knobs, which are fancifully taken for fossils, and known as lapides judaei.

Laph'idoth (Hebrew לָפְּרִיתּ, ḥarōth, Sept. ἄρκαδας, the husband of Deborah the prophetess (Judg. iv). He may have resided with her at the time of her public services as female judge (ver. 5), or more probably he was deceased, and she is named as his widow. B.C. ante 1409. From the fact that the name is in the form of a fem. plur. some have taken it to mean her place of residence (לָפְּרִיתּ, komes of; being understood before it), but without probability (Bërthaean, ad loc.). By others the term laphidoth has been understood to denote merely her character (q. d. "woman of splendor," i.e. noble, brilliant), or even her occupation merely (q. d. lep-tom-činer); but all these are equally nugatory suppositions. See DIBORAH.

La Philoméne, FRANÇOIS, an eminent French writer, was born in the second half of the 17th century. After writing for some time a member of the Order of the Jesuits, he was converted to Protestantism, and on this account was obliged to flee the country. He took refuge first in Holland, then in England, where he was welcomed to the Church of Bishop Hobart. (The actual time of his death is not ascertained. He wrote L'athéisme dévoilé par le P. Hardouin, Jésuite, dans les écrits de tous les Pères de l'Eglise et des philosophes modernes (1715, 8vo); and in St. Hyacinthe, Mémoires Littéraires, 1716):—L'Abus des Confessions de Foi (1716, 8vo):—An Answer to the R. D. Sarte's A Causation, containing an accout of his behavior and suffering among the Jesuits (Lond. 1717, 8vo; transal. into Latin in 1718): it is a sort of autobiographical—Défense des Principes de la Tolérance (Lond. 1718, 8vo): Further Account of himself (Lond. 1729, 8vo). He translated also into French Pope's Essay on Criticism (1717); Plauto's Republic (1725, 8vo); Burnet's Histoire des dernières Révolutions d'Angleterre (La Haye, 1725, 2 vols. 4to; London, 3 vols. 12mo; latest ed. La Haye, 1785); and some works of bishop Bauger and of Steele. See Adelung, Suppl. zu Jocher; Haag, La France Protestant; Hoeber, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxix, 697. (J. N. P.)

Lapis (the stone), a surname of Jupiter at Rome, as is evident from the expression "Jovem Lapidem" (Cicero, ad Fam. vii, 12; Gallius, i, 21; Polybius, iii, 26). It was formerly believed that Jupiter Lapis was a stone statue of the god, or originally a rude stone serving as a symbol, around which people assembled for the purpose of worshipping Jupiter. But it is now generally acknowledged that the pebble or flint-stone was regarded as a symbol of lightning, and that therefore, in some representations of Jupiter, he held a stone in his hand instead of the thunderbolt (Arnobius, adv. Gent. iv, 25). Such a stone ("lapis Capitolinus," August. de Civ. Del. ii, 29) was even set up as a symbolic representation of the god himself (Serv. ad Aen. viii, 641). When a treaty was to be concluded, the sacred symbols of Jupiter were taken from his temple, viz. his sceptre, the pebble and the thunderbolt, to be immersed in the fountain of the temple, for the purpose of swearings by them ("per jovem Lapidem jugando") at Calydon, i, 24; xxx, 43. A pebble or flint-stone was also used by the Romans in killing the animal when an oath was to be accompanied by a sacrifice, and this custom was probably a remnant of very early times, when metal instruments were not yet used for such purposes.—Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, s. v.

Laplacé (PLAÇAC), JOANNE de, a distinguished French Protestant theologian, was born in Brittany about the year 1605. After completing his studies in the University of Saumur, he taught philosophy for a
La Placette, Jean, a distinguished French Protestant theologian and moralist, was born at Pontac, in Béarn, Jan. 19, 1639, and studied theology at the Protestant Academy of Montauban. Appointed pastor of Orthez in 1669, he removed in the same capacity to Nal in 1664, and remained there until the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, refusing several pressing invitations from the important congregation of Charanten. At the revocation he obtained leave to go to Holland, from whence he afterwards went to Prussia. In 1686 he finally accepted the presidency of the Protestant Church at Copenhagen, which he held until 1711. He then resigned and retired to Utrecht, where he died April 25, 1718. His principal works are, Traité des Bonnes Oeuvres en général, 1709, 12mo; Logique et Mathématique, etc. (Amst. 1696, 12mo); La mort des justes, ou la manière de bien mourir (La Haye, 1729, 12mo); — Traité de la foi divine (Hertz, 1716, 3 vols. 12mo); — La communion dévote, ou la manière de participer saintement et utilement à l'Éucharistie (Amst. 6th ed. 1706, 12mo); — La morale Chrétienne admirable, etc. (Amst. 2d ed. 1701, 12mo); — Essai de morale (Amst. 1707, 12mo); — Nouvelles Littératures, etc. (La Haye, 1715, 2 vols. 12mo); — The incurable Stérilité de la...
and severe; the summer lasts only nine weeks, but is, in consequence of the very long days, almost as hot as in Italy, and, owing to the innumerable mosquitoes, most oppressive for both man and beast. Only in the southern part of Swedish Lapland is the soil capable of cultivation; the corn is sown towards the close of May, and reaped in the middle of July, but is often spoiled by night frosts. The territory is but very thinly settled, and only a part of it is now occupied by the people to which it owes its name, the southern and better portions having been gradually encroached upon by Norwegians, Swedes, and Finns, till the Laplanders pretty much shut themselves up within the circle of the Arctic Circle. The territory is politically divided into three parts: 1. Norwegian Lapland or Finnmarsk, containing 27,315.70 square miles and 18,668 inhabitants, all Laplanders, or, as they are here called, Finnars. 2. Swedish Lapland, containing 49,035.17 square miles, with a population of 27,445 inhabitants, of which only 5665 are Laplanders, and all the remainder Swedish colonists, whose number has steadily increased since 1750, when the first two Swedish families settled in the country. 3. Russian Lapland, which partly belongs to Finland, partly to the government of Archangel, and embraces Eastern Lapland, with the peninsula of Kola, also called the Lapland peninsula. The number of Laplanders in Russian Lapland had in 1852 been reduced to 2290. The native inhabitants, Laplanders or Laps, call themselves Sami or Samelads, and consider Lapland and Lapps as synonyms. They are divided into Fjell-Lapper, Finner, mountain Laplanders, who lead a nomadic life, and pasture large reindeer herds; or Skoges-Lapper, forest Laplanders, chiefly occupied with hunting and fishing, leaving their herds of reindeer in charge of the preceding class; or Soit-Finner, sea or shore Lap-landers, who, too poor to possess much herd, have been obliged to fix their residence upon the coast, and subsist chiefly by fishing; or Sockne Lapper, parish Lappers, who hire themselves out as servants, chiefly for tending the reindeer. They are good-natured, honest, superstitious, and patriotic, and, with the exception of an inclination to drunkenness, they show neither great vices nor great virtues. The origin of the Laplanders is not yet fully cleared up, as their physical characteristics point partly to the Mongolian and partly to the Caucasian race. The prevailing opinion, however, is, that they are only a variety of the Chirchians of Finsmark. The Laplanders did not begin until, in 1757, a part of their territory was annexed to Sweden. For several centuries, however, no results were obtained except the introduction of Christian baptism and Christian marriage. The Laplanders belong to the archbishopric of Nidaros (Dronebrom); the Swedish to the archbishopric of Upsala. Gustavus I, of Sweden, in the first half of the 16th century, established the first Lap-land school in the town of Pilsä. Charles IX and Chris-tina made great efforts for bringing them over to the Lutheran religion, while in Norwegian Finmark king Christian IV, of Denmark (about 1600), extirpated the remnants of paganism by force. The Christianization of this part of Lapland was completed by the zeal of bishop Eric Bredahl, of Dronten (1648 to 1672), and his successors. At the beginning of the 18th century, Isaac Olsen, a poor schoolmaster, following fourteen years, labored among the Laplanders for their Christianization, and king Frederick IV, of Denmark, in 1715 and 1717, for the same purpose, established theological seminaries in Copenhagen and Dronten. In 1730 king Christian VI issued a royal order that every Laplander, before the nineteenth year of his age, must receive confirmation, from which time the parents began to bestow greater care upon the education of their children. The government appointed travelling teachers, and also several resident clergy, who at first found their progress greatly retarded by the ignorance of the Laplanders and their language. The kings of Sweden since Frederick I (1748) worked with great zeal, but little success, for the entire conversion of the Laplanders. In the treaty of Friedrischhoven Sweden had to cede its Lapland territory to Russia, but in 1814, in the treaty of Kiel, it received another portion from Norway. The most zealous missionary who has labored among the Laplanders was pastor Stocklef (born in 1878), who joined them in the middle of the last century, and labored in their own language, which it cost him great efforts to learn. At present divine service is held in the Lappish, Swedish, and Finnish languages. During the summer months the Laplanders, who during this time are moving with their reindeer further into the mountains, are visited by the men of South Sweden, who, in the summer, show great docility for the reception of the Christian doctrine, but their Christianity is still mixed up with many superstitious views and pagan customs. The Roman Catholic Church established in 1855 the Prefecture-Apostolic of the North Pole, which embraces Lapland, the Färö Islands, Greenland, and the northernmost part of America. The apostolic prefect resides at Tromsø, the capital of Finnmark; another Laplandish station has been established at Altengard. See Wiggers, Kirch. Statistik, ii, 421 sq. Neher, Kirch. Statist. 1868, 406 sq. (A. G.)

**Lapping (Lp.)** to lick up like a dog, 1 Kings xxii, 19, etc.) of water by "putting their hand to their mouth," spoken of as a test in reference to Gideon's men (Judg. vii, 5, 6), is still in the East supposed to distinguish those who evince an alacrity and readiness which fits them in a peculiar manner for any active service in which they are to be engaged. See Gideon. Among the Arabs, lapping with their hands is a common and very expedient way of taking in liquids. "The dog drinks by shaping the end of his long, thin tongue into the form of a spoon, which it rapidly introduces and withdraws from the water, sometimes before the fluid into his mouth. The tongue of man is not adapted to this use; and it is physically impossible for a man, therefore, to lap literally as a dog laps. The true explanation, probably, is that these men, instead of kneeling down to take a long draught, or successive draughts from the water, employed their hand as the dog employs his tongue—that is, forming it into a hollow spoon, and dipping water with it from the stream. Practice gives a peculiar tact in this mode of drinking; and the interchange of the hand between the water and the mouth is so rapidly managed as to be comparable to that of the right and left hands in similar circumstances. Besides, the water is not usually sucked out of the hand into the mouth, but by a peculiar knack is jerked into the mouth before the hand is brought close to it, so that the hand is approaching with a fresh supply almost before the previous draught has been swallowed, and this resemblance to the action of a dog's tongue. On coming to water, a person who wishes to drink cannot stop the whole party to wait for him when travelling in caravans, and, therefore, if on foot, any delay would oblige him to unusual exertion in order to overtake his party. He therefore drinks in the manner described, and has satisfied his thirst in much less time than one who, having more leisure, or being disposed to more deliberate enjoyment, looks out for a place where he may kneel or lie down to bring his mouth in contact with the water, and imbibe it by a long and slow draughts of it." (Kritt, Pictorial Bible, ad loc.)

**Lapse** is a term used in English ecclesiastical law to denote the failure to exercise the right of presentment or collating a vacant ecclesiastical benefice within the lawful period. On such occasions, if the bishop be the patron, the right to the benefice goes to the archbishop, and if the archbishop omits to take advantage thereof, to the king. So also if any person, other than the bishop, be patron, on his neglecting to present, the right lapses in the first place to the bishop, on the bishop's neglect to present, to the king. The patron, the bishop, and the archbishop are severally and successively allowed the full period of six calen-
dar months, exclusive of the day on which the benefice becomes void; and if the bishop be himself the patron, he must collate to the benefice within the period of the first six months after the vacancy, as he is entitled to six months in his character of patron, and six months more in that of bishop; but if the patron's six months have expired, his right of presentation is not absolutely destroyed by the lapse which then takes place, but the bishop acquires merely a kind of concurrent right with him; for, although the bishop may collate immediately after the lapse, yet, so long as he suffers the benefice to continue vacant, he cannot refuse to institute a person presented by the patron; and, in like manner, when the bishop's six months have expired, the patron may present at any time before the archbishop has filled up the vacancy. By these means provision is made against the improper duration of vacancies in the Church; for when the benefice has continued vacant for six months, the patronage for that term becomes an object of competition between the original patron and the bishop or archbishop, as the case may be, the nominee of that party which presents first being entitled to the benefice. But when the right to present has passed to the bishop and the archbishop, and through their neglect has actually lapsed to the crown, a different rule prevails, arising from an old maxim of English law, that the king's rights shall never be barred or destroyed by delay only. When, therefore, the king has actually occurred, the right of presentation for that term is absolutely vested in him; and if the patron presents while the benefice continues vacant, the king may present at any time after-wards before another vacancy occurs, and may turn out the patron's nominee. But if the patron's nominee is instituted and inducted, and dies incumbent, or if, after his induction, he is deprived by sentence of the ecclesiastical courts, or resigns bona fide, and not with intent to defeat the king's right to present, before the king has exercised his right, he is then held to have his right is destroyed; for he has only entitled to the presentation for one turn, and his having permitted the patron to present for that turn will not entitle him to any other. When the vacancy is occasioned by the death of the incumbent, or by his cession, which is his own voluntary act, being the acceptance of a second benefice incompatible with the one which he already holds, the patron is bound to take notice of the vacancy, without its being notified to him by the bishop, and his six months are calculated from the time at which the vacancy actually occurs. But when the incumbent is deprived by sentence of the ecclesiastical courts, and dies in office, such resignation being necessarily made into the hands of the bishop, it is held that, as neither his deprivation nor resignation can be complete without the concurrence of the bishop, the bishop ought to notify the vacancy to the patron, and that the patron's six months are to be calculated from the time at which such notice is given. And in like manner, if the patron presents in due time, and the bishop refuses to institute the person so presented on the ground of his insufficiency, the bishop ought, if the patron be a layman, to give notice of his refusal, and inform him that the vacancy can only be filled, but if the patron be a spiritual person, it appears from the old law-books that no notice is necessary, because the spiritual person is presumed to be a competent judge of the morals and abilities of the person whom he has selected for the episcopal appointment. If, on account of some such neglect or omission on the part of the bishop, the benefice does not lapse to him, it cannot lapse to the archbishop or to the king; for it is a rule that a lapse cannot take place per saltum, that is, by leaping over or leaving out the intermediate steps. This rule protects the patron's right from being ever injured by the improper refusal of the bishop to institute his nominee; for the bishop can take no advantage of that which is occasioned by his own wrongful act, neither can the archbishop or the king, for the reason alleged above. This right of lapse appears to have been first established about the time of the reign of Henry II, and to be coeval with the practice of institution. Preceding to that period the incumbent's title was complete, upon his appointment by the patron, without his being instituted by the bishop. But the cession of the patron to the bishop, which is the consent and assent by which a new clergy independent of the laity, strongly opposed this custom (procem conunctudinem, as Pope Alexander III, in a letter to Thomas a Becket, designates it), and insisted that the right of appointing to ecclesiastical benefices belonged exclusively to the bishops. This introduced the ceremony of institucionem, but it is, however, contended by some that that institution is as ancient as the establishment of Christianity in England; but Blackstone (i. 35) maintains that it was introduced at the time stated above. After that period the bishop alone had the power of confirming the legal title to the vacant church, which he did by institution; but he was still bound to institute the person presented to him for that purpose by the patron, provided the patron presented some one. But how long was the bishop to wait to see whether it was the patron's intention to exercise his right of presentation? The law declared that he should wait a reasonable time; and with a due regard to the interest of the patron and the convenience of the public, it has settled that time to be six months. See Jus Devolutum (sanguinis). See Lapsi.

Lapsi, in the more extended meaning of the word, "the fallen," especially those who were excluded from communion with the Church on account of having committed one of the peccata mortalia. In a more restricted sense, it was used to denote such as had fallen away," i. e. committed the peccatum mortale of denying their faith. It was natural that these should be first designated by the expression of "lapiis," as heretics were very numerous in the early ages of the Church, and the question of their reintegration into the Church did not possess so much importance. As, after the close of the persecutions, there were no longer any "lapii" in that sense of the word, it came to be applied as synonymous with penitentia or haretici, though only occasionally.

Compare Henschel, Glossarium, s. v.

The "lapii" were especially numerous when persecution assumed the regular systematized form it obtained in Roman law under Nerva and Trajan. Persistence in the profession of Christianity was alone considered a crime against the state. Yet Trajan granted full forgiveness to the Christians who consented to offer up incense before the statues and those of the gods. During the Decian persecution, the situation was made even more simple. Those who shrank from offering up sacrifices were supposed to have done so by the authorities. Indeed, in many instances certificates were given by magistrates that the law had actually been complied with. Such mild measures made it easy for many to recant. Cyprian informs us that large numbers eagerly recanted in Carthage even before the persecution broke out; and Tertullian (De fugis in pernec. c. 18) relates with righteous indignation that whole congregations, with the clergy at their head, would at times resort to the basilica of Maxentius, and there ordain themselves bishops after the end of the persecution, many tried to unite again with the Church. The question now arose whether the Church could again receive them as members, and on what conditions; and also, who had the power to decide that question? In the first place, many penitents were, upon their confessions, readmitted by imposition of hands. Conferences had the privilege of issuing letters of peace (libelli pacis) to the laicized, which facilitated their early reception to communion. But such penitents were ineligible for holy orders, and, if already ordained, they were deposed, not being allowed to resume their clerical functions, but suffered only to remain in lay communion. By degrees these admissions were made still easier, and therefore became a matter of serious consideration by the Council of Ancyra (q. v.), and
LAPWING

resulted in the revival of the old Montanist controversy as to the purity and holiness of the Church, besides provoking another as to the extent of episcopal power. On the connexion and acausal which were thus provoked in the African Church, see the articles Cyriac; Demus; Feliciusimus; Martyn and Confessions; Novatian; Novatus. (Compare also Schaff, Ch. Hist. vol. i, § 114 and 115.) Epiphanius asserts that Meletemus revolved the struggle against the laxity of church discipline; yet this assertion is not fully substantiated; the question of authority was already the foremost in these discussions. See Meletius. This was still more the case in the controversy with the Donatists (q. v.).

The only other points to be noticed are some decisions of the Council of Arles, of 309, which were, however, not generally observed without being threatened in their lives or fortunes; yet even those, while declared to be "unworthy of the pity of the Church," were also redmitted. Naturally, as persecution decreased, the Church became less stringent, as it had no need of resorting to external fables, to maintain the integrity of its stories. Even before this the practice of the Eastern Church had become very lenient. See Tertullian, De pudicitia; De pessimis; Cyriac, De lapita; epistola; epp. canonice Dionysii Alexandrinii, c. 262; Mansi, Acta Concil. (Ancy. 1-8; Nomina, 10-13; II Carthag. 9; III Carthag. 27; Agath. 19); Jacobo Sirmond, Historia pontificum pauli (1658); Joh. Morini, Comm. histor. de disciplinis in administratione ur. pont., 13 primis saeculis (1631); Kleef, Die Beichte, eine hist. krit. Untersuchung (1824); Krause, Die lapita primae ecclesiae; Riddle, Christian Antiqu. p. 624 sq.; Siegel, Christlich-Kirchliche Alterthümer, i, 290 sq.; Schrick, Kirchengesch., iv, 215, 282 sq. v. i, 20, 218, 284; Herzog, Real-Encyklop., viii, 200; Blunt, Dict. Hist. and Doc. Theology, p. 395. See Apostasy. (J. H. W.)

Lapwing, in our version, is used for ἐρυθρός (dukiphat, perhaps from ἵππος, the cock for, and ἵππος, head, i.e. topknot), a word which, occurring as the name of an unclean bird only in Lev. xi, 19 and Deut. xiv, 18, affords no internal or collateral evidence to establish the propriety of the translation. It has been supposed to mean "ducksnest," which is sufficiently correct when applied to the nest of the lapwing when applied to the lapwing (Targum, Gullia montanus), or the cock of the woods, Tetrao urogallus, for which bird Bouchart produces a more direct etymology; and he might have appealed to the fact that the Attic is "a winter, exclusive of at least two species of Phrater, or sand-grouse, which probably remain all the year. But these names were anciently, as well as in modern times, so often confounded that the Greek writers even used the term Gallinacea to denote the hoopoe; for Hesychius explains ἰπίως in Ἐξαχθίαν by the Greek appellations of the "ducksnest" (see Bouchart, a. v. Dukiphat); and in modern languages similar mistakes respecting this bird are abundant. Ἐξαχθίαν speaks of the hoopoe by name, and expressly calls it the bird of the rocks (Fregom. 291, quoted by Aristophanes). (A.-Ch.) But it is not to be supposed that these birds build their nests in lofty rocks. Aristotle's words are the same to effect, for he writes, "Now some animals are found in the mountains, as the hoopoe, for instance" (F. A. 1, 1). When the two lawsuits-wearied citizens of Athens, Exeipides and Phæthetron in the comedy of the Birds, Aristophanes (200), beans in their search for the home of Epops, king of birds, their ornithological conductors lead them through a wild, deserted tract terminated by mountains and rocks, in which is situated the royal aviary of Epops. The Septuagint and Vulgate agree with the Arubian interpreters in translating the Hebrew term by ἰπίως and ἵππος; and, as the Syrian name is κυκάφη, and the Egyptian κυκαφή, both apparently of the same origin as dukiphat, the propriety of substituting hoopoe for lapwing in our version appears sufficiently established. The word hoopoe is evidently onomatopoetic, being derived from the voice of the bird, which resembles the words "hoop, hoop," softly but rapidly uttered. "It uttereth at times a sound closely resembling the word hoop, hoop, hoop, but breathed out so softly, but rapidly, as to remind the hearer of the sneeze of the dog after the dust of a broom (Plut. De mor. 176). The Germans call the bird Ein Hopf, the French, Le Huppe, which is particularly appropriate, as it refers both to the crest and note of the bird. In Sweden it is known by the name of Hår-Foje, the army-bird, because, from its ominous cry, frequently heard in the wolds of the forest, while the bird itself moves off as any one approaches, the common people have supposed that seasons of scarcity and war are impending (Lloyd's Sound, Advert., ii, 521).

The hoopoe is not uncommon in Palestine at this day (Vonlack, Die Ermiten, p. 7; Russel, Aleppo, ii, 81; Höst, Nuebr. v. Marroko, p. 297; compare Jerome, ad Zech. v. 9; Bechstein, Naturaurei, ii, 547), and was from remote ages a bird of mystery. Many and strange are the stories which are told of the hoopoe in ancient Oriens, concerning their mystical fables and their stories. It is evident that the practice of the Eastern Church had become very lenient. See Tertullian, De pudicitia; De pessimis; Cyriac, De lapita; epistola; epp. canonice Dionysii Alexandrinii, c. 262; Mansi, Acta Concil. (Ancy. 1-8; Nomina, 10-13; II Carthag. 9; III Carthag. 27; Agath. 19); Jacobo Sirmond, Historia pontificum pauli (1658); Joh. Morini, Comm. histor. de disciplinis in administratione ur. pont., 13 primis saeculis (1631); Kleef, Die Beichte, eine hist. krit. Untersuchung (1824); Krause, Die lapita primae ecclesiae; Riddle, Christian Antiqu. p. 624 sq.; Siegel, Christlich-Kirchliche Alterthümer, i, 290 sq.; Schrick, Kirchengesch., iv, 215, 282 sq. v. i, 20, 218, 284; Herzog, Real-Encyklop., viii, 200; Blunt, Dict. Hist. and Doc. Theology, p. 395. See Apostasy. (J. H. W.)
ter wades in the mud when the Nile has subsided, and seeks for worms and insects; and the former is known to rear its young so much immersed in the shards and fragments of beetles, etc., as to cause a disagreeable smell about its nest, which is always in holes or in hollow trees. Though an unclean bird in the Hebrew law, the common migratory hoopoe is reared in Egypt, and sometimes also in Italy; but the stationary species is considered inedible. See Macgillivray’s *British Birds*, iii, 45; Yarrell, *Brit. B.* ii, 178, 2d ed.; Lloyd’s *Quadrupedal Adven-
tures*, ii, 221. The chief grounds for all the filthy habits which have been ascribed to this much-maligned bird are to be found in the fact that it resorts to dung hills, etc., in search of the worms and insects which it finds there. A writer in *Ibis*, i, 49, says, “We found the hoopoe a very good bird to eat.” Tristram says of the hoopoe (ibid., i, 27): “The Arabs have a super-
stitious reverence for this bird, which they believe to possess marvellous medicinal qualities, and call it ‘the Doctor.’ Its head is an indispensable ingredient in all charms, and in the practice of witchcraft.” See Bach-

Dr. Thomson, however, dissent from the common view above that the Hebrew *dukiphit* is the ordinary bed-hood or hoopoe, on the ground that the latter “is a small bird, good to eat, comparatively rare, and therefore not likely to have been mentioned at all by Moses, and still less to have been classed with the unclean.” He proposes the English *pecut*, called by the natives now and bu-rett. ‘The bird appears in Palestine only in the depth of winter. It then disperses over the mountains, and remains until early spring, when it entirely disappears. It roosts on the ground wherever

night overtakes it. It utters a loud scream when about to fly, which sounds like the last of the above names. It is regarded as an unclean bird by the Arabs. The upper parts of the body and wings are of a dull slate-color, the under parts of both are white. It has a topknot on the hinder part of the head pointing backward like a horn, and when running about on the ground closely resembles a young hare” ( *Land and Book*, i, 104).

Lardner, Dionysius, Ill.D., a distinguished English writer on physical science, was born in Dublin April 3, 1798, and was appointed professor of natural philo-

sophy and astronomy in University College, London, in 1828. In 1830 he projected a sort of Encyclopaedia consisting of original treatises on history, science, economics, etc., by the most eminent authors, and 134 volumes were accordingly published, under the general name of *Lardner’s Cyclopaedia*, between 1830 and 1844. Some of these volumes were from his own pen. A second is-

sue of this work was begun in 1838. He has published various scientific works, the most important of which are his “hand-books” of various branches of natural philo-

sophy (1844-56). He is also the author of the *Museum of Science and Art*, an excellent popular exposition of the physical sciences, with their applications. He died in Paris April 29, 1850.

Lardner, Nathaniel, D.D., a very noted English theologian and minister of the Presbyterian Church, of Arian tendency, was born in Hawkshurst, in Kent, in 1694. In early life he was a pupil of Dr. Joshua Okey,

field, a man of high eminence in that denomination. But, like many of the Dissenters of his time, he preferred to go abroad to prosecute his studies. He spent more than three years at the University of Utrecht, where he studied under Grevisius and Burman, and was then some time at the University of Leyden. He returned to England in 1708, and continued to prosecute his theological studies with a view to the ministry, which he entered at the age of twenty-five. He began preaching at Stoke-New-

ington in 1709, but, owing to his want of power to mod-

ulate his voice, soon became private chaplain and tutor in the family of lady Truby. In 1724 he was appointed lecturer at the Old Jewry, where he delivered in outline his work, *The Credibility of the Gospel History* (London, 1727-48, 5 vols. 8vo), generally acknowledged as constit-

uting the most unanswerable defence of Christianity to our own day. “The work is unequalled for the extent and accuracy of its researches; and whatever supplement it, but it is not likely that they will ever sur-

pass it” (W. J. Cox in *Kitto*). Sir James Mackin-

tosh, in his remarks on Paley (in the *View of the Prog-

ress of Ethical Philosophy*), rather discredit its general usefulness as a theological work, because it “ex-

cretes the greater part of readers,” though there are many eminent English critics who think otherwise (com-

pare Allison, *Dict. of Engl. and Am. Authors*, ii, 1060). But even Sir J. Mackintosh concedes that with the scholar it has power: “The few who are more patient have almost always been gradually won over to feel pleasure in a display of knowledge, probity, charity, and meek-

ness unmatched by an avowed advocate in a case deeply interesting his warmest feelings” (compare also Leland, *Irregular Writers*). In 1729 he was unexpectedly called to the Church in Crutched Friars, which position he accept-

ed and held for about twenty-two years. He died at his native place in 1768, having de-

voted his long life to the prosecution of theologi-

cal inquiry, to the exclusion of almost any other subject. As a supplement to *The Credi-

bility*, Lardner wrote *History of the Apostles and Evangelists*, writers of the *N. Test.* (1756-

57; again 1786, 3 vols. 8vo; also in vol. ii of *Watson’s Colle.

ct.* of *Tracts*. Dr. Lardner likewise wrote many other treatises, in which his store of learning is brought to bear on questions important in Christian the-
alogy. The most remarkable of these, his minor publications, are his Letter on the Logos (1759), in which it distinctly appears that he was of the Unitarian or Socinian school; and History of the Heretics of the first two Centuries after Christ (published after his death 1780, 4to), with additions by John Hogg. The best edition of Lamb- massac's works is that by Dr. Andrews Kippis (London 1788, 11 vols. 8vo); but it is no mean proof of the estimation in which they are held, that, large as the collection is, they were reprinted entire as late as 1888 (London 10 vols. 8vo, a very handsome edition). His writings, now more than a century old, are still read, and their weight in the scale of modern thought is considerable. With respect to the side of truth," so much so that not only ministers and students of theology of our day can ill afford to be without them, but every intelligent layman who seeks to do his duty in the Church, of which he is a part, should possess and study them. "In the applause of Dr. Lascelles," says T. H. Horne (Bib. Bib., p. 368), "all parties of Christians are united, regarding him as the champion of their common and holy faith. Seeker, Porter, Watson, Tomline, Jortin, Hay, and Paley, of the Anglican Church; Doddridge, Kippis, and Priestley, among the Dissenters, and all foreign Protestant Bibles, volunteers, writers, for ages, are indebted for his sagacity, his faith, and his great merits as a Christian apologo- cate. The candid of the literal of the Romish communion have extolled his labors; and even Morgan and Gibson, professed unbelievers, have awarded to him the merit of fidelity. Every man of letters is a witness of scattered evidences in favor of the authenticity of the evangelical history, he established a bulwark on the side of truth which invidious has never presumed to attack." See Dr. Kippis, Life of Lascelles, in vol. i. of the works of the latter; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, ii, 1067; English Cyclopedia, s. v.; Farrar, Critical Hist. of Free Thought, p. 486; Dorner, Person of Christ, i, ii, iii., App. p. 407.

Larés, in connection with the Mānas and the Pērīkāra, were tutelary spirits, genii, or deities of the ancient Romans. The derivation of the names is not perhaps quite certain, but the first is generally considered the plural of lar, an Etruscan word signifying "lord" or "here;" the second is supposed to mean "the good or beneficent one;" and the third is connected with per, "the innermost part of a house or sanctuary." The Larès, Manes, and Penates do not appear to have been regarded as personal divinities different in their characteristics, but the latter three are generally used either interchangeably or in such a conjunction as almost implies identity. Yet some have thought that a distinction is discernible, and have looked upon the Larès as earthly, the Manes as infernal, and the Penates as heavenly protectors— a notion which has been repeated or confirmed by the general name for the souls of the departed, those who inhabit the lower world; while among the Penates are included such great deities as Jupiter, Juno, Vesta, etc. Hence we may perhaps infer that the Manes were just the Larès viewed as departed spirits, and that the Pen- ates embraced not only the Larès, but all spirits, whether demons or deities, who exercised a "special provin- cence" over families, cities, etc. Of the former, the Larès, we know almost nothing distinctively. An annual fes- tival was held in their honor on the 19th of February, called Februalia, or Festival of the Larès. It was celebrated at Rome after the advent of the Pagan rites, and exalted to the rank of protectors of their descendants. They were, in short, household gods, and their worship was really a worship of ancestors. The first of the Larès in point of honor was the Lar fas- cicularis, the founder of the house, the family Lar, who accompanied the ancestors in the labyrinth of the Larès, and Larès publici had a wider sphere of influence, and received particular names from the places over which they ruled. Thus we read of Larès capitales (the Larès of cross-roads), Larès ecorum (the Larès of streets), the Larès rurales (the rural Larès), Larès ridicul (the Larès of the highways), Larès peruaniri (the Larès of the sea), and the Larès cubiculari (the Larès of the bedchamber). The images of these guardian spirits or deities were placed (at least in larès publici) in small shrines or compartments called indicula or lararia. They were worshipped every day; whenever a Roman family sat down to meals, a portion of the food was presented to them; but particular honors were paid to them on the first of the months, and in the month of July the Larès were assembled in a great public sacrifice. The gatherings the lararia were thrown open, and the images of the household gods were adorned with garlands. See Smith’s Dictionary of Classical Biography and Mythology, s. v.

Larned, Sylvester, an American Presbyterian minister, born in Piscataway, Mass., Aug. 31, 1776, was educated at Lenox Academy and Middlebury College, studied theology in Princeton Seminary, and was ordained in July, 1817. His earliest efforts at preaching showed rare gifts of eloquence, and his first sermons, delivered in New York city, attracted large crowds, and converted a considerable number of persons to the faith. Middlebury College, remarked of him in his composition and eloquence he was not surpassed by any youth whom he had ever known; and John Quincy Adams declared that he had never heard his equal in the pulpit. To this wonderful gift of oratory Larned added the strength of a dignified and controlled and a voice of fullness and pathos, thorough and sympathetic appreciation of his theme, and an unyielding devotion to his calling. He had the unusual power of winning his audience with the utterance of almost his first sentence. His very voice was eloquent. Sometimes he was solicited to take the first stations, with the largest salaries; but, desiring to give his energies to build up the Church where it was weak, he went to New Orleans, and soon organized a church, the First Presbyterian, over which he became pastor. He labored there with the greatest success, creating deep impressions upon the popular mind until his death, Aug. 20, 1820. Seldom, if ever, has the death of one so young caused such widespread sorrow. His Life and Sermons were published by Rev. R. R. Gurley (New York, 1844, 12mo). - Alli- bone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, ii, 1067; Water- bury, Sketches of Eloquent Preachers, p. 33 sq.; New Eng- lander, v, 70 sq.

Larned, William Augustus, a noted American Congregational theologian and professor, was born in Thompson County, Conn., June 23, 1806. His ancestors had lived in that county for four generations, the first of the family being come over in John Winthrop's col- ony in 1630. Provided with suitable opportunities for obtaining an education by his father, a lawyer of consider- able ability and renown, young Larned was gradu- ated at Yale College with honor when about twenty years of age. Although religiously trained he was somewhat sceptical in his youth, but, under the teaching of Dr. Fitch while in college, he was powerfully im- pressed, and in the great revival that occurred soon after his graduation he resolved to be a follower of Christ. After teaching five years, first at Salisbury, N. C., and then for three years as tutor in Yale College, he went upon his theological studies, and was ordained in 1834 pastor of the Second Congregational Church, Millbury, Mass., but was compelled to relinquish this charge in the following year on account of impaired health. From 1835 to 1839 he was professor of rhetoric in Wm. Rev. N. S. Beman, D.D., and Rev. Mr. Kirk, in instructing theological students in Troy, N. Y. Soon after fin- ishing his labors in Troy he was appointed professor of rhetoric and English literature in Yale College, a position which he filled with honor and usefulness till his death, Feb. 5, 1862. Prof. Larned's literary labors were mostly confined to the New Englander, of which he was editor for two years, and to which he contributed twen-
LAROCHE

ty-seven different articles on a variety of topics. As the pastor of a church, as the successor of Dr. Goodrich in the professor's chair, and as a literary man, he acquitted himself with fidelity and success. He was a man simple and unpretending in his tastes and habits, of great industry and perseverance, at once a Christian and as his Saviour. See New Englander, 1862, April, art. ix.; Appleton, New Am. Cyclop. vol. x., n. v.; Congreg. Quart. 1863; Dr. Theodore Woolsey, Funeral Discourse commemorative of Rev. W. A. Larned (New Haven, 1862, 8vo.). (H. A. B.)

LAROCHE, ALAIN DE, also called ALANUS DE REUPE, a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born in Brittany about the year 1428. While yet quite young he joined the Dominicans, studied philosophy and theology at Paris, and was sent to the Netherlands in 1450. After lecturing for a while in the conquests of Lille and Douai, he became professor of theology at Gand in 1468, and at Rostock in 1470. He died at Zwill Sept. 8, 1475. Full of zeal, but very deficient in knowledge, Laroche labored ceaselessly to propagate the use of the rosary; he was the first to preach on this practice, introducing in his sermons marvelous stories which he so neatly invented himself. His works were published more than a century after his death, under the title Bestia Alamus de Reupe reditica, de Pastorali, seu Rosario Christi et Mater, tractatus, in V partes distributa (Friburg, 1619, 4to; Col., 1624, Naples, 1629). See Trithemius, De Script. Kest. Lib. IV. chap. 18; Bozac, Servit. Dixit, p. 202-218; Echard, Script. Ord. Prudent.; Paquot, Mémoires, etc., iii, 144-150; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Générale, xxii, 622. See ROSARY. (J. N. P.)

Larochefoucauld, François, Duc de, a noted French philosophical writer, the descendant of an old French family of great celebrity, was born in 1613. He early enjoyed the favor and confidence of the court, but involved himself in intrigues against cardinal Richelieu, and in the tumults of the Fronde, and was obliged to retire into private life. Ever attached to literary pursuits, he cultivated the society of the most eminent literary persons of his time, Boileau, Racine, and Mollière, and composed his famous Mémoires (Cologne, 1662; Amsterdam, 1723, etc.), in which he gives a simple but masterly historic account of the political events of his time. In 1665 he published Réflexions sur Sentences et Maximes Morales, a work containing 360 detached thoughts, of which, perhaps, the most celebrated is his definition of hypocrisy, as "the homage which vice renders to virtue." The book is regarded as a model of French prose, and exhibits much acuteness of observation, and a clear perception of the prevalent corruptions and vices of his time. Larochefoucauld died March 17, 1680. His Oeuvres de Complétes were edited by Depping (Par. 1818), and his writings have been commented on by a host of critics of the most different schools, as Voltaire, Vinet, Sainte-Beuve, and Victor Cousin. See Saint, Notes sur La Rochefoucauld; Sainte-Beuve, Études sur La Rochefoucauld, in his Portraits des Femmes; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Générale, xxix, 694 sq.

LAROMIGUIÈRE, Pierre, a distinguished French metaphysician, was born at Livignac-le-Haut, Aveyron, Nov. 3, 1736. He studied at the College of Villefranche, and became successively professor of philosophy at Carcassonne, Lescar, and La Flèche, and Toulouse. In 1759 he went to Paris, where he soon became professor of the normal school. In 1821 he confined himself to his office of librarian of the university, still retaining, however, the title of professor of the faculty of philosophy. He died at Paris Aug. 12, 1827. With the exception of a few miscellaneous works, all his chief labors are to be found in his Leçons de Philosophie (3d ed. Paris, 1831, 8 vols. 12mo). He had been educated a zealous pupil of Condillac, but there were, as Cousin expresses it, two men in Laromiguière, the ancient and the modern; the disciple and the adversary of Condillac.

LAROMIGUIÈRE'S Philosophy.—(1.) Classification of the Faculties.—These powers and capacities he separates into two great classes—those of the understanding and those of the will. The faculties of the understanding he reduces to these three: 1. Attention; 2. Comparison; 3. Reasoning. Of these three, attention is the fundamental principle from which the other two proceed; and of these two, again, the phenomena usually denoted by the words memory, judgment, imagination, etc., are simply modifications. Since, however, these three generic powers, in their last analysis, are all included in the first, the whole of the phenomena of the understanding may be said to spring from the one great fundamental faculty of attention. If we now turn to the will, we find, according to M. Laromiguière, a complete parallel existing between these phenomena and those we have just been considering. The foundation of all voluntary action in man is desire; and in the same manner as we have already seen the two latter faculties of the understanding spring from the first, so now we see springing from desire, as the basis, the two corresponding phenomena of preference and liberty. These three—then, being all published, all the subordinate powers of the will are without difficulty reducible to them, so that, at length, we have the complete man viewed in two different aspects—in the one as an intellectual, in the other as a voluntary being, the chief facts of his intellectual exactly corresponding to those of his voluntary life. Law is the system of all the phenomena of the whole state to a system of complete unity, our author shows that desire itself is, strictly speaking, a peculiar form of attention; that the fundamental principle, therefore, of our intellectual and voluntary life is the same; that the two attentions, broadly viewed, in fact, but another expression for the natural activity of the human mind, is the point from which the whole originally proceeds. Now the contrast between this psychology and that of Condillac is sufficiently striking, the one being indeed, in a measure, directly opposite to the other. Condillac lays at the foundation of his intellectual and active life a faculty purely passive in its nature, and regards all phenomena as simply transformations of it; the other assumes a primitive power, the very essence of which is activity, and makes all our other powers more or less share in this essential power.

(2.) Origins of our Ideas.—Here, in order to swerve as little as possible in appearance from the philosophy of Condillac, he makes the whole material of our knowledge come from our sensibility. Condillac had derived all our ideas from sensation in its ordinary and contracted sense: he had derived them from the passive element of the mind, by reflection, thus taking in the active as well as the passive element to account for the phenomena of the case; M. Laromiguière, however, explains his meaning of the word sensibility in such a manner as to make the foundation still broader than that of Locke himself. Sensibility, he shows, is of four kinds: 1. That produced by the action of external things upon the mind—this is sensation in the ordinary sense of the word; 2. that produced by the action of our faculties upon each other—which is equivalent to Locke's reflection; 3. that which is produced by the recurrence and comparison of several ideas together, giving us the perception of relations; and, 4. that which is produced by the contemplation of human actions, as right or wrong, which is the moral faculty. In this theory it appears at once evident that there is a secret revolt from the doctrines of sensationalism. The activity of the human mind was again indicated, the majesty of reason restored, and, what was still more important, the moral faculty was again raised from its ruins to sway its sceptre over human actions and purposes. M. Laromiguière, the idealist, will always be his disciples' chief point of argument (Moroel, History of Modern Philosophy, p. 631 sqq.).

Laromiguière's works were published, in the 7th edition, as Œuvres de Laromiguière, at Paris, in 1862. See Cousin, Fragmenta philosophica (1880), ii, 468; Damiens, Essai sur l'Histoire de la Philosophie en France au
LA SALLE

CHARLES DE, a French Jesuit and celebrated preacher, was born at Paris in 1648; joined the order in 1659, became soon after professor of rhetoric, and at once attracted the attention of Louis XIV by his talents as a preacher and poet. He was for a while sent as a missionary among the Protestants of the Cévennes, but soon returned to Paris, where he was appointed professor of rhetoric in the college Louis-le-Grand. He was also chosen confessor of the dauphin, and of the duke of Berri. He died at Paris May 27, 1725. Larue wrote

L'Officale (Rouen, 1669, 12mo), reprinted under the title

Curriculum Liturgicum (Rouen, 1734, 4 vol., 12mo). Larue was, among a number of profane pieces, a Greek ode in honor of the immaculate conception (1670) — P. Virgilii Maronis Opera, interpretationis et notis, ad usum Delphini (Paris, 1765, 4to, often reprinted) — Sermons (in Migne, Collection des Orateurs Sacrés); these are celebrated as models of pathos, as well as for vehemence of style and grace of diction — Pénitentaires des Saints, etc. (Paris, 1740, 2 vol., 12mo); and a number of theatrical pieces, etc. See Mercure de France, June, 1725; Beillet, Jugesimen des Savants; Journal des Savants, 1895, 1706, 1712, 1735, 1740; and Vergette, Des Poètes français; Théâtre Historique; Moret, Dictionnaire Hist. xix. Bibliothèque, de la Companie de Jésus, p. 568—665; Hoefner, Nouv. Bio. Générale, xxi, 700.

LA SALLA (Lassallia, derivation unknown), a place mentioned only in Acta xxvii, 8, as a city lying near the Fair Havens, in the island of Crete. Other MSS. have

Lasa de (Lasa), and some (with the Vulgata) Thalassa (Thalassa), which latter Beza adopted (see Kuhn, Comment. ad loc.), and Cranmer mentions coins of a Cretan town by this latter name (Ancient Greek, iii, 574); but neither of these readings is to be preferred. It is likely that during the stay at the adjoining port the passengers would have come to St. Paul, ii, 280, n.). It is probably the same as the Leaus of the Peutinger Table, sixteen miles east of Gortyna (see Héck, Kreti, i, 412, 439). In the month of January, 1866, a yachting party made inquiries as to Fair Havens, and was assured that the name Lasala was still given to some ruins in the neighborhood. It lies about the middle of the southern coast of Crete, some five miles east of Fair Havens, and close to Cape Leuca. Mr. Brown thus describes the ruins: "Inside the cape, to the eastward, the beach is lined with masses of masonry. These were composed of small stones cemented together with mortar so firmly that even where the sea had undermined them huge fragments lay on the sand. This sea-wall extended a quarter of a mile along the beach from one rocky face to another, and was evidently intended for the defence of the city. Above we found the ruins of two temples. The steps which led up to one remain, though in a shattered state. Many shafts, and a few capitals of Greek pillars, all of marble, lie scattered about, and a gory wound by a torrent lies bare the substructions down to the rock. To the east a conical rocky hill is girdled by a wall, and on a platform between this hill and the sea the pillars of another edifice lie level with the ground." (Smith's Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, Appendix, i, p. 260, 3d edit., where a plan is given). Captain Spratt, R. N., had previously observed some remains which probably represent the harbor of Lasala (see p. 90, 92, 245). It ought to be noticed that in the Description dell' Isola di Candia, a Venetian MS. of the 16th century, as published by Mr. E. Falkener in the Museum of Classical Antiquities, Sept. 1853 (p. 267), a place called Lopeni, with a "temple ruin," was mentioned as "the harbor," as is also in the 17th century, as being close to Fair Havens.

LA SALLE, JEAN BAPTIST DE, a French priest, found- er of the Order of Brethren of the Christian Schools, was born at Rheims April 30, 1651. In 1670 he went to Paris to complete his education at the Seminary of St.
LAS CASAS

Sulpice. He was made canon of Rheims, and was or-
dained priest in 1671. Struck with the ignorance of the
closer classes with regard to religion, he resolved to es-

establish a congregation whose chief object should be to
teach and elevate them. In 1679 he began teaching in
two schools of Rheims, but was subjected to many an-
noyances from the secular teachers, and even censured
by some of the clergy. He nevertheless continued his
labors, gave all his means to the poor, and finally suc-
cceeded. A house which he had bought at Rouen, Saint-
Yon, became the head-quarters of his order, and when he
died, April 7, 1719, the Brethren of the Christian Schools
were established at Paris, Rouen, Rheims, and other
principal cities of France. Its institution was approved
by Benedict XIII in 1726. The Brethren of the Chris-
tian Schools take the three vows of chastity, poverty,
and obedience, but they are not perpetual. La Salle
did not wish any priest to be ever received among them.
Their dress consists of a black robe resembling a cas-

cock, with a small collar or white bands, black stockings
and coarse shoes, a black cloak of the same material as
the dress, with wide hanging sleeves, and a broad-brim-
med black felt hat, looped up on three sides. Their
order became widely disseminated, and they are now
scattered nearly through the whole world. In 1854
they counted over 7000 members, employed in France,
Algeria, the United States, Italy, etc. Pope Gregory
XVIII in 1845 plunged the Church into a storm and he
was canonized by Pius IX. La Salle wrote a number of
books for the education of children, many of which are
still in use; among them we notice Les Devoirs du Chré-
tien avant Dieu, et les moyens de pouvoir bien s’en ac-
quitter;—Lesутрісніzіи du
d’Amour de la Bienveillance et de l’Amour Chi-
tien:—Instructions et Prières pour la Sainte Messe:—
Conduite des Ecoles Chrétiennes:—Les douze Vertus d’un
bon Maître. He is also considered the author of Mé-
dications sur les Éxemples de tous les Démânces et sur
les principales Fêtes de l’Avenir, of which a new edition
was published in 1825. See also Car-
ron, Vie de J.-B. de La Salle; Garreau, Vie de J.-Bapt.
de La Salle; L’Ami de l’Enfance, ou Vie de J.-B. de La
Salle; Le véritable Ami de l’Enfance, ou Abrégé de la Vie
et des Vertus du vénérable Serviteur de Dieu J.-B. de La
Salle; abbé Treuvaux, Vie des Saints; Hoeder, Nouv.
Biog. Génér. xxix, 724. (J. N. F.)

LASAS. See CASAR.

Lasb’aron [many Lasb’aron] (Heb. Lashkarak), יָּשָּׁרוֹן, signif. unknown; Sept. Αἰσχραῦ, but almost all
copies omit: Vulg. Saros, but in the Benedictine text
Lasarum, one of the Canaanitish towns whose kings
were killed by Joshua (Josh. xii, 18). "Some differ-
ce of opinion has been expressed as to whether the
first syllable is to be interchanged with the second;
see the introduction to the breviary and the preface to the
breviary with the ant. implied (see Keil, Jonch, ad loc.).
But there seems to be no warrant for supposing
the existence of a particle before this one name, which
certainly does not exist before either of the other
thirty names in the list. Such, at least, is the conclusion
of Bochart (Hieros. i, ch. 81), Roland (Polest. 871),
and others, a conclusion supported by the reading of the
Tarqum, and the Arabic Version, and also by Jerome, if
the Benedictine text can be relied on. The opposite
conclusion of the Vulgate, given above, is adopted by
Genesius (Thecuresa, p. 649, b), but not on very clear
grounds, his chief argument being apparently that,
as the name of a town, Sharon would not require the arti-

cle prefixed, which, as that of a district, it always bears.
The name has vanished from both the Vat. and Alex.
MS. of the Sept., unless a trace exists in the Ḥeber-
spaher of the Vat. " (Smith). Masius supposes Lasba-
ron to be the place mentioned in Acts ix, 35, where
the reading of some MSS. is Ἰασφαράνα instead of Ἰασφρον;
but there is no evidence to support such a view.
From the fact that in Joshua it is named between Aphek
and Madon, and for Fisher’s Dict. is assigned by Fairbairn’s
Appendix, p. 181; but the reasoning is wholly inco-

nclusive, and the location utterly out of the question. Lasbaron was possibly the same

place with the Lasbana of Gen. x. 19.

LASH. See KHALSTEIR.

LASITIUS. John, a noted Polish Protestant eclesi-
astical writer, often mistaken, formerly, for the cele-
brated John A. Lasco, flourished in the second half of
the 16th century. He was born of a noble family about
1534, and, as was the custom of his day, was early sent
abroad to pursue a course of studies at the high-schools
of Basle, Berne, Geneva, and Strasburg. After qui-

ting the university he taught for a short time in a
private family of one of the most celebrated noble families
of Poland, John Krotowsky, an ardent follower of
the Moravian Brethren. Of a restless nature, and greatly
addicted to study, he soon took up his wandering-staff
again, and roamed nearly over all Europe, bringing up,
most generally, at some place or other, where he was
noted for his learning. First we find him in Paris, next in Basle, next in Gene-

va, and next in Heidelberg, etc., until, in 1567, he
brings up again in Paris, and holds a disputation on
the Trinity with the Roman theologian Genebrard (Chro-
nolog. lib. iv, a. a. 1582, p. 786). After 1575 Lasitis
seems to have settled in his native country, but frequent-
ly, even after this date, he went abroad, not for his own
gratification, however, but in the interests of the State
and the Church. He early became an admirer of the
Moravians, and is by many (e.g. Gieseler, Kirchengesch.
ii, 4, p. 469) supposed to have joined their sect,
but, however, his personal membership certain it is
that Lasitius greatly favored the Moravians, and that
he was engaged on a history of them. He was one of the
most energetic and indefatigable workers among the
Poles for the union of all his Protestant brethren into
one common bond, and in 1570 (less in 1569) he
saw his efforts crowned with success at the Synod of Sendomir. See

POLAND. He died July 12, 1599. His history of the
Moravians Lasitius enlarged after the union of the Protes-
tant, but it was never published entirely. In
1649 Amos Comenius published an outline of the larger one
under the title Johannes Lasiti us, of de origine et rebus gestis Fratrum Bohemicorum liber oc-
tavus, cui est moribus et institutis eorum. Ob presen-

tem rerum statum scolior scolis. Ad muturum tamam

ruinam et liberorum argumenta et particulatiae gudsum
Lasius, a very celebrated Roman Catholic prelate, was bishop of Posen from 1414-1426. He was a member of the Council of Constance, and the assembled clergy agreed with him. On his return home he sought cloister life, but was restrained by the pope, and subsequently by his active influence secured such marked prosperity for an episcopal village in Masowia that it was called after his name, Laszkarzewo.

Wetzler und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s. v.

Lascko (Polish Laski, Latin Lascov), John (1), a very celebrated Roman Catholic prelate of the Church of Poland, was born in the early part of the year 1466. He was at first provost at Skalimierz, then at Posen, and was afterwards chosen by Andreas Roza, of Boryszew, archbishop of Gnesen, as his coadjutor. During the reign of Casimir IV, John Albrecht, and Alexander, he resided at court as chamberlain, and on the death of the archbishop of Gnesen (in 1510) Lascko succeeded him in that eminent position. In 1518 he was sent to the fifth general council of Lateran, together with Stanislaus Ostrog, and in the presence of pope Leo X implored the Christian princes there present to assist Poland and Hungary against the attacks of the Turks and Tartars. In this council Lascko obtained for himself and all succeeding archbishops of Gnesen the title of legatus natus sedis apostolicae. He died May 19, 1531. He wrote Relatio de erroribus Moenchorum, iuxta in concilio Lateranensi anno 1512; 1520; 1528; 1530. His activity as archbishop is manifest in the number of provincial synods over which he presided: 1: at Gnesen, in 1506; 2: at Petrikau, in 1510: 8: same, 1511: 4: Leczycy, 1528; 5: same, 1527; 6: Petrikau, 1580. He was a decided opponent of the Reformation and its propagation in Poland, as is evidenced by his canons and decrees: Constitutions synodorum metropolitanae ecclesiae Gnesenensis, Cracovia, 1560. He wrote also Sanctorum ecclesiasticorum tam ex pontificiis decreta quam in constitutionibus synodorum provinciae Gnesenensis autem statuta in diversis provincialibus synodis. 1508. He was a man of resource and courage, and his activity as archbishop was such that the country was called Lascko. He was a well-informed man, and his writings on history, theology, and ecclesiastical law were regarded with respect and admiration.

Döring, Kirchen-Lex. s. v. (J. H. W.)

Lascko, John (2), one of the most distinguished of the Polish reformers, was born at Warsaw in the early part of 1499, of one of the noblest families of Poland, which, during the 16th century especially, furnished many men illustrious in the Church, in the council, and in the camp. We know a little about John Lascko's early education, but it was probably conducted under the supervision of his uncle (see the preceding article), who would naturally intend him for the priesthood. While he was yet a youth, the German Reformation commenced, and evidently attracted a large share of his attention. The archbishop, however, was his ardent foe, and young Lascko, at the University of Cracow, where Luther's writings were publicly bought and sold, may have contented himself with accepting the current religious sentiments of his countrymen, which by no means accorded with the highest standards of Roman Catholic orthodoxy. At the age of twenty-five he set forth on his travels. It was his purpose to visit the courts and universities of other lands. Passing by Wittenberg, with its Luther and Melanchthon, he directed his course
to Louvain, where he seems to have been repelled by the ignorance and bigotry of the priesthood, and thence passed to Zürich, where he ultimately took up his residence. From thence he made occasional visits to Zwolle, and was by him influenced to take a decided stand for the reformatory movement. From Zürich he went to Paris, where he was honorably received, and entered into a correspondence with the sister of the king, the famous Margaret of Navarre, already favorably disposed toward all the churchmen who were interested in the cause of the Reformation, and attracted thereto by the fame of Erasmus, who extended to him a cordial welcome, and did not disdain to accept his hospitable gifts. The veteran scholar admired and praised his young friend, and Lasko seems to have received from him his confidence and affections. Both occupied the same dwelling, and for some months the expense of the household was met from Lasko's purse. Perhaps the fact that at this very juncture the break between Luther and Erasmus took place may not have been without its effect in repelling Lasko from too close association with the German reformer. In October, 1525, Lasko was recalled to Poland, doubtless with a view to be engaged in state employ, or as an ambassador to France or Spain. However this may be, he probably passed through Italy previous to his return, and there formed some acquaintance with such reforming influences as were prevailing there. Not long after his return he fell in with the writings of Melanchthon, with whom he subsequently corresponded, and we may reasonably conclude that by his counsel, or with his sanction, Polish youth were sent abroad to complete their studies at Wittenberg, or in any other place, and thus to be brought into the current of the new truth that was spreading in the land. Notwithstanding his own, no world-wisdom, could have saved him from ruin. There was more of Luther than of Erasmus in such soul-humbling confessions. The death of his uncle, the archbishop (1581), who was resolutely opposed to the cause of reform, restored a certain measure of restraint which had checked young Lasko's freedom of action, if not speculation. No outward manifestation of any radical change of sentiment had hitherto been apparent. He was successively nominated canon of Gnesen, custos of Plock, and dean of Gnesen and Lencica. In accepting these dignities, particularly the last, he expressed his conviction that Erasmus that reform might take place within the Church itself, and to this end he was induced, in a cautious manner, to present the Polish monarch with suggestions as to the necessity of measures directed to that object (Krasinski, ii, 238). During this period his residence at the court of the Polish king, where he was favored with the royal patronage, it is easy to conceive how it might have been expected that Lasko would be the favorite of and receive the appointment of bishop of Cujavia, and the most inviting prospects of ecclesiastical promotion opened before him. But already his hope that the Church of Rome would reform herself had died out. He opened his heart to the king, and freely confessed the views and convictions which forbade his acceptance of the professed Church. With the royal permission, and provided with commendatory letters, he chose temporarily to withdraw from his native land. He directed his course to the Netherlands. At Antwerp he was sought out and his acquaintance cultivated by the most respectable citizens. The royal letters alone would have opened all doors to him. But his final decision to withdraw entirely from the Roman Catholic Church was hastened in or before 1540. In that year he married a woman of humble rank, without dowry, whom he met at Louvain (Krasinski says Mayen, ii, 238). It is not known with what amount of freedom he traveled with Rome irreparable. Instead of returning to his native land, he sought a retired residence at Emden, in Friesland. Count Enno, who was anxious to secure a reforma

The impression which he made in England was favorable, and in a sermon preached before the king Latimer extolled him with high praise. Returning to Emden, Lasko entreated the emperor, who was in the midst of his campaign against the emperor, to give up the cause of Church reform in all his states. Lasko wrote back to his friends in Emden to abide firm, assuring them that it was better to fall into the hands of God than into those of men. His first visit to England was designedly temporary. For six months he resided with Cranmer at Lambeth. The views of the two men were coincident in doctrine, and apparently not greatly divergent in matters of order and discipline. The impressi

Lasko's reputation as the founder of the Protestant Church in Friesland now spread rapidly, and he was repeatedly consulted by foreign rulers and divines on questions of Church polity and order. The duke of Prussia invited him to accept the superintendency of the churches of his dominions, but the project was defeated by the condition on which Lasko insisted that the Church should be independent of the state, and that Lutheran rites, kindred to those of the Roman Catholic Church, should be abolished (Krasinski, i, 238). During this period his residence at the court of the Polish king, where he was favored with the royal patronage, it is easy to conceive how it might have been expected that Lasko would be the favorite of and receive the appointment of bishop of Cujavia, and the most inviting prospects of ecclesiastical promotion opened before him. But already his hope that the Church of Rome would reform herself had died out. He opened his heart to the king, and freely confessed the views and convictions which forbade his acceptance of the professed Church. With the royal permission, and provided with commendatory letters, he chose temporarily to withdraw from his native land. He directed his course to the Netherlands. At Antwerp he was sought out and his acquaintance cultivated by the most respectable citizens. The royal letters alone would have opened all doors to him. But his final decision to withdraw entirely from the Roman Catholic Church was hastened in or before 1540. In that year he married a woman of humble rank, without dowry, whom he met at Louvain (Krasinski says Mayen, i, 238). It is not known with what amount of freedom he traveled with Rome irreparable. Instead of returning to his native land, he sought a retired residence at Emden, in Friesland. Count Enno, who was anxious to secure a reform at the Church in his principality, proposed to Lasko the charge of the matter as he owed especial trust to him. His death suspended the negotiation, but his sister Anna, who succeeded him, renewed the proposal. After much hesitation, Lasko was induced in 1548 to accept the charge, and in the following year was nominated superintendente; but his personal residence in the Netherlands, where he was already declined the invitation to return to Poland, where he was assured that his marriage should not stand in the way of the bestowment of a bishopric. He longed, indeed, to return, but only that he might labor as an angel without ceasing, and serve with any connection with Rome. He accepted his present post— as he did others to which he was subsequently called— with the express proviso that if duty and the prospect of useful service called him back to his native land he might be free to go. He made it also a condition of his acceptance that no obligation should be imposed upon him to any connection which was inconsistent with the word and will of God. In neighboring lands his proceedings were jealously watched. The duke of East Courland, who had married a daughter of Maximilian, as well as the duke of Brabant, felt that his influence and influence in the Church. Lasko pushed on the cause of reform by assailing the monasteries and the pictures in the churches. A formidable opposition was provoked, but he manfully defended himself, and was sustained by the counts. Opposition gradually yielded, and Romish rites and ceremonies were prohibited in Church and court. A new improved order of Church organization and discipline was introduced and established, substantially Presbyterian. He employed the eldership to enforce discipline. He sought to promote pastoral care and improvement, as well as conformity in the unity of doctrine. In his own person he habitually insisted on the sole and supreme authority of the Word of God. In correspondence with Melanchthon, Bucer, Bullinger, Pellican, and Hardenberg, he drew up a confession of faith, which yet proved unsatisfactory to the Lutherans, leasing as it did to the views of both Anglican and Reformed churches, though by no means in full correspondence with those of Calvin.

Lasko's reputation as the founder of the Protestant Church in Friesland now spread rapidly, and he was repeatedly consulted by foreign rulers and divines on questions of Church polity and order. The duke of Prussia invited him to accept the superintendency of the churches of his dominions, but the project was defeated by the condition on which Lasko insisted that the Church should be independent of the state, and that Lutheran rites, kindred to those of the Roman Catholic Church, should be abolished (Krasinski, i, 238). During this period his residence at the court of the Polish king, where he was favored with the royal patronage, it is easy to conceive how it might have been expected that Lasko would be the favorite of and receive the appointment of bishop of Cujavia, and the most inviting prospects of ecclesiastical promotion opened before him. But already his hope that the Church of Rome would reform herself had died out. He opened his heart to the king, and freely confessed the views and convictions which forbade his acceptance of the professed Church. With the royal permission, and provided with commendatory letters, he chose temporarily to withdraw from his native land. He directed his course to the Netherlands. At Antwerp he was sought out and his acquaintance cultivated by the most respectable citizens. The royal letters alone would have opened all doors to him. But his final decision to withdraw entirely from the Roman Catholic Church was hastened in or before 1540. In that year he married a woman of humble rank, without dowry, whom he met at Louvain (Krasinski says Mayen, i, 238). It is not known with what amount of freedom he traveled with Rome irreparable. Instead of returning to his native land, he sought a retired residence at Emden, in Friesland. Count Enno, who was anxious to secure a reform at the Church in his principality, proposed to Lasko the charge of the matter as he owed especial trust to him. His death suspended the negotiation, but his sister Anna, who succeeded him, renewed the proposal. After much
favor a compromise with the emperor. There was some danger that Lasko himself would be sacrificed to their policy. Leaving Eminem, therefore, he resided for a time at Leuven. He had, however, a sudden change of heart and a sudden return to his course back to England, in May, 1560, to which he had been reinvited. Here, under the protection of a Protestant monarch (Henry VI), refugees from persecution on the Continent were collected in considerable numbers. The foreign Protestant congregation in London was composed of French, Germans, and Italians. Of this, in all about 3000 members, Lasko, by the king's nomination (July 24, 1560), was made superintendent. He seems, however, to have had supervisory charge over the other foreign churches of the city, while his school was subject to his inspection and control. The wisdom of his measures is attested by a letter of Melancthon, who speaks (September, 1551) of the purity of doctrine of his churches. He differed with Cranmer on some points, as in reference to sacramental doctrine and the use of priestly habits, but his scruples were respected, and his intervention secured the foreign churches from molestation. In London he introduced the same system of Church order which he had established at Eminem. He brought out an edition of his Catechism for the instruction of the people, and thus the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism said they had been manifestly indebted. The English liturgy he rejected. He viewed his views on the sacraments as inferred from his republication in England of the work of Bullinger, to which he furnished an introduction. This was followed, however, by his Dieresi et deludea de Sacramentis Ecclesia Christi (2nd ed. 1562), a work which he had to follow up at once. His views on the sacraments are expressed in the introduction to the book of Zwingli and Calvin. On the doctrines peculiar to Calvin Lasko was not disposed to stand. He uses language that would seem to indicate an acceptance of the belief in a general atonement. While insisting on the insufficiency and inability of human effort without the grace of God, he has a strong affection for the freeness and rich provisions of the Gospel of Christ. It was during his residence in England that Lasko's wife died, and his second marriage took place. The death of the young king suddenly wrought an entire change in the prospects of the exiles, and on the accession of Queen Mary they prepared to return to the Continent. On the 17th of September, 1553, the first band of them, more than 170 in number, embarked for Denmark, where they had been assured of a welcome reception from a Protestant monarch. But a bigoted Lutheranism repelled him, and he returned to England, his fellow-pilgrims, called by Westphal, a Lutheran divine, "martyrs of the devil," and repulsed at Hamburg, Lubeck, and Rostock, finally found a hospitable reception at Dantzic. At Eminem he had chosen a position uncomfortable in which he was unable to fully develop his talents and abilities. He was given occasion for those who feared his influence to intrigue against him. Gustavus Vasa invited him and his friends to Sweden, assuring him of entire religious liberty. But he longed to return to his native land. His views concerning the sacrament, however, represented to the king as objectionable, and it seemed essential that he should first seek to harmonize them with the Augsburg Confession. His opponents in controversy, Westphal especially, had spoken of him as a professional pamphleteer. He determined to consult with Melancthon, and in April, 1555, he left Eminem for many months, passing from stirring discussing the habits to that city, and involved there to some extent in the Lutheran controversy. He was compelled of as a dissent from the Augsburg Confession, but in reply he asserted that he accepted its very language in regard to the sacrament in the sacrament. At Stuttgard (May 22, 1556) he entered with Brenz on a disputa-
LATERAN COUNCILS

Lassennes (Angevino: comp. Ad. genyoc), an officer who held high in the favor of the Emperor H. Niceta. He is described as "cousin" (cognatio, 1 Macc. xi, 81) and "father" (1 Macc. xi, 82; Josephus, Ant. xiii, 3, 9) of the king. Both words may be taken as titles of high nobility (compare Grimm on 1 Macc. x, 89; Diod. xvii, 59; Geosenis, Theaur. v. 25, § 4). It appears from Josephus (Ant. xiii, 4, 8) that he was a Cretan, and that Demetrius was indebted for a large body of mercenaries (compare 1 Macc. x, 67), when he asserted his claim to the Syrian throne against Alexander Balas. B.C. 148 or 147. It appears that Lassennes himself accompanied the young prince; and when Demetrius was exiled from the Syrian throne, he appointed Lassennes his chief minister, with unlimited power. His arbitrary government, added to his persuading Demetrius to disband the regular troops and only employ Cretans, is supposed to have alienated the subjects from the king, and caused great dissatisfaction to the soldiers. This conduct led to the downfall of Demetrius, for it enabled Tryphon to set up Antiochus, the young son of Alexander Balas (Diodotus, Relig. lib. xxxiii, 4, ed. Diodot. ii, 592). What became of Lassennes is not known. See DEMETRIUS.

Lactantius must not be identified with the Cretian instructor of the sons of Demetrius I Soter (Justin, xxxvii, 2; comp. Livy, Epit. 52). There is a later Lassennes, also a Cretan, who took a prominent part against the Romans in B.C. 70-68 (Smith, Dict. of Biogr. a. v. Lassennes, No. 3).

Last Time. See Eschatology.

Latchet (λατάχ, serok), so called from lacing and binding together; Gr. iacā, a thong, as it is rendered in Acts xxii, 23, the cord or strap which fastens an Oriental shoe upon the instep (v. 7; Mark i, 7; Luke iii, 16; John i, 27); proverbial for anything of little value (Gen. xiv, 28). See SANDAL. "Geosenis (Theaur. v. 237) compares the Lat. alutum = filum, and quotes two Arabic proverbs from the Hasmara and the Kamis, in which a corresponding word is similarly employed. In the poetical figure in Isa. v, 27, the 'latchet' occupies the same position with regard to the shoe as it did to the long flowing Oriental dress, and was as essential to the comfort and expedition of the traveller. Another semi-proverbial expression in Luke iii, 16 points to the same easily-removed article of clothing" (Smith).

It is not certain that the name latchet is expressed rather differently, 'Whose shoes I am not worthy to loosen, to guide to the long flowing Oriental dress, and was as essential to the comfort and expedition of the traveller. Another semi-proverbial expression in Luke iii, 16 points to the same easily-removed article of clothing" (Smith).

I. The Council of 465, under Martin I, condemned the Monothelitic doctrine, or that of one will in the person of Christ. This view was developed as a continuation of the Monophysite controversy. The Council of Chalcedon, in 401, had affirmed the existence of two natures in Christ in one person, against the Antiochians, the Nestorians, and Eutychians. This determination of the council did not obtain final supremacy in the Greek and Latin churches till after the time of Justinian, and the conflict with it was continued under various forms. From the Council of Chalcedon till that of Frankfurt, in 789, the Church councils especially sought to maintain the twofoldness of the nature of Christ ascribed to Chalcedon, with less regard to the unity, which was at the same time established. An early source for the rise of Monothelitism appeared in the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, which, originating probably about the 4th century, obtained for many centuries thereafter great credit in the Church. A Neo-Platonic mysticism in these writings seeks to mediate between the prevalent Church doctrine of Monothelitism (or the doctrine of one nature in Christ). The Areopagite, the Neo-Platonic mystic, is a well-known figure in the Church, and is known for his writings on the nature of Christ. This book is a form of the divine, and there is in all...
The act of Christ but one mode of operation, the theandric energy (ματ Θεότροπη Ιψισία). This expression became a favorite one with all the Monophysites opposed to the Nicene and Chalcedonian creeds.

The Monothelitic controversy proper extends from 633 to 660, at which latter date the symon of Constantinople gave the most precise definition of two wills in the two natures of Christ. The earlier stage of the controversy, extending to the year 636, concerned the question of one or two energies or modes of working in the act of Christ. The emperor Heraclius, on occasion of his reconquering the Eastern provinces from the Persians in the year 622, and there coming in contact with certain Monophysite bishops, conceived the idea of reconciling the Eastern theological position with that of the West. This was followed by the emission of a circular letter containing a reference to the acts of Christ which was used by Diospyros—the παλα Θεοτροπὴ Ἰψισία. Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, being consulted, admitted the propriety of the expression as one sanctioned by the fathers, and recommended it to Cyrus, bishop of Phasias, who, being a natural bishop of Alexandria, set up a compromise for the Monophysites with the Council of Chalcedon on nine points. Sophronius, a monk of Alexandria, seriously objected to the course taken by Sergius, and, on being made bishop of Jerusalem, became so prominent a figure and was so often called on by the emperor to express the opinion of Honorius, bishop of Rome, who expressed himself in favor of the view rather of one will than of one operation, but admitted that controversy should be avoided.

It is unquestionable the fact that the expressed views of Honorius, though a pope, were subsequently condemned in council. By means of the more decided opposition of Sophronius, the emperor Heraclius, under advice of Sergius, issued his edict, the Ecthesis, in the year 636, in which he forbade the use of either expression, "one mode of working" or "two modes of working," in a controversial way, but especially prohibited the latter, declaring that it was evident that Christ had but one will, the human being subordinate to the divine. This was distinct Monothelitism. A powerful opponent of this view was the monk Maximus, whose writings had a controlling influence with the Lateran Council. He asserts that for the work of redemption a completeness in the two natures of Christ is necessary; there must be a complete human will. The Logos, indeed, works all through the human working and willing.

There is a theandric energy in his own sense. It is rather as a πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπος, or what was called the communicatio idem essentiae, that the maximus worked against Monothelitism in Rome and Africa, sending out thence tracts on the subject to the East. Sophronius still carried on the controversy, as also, with him, Stephen, bishop of Dorias, his pupil. After the death of Honorius, the bishop of Rome were decidedly opposed to Monothelitism, and Martin I, who zealously contended against the view while representative of the Roman Church at Constantinople, became, when made pope in 648, the chief pillar of the contrary opinion. Advocates of the view enunciated in the Ecthesis of Heraclius were Theodore, bishop of Phasias, and Pyrrhus of Constantinople. In 648 the emperor Constant II, under the influence of the patriarch Paul, issued his Type (τύπος ἀνθρώπων), which, though not so decidedly Monothelitic as the Ecthesis, contained under the threat of the severest penalties, any further controversy upon this subject. Without consulting the emperor, Martin I now convoked this first Lateran Council, in which he presided over about 104 bishops from Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, and Africa.

The pope sought to obtain generally recognition for the concordat he had concluded with the Chalcedonian council, the five ecumenical councils. Five sessions were held; the writings of the prominent Monothelites were examined and condemned; pope Martin explained the proper meaning of Diospyrus's term "theandric operation," stating that it was designed to signify two operations of one person; the Ecthesis of Heraclius and Type of I Constans were condemned; and the judgment of the council pronounced in twenty canons, which mathematized all who do not confess in our Lord Jesus Christ two wills and two operations.

II. The councils of 1105, 1112, and 1116, under Pascal II, concern the contest about investitures between the pope and the emperor, which was brought to a close in the Council of 1128, called and presided over by Calixtus II. This was composed of 360 bishops and 60 abbots, all of the Latin Church. The investiture (q.v.) contest, which began as early as 1054, when, by mutual decrees of excommunication, the breach between the Eastern and Western churches was made final, arose from the claim made by the German emperors to an inheritance of the rights exercised by the Roman emperors concerning the appointment of candidates to ecclesiastical offices, and their investiture with the right to hold Church property as subjects of the empire. Under the new German empire, from Otto the Great to Henry IV, 980-1066, the popes themselves were confirmed in their seat by the emperor. Henry III obtained the assent of the Council of Sutry, which was held near Rome, in the midst of his own army, in 1046, the power of nominating the popes, without intervention of clergy or people. The influence of Hildebrand was now felt—an influence which was reflected in the appointment of the cardinals and which secured from Nicolas II, 1099, a decree transferring the election of popes to a conclave of cardinals. Hildebrand, as Gregory VII, maintained a celebrated contest with Henry IV, to whom, in 1075, he forbade all power of investiture, excommunicating the emperor the next year, and causing him to do penance at Canossa. With his victorious campaign in Italy, 1080-88, Henry drove the pope into exile at Salerno, where he soon after died. His immediate successors, however, were such as he had designated for the post, and were the inheritors of his doctrines and plans for the supremacy of the Church. Urban II sent forth an encyclical declaring his adhesion to the principles of Gregory—the Dictatus Gregorii; and Pascal II (1099-1118), who had been one of Gregory's cardinals, showed more zeal than firmness in the same course. In the Lateran Council under the pope, 1105, an act of obedience to the pope was taken by the clergy, and a promise rendered to affirm whatever he and the Church in council should affirm. The count De Meulan and his confederates were excommunicated for having encouraged the king of England in his conduct toward the English church in the rebellion against his father, was encouraged by Pascal, would nevertheless yield nothing on becoming emperor, 1105, in the matter of investitures, his example being followed in this respect by England and France. Henry marched into Italy and imprisoned the pope in 1111, forcing through him the concession of rendering back to the emperor the fees of the bishops on condition that there should be no imperial interference with the elections. For his weakness in this and in other points the pope was bitterly reproached, and the council of 1112 revoked all the concessions and excommunicated the emperor. Now extending the rebellion of his German subjects, Henry collected an army and invaded Italy anew in 1116. The council convoked the same year therupon renewed the revocation of the concessions Pascal had formerly made, and anathematized the emperor. At last, the German people, weary of the conflict between State and Church, brought about a peaceful compromise in the concordat at the imperial Diet of Worms, 1122. The principles of this concordat were adopted by the council of 1128. The terms of the concordat are as follows: The emperor surrendered all the investitures in St. Peter and Paul, and to the Catholic Church, all right of investiture by king and staff. He grants that elections and ordinations in all churches shall take place freely in accordance with ecclesiastical laws. The pope agrees that the election of German prelates shall be in the presence of the emperor provided it be done without violence or simony. In case any election is disputed,
the emperor shall render assistance to the legal party, with the advice of the archbishop and the bishops. The person elected is invested with the imperial fief by the royal sceptre pledged for the execution of everything required by law. Whoever is consecrated shall also receive in like manner his investiture from other parts of the empire within six months" (Hase, Church Hist., II, 303). The new pope here made considerable concessions in form, but actually, through his influence, obtained all power at the elections. The council of 1128 also renewed the grant of indulgences promulgated by Urban II in promotion of the first crusade in 1095, and decreed the calls of the clergy. Twenty-two canons of discipline were established.

III. The council of 1139, under Innocent II, condemned the anti-pope Anacletus II, with his adherents, and deposed all who had received office under him. On the same day with the installation of Innocent II, in 1138, Peter of León, a cardinal, and grandson of a rich Jewish banker, had been proclaimed pope, as Anacletus II, by a majority of the cardinals. Innocent took refuge in France, where he was supported by the king. His cause was warmly espoused by Bernard of Clairvaux, whose influencechiefly recovered his position in Italy, and marched into Rome triumphantly with Lothaire II in 1139. Anacletus died in 1139, and a successor was chosen by his party only with the purpose of making peace. Roger of Sicily had supported scenes on this occasion. The persecution on this council, in 1139, though the origin of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies belongs to the same year, Roger having taken Innocent prisoner, and having compelled the pope to bestow upon him the investiture of this kingdom. At this council Arnold of Breccia was also condemned. This was a young clergyman of the city of Breccia, a disciple of Abelard, who, inspired by the free philosophical spirit of his master, devoted himself to the promotion of practical reform in Church and State. A marked spirit of political independence was manifesting itself about this time, both individually from the old Roman municipalities established there. The pope, from the days of Leo IX, had themselves inspired movements of ecclesiastical reform. Pascall II had admitted that the secular power of the bishops interfered with their spiritual duties. Bernard, though a zealous opponent of Arnald, yet, in his Contemplations on the Papacy: "Who can mention the place where one of the apostles ever held a trial, decided disputes about boundaries, or portioned out lands?" I read that the apostles stood before judgment seats, not sat. I preached withArnold against the political power and wealth of the clergy. The Church ought rather to rejoice, he said, in an apostolic poverty. He was driven successively from Italy, France, and Switzerland, but in 1139 was recalled to Rome by the populace, who sought to revive the sovereignty of the state, established a senate, limited the pope to the exercise of spiritual power and the possession of voluntary offerings, and invited the German emperor to make Rome his capital. Arnold and his "politicians" at Rome thus gave pope Innocent and his immediate successors—Lucius II, Eugenius II, and Adrian IV—more trouble than any political movements elsewhere. This condemnation at the council did not effectually diminish his power. When, however, Adrian, in 1154, put the city of Rome under ban, and prohibited all public worship, Arnold was abandoned by the senate, sacrificed by Frederick I, and hung at Rome in 1155, his body being burned and thrown into the Tiber. Among the canons of the council, the twenty-third condemns the heresy of the Manichæans, as the followers of Peter de Bruis were called. This heresy was attributed to the early Waldensians in France and elsewhere, arising partly from their ascetic mode of life. These canons of discipline were published, and among them reaffirmations of former canons against simony, marriage, and concubinage in the clergy.

IV. The council of 1173, under Alexander III, numbering 290, mostly Latin bishops, was called to correct certain abuses which had arisen during the long schism just brought to a close by the peace of Venice, 1177. Until near the end of the 12th century the popes were hard pressed in the Holy Land by the crusades in the contest of Ghibelline and Guelf. Frederick I had taken umbrage at the use of the term "beneficium" in a letter addressed to him by Adrian IV about the rudeness of German knights to pilgrims visiting Rome, as if to intimate that the imperial dignity had been conferred by him. The emperor marched into Italy, and other letters were interchanged between him and the pope, when, upon the death of Adrian in 1159, the two parties—the hierarchic and the moderate among the cardinals—chose two opposing popes, viz. Alexander III and Victor IV. The emperor’s council, called at Favia in 1160, recognized the latter. Pascal III and Calixtus III followed at the imperial dictation, with but little influence. Alexander, from his refuge in France, enjoyed great popularity. He had on his side the arian Bishop of Trieste. The case was defended by the lawyers of Bologna, who ascribed to him unlimited power, to the prejudice of the people. Defeated at Legnano in 1176, the emperor subscribed, at the dictation of Alexander, the peace of Venice, the provisions of which were based on the Concordat of Worms. The first substantial results were the concordat established by this council, which were mostly disciplinary, provides that henceforth “the election of the pope shall be confined to the college of cardinals, and two thirds of the votes shall be required to make a lawful election, instead of a majority only, as heretofore.” It was by this constitution that the "human and impious" of the Waldenses and Albigensians were declared heretical. At the unimportant council of 1167, pope Alexander excommunicated Frederick I.

V. The council of 1215, under Innocent III, was the most important of all the Lateran Councils. It is usually styled the Fourth Lateran. It continued in session from November 11 to November 80, having present 71 archbishops, 412 bishops, 800 abbots, the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and the legates of other patriarchs and crowned heads. The pope opened the council with an assembly at the Lateran, the liberation of Italy from all foreign rule, the union of the Holy Land, and the recovery of the Holy Land and the reformation of the Church. The remarkable power of Innocent III is displayed in his influence over this council, which was submissive to all his wishes, and received the several canons proposed by him, and the papal regulations to attain the greatest height in Innocent, who pontificate extended from 1198 to 1216. The bull Unam Sanctam of Boniface VIII, directed against Philip IV the Fair in 1302, marks the limit from which the power of the pope evidently declined. Innocent III—a man of great personal power, of marked ability as a writer and orator, bold, crafty, and ever watchful of affairs—had his eye on all that transpired through his legates. The chief object which his pontificate sought were “the strengthening of the States of the Church, separation of the Two Sicilies from all dependence on the German emperor, the liberation of Italy from all foreign rule, the exercise of guardianship over the confederacy of its states, the liberation of the Oriental Church, the extermination of heretics, and the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline” (Hase, Church Hist., p. 207). Hitherto England, Germany, and France had constituted a balance of power against the pope, but under Innocent the two former, as well as Italy, submitted to the claims of the pseudo-Isidorean decretals. France was early laid under interdict (1200) on account of Philip Augustus’s repudiation of Ingeburge and the French bishops’ approval of the marriage of his son-in-law with Matilda, the wife of his cousin, in his realm, to receive it back (1218) only as a fief of Rome. Deciding at first for Otto IV, the Guelp, against the
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Hebestäffen Philip, in Germany, Innocent subsequently
ly secured from the council the recognition of Frederick
II, vainly seeking in this his German policy to free It-
aly entirely from the power of the emperor. The famous
sevenovt clauses of Innocent, if not discussed con-
sidered as a whole, by the papacy that term of
enactment, were nevertheless regarded as the canons of
the council, so recognised by the Council of Trent and
by Church authorities of the intervening age, and they
have constituted a fundamental law for many well-
known practices of the Romish Church. The first
of these clauses, the one that the Catholic faith in the unity
of God against all Manichæan sects. It also, for the
first time, makes the doctrine of transubstantiation, in
the use of this express term, an article of faith. “The body
and blood of Jesus Christ in the sacrament of the altar
are truly and corporally the species of bread and wine,
the bread being, by the divine omnipotence, transub-
stantiated into his body, and the wine into his blood.”

The second canon condemns the treatise of Joachim, the
prophet of Calabria, which he wrote against Peter Lombard
on the subject of the Trinity. The third canon is of
great importance, furnishing the basis for the crusade
against the Albigenses, and for all severities of a like
character on the part of the Romish Church. It “anath-
emasizes all heretics who hold anything in opposition to
the preceding exposition of faith, and enjoins that,
after condemnation, they shall be delivered over to the
secular arm, to be punished as traitors and rebels. They
protect, or maintain heretics, and threaten with deposition
all bishops who do not use their utmost endeavors to
clear their dioceses of them” (Landor, Manual of Coun-
cils, p. 205). The fourth canon invites the Greeks to
unite with the Romans in the crusade against the Albigenses,
and also the fifth canon, regulating the order of precedence
4. Antioch; 5. Jerusalem; and permits these several pa-
triarchs to give the pall to the archbishops of their de-
pendencies, exacting from themselves a profession of
faith, and of obedience to the Roman see, when they
receive the pall from the pope. The sixth to the twen-
tith, inclusive, are of minor importance (see Landor,
enjoins “all the faithful of both sexes, having arrived
at years of discretion, to confess all their sins at least
once a year to their proper priest, and to communicate
at Easter.” This is the first canon known which orders
sacramental confession generally, and may have been
occasioned by the teachings of the Waldenses, that nei-
ther confession nor satisfaction was necessary in order
to obtain the sacraments. From the time in which it
commences, it is known as the canon “Omnis utris-
quse sexus,” and was solemnly reaffirmed by the Council
of Trent. The canons (given completely by Landor,
Mem. of Councils, p. 236 sq.) in general constitute a body
of full and severe disciplinary enactments. This council
reaffirmed and extended the Truce of God on plenary
indulgence which had been previously proclaimed in
behalf of the Eastern Crusades, and fixed the time, June
1, and place, Sicily, as a rendezvous for another crusade.

This council also confirmed Simon de Montfort in
possession of the see of Narbonne in southern France and
condemned by papal confiscation from the Waldenses, and
decreed the entire extirpation of the heresy. The Waldenses
or Albigenses in the south of France were the followers
of Peter Waldo, a wealthy citizen of Lyons, who, from
religious principles, adopted a life of poverty. His fol-
lowers were called(paduates, or “Poor men of Ly-
oons.” They were allied in their sentiments to the Vau-
dois of the Piedmontese valleys, with whom they became
united for mutual defence. They protosted against
these points in the doctrine of the Romish Church: 1. The
Trinity, with which was substituted the union of
the sacraments, confession, and marriage. 3. The invocation of saints.
4. The worship of images. 5. The temporal power of the clergy.
A crusade was instituted against them by the papal power in 1178. Innocent sought to win
them over and make monks of them by establishing in
1201 the order of “Poor Catholicks.” Unsuccessful in
this, he confiscated their lands to the feudal lords, and
established an inquisition among them under the direc-
tion of Dominic, which was formally sanctioned by the
present council. He was first made war against them, incited and
directed by the monks of Citeaux, was as a crusader
by Alexander Augustus. Count Raymond of Toulouse espoused
the cause of his persecuted vassals. The papal legate,
Peter of Castelnau, sent to convert the Waldenses, was mur-
dered by Raymond, whose dominions were thereupon
ruled in 1216 by a fervor crusade of “Christian Pilgrims,” led
by Simon de Montfort and Arnold, the abbot of Citeaux.
The count of Toulouse submitted,
but a bloody warfare was prosecuted against Ray-
mond Roger, viscount of Beziers and Albi, and sub-
sequently two hundred towns and castles within the boundaries of the two
states were granted to the successful Simon de Montfort.
A rebellion, however, against his power de-
prived him of all; but Raymond of Toulouse, who ap-
ppeared at the council of 1215, obtained no favor, and his
territory was declared to be alienated from him forever.
VI. The council of 1212-1217, under Julius II and
Leo X, was convened for the reformation of abuses, for
the condemnation of the Council of Pisa, and attained
its most important result in the abolition of the Pra-
gmatic Sanction. France, under Louis XII, had obtained
great military successes in Italy by the League of Cam-
parny, formed against the interests of France, and by the
friendship of some of the cardinals, Louis XII summoned a Church council at Pisa,
Nov. 1511, which in 1512 was moved to Milan, but was
entirely fruitless of results, being dissolved by the
presence of the pope’s army. Julius II, though at first jeal-
ous of Venice, had nevertheless, aroused by the successes
of the French general, formed the Holy Alliance with
Venice, Spain, England, and Switzerland, and now, at
the head of his army, drove the French beyond the
Alps, and himself summoned a council at the Lateran
May 10, 1512. This council extended over twelve ses-
sions, until March, 1517. The bishop of Guer had ac-
tively promoted the summoning of the council, and at-
tended as representative of the German emperor.
All the acts of the Council of Pisa were at once annulled.
Julius having died in Feb. 1513, Leo X presided over
the sixth session. At the eighth session, in Dec. 1518,
Leo XII, through his ambassador, declared his adhe-
sion to this Council of the Lateran. At the eleventh
session, in Dec. 1516, the bull was read which, in place
of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1408), wherein
France acceded to the declarations of the council of
Pisa, and far as they were consistent with the liberties of the Gal-
lican Church, substituted the Concordat agreed upon this
year, 1516, between Leo X and Francis I. Through
hope of increasing his power in Italy, Francis largely
sacrament the liberties of the Church. Several of the
articles of the Pragmatic were retained, but most of
them were altered or abolished. The first article was
entirely contrary to the Pragmatic, which had re-
established the right of election, while the Concordat declares
that the chapters of the cathedrals in France shall no
longer propose candidates to the see of any Church, but
that the king shall name a proper person, whom the
pope shall nominate to the vacant see. The Concor-
dat, on account especially of this provision, met with
great opposition in the Parliament, universities, and the
Church at Paris. It was a great advance of the pope
against the liberties of France (compare Janus Pope and
Councils, § xxviii and xxix). Neither this council nor
the other four, viz. those of 1129, 1139, 1179, and 1215,
styled eccumenical by the Romish Church, can be proper-
ly regarded as such.

Some writers mention as the sixth Lateran the coun-
cil convened by pope Benedict XIII on the bull Uni-
genitus [see Janexius], and for the purpose of general
reform in the Church (compare Klemm, Conc. a Bened.
XIII, in Lat. habiti probre tres examen (1729); Walch, De
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collat. Lat. a Revcl. XIII (Lips. 1726). For a detailed account of the council at the Lateran opened Dec, 18, 1865, see Ecclesiastical Councils, and the article Infallibility in vol. iv, especially p. 578 sq. See Landon, Manual of Councils, p. 287–303; Mansi, Concil. v. 78: v, 741, 767, 806, 861, 999, 1508: xi, 117, xiv, 1-154: Giesebrecht, Lexicon, Ch. Hist. i, 368; ii, 131, 181, 195, 988; Millman, Latin Christianity, iii, 297, 298 sq., 434, iv, 146, 175, 236; v, 211 sq; Cunningham, Hist. Theol. i, 417 sq; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, i, 551; ii, 206;

Lately, Gilbert, an English Quaker, was born in England in 1627. He was one of the most active and efficient members of his society in London. His labors were done especially to the relief of the more unfortunate of his Church. He died Sept. 15, 1705. See Janney, Hist, of Friends, iii, 105.

Lathrop, Joseph, D.D., an eminent Congregational minister, was born October 20, 1781 (O. S.), at Norwich, Conn.; graduated at Yale College in 1764; entered the ministry January, 1766; was ordained pastor in West Springfield, Mass., and labored there until his death, December 31, 1820. In 1793 he was elected professor of divinity in Yale College, but declined the position. He published A Letter to the Rev. the associated Pastors in the County of New Haven concerning the Ordination of the Rev. John Imphare in New Haven (1770): Miscellaneous Collection of Original Pieces, political, moral, and entertaining (1786); and a number of occasional Sermons (Hartford, 1793, 8vo; 1808, 8vo; Worcester, 1807, 8vo). Doctor Lathrop was a popular preacher, and his sermons have long been highly commented upon both in this country and in Europe.—Sprague, Annals of the American Pulper, i, 526.

Lattimer, Hugh, one of the most distinguished prelates of the Church of Rome, undoubtedly one of the ablest, if not the ablest ecclesiastic among the English reformers of the 16th century, called by Froude (Hist. of England, i, 254, comp. ii, 101) the John Knox of England, the bearer of a name that "now shines over two hemispheres, and will blaze more and more till the last day," was born at Thurcaston, in Leicestershire, about 1490. His father, a farmer of good practical judgment, early discovering in Hugh talents that would fit him for a literary position, sent him to the monastery at the advantage of his time at school, and at fourteen Hugh was transferred to Cambridge, where he was soon known as a sober, hard-working student. At nineteen he was elected fellow of Clare Hall, took his degree at twenty, and entered on the study of theology, having decided to devote himself to the service of the Church. A sincere and devout believer in the doctrines and rites of the Church of Rome, we need not wonder at finding him, at this period of his life, loud and frequent in his denunciation of the would-be reformers, seldom losing an opportunity of inveighing against them. "He even held them," says Middleton (Memoirs of the Reformers, iii, 103), "in such horror that they thought they were the supporters of that Antichrist whose appearance was to precede the coming of the Son of Man, and conjectured that the day of judgment was at hand." Nor were the events of the day likely to cool his mistaken zeal. Lathyer, who was making havoc in the ranks of the papacy, had just been assailed by the "defender of the faith" (king Henry VIII); and as a most fit subject for his dissertation for the divinity degree, Lattimer could find no better work than "flashing his maiden sword" in an attack upon Melancthon—surely no small task for a man not much beyond his teens. But even at this early age Hugh Lattimer proved himself quite a formidable polemic, and, what is even more noteworthy, a man not afraid to speak his mind—a trait which distinguishes our subject in all the acts of his life. Immediately after his attack on Melancthon he came under the eye and tongue of Blinney, the famous advocate of the Reformed doctrines in the English Church, and he was led to examine more critically the doctrines and discipline of his Church. The result was, naturally enough, a conversion to the cause which Blinney so ably advocated. Lattimer was at this time about thirty years of age, and as he was not a man accustomed to do things by halves, he became a zealous advocate for reform, and preached manifestly against the false doctrines and various abuses of Romaniast which had crept into and polluted the Church of England. Naturally gifted with great oratorical powers, and inspired by the fitness of the subject with which he was dealing, he soon made himself famous as a preacher at Cambridge. "None, except the boldest and most uncircumcised, could stand a moment from his preaching, it was said, without being affected with the highest detestation of sin, and moved to all godliness and virtue" (Jocel of Joy [Parker Society edition], p. 224 sq.). Such preaching, however, greatly as it was appreciated, the times in which Lattimer lived, could not meet the approval of the servile ecclesiastics. It was too much tinged by theological statements that had originally sprouted in England, and, after being transplanted to Germany, had been brought back with improved fibre; and Lattimer soon found himself surrounded by a formidable opposition, daily growing in strength: His "heretical preaching," as it then called, caused a remonstrance made to the diocesan bishop of Ely by a grey friar named Venetus, but really due to most of the divines of Cambridge, requesting episcopal interference. Among these was the incumbent of Ely, naturally a mild and moderate man, inclined to favor Lattimer at first, and only mildly rebuked him. Here the matter might have ended, and it is more than likely that "he would not have been the Lattimer of the Reformation, and the Church of England would not, perhaps, have been here to-day" (Froude, i, 101), had not this bishop, while on a visit to Cambridge (1525), unexpectedly attended one of Lattimer's preaching services, and had not his prelatical dignity been sorely touched on the occasion. Lattimer was right in the midst of his sermon when the bishop entered; immediately he turned his face about, and addressed the congregation as the bishop had been seated, according to Strype, addressed the audience as follows: "It is of congruence meet that a new auditory being more honorable, requireth a new theme, being a new argument to entreat of. Therefore it behoveth me now to deviate from mine intended path so as somewhat to entreat of the honorable estate of a bishop. Therefore let this be the theme, Chrestus eratens pontifice futurorum bonorum, etc." This text, says a contemporary, he so fruitfully handled, expounding every word, and setting forth the office of Christ so sincerely as the true and precious instrument of the Church, that he should succeed him in his Church, that the bishop then present might well think of himself that neither he nor any of his fellows were of that race, but rather of the fellowship of Caiaphas and Annas. It cannot appear strange to any one that "the wise and politic man," as the bishop of Ely was generally called, thereafter also went over to the enemy, and forbade Lattimer's preaching within the diocese over which he presided. Lattimer, however, overcame this obstacle by gaining the use of a pulpit in a monastery of Austin friars, exempted from episcopal control, and from out of which, under the prior of which, Dr. Barnes, decidedly favored the reformed doctrines. This daring attitude of the young preacher so provoked Dr. West and the Cambridge clique that the bishop made complaint to cardinal Wolsey. "No eye saw more quickly than the cardinal's the difference, and at the same time, and at all times," says when he had heard from the lips of Lattimer himself the substance of the sermons that had given cause to the complaint, the cardinal, instead of punishing Lattimer, replied to the accusations by granting the offender a license to preach in any church in England, and the bishop of Ely not only preached that doctrine as you have here repeated," he said, "you shall preach it to his board, let him say what he will" (Latey, Remains, p. 27 sq, as quoted by Froude, ii, 105). From this time forward the career of Lattimer seems
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dearly marked out. Hitherto he had been quite ortho-
dox in points of theoretic belief. "His mind," says Froude,
"would accept rather than question, and he was slow in ar-
riving at conclusions which had no im-
mediate bearing upon action." Now he broke loose al-
together from the position of the Cambridge authorities,
and probably became defiant of them. But Wolsey
(1519), fell from grace, and fear made him see that
Latimer was working now, at last, also fall a prey to the
malice of his formidable adversaries, greatly increased
in numbers by his success in gaining followers, who were
drawn towards him by his eloquence, his moral conduct,
and his kindness of disposition, as well as by the mer-
it of his object. Unexpectedly, however, and quite to
the chagrin of the Cambridge men, he found a fresh
protector in the king himself. He had preached before
Henry in the Lent of 1530, having been introduced to
his royal master by the king's physician, Dr. Butts; and
he won the favor of Henry by his honest, straightforward
logic and his enthusiasm. In this new position he
performed his duty as faithfully as he had in preaching at
Cambridge, and he dared to speak the truth in a place
where the truth is generally forgotten. A special oppor-
tunity to speak in defense of the Protestant cause was
offered him by the v�ceipitation of those great men in
Henry's dominions who were subjected at this time on
account of their religious faith; and, though he did not
succeed in staying the hand of persecution by this
address of almost unexampled grandeur, it yet remains
"to speak forever for the courage of Latimer, and to
speak to his memory, that a more ample valediction is
not to be found in the annals of ecclesiastical history.
Men in Henry's dominions were subjected at this time
on account of their religious faith; and, though he did
not succeed in staying the hand of persecution by this
address of almost unexampled grandeur, it yet remains
"to speak forever for the courage of Latimer, and to
speak to his memory, that a more ample valediction is
not to be found in the annals of ecclesiastical history.
Men in Henry's dominions were subjected at this time
on account of their religious faith; and, though he did
not succeed in staying the hand of persecution by this
address of almost unexampled grandeur, it yet remains
"to speak forever for the courage of Latimer, and to
speak to his memory, that a more ample valediction is
not to be found in the annals of ecclesiastical history.
Men in Henry's dominions were subjected at this time
on account of their religious faith; and, though he did
not succeed in staying the hand of persecution by this
address of almost unexampled grandeur, it yet remains
"to speak forever for the courage of Latimer, and to
speak to his memory, that a more ample valediction is
not to be found in the annals of ecclesiastical history.
Men in Henry's dominions were subjected at this time
on account of their religious faith; and, though he did
not succeed in staying the hand of persecution by this
address of almost unexampled grandeur, it yet remains
"to speak forever for the courage of Latimer, and to
speak to his memory, that a more ample valediction is
not to be found in the annals of ecclesiastical history.
Men in Henry's dominions were subjected at this time
on account of their religious faith; and, though he did
not succeed in staying the hand of persecution by this
address of almost unexampled grandeur, it yet remains
"to speak forever for the courage of Latimer, and to
speak to his memory, that a more ample valediction is
not to be found in the annals of ecclesiastical history.
Men in Henry's dominions were subjected at this time
on account of their religious faith; and, though he did
not succeed in staying the hand of persecution by this
address of almost unexampled grandeur, it yet remains
"to speak forever for the courage of Latimer, and to
speak to his memory, that a more ample valediction is
not to be found in the annals of ecclesiastical history.
Men in Henry's dominions were subjected at this time
on account of their religious faith; and, though he did
not succeed in staying the hand of persecution by this
address of almost unexampled grandeur, it yet remains
"to speak forever for the courage of Latimer, and to
speak to his memory, that a more ample valediction is
not to be found in the annals of ecclesiastical history.
Men in Henry's dominions were subjected at this time
on account of their religious faith; and, though he did
not succeed in staying the hand of persecution by this
address of almost unexampled grandeur, it yet remains
"to speak forever for the courage of Latimer, and to
speak to his memory, that a more ample valediction is
not to be found in the annals of ecclesiastical history.
Men in Henry's dominions were subjected at this time
on account of their religious faith; and, though he did
not succeed in staying the hand of persecution by this
address of almost unexampled grandeur, it yet remains
"to speak forever for the courage of Latimer, and to
speak to his memory, that a more ample valediction is
not to be found in the annals of ecclesiastical history.
Men in Henry's dominions were subjected at this time
on account of their religious faith; and, though he did
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trangement between the pope and the king had been quite decided. Cranmer's decree of 1583, approving the marriage with Anne Boleyn, had been declared first null and void by the pope, and Henry had been threatened with excommunication; but, as he had ignored the papal threat, a bull to this effect was published in 1584. In the same year a bull was also published condemning the separations by which the king of England and the pope of Rome had become complete, the Lutherns grew anxious to effect a union with the English Reformers, and to this end three German divines, with Bucerharrt at their head, had come to England in 1584 to discuss and amicably settle all minor religious differences of opinion. Unfortunately, however, they not only failed to bring about an agreement on sacramental doctrine, but the discussion even induced the king to cling more tenaciously than ever to the belief of the Romish Church, especially on transubstantiation; and in 1589 the king actually caused the passage of "the bloody act of the Six Articles," or "the whip with six strings," as the Protestants termed it, by which the denial of transubstantiation was made punishable with death, and other medieval dogmas were enforced. The statutes were enforced, but the people paid no regard to them, and historians will have it that he was induced to resign by lord Cromwell; the latter, "either himself deceived or desiring to smooth the storm, told Latimer that the king advised his resignation" (Froude, iii, 370, foot note). In 1588 there was a short war with Spain, and the state of war afterwards denied this, and pitied Latimer's condition; and when we consider that Latimer had found a tried friend in Cromwell, we can hardly conclude that either he or the king had anything to do with the resignation, which was an act only to be expected of Latimer, ever independent and bold to speak the truth. Froude (on the authority of Hall) will have it even that Latimer, together with Shaxton (q.v.), were imprisoned immediately after their resignation, but if this be true he can have been confined only a brief period, as by a summary declaration of pardon the bishop's dungeon door was thrown open and the prisoners were dismissed a very short time after their imprisonment.

Latimer thereafter sought retirement in the country, where he would have continued to reside had not an accident befallen him, the effects of which he thought might prove fatal to his skill of life. A horse that he was riding in London when the power of Cromwell was nearly at an end, and the mastery in the hands of Gardiner, who no sooner discovered him in his privacy than he procured accusations to be made against him for his objections to the Six Articles, and he was committed to the Tower. Different causes being alleged against him, he remained a prisoner for the remaining six years of king Henry VIII's reign, his enemies evidently designing mainly to prevent his influence for the cause of the Reformers in the capital of the nation. Upon the accession of Edward VI, it happened that a document referred to the king of Spain, and that Latimer was firm in his refusal to receive it: his great age, he said, made him desirous of freedom from any and all responsibility. He preached, however, frequently, and gave himself up to all manner of benevolent works. He was a decided opponent of "the bloody Bonner." Occasionally his advice was sought by the king, and he was continually active as the strenuous preserver of the vices of the age; but the reign was short, and with it expired Latimer's prosperity. In July, 1553, king Edward died; in September, Mary had begun to reign, but yet it took very little to regain the doctrine, and under her rule the old ordered service was restored, Latimer was committed to the Tower. Though he was at least eighty years old, no consideration was shown for his great age, and he was sent to Oxford, March 8, 1554, together with Cranmer and Ridley, to dis-
LATIMER

peute on the corporal presence. He had never been ac-
counted very learned: he had not used Latin much, he
had spent these twenty years, and was now able to dis-
pute; but he would declare his faith, and then they
might do as they pleased. He declared that he thought
the presence of Christ in the sacrament to be only spiri-
tual; " he enlarged much against the sacrifices of the
mass, and lamented that they had changed the com-
munion into a private mass; that they had taken the
cup away from the people; and, instead of service in a
known tongue, were bringing the nation to a worship
that they did not understand" (Burnet, Reformation, vol.
ii). He was laughed at, and told to answer their argu-
ments; but he would not; and that he knew his memory had
failed; the laughter, however, continued, and
there was great disorder, perpetual shoutings, taunt-
ings, and reproaches. When he was asked whether he
would abjure his principles, he only answered, "I thank
God most heartily that he hath prolonged my life to this
end, that I may in this case glorify God with this kind
of death." He was found guilty of heresy and sentenced
to death, but the Romanists, to make sure that no claims
for the irregularity of the trial should be charged upon
them, set aside the sentence which had been passed at
the first trial, and, by direction of cardinal Pole, an-
other court was held, consisting of Bishop of Glou-
cester; Holyman, bishop of Bristol; and White, bishop of
Lincoln, was convened on the 7th of September, under
the altar of St. Mary's Church at Oxford, and the three
"arch heretics" given a second hearing and condemned.
Latimer was then introduced to the court with an eight-
year old, "dressed in an old threadbare gown of Bristol
frizee, a handkerchief on his head with a night-cap over
it, and over that again another cap, with two broad flaps
buttoned under the chin. A leather belt was round his
waist, to which a Testament was attached; his spectac-
ules, without a case, hung from his neck. So stood the
greatest man, perhaps, then living in the world, a pris-
oner on his trial, waiting to be condemned to death by
men professing to be ministers of God.... Latimer's
trial was the counterpart of Ridley's (see Froude, vi, 556
sq.); the charge was the same (on the sacrament), and
the result was the same, except that the stronger intell-
lect vexed itself less with nice distinctions. Bread was
bread, said Latimer, and wine was wine; there was a
change in the sacrament, it was true, but the change
was not in the nature, but the dignity" (Froude, vi, 559
sq.). Latimer's character was not less admirable, but Latimer, like Ridley, remained firm, and sentence
was pronounced upon them as heretics obstinate and in-
curable, and on the 16th of October, 1555, both Latimer
and Ridley were led to the stake and burnt, outside the
northern wall of the town, a short story from the south-
western corner of Oxford College and about the same
distance from Brocado prison, where Cranmer still
lurged.
The last words of Latimer were addressed to his
companion, and are characteristic of our subject:
"Be of good comfort, master Ridley, and play the man:
we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in
England, as I trust shall never be put out." (Gunpow-
der had been fastened about his body to hasten his
death; it took fire with the first flame, and he died im-
mediately.
Latimer's character, which has been treated most
beautifully by the late Rev. E. Thomson, D.D., L.L.D.,
in his Sketches, Biographical and Occidental (Circ. 1866), p.
42 sq., seems to present a combination of many
noble and disinterested qualities. " He was brave, hon-
est, devoted, and energetic, homely and popular, yet
from all vices of the body and spirit. He was a plain,
simple-hearted, and unpretending man; an earnest,
hopeful, and happy man, fearless, open-hearted, hating
nothing but baseness, and fearing none but God—not
throwing away his life, yet not counting it dear when
the great crisis came—an calmly yielding it up as the
champion of his tongue, life, and struggle. There may be
other reformers that more engage our admiration, there
is no one that more excites our love" (Tulloch, Leaders
of the Reformation, p. 322-324). Latimer's sermons, charac-
terized by humor and cheerfulness, manly sense and direct
evangelical force, were the printed ones only, of 1549,
8vo, and in 1570, 4to; one of the best editions, with
notes and a memoir, was prepared by John Watkins,
L.L.D. (London, 1824, 2 vol. 8vo). A complete edition of
his Works (the only complete one) was edited for the
Parker Society by the Rev. G. B. Rome (Cambridge, 1844-4,
4 vol. 8vo). See Gilpin, Life of Latimer (1854, 8vo);
Fox, Book of Martyrs; Middleton, Mem. of the Reform-
ers, iii, 101 sq.; Tulloch, Leaders of the Reformation,
vol. ii, 50 sq.; Hook, Eclogæ, Bisogv, vi, 561 sq.; Burnet, Hist. of
the Reformation (see Index); Collier, Eclogæ, Hist. (see
Index); Frothingham, History of England, vol. i, 507 sq.
(see Index); Engil. Cyclop. s. v.; Blackwood's Mag., lxix, 181 sq.;
Lond. Rev., 1822, vi, 272 sq. (J. H. W.)

LATIN

Latin, William, an English humanist of the 15th century,
began in 1489 a fellow of All Souls' Col-
lege, Oxford. He studied theology in that university,
and afterwards Greek at Padua, and subsequently be-
came teacher to Reginald Pole. He was a friend of Eras-
u ms, and even assisted him in preparing his second edi-
tion of the N. T. He died about 1545. Erasmus and
Leland both speak of Latimer in high terms as a writer
and scholar. Unfortunately, however, he never publish-
ed any of his writings, and there remain in MS. form
only a few of the letters he wrote to Erasmus. See Hallam, Lit-
Hist. of Europe (London, 1864), i, 292, 271.

Latin (Lattanie, Roman, Luke xxiii, 88; pvega-
tai, in Roman, John xix, 20), the vernacular language
of the Romans, although most of them in the time of
Christ likewise spoke Greek. See the monographs on
the subject cited by Volviding, Index, p. 135. See Lat-
inisms.

LATIN, USE OF, IN THE ADMINISTRATION
OF THE SACRAMENTS. The words of St. Augustine against he-
then Rome in De civitate Dei, ix, 7, "Opera data est,
ut imperiosa civitas non solum jugum sed etiam linguam
suam domitis gentibus imponeret," may be justly ap-
plied to modern Christian Rome. By imposing its lan-
guage on all nations acknowledging its sovereignty it
has obtained also the mastery over their spiritual life.
Benefice XIV, indeed, nobly declared, "Ut omnes cath-
tolicis sint, non ut omnes Latini sint, necessarium est."
But this principle of true, ancient catholicity resulted
only in securing the domination of Rome, as the pope,
for Roman Catholicism early found that it cannot af-
ford to dispense with the use of Latin and adopt the
vulgar tongues; that it would thereby endanger the
consolidation of the Church's power—yes, its very ex-
istence. Thus the Latin language was originally used
in the public worship of the Roman Church in those
in countries where Latin was the popular language, can-
not be a matter of surprise or condemnation, nor that
the clergy should have continued to use it in Chris-
tianizing the nations who became subjects to Rome,
even after its use had become obsolete in Rome itself.
Of course there is every reason to believe that in the
earliest stages the ecclesiastical language of the Greek-
speaking Roman Church was Greek, and continued such
till the transfer of the empire to Byzantium (Forbes,
Explan. XXIX. X. Art. ii, 490), and that, indeed, in the
early church and in the practice of the apostles, to
whom the use of a foreign language was repugnant
(compare 1 Cor. xiv, 19; ibid. 16), and made use of their
own vernacular, as in the introduction of the Gospel to
India, Parthia, and other regions. But the use of the
Latin tongue by the Roman Church was in its early
period admissible, when we consider that it was only the
Church that had it in its power, at a time when the
influence of the infant modern languages was derogatory
to the Latin, to maintain the ancient language in com-
parative purity, and to preserve it as its most noble mon-
uments. Indeed, a Latin (Theophrastus) and a Greek
has well said, "It has not been adopted by the Church,
the Thirty-nine Articles, ii, 484; Adolphus, Compendium Theologiae, p. 49.

Bellarmine (in his Works, iii, 119) attempts to complete and comment on these grounds. 1. He says "the Latin Church has always administered the sacraments in Latin, although this language had long since ceased to be the common language of the people. This is admitting the sacraments to be connected with a dead and corrupt tongue, at the same time, that it is to be retained simply from habit. Bellarmine then attempts to prove its reasonable-ness. He says: "There is no pressing motive why the sacraments should be administered in the vernacular, while there are manifest objections to it; for there is no necessity that those who receive the sacraments should understand the words which accompany them; for the words are addressed either to the elements, as in the eucharist, the blessing of holy water, oil, etc., and these understand no language; or else they are addressed to God, and he understands them all; or, again, they are addressed to persons who are to be consecrated or absolved, not instructed or edified, as in the sacraments of baptism and absolution; hence it is at best a matter of indifference to the person concerned whether he understood the words or not; it is further proved that persons who understand the words of the sacrament can be deprived of them in the sacrament of reconciliation, which is seen in the baptism of new-born infants and the reconciliation of sick persons when in an unconscious state." Yet Bellarmine himself, perceiving the difficulties of the position he had assumed for himself, observes: moreover, how many of the truly ignorant persons in the Latin Church as not to know in general, by the words which accompany it, which of the sacraments is being administered to them." Granting this, we cannot understand, then, in what manner the use of Latin is to prevent the profanation of the sacraments as set forth by the Council of Trent. Among the objections to the use of modern languages, we find that "the free intercourse between the different churches, which they need as members of one body, is rendered by it much more difficult. Moreover, Christians leaving their native country would thus be obliged to deprive themselves from attending the divine offices." This is taking for granted that all Christians understand Latin; for, unless they do, it would become a matter of indifference to them whether they heard mass in that or another foreign language. "The sacraments should always be in the same language, and in the aspiring solemnity, which can be better preserved by not using their usual language. If it is granted that in public worship we should use special buildings, special costumes, special forms, etc., there cannot be any objection against the propriety of using also a different language. Latin is adapted to a higher language than another, but because it is better calculated to produce a feeling of reverence than the common tongue. 8. It is right that the sacramental words should always be presented to all the people in the same manner and under the same form, to avoid the danger of changes and alterations. This is the more easily accomplished by making all priests use the same language. Yet this does not always avoid the danger, for there have been instances of priests administering baptism "in nomine patria, filia et spiritus sancta." 4. By administering the sacrament in this manner, the door would be opened to ignorance, for the priests would at last consider themselves fully qualified if they knew how to read. Latin would be totally forgotten, and they would be unable to read the fathers and even the Scriptures." Here we see another instance of the almost complete, surpassing that of heaven Rome, which, if it compelled subject nations to adopt its language, did not, at least, prevent them from understanding it. Christian Rome seems, indeed, to be imbued with the idea that mankind praise and value most what they do not understand, and the times had changed in defense of the custom by Roman Catholic writers are but variations on the above (comp. Forbes, Explanation of..."
LATINISMS

1. Latin Words in Greek Characters.—The following are instances (see Tregelles in Horne's *Introd. iv., 16*; Αὐτόναμον, "farting," from the Latin *aurum* (Matt. xxix., 29). This word is used literally by Pliny, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Athenaeus, as may be seen in Wetstein, ad loc. See *Abridg.* Κύνος, μοσαί (Matt. xxv., 25); εὐκατόρτιον, *centuria* (Mark xv., 89), etc. λεγών, *legion* (Matt. xxvi., 53). Polybius (B.C. 150) has also used it in the Roman military terms (vi., 17) 1616. Σεκουλανώμος, *speculator,* *a spy,* *speculator,* "to look about," or, as Wahl and Schleusner think, from *epiculum,* the weapon carried by the spectator. The word describes the emperor's life-guards, who, among other duties, punished the condemned; hence "an executioner" (Acts xxi., 37). It is used in the *Novum Testamentum* (comp. Tacitus, *Hist.* i., 26; Josephus, *War,* i., 83, 7; *Seneca, De Irā, i., 16). Μάκελλων, from *macellum,* "a market-place for flesh" (1 Cor. x., 25). As Corinth was now a Roman colony, it is only consistent to find that the inhabitants had adopted this name for their public market, and that Paul, writing for them, should speak of the *mikōn,* "a mile" (Matt. v., 41). This word is also used by Polybius (ibid. i., 11, 8) and Strabo (v., 882).


The importance of the Latinisms in the Greek Testament consists in this, that, as we have partly shown (and the proof might be much extended), they are to be found in the best Greek writers of the same era. Their occurrence, therefore, in the New Testament, is more than accidental; it is more than a mere illustration of the peculiar grammatical and linguistic development of the Christian church. The subject is intricate, and adds much of discussion. See Dr. Marsh's dissertation on the subject, *De Latinis in Nov. Test. et usu.*

4. Latin Versions of the Holy Scriptures.—The extensive use of the Latin as a learned language, and the great influence which the translations in it have had upon all subsequent versions, render the study of Latin versions important. The various recensions or editions, however,
Latin Versions

need to be carefully distinguished and critically examined in order to show their real value and bearing.

I. Ante-Hieronymian Versions.—The early and extensive diffusion of Christianity among the Latin-speaking people renders it probable that means would be used to supply the Christians who used that language with versions of the Scriptures, especially those resident in countries where the Greek language was less generally known. That from an early period such means were used cannot be doubted; but the information which has reached us is so scanty, that we are not in circumstances to arrive at certainty on many points of interest connected with the subject. It is even matter of debate whether there were several translations, or one translation variously corrupted or emended.

1. The first writer by whose reference is supposed to be made to a Latin version is Tertullian, in the words "Sci Tâmum plano non sic esse in Graeco authentico, quodmodo in usu exitii per duorum syllabarum aut callidam aut simplicem versiorem," etc. (De Monogaminis, c. 11). It is possible that Tertullian has in view here a version in use among the African Christians; but it is by no means certain that such is his meaning, for he may refer merely to the manner in which the passage in question had come to be usually cited, without intending to intimate that it was so written in any formal version. The probability that such is really his meaning is greatly heightened when we compare his language here with similar references to other parts of the Scriptures. Then, speaking of the Logos, he says, "Hanc Grecem Aetouv dicant, quo vocabulo etiam sermonean appelletam. Ideoque in usu est nostrorum per simplicitatem interpretationis, Sermonean, dicere, in primum apud Deum esse" (Ado. Prax. c. 5), where he seems to have in view similare应用 the colloquial usage of his Christian compatriots (comp. also Ado. Marc. c. 4 and c. 9). The testimony of Augustine is more precise. He says (De Doct. Christ. ii, 11): "Quia Scripturam in Hebrew lingua in Graecam verterunt numerari possunt, Latinis autem interpretes nullo modo. Ut enim quia primis fictae temporibus in manus venit codex Graecus et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguae Latine videbatur, aucus est interpretari. A few sentences before he speaks of the "Latinorum interpretum infinita varietas," and he proceeds to give instances how one of these versions elucidates another, and to speak of the defects attaching to all of them. This testimony not only clearly establishes the fact of the existence of Latin versions in the beginning of the 4th century, but goes to prove that these were numerous; for that Augustine has in view a number of interpretations of not merely a variety of meanings, is evident from his statement in this same connection, "In ipsius interpretatioibus Italus cetera preferatur, nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiae," and from his speaking elsewhere (Cont. Faustianum, ii, 2) of "codies illiarum regionum." On the other hand, the testimony of Hilary is in favor of only one Latin version: "Latinae translatione divitum virtutem dictum magnam intuitum obsecrationem, non discernens ambigui sermone proprietatem" (in Ps. cixii). On the same side is the declaration of Jerome: "Si Latina exemplaria est diversa, multis responsibus, tot sunt enim exemplaria pene quot codices." That by "exemplaria" here Jerome refers to what would now be called editions or recensions, is evident from the nature of his statement, for it cannot be supposed that he intends to say that almost every codex presented a distinct translation; and this is rendered still more manifest by these words: "Si autem veritas est querrenda de pluribus, cur non ad Graecum originem revertentes ea que vel a vitiosa interpretationes male reddita, vel a presumptibus imperitiis emendata persueris, vel a librarium dormitantibus addita sunt aut sunt consuetudines" (Prof. in Josam). Elsewhere (Prof. in Josam) he says also: "Apud Latinos tot exemplaria quot codices et unusquisque pro suo arbitrio vel addidit vel subtraxit quod ei visum est;" where there can be no doubt as to his meaning. Jerome frequently uses the expression consomma et seu vulgata editio, but by this he intends the Sept., or the Old Latin translation of the Sept. In reference to the Latin N.T. he uses the expressions Latinus interpres, Latini codices, or simply in Latino.

The statement of Augustine, that of those interpretations the Italia est saeculi, that has been supposed to indicate decidedly the existence of several national Latin versions known to him. For this title can only indicate a translation prepared in Italy, or used by the Italian churches, and presupposes the existence of other versions, which might be known as the Africana, the Hispamica, etc. On the other hand, however, if there was a version known by this name, it seems strange that it should never be mentioned again by Augustine or by any one else: and further, it is remarkable, that to designate an Italian version he should use the word "Itala" and not "Italina." This has led to the suspicion that this word is an error, and different conjectural emendations have been proposed. Bentley suggested that for itala . . . nam there should be read itil . . . quae, a singularly infelicitous emendation, as Hug has shown (Introduct. i, 267). As Augustine elsewhere speaks of "codicibus ecclesiasticis interpretationes usitate", (De consensu Evang. ii, 66), it has been suggested by Potter that for Itala should be read usitata, the received reading having probably arisen from the omission, in the first instances, of the recurrent syllable as between inter- pretationem and usitate, in the version (usitata), and then the change of the unmeaning itala into itala. Of this emendation many have approved, and if it be adopted, the testimony of Augustine in this passage, as for a plurality of Latin versions, will be greatly enfeebled, for by the vero usitate he would doubtless intend the version in common use as opposed to the unauthorized interpretation of private individuals. As tending to confirm this view of his meaning, it has been observed that it is extremely improbable that if there was an acknowledged versus Africano, the Christians in Africa would be found preferring to that a version made for the use of the Italians. A new suggestion relating to this passage has been offered by Reuss (Gesck. d. Schr. d. N. T. p. 436), "Is it not possible," he asks, "that Augustine may refer in this passage (written about the year 387) to a work of Jerome, viz., his version of Our S. T. Hexateuch, which Augustine elsewhere (in his letters Ep. xxviii, tom. ii, p. 61) to Jerome prefers to his making a new translation from the original? At any rate," he adds, "it is remarkable that Isidore of Spain (Etymol. vi, 8) characterizes the translation of Jerome (the Latin version which he names) as the Latin version (in clariorem. May one venture to suggest that he has taken this phrase from Augustine, regarding him as using it of Jerome. To this, however, it may be replied, that whilst it is not improbable that Isidore took the passage from Augustine, he may have done so without regarding Augustine's words as referring to any work of Jerome. That they do so refer seems to us very improbable.

An effort has been made to obtain a decision for this question from a collection of the extant remains of the Latin translations. But (Einleitung, s. N. T. iv, 387 sq.) has compared several passages found in the writings of the early Latin fathers with certain extant codices of the early Latin text, and, from the resemblance which these bear to each other, he argues that they have all been taken from one common translation. And using this common text he has concurred both before and since the time of Eichhorn (Wetstein, Hody, Semler, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf), but others have, on the other side, pointed to serious differences of rendering, which, in their judgment, indicate the existence of at least three distinct translations (Michaelis, Hug, De Wette, Bleek, etc.). As the evidence stands, it seems impossible either to hold to the existence of only one accredited Latin version before the time of Jerome, the corruption of which,
from various causes is sufficient to account for all the discrepancies to be found in the extant remains, or to maintain with certainty that there were several independent versions, the work of persons in different parts of the Latin Church. There is, however, a third supposition which may be advanced: There may at an early period, and probably in Africa, have been made a translation from the Bible from the vernacular, and this may have formed the groundwork of other translations, intended to be amended versions of the original. In this case a certain fundamental similarity would mark all these translations along with considerable variety; but the effort would be not to unmask or correct, but to unde-

igned corruption, but to purposed attempts, more or less skillfully directed, to produce a more adequate version. This supposition meets all the facts of the case, and so far has high probability in its favor. Proceeding upon it, we may further suppose that these different revised or amended translations might have their origin in different parts of the western world, and in this case the meaning of Augustine's statement in the passage (Cont. Faust. ii, 2) where he speaks of "codes aliarum regionum" becomes manifest. In this case, also, if these translations were retained (and there were inclined to retain it) in the famous passage above cited, it will indicate the revision prepared in Italy and used by the Italian churches, of which it is natural to suppose that it would be both more exact and more polished than the others, and with which Augustine would become familiar on his residence in Rome and Milan. See ITALIC VERSION.

2. Of this ancient Latin version in its various amended
forms, all of which has become customary to include under the general designation Itala, we have re-
mains partly in the citations of the Latin fathers, part-
ly in the Greeco-Latin codices, and partly in special MSS.
A copious collection from the first of these sources (which yet admits of being augmented) has been supplied by Sabatier, Bibliotheca SS. Latinae Vera antiqua seu Vetus Itala, etc., parumque repertorium potissimum (Remis, 1743, 8 vols. fol., ed. 2, 1749). For the Apocalypse we depend entirely on this source, namely, the quotations made by Primasius. The Greeco-Latin codices are the Conta-
bridgian or Codex Bezae, the Lausitan, the Claromontane, and the Boernerian. See MANUSCRIPTS. Of the known special codices containing portions of the N.T., the fol-
lowing may be noticed or collated:

1. Cod. Vercellensis, written apparently by Eusebius the Martyr in the 4th century. It embraces the four Gospels, though with frequent lacuna. It is mentioned by Mont-
ferrat, Codices Italice, p. 353, and has been edited by Blanchinus (Blanchin), in Scripturis qualis.

2. Cod. Smaragdus, found not to exist, see Pet. in Tert. Capit. 1740, 4 vols. fol.); previously, and still more carefully, by J. A. Iriel, SS. Evangeliorum Cod. S. Eusebii mons clarissimum, at antependia et antiquitatem, etc. (Mediolani, 1742, 2 parts.

3. In this codex the Gospels are arranged in the order Matthew, John, Luke (Lacazet, Mark). As a specimen of the style of this codex, and in order to show some of its parts, we are given the following passage (John iv, 45-59 from the edition of Iriel):

4. Cod. Veronaensis, a MS. of the 4th or 5th century, in the library at Verona, containing the Gospels, but with many lacunae, edited by Blanchin.

5. Cod. Brixiensis, of about the 6th century, at Brixiæ, in the province of Verona, also containing the four Gospels, with the exception of some parts of Mark: printed by Blanchin.

6. Cod. Carthusianus, a very ancient MS. from which many of the early portions of Matthew’s Gospel are quoted, etc. (Paris, 1806). The gospel appears also in Blanchin’s work, 1-99.
clam of the sacred text is very considerable. They afford important aid in determining the condition of the Greek text in the early centuries. This, which Bentley was the first to perceive, or at least to announce, has been fully recognised by Lachmann, Tregelles, and Tischendorf, though they have not all followed it out with equal discretion (see Tischendorf's strictures, Prolegomena, p. 381, etc.).

The general character of the Itala is close, literal adherence to the original, so as often to transgress the genius of the Latin language; its phraseology being marked by solecisms and improprieties which may be due to its having been originally put either in a remote region from the centre of classical culture, or among the more illiterate of the community. Thus Spong is rendered by saltarius, dafid arom by supernumere (e.g. "quanto ergo superponit homo ab ovo," Matt. xii, 12); proponitur by prosperare, somnus apertus by insomnium, etc.; and we have such constructions as "stellam quam viderent in orientem" (Matt. ii, 9); "ut ego veniens adorem ei" (Matt. ii, 8); "qui autem audientem" (ii, 9); "pressuris quibus sustinetis" (2 Thess. i, 4); habitavit in Capharnaum maritimam" (Matt. iv, 13); itam maritimam, "verbum audet et continuo cum gaudio accipit eum" (xiii, 20); dominaturn eorum, principiantur eorum" (xx, 25), etc. It must be borne in mind, however, that the current text was exposed to innumerable corruptions, and that we can hardly, from the specimens that have come down to us, frame a fair judgment of the state in which it was at first. One can hardly suppose that by any Latin-speaking people, the following version, which is that presented by the Colbertine MS. of Col. ii, 18, 19, could have been accepted as idiomatic, or even intelligible: "Non vos conscitati volens in hominibus et religione angelorum, quos vidi ambulans, sine causa infatius eum carnis sum, et non tenens caput Christum, ex quo omne corpus communextr et conductione subministratur et proventum crescit in incrementum Dei." If this be (to borrow the remark of Eichhorn from whose Einleitung in N. T. IV, 834, we have taken these specimens) "verborum tenax, where is the "perspicuitas sententiae" of which Augustine speaks?

II. Hieronymum or Vulgate Version. See Vulgate.

III. Later Latin Versions.—Both before and since the invention of printing attempts have been made to present, through the medium of Latin, a more correct version of the original text than that found in the ancient Latin versions. Of these we have space only for a bare catalogue. (See notices of the authors under their names in their work.)

1. Adam Esten, a monk of Norwich, and cardinal (died 1397), seems to have been the first who thought of a new version; he translated the O.T., with the exception of the Psalter, from the Hebrew; his work is lost (Hody, p. 440; Le Long—Masch ii, 3, p. 482).

2. Giornorio Guaitetti, who died in 1498, began a translation of the Bible, of which he finished only the Psalms and the N.T.; this is lost (Tiraboschi, Storia della Lett. Ital. vi, 2, p. 109 sq.).

3. Erasmus translated the N.T., and published the translation along with the Greek text (Basil. 1516, fol.).

4. Th. Bengel issued his translation of the N.T. in 1554; it appeared along with the Vulgate version. Four other editions followed during the author's lifetime, and these present the Greek text as well as the Vulgate and Beza's own translation; many other editions have since followed. Beza aimed at presenting a just rendering of the original, without departing more than necessary from the Vulgate. His renderings are sometimes affected by his theological views.

5. Sanctus Pagninus, a learned Dominican from Lucer, produced a translation of the whole Bible (Lugdun. 1529, 4to., and Colen, 1641, fol.). Later editions of this work, with considerable alterations, appeared: one, edited by the famous Mich. Servetus, under the name of Villa- novanus (Lugd. 1542); another, revised and edited by R. Stephen (Paria, 1557, 2 vols. folio; with a new title, 1577). This latter has been often reprinted. The version of Arias Montanus, printed in the Antwerp, Paris, and London polyglots, is a revision of this version.


7. Sebastian Munster added to his edition of the Hebrew Scriptures a Latin translation (Basel, 1554—58, and 1556, 2 vols. folio). This is not faithful without being slavishly literal, and is executed in clear and correct Latin. Portions of it have been published separately.

8. The Zürich version, begun by Leo Judae, and completed by Billander and others (1458, folio, and in 4to and 8vo in 1444). This version is much esteemed for its ease and fluency; it is correct, but somewhat paraphrase. It has frequently been reprinted, there is one edition by R. Stephen (Paris, 1545).

9. Sebastian Castello produced, in what he intended to be the perfect Latin translation of the O. and N. T. (Basel. 1551, again 1573, and at Leipsic, 1738).

10. The version of Junius and Tremellius appeared at Frankfort in parts between 1575 and 1579, and in a collected form in 1579, 2 vols. folio. Tremellius took the principal part in this work, his son-in-law Junius rather assisting in the translating and revising. The work with him Tremellius translated the N.T. from the Syriac, and this, along with Beza's translation, appeared in an edition of Tremellius's Bible, published at London in 1586. The translation of Piscator is only an amended edition of that of Junius and Tremellius, and is much esteemed for its scholarly exactness, though in some cases its adherence to the original is over close.

11. Thomas Malvenda, a Spanish Dominican, engaged in a "nova ex Hebrew translation," which he did not live to finish. What he accomplished was published along with his commentaries (Ludg. 1650, 5 vols. folio), but the extreme barbarism of his style has caused his labors to pass into oblivion.

12. Cocceius has given a new translation of most of the Biblical books in his commentaries, Opera Omnia (tom. i-vi, Amsterdam, 1701).

13. Sebastian Schmid executed a translation of the O. and N. Test, which appeared after his death in 1596, 4to.; it has been repeatedly reprinted, and is esteemed for its scholarly exactness, though in some cases its adherence to the original is over close.

14. The version of Jean le Clerc (Clericus) is found along with his commentaries; it appeared in portions from 1610.


16. A new translation of the O. T. was undertaken by J. A. Dathe; it appeared between 1775-1817. At one time much admired, this version has of late ceased perhaps to receive the attention to which it is entitled.


20. H. A. Schott and F. Winer commenced a translation of the Bible, of which only the first volume has appeared, containing the Pentateuch (Alton, et Lipiae, 1810). Schott has also issued a translation of the N.T., with considerable alterations made by him from the Vulgate. This has passed into four editions, of which the last (1839) was superintended by Baumgarten-Crulius.

21. Rosenmiller (in his Scholia in V. T. Lipiae, 1788 sq.). Translations of the N.T. have also been issued by F. A. Ad. Zacharie Lips. 1823, and 1837, 4to.; See Carcopo, Crit. Sacr., p. 707 sqq.; Fritzsche, art. Vulgata, in Herzog's Kaysc. ; Bible of every Land, p. 210, etc.

IV. Literature.—Simon, Hist. Crit. des Versions du N.
LATITUardinarians (267)

Tet. (1690); Hody, De Bibliorum testibus originibus, editionis Graeci et Latinae Vulgatae, Libri iv (Oxford, 1786, folio); Martainan, Hieronymi Opp. (Paris, 1688); Banchinus, Vindicatio Commentii Sca. Vulg. Lat. ed. (Rome, 1740); Riiger, Krit. Gesch. der Vulgata (Salzburg, 1820); L. van Esse, Pragmatismus-Krit. Gesch. der Vulgata (Tib. 1834); Wiseman, Two Letters on 1 John v, repr. in his Essays, vol. I; Dietel, Gesch. d. Alem. Text. (Jena, 1860); Ritondale, in the later volumes of his commentaries, 1687, 1690, 1670. See also the Introductions of Eichhorn, Michaelis, Hug, De Wette, Haevernick, Bleek, etc.; Davidson, Biblical Criticism; Reuss, Gesch. der Heil. Schrif. N. T. sec. 448-457; Darlington, Cyclopedia, p. 80. See Van- son.

Latitudinarians, a name given to those divines who in the 17th century professed indifference to what they considered the small matters in dispute between Puritans and High-Churchmen, and, looking at theology from a philosophical point of view, laid more stress on classical philosophy than on Christian theology. They attempted to compromise the differences between Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents. Their views were a result of the changes then going on in the religious world, and of the influence of philosophy. The doctrinal Puritans had already taken a position midway between these two extremes, and these five differences into the schism. Abbot, Carlton, Hall, and others were the chief leaders of that party. They attached no importance to externals, and prized practical piety far above all matters of form: and, though themselves attached to the Protestant Episcopal Church, they allowed others to differ from them. As liberal, but differing from them in doctrine, we find among the Eaton scholars Hailes, who, although an opponent of Laud's High-Churchism, was in dogmatics an Arminian; and Chillingworth, who desired to reduce Christianity to a few essential practical principles. In the midst of the struggle, and the rapid changes of religious views and systems, the moral conception of Christianity was daily gaining ground; on the other hand, theology was unable to withstand the influence of philosophy. The regeneration which the latter had experienced at the hands of Bacon and Des Cartes obliged theology to review its foundations in the light of philosophy. The school of Latitudinarians was fostered by Maurice, Moral and metaphysical Philosophy, in the Encyclopædia, vol. ii, 656; Stewart, Essay on Metaphysic Philosophy, p. 58, 61, notes, and 246, note O). Thus Platonic philosophy and theology were introduced into Cambridge by Cutbush (q. v.) and Henrietta More (q. v.). Men of these views (among others, also, John Smith, Worthington, bishop Wilkins, and Theophrus (tale), and especially the more moderate among them, were looked down upon with contempt by the more ambitious ones in power, and, as they would not follow the selfish tendencies of the times, were called Latitudinarians. In the days of the Commonwealth they were reproached with Arminianism and prelatism. But when the High-Church party came again into power with the Restoration, and its old adversaries tried to use for their former attacks by all means in their power, the moderate party was accused of want of loyalty and of opposition to the Church. Whoever refused to submit to the High-Church, or did not take sides with the strict Puritans against it, were called Latitudinarians. "That name," says a contempor ary, "is the man of straw who in the name of the church is proposed to the people to be killed in their stead in order to set up for want of a real adversary—a very convenient name wherewith to defame any one who we may wish to injure." As the name came thus to be applied to a number of persons who had no connection whatever with the party which it designated at first, nothing better may be said of it than that it is a designation used so as to attach to persons of any religion, the appellation soon came to be regarded as equivalent to Socinian, Deist, and Atheist. As regards the original Latitudinarians, they retained the liturgy, rites, and organization of the English Episcopal Church. They considered a general liturgy as a necessary ground of unity, and often the fanatical prayers of the Puritans, and they considered the English liturgy as the best, on account of its solemn earnestness and its character of primitive simplicity. The form of public worship they looked upon as a higher form of observance for the Roman Church and that of the conventicles. Ceremonies against they deemed useful for the purpose of edification, and episcopacy they cherished as the most correct and evangelical form of Church government, differing both from what they regarded as the tyrannical authority of Scotch Presbyterianism and from the anarchy of the Independents. In point of doctrine they also retained the confession of the English Church, which they considered as according thoroughly with the Scriptures. The commentators of the primitive Church were the guides by which they wished reason to be governed, and reason they recognised as the source of our knowledge of revealed and natural religion, which agree on all points. The fundamental principles of true religion are freedom of the will, the universality of the redemption by the death of Christ, the sufficiency of divine grace; and that the redemption is brought into the world through the testimony of Scripture, sometimes by the unvarying testimony of the primitive Church, and again by reason only. In theology, the oldest views are always found to be the most reasonable. Nothing that is false in philosophy is true in theology; but what God has united, let no man put asunder. Natural sciences have made immense progress, and philosophy and theology cannot remain behind. True science cannot be put down any more than the light of the sun or the motion of the ocean. It is the best weapon against atheism and superstition (comp. Smith [John], Discourses (ed. 1821), ii, p. 19). Thus the Latitudinarians took at once for their basis science and toleration. They taught respect for the Church by their submission to it, defended it by their learning and activity, and hoped to win over the Dissenters by their moderation, and the Presbyterians by their accommodating spirit, thus preventing them from anarchy. This is the character given to the Latitudinarians by one of their contemporaries in a work entitled A brief account of the New Sect of Latitudinari- ans (1652). It is remarkable how many ideas of the school of Latitudinarians still remain in the modern Presbytery. Thus, the doctrine of the Necessity of the New Gospel (1690), declared all Christian doctrines, except those of repentance and faith, non-essential. For this he was attacked by Jurie in his La Religion du Latitudinaire, and vainly attempted to defend the orthodoxy of his views in his Latitudinaris orthodosus (1697). The attempts made by the Latitudinarians in 1689-1699 to reconcile the Episcopalians and Presbyterian leaders failed utterly. Latitudinarianism was subsequently identified still more with indiscrimination, and seldom appeared in theological works. It is only in quite modern times, when especially the influence of human theology, that this tendency has been brought to light again in the Broad-Church party, which forms a sort of medium between the High and Low Church. By their opponents the Broad-Churchmen are, however, designated as Latitudinarians or Indifferentists. They consider these the difference of the Church, and insists that it should be compared with their essential unity. The watchword of the party is love and toleration. For doctrines, they hold to those of incarnation and atonement, conversion by grace and justification. They coincide with the Low-Church in condemning the ordo missae and the Church of England liturgy, but taking exceptions here and there to miracles, and with the High-Church in believing that man shall be
judged according to his works. In opposition to the doctrine of the invisible Church of the evangelical Church, they lay great stress on the doctrine of a visible Church. They take what is good anywhere, as well in the Roman as in the evangelical churches. They aim at nothing less than the accomplishment of a religious and moral reformation, and seek to occupy in our day the place held at the beginning of this century by the evangelical party. This end they strive to attain partly by their science and partly by their practice, and thus distinguish among themselves between the theoists and the praxeists. They derive great comfort from the high scientific attainments of many of their members, and try to advance the education of the masses. The founders of this school were S. T. Coleridge and Thomas Arnold, and its most eminent followers were Hare, Whately, Maurice, Kingsley, Stanley, Alford, Conybeare, and Howson. About one seventh of the English clergy and a number of bishops belong to it. See Coneybeare, Church Parties; Schaff, Zat. u. Parteien d. engl. Staate-Kirche in Deutsch, Zeitschrift, 1856, No. 17; Edward Churton, The Latinidades from 1671-1767 (Lond, 1861, 8vo); Amer. Presb. Rev. 1861, April, art. viii; Westminster Rev. 1854, January; Bib. Stor., 1863, p. 855; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought; Gass, Dogmengeschicht. iii (see Index); Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. of England (since the Restoration), i, 262 sq., 341 sq., 359 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encykl. viii, 210; Blunt, Dict. Doctr. and Hist. Theol. p. 399 sq. and his Key to the Knowledge of Ch. (Lond, 1859), p. 97 sq. On the present Church Board of England, see Miss Cobbe, Broken Lights (London ed. p. 63), and Hurst's History of Rationalism, Eng. edition (greatly enlarged), p. 423-438.

Latomius, Jacobus (Jaques Masson), a celebrated Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Cambrai, in Hainault, about the middle of the 15th century, and was educated at the University of Paris. In 1430 he became a resident of Louvain, where he was made a professor of theology. He died in 1454. A zealous disciple of scholasticism, he ardently opposed the Reforma[...](text cut off)

Latter-Day Saints. See Mormons.

Lattise stands in the Auth. Vers. for the following Hebrew words in certain passages: 1. סִּֽבְּאָבָּה (sebabah), so called from darkness a room, a latticed opening (as like a window), throughout which a light enters; at the same time screens the inmates, especially females, from exterior sight (Judg. v, 28; “casement,” Prov. vii. 6). See Window. 2. עָפָּרָה (charakkim, prop. nets; Sept. צַעָּרָה), the net-work or lattices of a window (Cant. ii. 9. 3. עָפָּרָה (seba'ah), an interlacing), the latticed balustrade before a window or balcony (2 Kings i. 2; elsewhere a net or “sare,” Job xviii. 8; “net-work,” etc., around the capitals of columns). The lattice window is much used in warm Eastern countries. It frequently projects from the wall of the building, and is formed of fretted work, or of highly ornamental, portions of which are hinged, so that they may be opened or shut at pleasure. The object of the contrivance is to keep the apartments cool.
by intercepting the direct rays of the sun, while, at the same
time, the air is permitted to circulate freely through the
trellis openings. Through the lat-
tice the mother of Sinera and the mys-
tical bridgroom are represented as
looking. Through this Athaziah fell
and injured himself, and it is no
reason to adopt an old idea that he
to fell through a grating in the floor.
The words in these three texts, how-
ever, are different each time in the
original, though it is now impossible to
determine with certainty whether the
change is due to the competence of the
scribes, or whether there were certain differences of construction indicated by
each of them." See House.

Latzembock, Henry de, a native of Bohemia,
lived in the latter part of the 14th and first part of the
15th centuries. He was a friend of the reformer John
Hus, whom, in connection with two other friends, he
was appointed to conduct in safety to the Council of
Constance. He stood very high in the favor of the
emperor Sigismund, and appealed to him in behalf of the
reformer. After the condemnation and burning of Hus
he was himself suspected of heresy, was summoned be-
fore the council, and required to adjure the doctrines of
his friend and approver of his condemnation, and in this
connection he complied, being more intent on his own
safety and advancement at court than anxious for reform.
After this period little information concerning him is
attainable.—Gillet, Life and Times of John Hus, i, 352—
354, 386; ii, 28, 260.

Laud, William, the celebrated archbishop under
James I and Charles I, was born at Reading, the prin-
cipal town of Berkshire, the 29th of July, 1573, of humble but
respectable parentage. In 1589 he entered St. John's
College, Oxford, graduated with distinction in 1594,
and proceeded A.M. in 1598, when he was appointed
reader in grammar. In January, 1600, he was ordained
deacon, and priest in 1601. The Calvinistic and Puri-
tan tendency was strong in Oxford at that time; but
Laud's immediate instructors and friends had been on
the other side; his natural instincts inclined him to
High-Church views and high ritualistic observances;
he saw, too, that the court was on that side, and that a
powerful reaction against the Calvinistic ascendency
was already in progress. Abbott (afterwards primas
and Primate) had succeeded Dr. Holland and Reynolds
as theological professors in the university; but Laud,
being appointed in 1602 to read the Maye divinity lec-
ture in St. John's College, did not hesitate to attack Ab-
ott's doctrine of the invisible church. The latter had,
the latter had traced the visible Church down, in the
Middle Ages, through the Berengarians, the Albigenses
or Waldensians, the Wicklifites, and the Hussites, to
Luther and the Reformation; Laud traced it boldly and
exclusively through the Church of Rome. They did not
see that exclusion was the error of both parties. In
1603 James succeeded to the throne of England, and,
greatly to the disappointment and disgust of the Pur-
tans, but to the unsatisfied demand of Laud and his
friends, he openly took sides with the highest hierar-
chical party in the English Church, early adopting as
his pet motto, "No bishop, no king." Then followed the
"Millenary petition" and the famous conference at
Hampton Court, which resulted in the king's proclama-
tion of "uniformity in discipline and worship." This
year Laud was chosen proctor for the University of Ox-
ford, and in the same year he was appointed chaplain
to the earl of Devonshire. In 1604 he took his degree of
B.D., and in the thesis which he presented on the
occasion he maintained the absolute necessity of bap-
tism to salvation, and of diocesan bishops to the exist-
cence of the Church. In 1610, the following year, Laud
committed one of the most unfortunate, though oft-re-
peated faults of his life, in solemnizing the marriage of
his patron, the earl of Devonshire, with lady Rich, who,
acusteric fallacy and one-sidedness, "the state of the times rendered such instructions necessary; and the con-

ernation of the Puritan faction, when they were made

know at Oxford, is a proof of the wisdom of the monarch

and his advisers in thus placing a timely restraint on

the puritan partyism."

James had already (1610–12) re-established episcopacy

in Scotland, and with a special view to effect a more per-

fect uniformity in the two churches, he set out in 1617

to visit his northern kingdom for the first time since his

accession to the English throne, and ordered Laud to ac-

company him. The object of the visit was to substi-

tute in the Scottish Church the Episcopal liturgy in

stead of the Presbyterian form of worship; and, though

the Presbyterians prayed that they might be preserved

from the same, Laud and some of the royal chaplains

courage James to persist in regarding the mass of the

nation as a set of "factious enthusiasts," and to obsti-
nately adhere to his purpose of imposing upon these

people his own form of religion in the name of "the

Church." James and Laud, with a little knot of arch-
bishops and bishops who had been consecrated to their

office, not in Scotland, but at Westminster, were "the
n Church," and the Scottish nation was "the faction"—a

mistake big with sad and fearful consequences. James

now propounded the famous Five Articles, which he

subjected first to the assembly called together at St.

Andrew's Church, Westminster, on January 22, 1618,

where, through the indefatigable exertions of the bishops,

and the shrewd and cunning management of the king, the

Five Articles were confirmed. These articles were rig-

idly enforced, but without the desired effect. The Scot-

nish "rabble" were too "factious" to submit to a religion

manufactured for them and forcibly imposed upon them

by others. It was left for James's successor to continue

his father's design, but with still worse success; and it

was reserved for Laud to take a more dominant part in

the business, and from a higher position, at a subsequent

period. At first, though Lillas inquisitor, he was in-

ducted into the rectory of Bustoock, which he had taken

in exchange for Norton; and, arriving at Oxford, he

learned with pleasure that his exertions had effectually

restrained the "Puritan enthusiasm" at Gloucester.

In 1620 Laud was at length raised to the episcopate,

being made bishop of St. David's, in spite of the strenu-

ous opposition of archbishop Abbot, as his friends assert,

and through the earnest solicitations of the duke of

Buckingham and of the lord-keeper Williams, then

bishop of Lincoln, as is commonly alleged. Before his

consecration, Laud, much distrusted, re-

signed the presidency of St. John's College, because,

though such things were often winked at, he could

not hold it without a violation of the statute. In his

primary visitation of his diocese, he set things "in or-

der" according to his peculiar views of what constituted

the essentials of "the Church's" religion. He also built

a chapel for himself, which he proceeded to fit up to his

own taste as a model, and consecrated it with sundry

extraordinary ceremonies.

In 1622 Laud's dispute with the Jesuit Fisher took

place, which was, perhaps, the most mortifying perfor-

mance of his life, evincing extensive knowledge and no

mean ability. Yet, dealing with the controversy from

the high Anglican point of view, it fails to cover the

whole Protestant position, and is now almost forgotten,

being a document of much less breadth and historical

interest than some still older defences of the English

Church, as, for example, Jewell's Apology.

About this time Laud became chaplain to the duke of

Buckingham, and between them there grew up an in-

imate and lasting friendship. While Buckingham was

absent with the Queen in Spain, Laud was in corre-

spondence with him, and seems to have charged him

with the care of his interests at court during his ab-

sence; for, observing or suspecting some movements of

the lord-keeper Williams towards undermining the duke

in the royal favor, he immediately informed his patron

in Spain of the apprehended danger, who accordingly

hastened home to protect himself. Hence arose a de-

termined hostility of the duke towards Williams, and

Williams accused Laud of ingratitude, while Laud, on

the other hand, charged him with duplicity and selfish-

ness. Externally the duke's enmity was judged of

more value than the bishop's, and the breach ripened

into a rooted enmity between the two churchmen.

Laud chose to consider himself insulted by Abbot and

Williams because his name was not inserted in the

High Commission. He complained to Buckingham

for-wardly of this exclusion. In 1624 James died, and

Laud lamented him with demonstrations of the ut-

most sorrow. On the first day of March, the year after

the death of James, Laud received his appointment to

preach before Charles at Westminster at the opening of

the first Parliament; and the king, upon the advice of

bishops Laud and Andrews, prohibited, in the Convoca-

tion which met at the same time with Parliament, the

discussion of the five predestinarian articles of the Synod

of Dort, "on account of the number of Calvinists ad-

mitted under Abbot's auspices into the Low-Court; On

the Sunday after the marriage of Charles and Henri-

rietta Maria, Laud again preached before the king and

the House of Lords. The king had summoned this Par-

liament to procure supplies for the prosecution of his

wars; but they chose to look after the righting of their

domestic wrongs. The king therefore, after proceeding to cite and condemn a certain Mr. Montague for

preaching what they judged heretical and unconsti-

tutional doctrine, Laud immediately flew to Monta-

gue's protection, and, at his remonstrance, the king re-

voked the proceedings of Parliament, and prorogued

them to Oxford. Parliament was no more pleasant at

Oxford than it had been at Westminster, and in a pet

Charles suddenly dissolved it.

Meanwhile Laud was continually rising in the king's
esteeem and confidence, while Williams was removed

from his duties, and his influence declined. Laud was

indestructible in his labors in preaching and purging the

Church, refusing to ordain any whom he found to be

unqualified for the sacred office, according to his view

of the proper qualifications. He was ap-

pointed by the king to supply the place of the now

disgraced Williams, the dean of Westminster, in the

ceremony of the coronation. He here had official charge

of the regalia, and is accused of having placed a crucifix

upon the "altar," and tampered with the coronation

oath; but of this accusation not much was ever made.

By the king's appointment, Laud again presided at

the coronation of the king of Portugal, which assembled

immediately after the coronation. This Parliament like-

wise proceeded at once to appoint a committee on re-

ligion. They also impeached the duke of Buckingham,

and refused to do any other business until his case was

disposed of. The king, finding them resolved on the

ruin of his minister—and it is to be observed it was the

House of Lords and not the House of Commons before

which he was to be tried—to save his favorite, was com-

pelled to dissolve his second Parliament. Unquestion-

ably Laud was deeply and anxiously interested in the

cause of his patron and his church, and on some show of

evidence, with having written the speech of Bucking-

ham in his own defence, and the speech of the king in

Buckingham's behalf.

In 1626 Laud was translated to the see of Bath and

Wells—a richer bishopric than that of St. David's. Both

of Charles's Parliaments had refused to vote the

subsidiary to supply his pecuniary wants, and he re-

solved to collect the money without parliamentary

authority. With this view he resorted to the expedi-

ent of "turning the pulpits," and Laud was instrumen-
t for it. He was directed to prepare letters to be issued to the two archbishops and their

suffragans, through them to the inferior clergy, and by

them to the people, persuading them to pay cheerfully

the taxes necessarily imposed on them. 'The in-


LAUD

actions," as Laud informs us, "were partly political and partly ecclesiastical," and were to be published in every parish. Laud engaged in the duty with his wonted alacrity, and almost immediately upon receiving the royal commands he had the instructions prepared. His apologists admit that it is a difficult matter to justify these instructions, "because they affect dangerous proceedings, which, when once set on foot, would be attended with the worst consequences;" it was no less than undertaking to tax the people without the consent of their representatives. By Laud's prompt and efficient management of this affair he was still further advanced in the king's good opinion, and was rewarded with the appointment of dean of Westminster, and the promise of the primacy in the event of Abbots's decease. In enforcing Laud's "instructions," doctors Sibthorpe and Manwaring preached sermons in which they maintained the extreme doctrines of passive obedience, and which, after Laud's revision, were published. Abbott, too, had refused to license Sibthorpe's sermon, for which factionuous procedure a commission of sequestration was issued against him, and the administration of his metropolitan functions was put into the hands of Laud, in conjunction with four other bishops. In the same year the papists committed a new outrance, and a distribution of sundry bishops and bishopsrics, arrangements were initiated to make a vacancy in the see of London, that Laud might at once be translated to that rich and powerful bishopric. Meanwhile Charles had been compelled by his necessities to try the third Parliament, although it was well understood that Laud as well as Buckingham would be thereby endangered. But, to propagate the popular feeling, several commissions were made, and, among other things, Abbott was restored to his functions, and received at court. Again Laud preached the opening sermon, and the king concluded his speech by exhorting Parliament to follow the good advice which Laud had given them. But the Commons determined to proceed in business in their own way. They first drew up and passed the famous Petition of Right. They then presented a remonstrance of grievances against the duke of Buckingham, not omitting to mention Laud in their indictment. They cited Dr. Manwaring to their bar, ordered him to be severely punished, and his sermons to be burnt. The king procured Parliament, ignored the complaints against Buckingham, restored Manwaring, and, successively giving him various livings, at length promoted him to the deanship of Worcester, and then to the bishopric of St. David's, made Sibthorpe prebendary of Peterborough, and translated Laud to the see of London, July 13, 1629. On the death of Buckingham, which took place on the 14th, the king was so satisfied that the king was pleased to assure Laud that he intended to intrust him with his confidence in Buckingham's room. At the examination of Felton, the assassin of Buckingham, before the privy council, the man admitted the deed, but denied the privity of any other parties. Laud, in his eagerness to improve this presented opportunity for reaching and crushing his enemies, threatened him with the rack if he would not disclose his accomplices. But, upon the judges being asked whether Felton could be lawfully put to the rack, they returned for answer that by the laws of England he could not. It was in this interval, too, that Laud, "in order to put a stop to the disturbances which arose from the preaching of the abstruse and mystical doctrines of predestination," as his friend aver, "procured a royal declaration to be prefixed to the Laud Articles," prohibiting such preaching. Sir Thomas Wentworth, afterwards Earl of Strafford, was gained over from the popular party to the king's side by largesses of royal favor, and he and Laud immediately commenced a friendship which ever after remained inviolate.

When the length Parliament again assembled, the Commons opened with a remonstrance upon the alleged infractions of the Petition of Right, and then turned their attention to their religious grievances. Excited to great exasperation by the king's declaration which Laud had procured, they passed a solemn vote against it, claiming, protesting, and vowing that the current and general exposition of the articles, "which had been established by act of Parliament," had ever been the same as their own. In the debate, Sir John Eliot denounced the bishops as "bishops without Bishop," and the courtiers of the courtly sound in religion. Witness," said he, "the two bishops, Laud and Nelle, who were complained of at the last meeting of Parliament. I apprehend much fear that, should we be in their power, we may be in danger to have our religion overthrown. Some of them are masters of ceremonies, and they have introduced those enmities into the Church." The House resumed the cases of Montague, Manwaring, and Sibthorpe, to all of whom the king had granted pardons and preferments. Laud and Nelle were the grand objects of attack, being accused of having procured those pardons. "In Laud and Nelle," declared Sir John Eliot, "is centred all the danger we fear," and he proposed to petition the king to leave those bishops to "the justice of the House." Oliver Cromwell, too, distinguished himself in this discussion; the preferment of Manwaring especially "excited his wrath," and, if these things were not bettered, the future Protector, "what may we expect?" At length the king, exasperated, endeavored to adjourn the House by royal command. This led to a scene of great excitement and confusion, and finally the third Parliament of Charles's reign was dissolved. Parliaments were now to be abolished, and Laud was prime minister. He must be held to all the responsibility attaching to such a position at such a time. He presided especially over the affairs of England, the duke of Hamilton over those of Scotland, and Wentworth over those of Ireland. In his ecclesiastical administration, Laud's friends commonly claim for him the character of toleration and liberty, in the face of the fact that, having advised with Harrel, bishop of York, he drew up certain articles which, under the royal authority, were immediately dispatched to archbishop Abbot, requiring him and his suffragans in brief) to suppress the preaching of the Puritans, to note all absentee's from the prescribed public prayers, and to render an account in the premises on the 2d of January every year. Early in 1630 Laud was chosen chancellor of the University of Oxford. In the same year he also enjoyed the honor of officiating at the baptism of the infant prince, afterwards Charles II, although this distinction belonged by usage to the archbishop of Canterbury. Laud was now in the full tide of prosperity, and it was thought he could stand in his place. Did the Puritans undertake to buy up the improperizations of Church livings, that they might have the disposal of them for their lecturers, Laud had them punished for their impertinence, and their purchases confiscated to the king. Did they presume to preach or publish their peculiar tenets at Oxford or in Ireland, Laud had them expelled or silenced. Were any bishops or deansers vacant, Laud saw that they were filled with the right sort of churchmen. He enlarged St. John's College with a new quadrangle. He repaired St. Paul's Cathedral. He took cognizance of the chapels and chaplains of English congregations abroad, and of the congregations or churches of foreigners in England, and reduced them all to conformity, or placed the members of the latter under the strictest surveillance, taking away the children, and burdening the parents with all the disadvantages of alienage. He urged the Scottish bishops, if they made any change in their liturgy, to adopt that of the Church of England without any variation; and the new liturgy which was drawn up by those bishops was submitted to his final revision. On the king's visit to Scotland, Laud, at the king's bidding, was made a member of the Scotch Privy Council, and preached before the king, in the chapel royal in Holyrood House, on "the utility of conformity."
At length, on the 4th of August, 1633, archbishop Abbot died; on the 6th Laud was promoted by the king to the primacy, and on the 19th of September was formally translated to this, the long-desired goal of his ambition. At the same time he was offered a cardinal’s hat by certain emissaries of the pope, which, without betraying either astonishment or indignation, or disturbance of any kind, he respectfully declined “till Rome should be otherwise than it then was”; and before his enthronement he was elected chancellor of the University of Dublin.

In his metropolitan chair his first act was to issue many titular acts for candidates for ordination, so as more effectually to shut out Puritan preachers and lecturers. The next was to revive and extend the king’s declaration concerning lawful sports on Sundays. The archbishop now proceeded upon his metropolitan visitations, and he made thorough work of it; for all Puritanism he was a perfect “root and branch” man. But one great business and burden with him was to see that the communion-tables were placed altar-wise, railed in, and approached always with the prescribed bows and obeisances, it being assumed that thus, and thus only, could the proper reverence be preserved in the Church. His old patron, bishop Williams, he suspended for contumacy. He busied himself earnestly in improving the revenues of the poor clergy of London and the poorer clergy of Ireland. He procured a new charter for the University of Dublin, another for Guildhall, and the adoption of the Thirty-nine Articles, instead of those of Lambeth, by the Irish Church. Indeed, through his intimacy with Wentworth, the lord deputy, and his chancellorship of the Dublin University, he seems, as prime minister and archbishop of Canterbury, to have had much more control of the affairs of the Irish Church than her own primate, Usher, or any or all of her bishops and archbishops. Civil appointments, also, were accumulated upon Laud. He was not only prime minister, privy counsellor in England and in Scotland, member of the courts of Star Chamber and High Commission, but he was also appointed a member of the committee of trade, and a commissioner of the Treasury, and placed on the foreign committee. He procured the new Caroline Charter for Oxford, and continued his munificent gifts. He took especial care of the restoration of the cathedrals and of the Cathedral service, with all the old accustomed appointments and ceremonies.

Laud, like Wolsey when in favor with Henry VIII, had reached the highest pinnacle of his greatness. All honor, power, and splendor seemed to converge towards him. All his projects were crowned with successful results. It was Laud here, it was Laud there, it was Laud everywhere. He had three kingdoms well in hand. Church and State lay submissive at his feet. But the scene was soon to change. He was disporting himself upon the bosom of a volcano, whose vents-bodes he was hoping to keep stopped up with his puny engineering. The quakings and rumblings of the approaching eruption were already increasing. In the year 1637, “some factious and refractory men had determined to establish their enthusiasm on the shores of America, amidst the forests and lakes.” These emigrants without a royal license was thought expedient to restrain, “because of the many idle and obstinate humors whose only or principal end was to live without the reach of authority.” Eight ships in the Thames were stopped by an order of Council, and no clergyman was allowed to leave the country without the approbation of the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of London. Among those intended emigrants Oliver Cromwell is said to have been thus stopped. The symptoms of dissatisfaction and uneasiness were drawing towards a crisis, and some prosecutions of this same year accelerated the national calamities. The first case was the trial of Pynne, Bastwick, and Burton in the Star Chamber. Pynne was a graduate of Oxford, and a barrister of Lincoln’s Inn; Bastwick left Cambridge before taking his degree, and, having travelled nine years on the Continent, took the degree of M.D. at Padua; Burton was A.M. and B.D. at Oxford, and had been clerk of the closet to the Prince of Wales, and rector of St. Matthew’s, Friday Street, London. Prynne, for his Histrio-Mastix, had already been condemned to pay a fine of £300, to be expelled for a term of years, and to lose his licence to print. He now came to stand in the pillory at Westminster and at Cheapside, and at each place to have an ear cut off, to have his book burnt before his face, and to remain a prisoner for life. In the execution of the sentence it is said that Prynne was nearly.Another violent scene of Puritanism was about to be opened, with the book of his book. From this, however, the irrepressible Prynne, as soon as he could procure writing materials, continued audaciously, and with amazing industry, to send forth his pamphlets against his persecutors; and now the doctor Bastwick and the rector Burton had joined the lawyer in the fray. These pamphlets were no doubt inseparable from extramural, coarse and violent in their language; they were naturally branded as seditious and seditious by the other side. But it is to be remembered that some authors were persecuted fanatics; and it is a better excuse for them to say that the controversial language of their writings is always a means of exposing the truth; and thus to say that the punishments of the age were barbarous. The use of epithets is largely a matter of taste and fashion; but humanity itself, wherever it exists, is shocked at the sight of torture, and cruelty, and blood. All this while three of his pamphlets were condemned a ninepenny fine of £600, to lose the remainder of his ears in the pillory, to be branded on both cheeks with the initials of slanderous libeler, and to be immured for life in Caernarvon Castle. Bastwick and Burton were to pay the same fine, to lose their ears in the pillory, and to be imprisoned for life in separate castles. On this occasion, Laud, who was a member of the court, made a long speech. As he had everything under his own control, he had no temptation to use violent language. He assumed an air of studied coolness and dignity. Having descanted upon the merits of his own immaculate administration in Church and State, and set forth in strong colors the dangerous and abominable character of factious and sedulous libeling, he added, “But because the business hath some reflection upon myself, I shall forbear to ensure them, and leave them to God’s mercy and the king’s justice.” That is to say, having fully given his views, he would not cast his formal vote in the case, but, knowing full well what the decision, yes, the “unanimous” decision of the judges would be, he concludes his speech thus: “I give all your lordships hearty thanks for your noble patience, and your just and sound sentence to the men, and your unanimous dislike of them and defence of the Church.” Who can doubt that Prynne was right in afterwards declaring that Laud was the cause and contriver of the sentence before it was given, and that he approved and thanked the lords for it when it was given? The three victims underwent their “punishment” (as Laud’s friends delight to call it) with the most astonishing heroism. Such “punishment” of such men, however ignominious or degrading it was meant to be, could never elevate the dignity nor strengthen the position of the party that gave it. The subjects in no degree were supported by the sympathies of an immense mass of the people, as well as by their own courage or obstinacy, their religious principle or fanaticism. No wonder that libels against the archbishop were multiplied and intensified, and that his victims were honored with the approbation of his adversaries in popular favor. It was found necessary, in order to remove them out of the reach of their friends, to transfer them from the prisons to which they had been confined to other castles in the Channel islands.

Having now seen the leaders of the maligna faction very few of the “punishments” lasted out of the way. Laud had the pleasure of having his early patron, bishop Williams—against whom he seems to have nursed a rancorous grudge, as though fearing that one
day he might be a dangerous rival—arraigned before him in the Star Chamber, at first on the old charge of violating civil authorities in Scotland and after this of suborning a witness; and, having again delivered himself of a long and dignified speech, magnifying the enormity of the crime of subornation of perjury, especially in a clergyman and a bishop, and at the same time protest ing his personal friendliness, he gracefully leaves the accused to the tender mercies of a court thus "tuned," who sentenced him to pay a fine of $10,000, to be imprisoned during the king's pleasure, and to be suspended from all his offices, preferments, and functions.

Upon Laud's recommendation, a decree was passed by the Star Chamber in 1637 for restraining the printing of books. The provisions of the edict were sufficiently severe. It limited the number of master printers under penalty of whipping; it forbade the printing of books without a license from the archbishop or the bishop of London, or their chaplains, or from the chancellors or vice-chancellors of the universities. It prohibited the sale of imported books without a similar license; it authorized the Company of Stationers to seize on all such books as they found to be schismatical or offensive, and to lay them before the ecclesiastical authorities. The bishop of London was given the power to print any books in English beyond the seas, or to import them into the country; and finally it provided that offenses against the decree should be punished by the court of Star Chamber or High Commission. Such was the law enacted—not by the English Parliament, but by the Star Chamber—to protect the English Protestant Church, but the Laudian ecclesiastical system against the "Puritan faction."

The "Short Parliament" of 1640 had been dissolved after a session of three weeks; but as the Convocation continued to sit, a set of measures was drawn up under the influence and presidency of Laud, which contained the famous election oath; and the first of which proclaimed that monarchy was of divine right, that the royal authority was independent, not only of the bishop of Rome, but of every other earthly power, and that it cannot be assailed on any pretense without resistance to the ordinance of God. Not only this canon, but the whole body of them, were of the most arbitrary character, especially enjoining, under severe penalties, the ceremonies to which the archbishop was notoriously attached; and all this at a time most unwisely chosen, when the whole condition of the empire was in a state of great disorder. Clarendon remarks, "the season in which synod continued to sit was in so ill a conjuncture of time that nothing could have been transected there of a popular and prevailing influence."

The archbishop prime minister had so completely established uniformity in England that he now had leisure to turn his particular attention to the reformation of Puritan abuses in the outlying islands of Jersey and Guernsey. He claimed to have brought Chillingworth back from the Church of Rome. If he did, he certainly did not make that irreligious defender of the religion of Protestants a disciple of his own system. He urged bishop Hall to write his treatise on Episcopacy; but Hall's claims were not put high enough to satisfy Laud, who was particularly offended because the pope was plainly called Antichrist. The plot now thickens. The Scottish troubles growing out of the attempted imposition of the new canons and liturgy upon the Scottish people, beginning with the "profane imprécation" of the dame Janet Geddes, in St. Giles's, at the first reading of the detested service: "Out, out, thou false thief; dost thou lay thy mass at my leg?" had roused anew into an irresistible storm of violence and rebellion. The uproar of the "old woman" in a church, and the brickbats of the mob around it, had turned into a national conspiracy.

Through all the business Laud had adroitly managed to keep himself out of the way and make the sufferings of the nation attributed to the heresy of the king or the Scottish bishops; nevertheless, it is evident he was mixed up with it all, not only as accessory, but as prime minister. He corresponded constantly with the Scottish bishops as well as with the civil authorities in Scotland. The bishops made their reports and their excuses, and his advice and direction were required and sought on all occasions.

The invasion of England by the army of the Covenanters at length compelled Charles once more to summon the English legislature. The Long Parliament met. Then theouble burst, then the flaming spher doms of a luxurious and insolent court were exchanged for humiliation and deepening gloom; then the vast machinery of ecclesiastical despotism, pushed to its utmost tension of pride and tyranny, suddenly gave way with a crash, and the accumulated usurpations of the prerogative hastened to their final and irreversible doom. The odious courts of the Star Chamber and High Commission were abolished, and all judges were henceforth made independent of the crown; no taxes, of whatever description, were to be levied without authority of Parliament, and Parliaments were by law to be triennial.

The earl of Strafford, lord deputy of Ireland, Laud's most intimate friend, the king's ablest political adviser, and the most skilful commander of the royal forces against the Scotch, was impeached for high treason, and an impeachment accuses forthwith committed to the Tower, where he was kept imprisoned three years (1641-5); his jurisdiction and all his offices and emoluments were sequestered by the House of Peers. Lambeth Palace was made a state prison, and Leightown, now almost a manse, was put in charge of it; Smyth was made his warden in the Tower. The bishops were unseated from the House of Lords; episcopacy and the liturgy were abolished by act of Parliament; and Laud—having seen the complete triumph of the miserable "fanatical faction" over which he had wielded the rod of power and of punishment so long, the utter destruction and abolition of the hierarchy and the ceremonies to which his aggrandizement and magnificence he had devoted his life, and the annihilation of all his fond dreams of personal grandeur, and glory, and lordly munificence—was at length condemned by an ordinance of Parliament, and suffered decapitation on Tower Hill, meeting his doom with perfect composure and quiet dignity, on the 10th of January, 1645.

Thus fell the famous archbishop Laud, perhaps the best praised and most blamed man that ever lived. As to the formal legality of his sentence, it may be admitted that its case was not one of those that fall within the statute of attainder; but its execution was not, by the law as declared by the clear and unambiguous language of the statute of attainder; it was not attainted. As to the specific charges against him, it may be granted that they could not, except constructively, amount to treason even if proved, and that few of any weight were proved with such evidence as would be satisfactory to an impartial and unprejudiced court of justice. But it must be remembered that Laud was tried before a revolutionary tribunal; that, in such circumstances, moral, not legal evidence swayed his judges; and that the general, known truth of the case, not the detailed proof of specific articles, determined the conclusion.

It may be conceded that the arbitrary and tyrannical acts of the administration of Charles and of Laud, whether in Church or State, did not go beyond the precedents which had been set from Henry VIII downwards; but it must be remembered that the spirit of the times had changed, and it was the bounden duty of wise men in high places to know it, and act accordingly. A people educated under Romish domination and superstition might submit to the imposition of taxes or of creeds by the sovereign and established authority, which a people educated under a pure form of government, and used to the inalienable rights of personal liberty and freedom of thought, could no longer brook. Moreover, a tyrannical despotism once constitutionally established can never be abolished or got rid of unless the governors either yield to the popular appeal or are illegally put down by revolutionary force and violence.

It may be conceded that Laud was honest and con-
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scientious in defending the extreme doctrines of the divin
right, of the royal prerogative, and of passive ob
compliance with his successor. The “Puritans’ fa
Church and State; but, in a historical esti
gh of his career and character, this proves nothing.

The constitution of successive Parliaments shows that
this “faction” was an increasing majority of the nation;
they, too, were conscious of their purpose. Thus the “Puritans
were conscious—fanatically, not by policy, conscious;
the parliamentary leaders, those noble defenders of
English liberty, were conscious; most despots, tyrants, and
conservatives, as well as rebels, revolutionists, and reformers, are conscious.
Their consciousness must be judged independent of
their well informed or ill informed public
consequences. There may be fault on both sides: one
extreme begets another. So it was then; so it was

It may be conceded that the charge of popery against
Laud—a charge from which he suffered more severer
than from any other, and which more than any other
was the cause of his ruin—was not literally true. What
was substantially true was thus put into the false and
extravagant formula of the demagogue—it was a cari
chere against the soul of the Church of England.
It was “as by law established,” so long as the laws were in
accordance with his sentiments, or as he had the interpreta
and execution of them in his own hands. It was
not Roman popery, but Anglican or Laudian popery
which he would have saved. No doubt he was more a
Protestant than a Protestant in the true sense of that
word. His sympathies were more with Rome than with
Augsburg or Geneva; and the people, who are instinctively
sagacious in questions of this kind, did not fail to
perceive it, and they expressed their judgment, as is
their wont, in the most summary and positive terms.

As to ecclesiastical ceremonies, Laud’s devotion to
them and to their enforcement is certainly not among
the marks of his greatness of mind. The opposition to
them may have been as unreasonable as their imposi
yet the fact was they were generally unpopular and odious, and Laud, in his position, was bound to have
the discretion to accommodate himself to that fact.
It boots nothing to say that they were not illegal; it is
enough that they were both unpopular and unnecessary.

It boots nothing to talk of the irreverence and solemnity
of the forms and ceremonies; that is merely exaggerating
that; but, at all events, decency and reverence could
have been preserved without the precision and multi
plied formalities of the Laudian ceremonial.

It may be conceded that Laud was a munificent pa
trion of learning and of the universities, with whose dig
naries he was on terms of intimacy, but it might be argu
able to inquire whence came all the funds of which he
made all this lordly distribution; and perhaps we shall
find that, in this matter, Laud deserves only this honor
above many other men, that he honestly paid over at
least a portion of the money to those to whom, after all,
rightfully belonged. He never stinted the splendor or
sumptuousness of his own establishment, or the ap
pointments of his personal retinue. Of his wealth and
grandeur he enjoyed what he could. But let it remain
to his credit that his vanity—if it were nothing better—to
the form in which his public benefactions were
amiable to inquire whence came all the funds of which he
made all this lordly distribution; and perhaps we shall
find that, in this matter, Laud deserves only this honor
above many other men, that he honestly paid over at
least a portion of the money to those to whom, after all,
rightfully belonged. He never stinted the splendor or
sumptuousness of his own establishment, or the ap
pointments of his personal retinue. Of his wealth and
grandeur he enjoyed what he could. But let it remain

to his credit that his vanity—if it were nothing better

As to intellectual abilities, Laud’s must have been
considerable, or he could never have been the historical
personage he was. In the personal habits of his private
life he was irreproachable. As a clergyman he was in
defatable and punctilious is the discharge of his du
ties. He was always narrow and bigoted in his views,
but he lived in narrow and bigoted times. How far his
high political positions were compatible with his ecle
siastical character may well be doubted, and his exam
ple can never be repeated again in England. How far
the corrupting influence of political place, and of the
association of political persons and of political life, may
have contributed to develop and exaggerate his worst
faults—which, after all, were chiefly those of adminis
tration—it is impossible to say. It must be remembered
that he was a courtier long before he was a bishop,
and continued a courtier till he became primate of all
England, and thereafter till he was “translated” from
the court to the Tower of London. If a man could pass
unassailed through the scenes of such a life, a natu
rally unprincipled man, he should have been almost
unassailable in such an atmosphere. Laud’s devotional
compositions, in the form of private prayers, are often admirable, and
are thought to give a very favorable insight into his
interior religious life. Let us hope that the prayers
were sincere and acceptable.

Laud’s public career may be considered with reference to
the lightness of his general purpose, or to the wisdom
of his aiming at its accomplishment, or to the manner
in which he endeavored to effect it. As to the right or
wrong of his general purpose, his theory and aim,
whether in Church or State, but particularly in the
Church, it has always been, and perhaps always will be,
a matter of dispute. It is useless to discuss it. Any
judgment of his character based upon the assumption
of this question is no better than a petitio princi-
As to the wisdom or folly of undertaking to accomplish
that purpose, there is more purpose in seeking to
judge it than in either, for he was more and more generally admitted that he made
a mistake in the attempt. His friends regard it as a ve-

tional error, his enemies reckon the blunder a crime. As to the means he employed, and, in general, his whole
character, he has been subjected to a general verdict against him. He had great personal
faults. Prominent among them were an overweening
ambition, self-sufficiency, and insolence. An aristocratic
estimate of the structure of society, and a sovereign con-
tempt for the people and the popular will—very natu-
ral, but too often that of a man of his origin and
profession—an utter desultion of the grand idea of
humanity, underlie all the mistakes and all the misfor
tures of his life.

We conclude our sketch with the following candid
admissions from Le Bas, one of Laud’s most earnest
apologists and admirers. “That the administration of
Laud was in some respects injurious to the Church can
hardly be denied; but then it is most important to keep
in mind that the injury was inflicted not so much by the
measures which he adopted as by the manner in
which he enforced them. That is to say, the exag-
eration of the forms and the zeal and force of his
mission, by his adherents, and the inattention and
irritation of the mass of the people, have made a
united people, and the man who contrived his good should be so
vindictively evil spoken of. From all that we learn of
him, his manner appears to have been singularly ungra
cious and unpopular, and his temper oppressively irritable
and hot. If we are to trust the representations of him
left us, he was not only an honest but a forgetful and
hardened person, and had been one of the most de-
shameful persons in the three kingdoms except to those who were intimately acquainted
with his worth. There was nothing affable or engaging in
his general behavior. His very integrity was often
made odious by wearing an aspect of austerity and
haughtiness. It would almost seem as if prudence had
been struck out of his catalogue of the cardinal virtues.

He was unable, as Warburton remarks, to comprehend
one important truth, with which Richelieu was so
familiar, when he said that if he had not spent as much
time in civilities as in business he had undone his mas-
ter. The consequence of this ignorance, or of this dis-
dain, of the ways of the world was unacceptably hurtful
to the cause which at all times was nearest his heart.
In the minds of many who were ignorant of the essen-
tial excellence of the man, the interest of the Engla
mission, his administration, by his adherents, and the
dom of those who either could not bear or could not
bear the impatience of control. Whether the Church could have been saved by any combination, in the person of its
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nier, of those rare endowments which secure at once both reverence and attachment, so that his dignity can at this day be competent to pronounce; but it certainly is not altogether surprising that this unhappy defect should, even in the minds of judicious and impartial men, have connected his administration with the ruin of the Establishment. In such unquiet times, more especially a man like Lagrange, who was not without his faults, a firm and conscientious disciplinarian, but as the rigorosus and overbearing priest; and the Church would be sure to suffer most grievously for the unpopularity of her governor.

In England, the parties with which Laud's life was implicated have not yet passed away, so that it is almost impossible even now to get an impartial estimate of the man from his own countrymen; but it can hardly be doubted that the ultimate verdict of history will be his final condemnation. The English monarchy has gloriously subdued the political principles which he defended; his ecclesiastical principles will ultimately be found equally unnecessary, nay, hostile, to the true strength and glory of the English Church. (D. R. G.)


Laud's Sion Salvatorum is the beginning of the renowned sequence of Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274) for Corpus Christi day. It consists of twelve double verses, which are as follows:

1. Lauda Sion Salvatorum
2. Lauda decem et postremum
3. In hymnals and canticles: [de, Quantum potes, tantum as]
4. Quia major omnium lauda, Neque laudare sufficit.
5. Laude, laude specialis.
6. Pange utrisque et vitalis
7. Hodie populi, Quem in secreta mensa cense
8. Verba fraterni ducendae
9. Dat honesta ambulator
10. Sit tua plena, sit bona
11. Sit jucunda, sit decorosa, Menele ratto.
12. Deus sumnum sollemnis agitur

In quibus prorsus relictus
Bajam, 108.

4. In hoc mensa novi regni
Novum pascua nove legis
Phare recta terminal
Vestimentum novitatem
Umbrat long veritas
Necem lux eliminat.
5. Quod licea Christus gestis
Facies eum hoc expressa
In eis memoriam.

Docet Maria instituta,
Patronis, virtutis salutis
Conservam nostram hostiam.

6. Dogmata dutius Christianis,
Quod in his sancti postremi
Et visum in sanctum
Quod non operis, quod non virtutum
Animae fore deorum
7. Sub diversis spectabilis
Signum tauren et non rebus
Resitetae temere.

Carus eburneus, rana potens
Manet tamen Christus utera
Sub urbea specie.
8. A smente non conclusa
Non contracta, non divisa
Quo non imposita
9. Summit unus, summa mille
Quantum loq, taceis
Nec summae consummatur.
10. Sumunt boni, sumunt mal
Sorte tamen inaequali
Vita inerter
Mora est malis, vita bona
Vide, patris summoponens
Quam sit dispar exitus.

11. Prato demum sacramen-
Te vaillere, sed memento
12. Tantum esse sub fragmento
Quantum totus tegitur.
Nulla rel fit essentia
Signa tantum fit fractura
Qua nec status nec statura
Sit forma posito, sit acta
13. Ecce panis angelorum,
Pactis eius viatorum
Verum panis
Non mittendus canibus.

14. In figura predictarius
Quantum derivatur, quantum
Agens Pascual deputatur,
Datur manna inatri.

15. Bone pastor, non secus
Es, non nostris misereore
To nos pace, to nos tuere
To nos hostem, nec vivere
In terra vivificant.
16. Qui in cuncta scia et vales,
Qui nos pati nolite.
Tuo ibi communes
Cohabentes et adae.
Fac sanctorum cibum.

Laudian Manuscript (Codex Laudianus), so called because presented by archbishop Laud in 1636 to the University of Oxford, now in the Bodleian Library, where it is numbered 385, usually designated as E of the Acts, is a very valuable MS. of the Acts, with the Greek and Latin in uncial letters in parallel columns, the Latin words which are neither Jerome's nor the Vulgate, but close (literal version) always exactly opposite the Greek. It is defective at Acts xxvi, 29-xxvii. 26. It is in size nine inches by seven and a half, and consists of 226 leaves of 23-26 lines. The vellum is rather poor, and the ink faint. There are no stops, and few breathings. It was probably written in the West during the sixth century. Readings were taken from it by Fell (1675) and Mill (1707). Hearne published the text in full: Acta Apostolorum Græco-Latīnae, litera majuscula (Oxon. 1715, 8vo); now very scarce. See Davidson, Interp. Crit. ii, 293; Thesaurus, in Horne's Introd. iv, 187 sq.; Scrivener, Introd. p. 128. See MANUSCRIPT.

Laudemium, a name given to the sum which beirs, on obtaining their inheritance, are to pay to certain parties. It was to be paid for the recognition and establishment (ludatatio) of the claim, and even, occasionally, on coming into possession other than an inheritance, as, for instance, by gift, etc. It subsequently became obligatory only in cases of sale, of inheritance from collaterals, intestate, deaths of decendants, etc. The Roman law states the amount to be paid in the case of a copyhold to be the fifth of the principal ("quinquagesimas para pretii vel restitutionis loci, qui transfertur," cap. 3, Cod. Just. de jure emphyteutico, 66). It subsequently increased to one thirtieth, one
Lauds, Hymn of praise (from Latin laus, praise).

In some of the ancient councils the hallajah appointed to be sung after the Gospel is termed Laudas. Also the name of the service which, before the Reformation, followed after the Nocturn, celebrated between 12 and 3 A.M., or in the 3rd watch. Du Cange assigns them this place, but cites a passage from which it would appear they rather belong to matins in the following watch. The Lauds, Du Cange tells us, consisted, in the monastic or pre-reformatory service, of the last three psalms. Durand, however, names five. See Procter, Common Prayer, p. 186 sq. — Eden, Theology, Dict. s. v.

Lauffter, Jacob, a Swiss Protestant minister and historian, was born at Zofingen July 23, 1688, and studied theology at Halle and Utrecht. In 1718 he became professor of history and eloquence at Berne. He died Feb. 26, 1704. His works are not of special interest to theology, as the name of Jacob, excepting one, De Heudamot Spolia Dei sacratissimae (1717).

Laughter (πρήστoς, γελασμoν), an action usually expressing joy (Gen. xxiv, 6; Ps. xxxvi, 2; Eccles. iii, 4; Luke vi, 21); sometimes mockery (Gen. xviii, 13; Eccles. ii, 2; James iv, 9); and occasionally conscious security (Job v, 22). When used concerning God (as in Ps. cvii, 4; fui, Ps. cvii, 4; and in the next verse) it signifies that he despoils or pays no regard to the person or subject. See ISAAC.

Laughton, George D., an English minister, lived in the latter half of the 18th century. Among his works of importance are his History of Ancient Egypt (Lond. 1774, 4to) — Reply to Chap. XI of Gibbon's Decline and Fall (1780-86). His sermons were published from 1773-90. — Allibone, Dict. of British and American Authors, ii, 1064.

Laugier, Marc Antoine, a French Jesuit, was born at Manos July 25, 1713. He was a priest at Paris until 1757, when he was appointed to the abbey of Ribeauvillé. He died April 7, 1769. For a list of his works on various subjects, see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvii, 894.

Launay, Pierre de, lord of La Motte and Vauflezan, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Blois in 1573. After holding a high position in the war department, he resigned in 1613, retaining only the title of secretary and counsellor to the king, and devoted himself exclusively to study. He acquired the mastery over Greek, learned Hebrew from a Jewish teacher, and was for forty years a member of the Consistory of Char-enton. He took part in several provincial synods, and was secretary of the two national synods of Charpenton in 1639 and of Alençon in 1634. He died at Paris June 20, 1665. His works are — Paraphrase et Exposition des Prophetes Daniel (Sedan, 1624); — Paraphrase et champ Exposition du Livre de Salomon vulgairement appelé l'Ecclesiaste (Saint-Maurice, 1624, 8vo); — Paraphrase et Exposition des Proverbes de Salomon et du premier Chapitre du Cantique des Cantiques (Charpenton, 1650, 2 vols., 8vo; 2d ed. 1655, 12mo); — Paraphrase et Exposition de l'Epitre de Saint Paul aux Romains (Saumur, 1647, 8vo); — Paraphrase sur les Épîtres de Saint Paul (Charpenton, 1650, 2 vols., 4to); — Paraphrase et Exposition de l' Apocalypse (Geneva, 1651, 4to); published under the name of the Marquis de la Priori. This last work, on which he advances opinions on the Millennium which were strongly opposed by Amyraut — Examen de la Réplique de M. Amyraut (Charpenton, 1656, 8vo), — Traité de la Sainte Cène du Seigneur, avec l'Exposition de quelques Passages difficiles du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament (Saumur, 1659, 12mo) — Remarks sur le Texte de la Bible, ou Explication des Mots, des Phrases, et des Figures difficiles de la sainte Écriture (Geneva, 1669, 4to), a posthumous and highly esteemed work. See Haag, La France Protestante. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxix, 907.

Launoy, Jean de, a noted French Roman Catholic historian and canonist, was born at Val-de-Sis, near Val- longue, Dec. 21, 1668. He studied at Constance and Paris, where he was received maîtris in June, 1694. In the same year he entered the Church. He was highly esteemed among the learned men of his time. On a journey to Rome he became the intimate friend of Luc Holstenius and Leo Altitiaus. His whole life was devoted to the study of theology at the Sorbonne in Paris; he never left it or ceased to exert himself in his Church by his pen, which he wielded with great power and ability. He died at Paris March 10, 1678. Moret says of him: "The great number of his works, and the manner in which they are written, give ample evidence of his extensive reading and ready ability. But his style is neither ornate nor polished; he uses awkward, obsolete expressions; handles his subjects very peculiarly; and, if he overcomes his adversaries, he also tires his readers by the profusion of his quotations. He could not endure fables nor superstitions, and defended with great firmness the rights of the Church and the French king, which were endangered by the ultramontanes." In a noble spirit of independence, he preferred expulsion from the Sorbonne rather than to indorse the condemnation of Arnald by that body, although he differed from that theologian in his views on grace. He even went so far as to write against the Formulaire of the assembly of the clergy of 1656. He particularly distinguished himself by his acumen in discovering the spuriousness of most of the acts of the saints, as also of a number of ecclesiastical privileges. Dom Bonaventure, of Argonne, writes of him: "He is dangerous alike to be heard or to be read; he has overthrown many points of paradise because were canonized by any ten popes. He looked with suspicion on the whole martymalogy, and examined the claims of the saints one after another, as they do in France about the nobility." His writings are mainly of a historically-critical nature, and in tendency apologetical in behalf of Gallicanism. The most important of them are, Syllabus rationum quibvs causa Durandi de modo conjunctionis concursuum Dei et creature, defenditur (Par. 1636, 8vo) — De mente concisi Tritirmi circa satisfactioem in sacrificio penitentiae (1644), in which he maintains the Council of Trent and the Church are the only church of the Church do not prove that satisfaction must precede absolution — De frequenti Confessione et Excommunicacione usus (1653) — De commentio Lustrari, Mogulenses, Marthe ac Mariniti in prosession Appulio (1660, 8vo) — De auctoritate negativa argumenti (Paris, 1650 and 1662, 8vo), wherein he affirms he had himself seen at Sienna, in 1634, the statue of the popess Joanna placed between those of Leo IV and Benedict III. It produced quite a controversy, and abbot Thiers wrote against it Defenso adversus Joh. de Launoy in qua defensione Lawntii frustra oppositio (Paris, 1644, 8vo) — De recta Novem canonum VI, et prout a Rufiano explicatur, Intelligenti: — De veteri Ciborum Delectu in jejuiis Christianorum: — Judicium de Auctore libri De imitatione Chriami (Paris, 1649, 1650, 1652, 1653, 8vo). Launoy advocates the claim of St. Peter to the keys — Thomas Aquinas, Thomas Aquinas, — De Curia Ecclesiæ pro Missar et paternibus (Paris, 1653, 8vo) — Epistolile (Par. 1646-1673, 8 vols., 8vo; Cambridge, 1682, 1 vol. fol.) — De vero Auctore famuli præcessus que Pelagio Hieronymi, Augustino tribu solt, in which he attempts to prove that the Pelagius is the only author of the profession of faith attributed to Jerome and Augustine — Explicatio Evangeliæ Troedici circa canonem "Omnia utrinque sese" (Par. 1672, 8vo), a highly-esteemed work — Regia in Motusnomion Potestas, del ree sacriulatul principum Christi'orium in
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laecanea impotensiam matrimonium dirimentes (Var. 1674, 4to). This work was condemned at Rome, Dec. 10, 1688, yet its principles were approved by a number of the most distinguished theologians and jurists:—Venerandas Romanas Ecclesiae circa sinuum (Paris, 1675, 8vo)—De Subterranea bulla Privilegio et de Sacrae et Sacrosanctae Consecrationis Hominis Fielibus (Paris, 1674, 8vo).—In Charta communitatis quomque beati Germanus, episcopus Parisinensis, sub urbano monasterio dedisse fertur:—In privilegio quod Gregorius I° monasterio Sintemi-Cardinali Sesiennensis dedisse dicere:—In ecclesiasticum, labor examen a numero privatis et privilegiis quis considerationem non ad unio lectura:—A treatise on the conception of the Virgin, in which he asserts that if an attempt were made to define "the point of the conception of the Virgin by the Scriptures and tradition, it would be shown that it was conceived in sin." The complete works of Launsi were published by abbot Granet (Geneva, 1713, 10 vols. fol.). See Dupin, Bibl. des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques, vol. xviii., 34-62; Journal des Savants, anno 1664, 1665, 1667, 1668, 1673, 1698, 1699, 1701, 1704, 1705, 1726, 1731; Bibl. sac- cere; Moretti, Grand Diction Historique; Guy-Patin, Épit.; Bayle, Dict. Critique, et Nouvelles de la République des Lettres; Nicier, Memoires, vol. xxxii.; Colomies, Recueil de Particulier, p. 829; Reiser, Elagum Joannis Laurain (London, 1685); Hoever, Nouv. Biol. Géné- ral., xxii, 912 sq., Herzog, Real-Encyklop. viii., 280 sq. Laura (collection of anchorites cells), a name given by Churchmen to ancient collections of cells, the habita- tions of hermits or monks of the early days of the Church, but incorrectly used as a synonym of monaste- rium, from which it greatly differs, inasmuch as the inmates of the latter were cœnobites, and held intercourse with each other, while those of the former lived apart, in seclusion. The holy tenants of a laura passed in solitude and silence five days in a week; their food was bread, water, and dates; on Saturday and Sunday they received the sacrament, and messed together on feast and a small allowance of wine. Bingham states that when many of the cells of anchorites were placed together in the same wilderness, at some distance from one another, they were all called by one common name, laura, which, as Evagrius informs us (i, 21), differed from a cenobium in this, that a laura was many cells divided from each other, where every monk provided for himself; but a cenobium was but one habitation, where the monks lived in society, and had every thing in common. Epiphanius (Haeres. 69, 1) says Laura, or Labra, was the name of a street or district where a church stood in Alexandria; and it is probable that from this the name was taken to signify a multitude of cells or monasteries. If so, it must have been in a certain district, yet so divided as to make up many separate habitations. The most celebrat- ed lauras were established in the East, especially in Palestine, as the laura of St. Euthymius, St. Saba, the laura of the towers, etc. See Monachiae; Monastery.

Laureate (from the Latin verb laureatus, crowned with the prize) was used of a successful theological candidate, in ancient times, at the Scotch universities.

Laurence, Richard, D.C.L., a distinguished Eng- lish prelate, was born at Bath in 1705; matriculated in the University of Oxford July 14, 1716, as an exhibi- tor of Corpus Christi College; took the degree of B.A. April 10, 1726: that of M.A. July 9, 1726, and those of B. and D.C.L. June 27, 1794. Upon the appointment in 1736 of his brother, Dr. French Laurence, to the regius professorship of civil law, he was made deputy professor at Oxford. In 1743 he preached his second lectures, and the reputation thence acquired secured for him from the archbishop of Canterbury the rectory of Mersham, Kent. In 1814 he was appointed to the chair of regius professor of Hebrew, and to the canonry of Christ Church, Oxford, and in 1822 was elevated to the archi- eapiscopal see of Cashel. He died in Dublin Dec. 29, 1838. His most important works are his translations of certain apocryphal books of the O.T. from the Ethi- opic, accompanied by critical investigations: Ascension Isaac Vultus, opusculum pseudopigraphum, multis abhine subsequi, ut incoluit, et regulas scriptum erat Christos accurate descripsisse perscriptum et cum versio Latina Anglicana publica juris factum (Oxon. 1819, 8vo)—Primi Evangeli Li- bri, qui apud Vulgatum appellatur quartus versio Aethi- opica, nunc prima in medium prolati et Latine Anglicae- nae procliti (Oxon. 1820, 8vo). The translation is fol- lowed by general remarks upon the different versions of this book, its apocryphal character, the creed of its author, and the probable period of its composition [see EMBRAS]—The Book of Enoch the Prophet, an apocryphal production, supposed to have been lost for ages, but discovered at the close of the last century in Abyssinia, now first published from an Ethiopian MS. in the Bodleian Library (Oxford, 1821, 8vo; 3d ed. 1828) [see SCHOE, BOOK OF]—also, Remarks on the systematical Classification of MS. adopted by Griesbach in his Edition of the Greek Testament (Oxf. 1814, 8vo)—Dissertatation on the MSS. of St. Matthew (Oxf. 1833, 8vo).—In this work he wrote, in opposition to Priestley, Law, and their respective follow- ers, discusses the usage of the terms υμεία and κεφαλή and enters into the critical examination of various scriptural narratives.—An Attempt to illustrate those Articles of the Church of England which the Calculists improperly consider as Calculistical (seven sermons preached as Hampton Lectures, Oxford, 1808, 8vo); and several sermons on the doctrine of Atonement (Oxford, 1810, 8vo), Baptismal Regeneration (1815, 8vo), and on Baptism (1836, 8vo). See Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. vol. ii., a; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Am. A. Hist. vol. ii., k.; London. Gent. Mag. 1839, pt. i, p. 205 sq.; Darlington, Cyclop. Bibliog- raphy, vol. ii. s. v.

Laurentius, anti-pope, lived about 450–590. He was archdeacon of a Church in Rome, and was opposed to Symmachus, who in 456 was elected successor of Anastasius II., and as anti-pope�� (458, 459).—Caused much disturbance in the city, Festus and Probinus, two of the most influential senators, sided with Laurentius. Both parties finally agreed to submit their difficulty to the decision of Theodoric, king of the Goths, though an Arian. He decided in favor of Symmachus, and Lau- rentius, having swore the Oath of Allegiance to Nocera. But as he subsequently created new disturb- ances, and was, whether justly or unjustly is not known, accused of Eutychianism, he was deposed by the Synodus Palmari, (601), and died an exile. See Ana- stasius, Vex Pontific.; Horantius, Amulet.; Plotinus, Vex Pontific. Roman.; Hoever, Nouv. Biol. Générale, xix, 297. (J. N. r.)

Laurentius, a noted prelate of the early English Church (Anglo-Saxon), flourished in the first half of the 7th century (A.D. 605) as successor of St. Augustine—suggested for the archbishopric by Augustine himself. Under the reign of Eadburg, the successor of Ethelbert, when England was in danger of a return to heathenish practices by Eadburg's marriage of his own mother-in-law, Laurentius shrewdly managed affi- rairs for the benefit of Christianity; he induced the king to renounce his incestuous marriage, and married him to the Christian faith. See Ethelbert, Hist. Early Eng. Church, p. 41 sq.; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. bk. ii. cent. vii, pt. i, ch. i, § 2, and note (5).

Laurentius, Sr., according to tradition, was a dis- ciple of pope Sixtus II (257–258), who received him among the seven Roman deacons, and afterwards made
him archdeacon. When the pope, during the persecution of the Christians by Valerian, was led out to suffer martyrdom, Laurentius wished to accompany him, and to share his fate; but Sixtus prevented him, prophesying to him at the same time that he would be called upon to fulfill his calling, for the glory of Christianity, and that he would follow him within three days. The omen was fulfilled: the Roman governor had heard of treasures belonging to the Christian Church, and wished to obtain possession of them. He desired Laurentius to reveal them to him. Laurentius seemed to consent to comply with the demands of his persecutors; but in the course of the following week, he dressed himself up as a young disciple of Christ returned, accompanied by a crowd of paupers, cripples, and sick, whom he presented to the governor, saying, "These are our treasures." This was regarded as an insult, and in punishment he was placed in arank chair. Laurentius underwent this martyrdom with resignation and cheerfulness. He is said to have been buried in the Via Tiburtina. The pope Leo I said of him that he was as great an honor to Rome as Stephen to Jerusalem, and Augustine that the crown of Laurentius was in the treasury of Rome itself. Under Constantine a church was erected over the place where his remains were supposed to be (St. Laurentii extra muros); another church dedicated to him is St. Laurentius in Damascus. He is commemorated on the 10th of October. The earliest accounts of the martyrdom are to be found in Ambros. De offic. minist., iv., 41; i., 28. The most glowing account of him is Prudentius's Hymn, in Laur. (Prudentius, Periplus.),—Hersog, Real-Enzyklop., viii., 232; Wetzer und Weite, Kirchen-Lex. vii., 965.

Laurentius Valla, a distinguished humanist, was born at Rome in 1415. He was still young when the reaction against scholasticism set in, and took an active part in the conflict. He attacked the authenticity of Constantine the Great's deed of donation in his De falso credito et eminativa Constantiani donatione Declamatio, as also all the other unproved assertions of the theologians. Thus he questioned the origin of the so-called alive in an iron chair. Laurentius underwent this martyrdom with resignation and cheerfulness. He is said to have been buried in the Via Tiburtina. The pope Leo I said of him that he was as great an honor to Rome as Stephen to Jerusalem, and Augustine that the crown of Laurentius was in the treasury of Rome itself. Under Constantine a church was erected over the place where his remains were supposed to be (St. Laurentii extra muros); another church dedicated to him is St. Laurentius in Damascus. He is commemorated on the 10th of October. The earliest accounts of the martyrdom are to be found in Ambros. De offic. minist., iv., 41; i., 28. The most glowing account of him is Prudentius's Hymn, in Laur. (Prudentius, Periplus.),—Hersog, Real-Enzyklop., viii., 232; Wetzer und Weite, Kirchen-Lex. vii., 965.

Lauretius Valla, a distinguished humanist, was born at Rome in 1415. He was still young when the reaction against scholasticism set in, and took an active part in the conflict. He attacked the authenticity of Constantine the Great's deed of donation in his De falso credito et eminativa Constantiani donatione Declamatio, as also all the other unproved assertions of the theologians. Thus he questioned the origin of the so-called alive in an iron chair. Laurentius underwent this martyrdom with resignation and cheerfulness. He is said to have been buried in the Via Tiburtina. The pope Leo I said of him that he was as great an honor to Rome as Stephen to Jerusalem, and Augustine that the crown of Laurentius was in the treasury of Rome itself. Under Constantine a church was erected over the place where his remains were supposed to be (St. Laurentii extra muros); another church dedicated to him is St. Laurentius in Damascus. He is commemorated on the 10th of October. The earliest accounts of the martyrdom are to be found in Ambros. De offic. minist., iv., 41; i., 28. The most glowing account of him is Prudentius's Hymn, in Laur. (Prudentius, Periplus.),—Hersog, Real-Enzyklop., viii., 232; Wetzer und Weite, Kirchen-Lex. vii., 965.

Lauretius Valla, a distinguished humanist, was born at Rome in 1415. He was still young when the reaction against scholasticism set in, and took an active part in the conflict. He attacked the authenticity of Constantine the Great's deed of donation in his De falso credito et eminativa Constantiani donatione Declamatio, as also all the other unproved assertions of the theologians. Thus he questioned the origin of the so-called alive in an iron chair. Laurentius underwent this martyrdom with resignation and cheerfulness. He is said to have been buried in the Via Tiburtina. The pope Leo I said of him that he was as great an honor to Rome as Stephen to Jerusalem, and Augustine that the crown of Laurentius was in the treasury of Rome itself. Under Constantine a church was erected over the place where his remains were supposed to be (St. Laurentii extra muros); another church dedicated to him is St. Laurentius in Damascus. He is commemorated on the 10th of October. The earliest accounts of the martyrdom are to be found in Ambros. De offic. minist., iv., 41; i., 28. The most glowing account of him is Prudentius's Hymn, in Laur. (Prudentius, Periplus.),—Hersog, Real-Enzyklop., viii., 232; Wetzer und Weite, Kirchen-Lex. vii., 965.

Lauretius Valla, a distinguished humanist, was born at Rome in 1415. He was still young when the reaction against scholasticism set in, and took an active part in the conflict. He attacked the authenticity of Constantine the Great's deed of donation in his De falso credito et eminativa Constantiani donatione Declamatio, as also all the other unproved assertions of the theologians. Thus he questioned the origin of the so-called alive in an iron chair. Laurentius underwent this martyrdom with resignation and cheerfulness. He is said to have been buried in the Via Tiburtina. The pope Leo I said of him that he was as great an honor to Rome as Stephen to Jerusalem, and Augustine that the crown of Laurentius was in the treasury of Rome itself. Under Constantine a church was erected over the place where his remains were supposed to be (St. Laurentii extra muros); another church dedicated to him is St. Laurentius in Damascus. He is commemorated on the 10th of October. The earliest accounts of the martyrdom are to be found in Ambros. De offic. minist., iv., 41; i., 28. The most glowing account of him is Prudentius's Hymn, in Laur. (Prudentius, Periplus.),—Hersog, Real-Enzyklop., viii., 232; Wetzer und Weite, Kirchen-Lex. vii., 965.

Lauretius Valla, a distinguished humanist, was born at Rome in 1415. He was still young when the reaction against scholasticism set in, and took an active part in the conflict. He attacked the authenticity of Constantine the Great's deed of donation in his De falso credito et eminativa Constantiani donatione Declamatio, as also all the other unproved assertions of the theologians. Thus he questioned the origin of the so-called alive in an iron chair. Laurentius underwent this martyrdom with resignation and cheerfulness. He is said to have been buried in the Via Tiburtina. The pope Leo I said of him that he was as great an honor to Rome as Stephen to Jerusalem, and Augustine that the crown of Laurentius was in the treasury of Rome itself. Under Constantine a church was erected over the place where his remains were supposed to be (St. Laurentii extra muros); another church dedicated to him is St. Laurentius in Damascus. He is commemo...
Lavater, Johann Kaspar, a noted Swiss theologian and the most interesting of the philosophers, who became one of the most influential characters of the last century, was born at Zürich Nov. 15, 1741. His father, Henry Lavater, was doctor of medicine and member of the government of Zürich. His mother, whose maiden name was Regina Escher, was a woman of marked character and extraordinary gifts. His childhood was not marked by any great promise of promise as a student, but he had a decided tendency to religion, and a great predilection for singing hymns and reading the Bible. It was while at school in Zürich that he conceived the idea of becoming a minister of the Gospel. He was educated at the Zürich school, and in 1762 was ordained a minister. In consequence of complications in the political affairs of his country, he traveled in company with the celebrated painter Fuseli, and successively visited the universities of Leipsic and Berlin, and of Hamburg. In 1764 he was invited to the theological advice of the celebrated provost Spalveldt. In 1764 he returned to his native place, and occupied himself with the duties of the ministerial office and Biblical studies. He also wrote some poetry, inspired by the poetical productions of Bodmer and Klopstock. In 1765 he married Miss Anna Schinz, the daughter of a highly respectable merchant. As the result of his study of Bodmer and Klopstock, he published in 1767 his Schriften, containing his finest poems, which was followed by his Ausachten in die Gleichheit (1768-78, 3 vols.), the first of a series of works in which he maintained the perpetuity of miracles, the irresistibility of prayer, and the necessity for every person to conceive of God as manifested in Christ crucified and in order to be really alive to himself. The last doctrine was called his Christosomia. In 1769 Lavater was made deceased of the Lavater-church, at Zürich, where the extraordinary effects of his sermons, his blameless life, and benevolent disposition made him the idol of his congregation, while his printed sermons sent forth his fame to distant parts. It was reserved, however, for his last acts to become a source of great sorrow. He was buried in Zürich on March 15, 1788. But his influence lived on, for he was the author of Meuchelmord und Meuchelmörder (Leipzig, 1775-78) to extend his celebrity generally. This work, which has often been reprinted and translated (best by Dr. H. Hunter, London, 1799-98, 5 vols. royal 4to), was the first elaborate attempt to reduce physiognomy to science. Having in early life been acquainted with a large number of eminent men, he had observed corresponding points of resemblance in their minds as well as their features, and from a disposition to generalize he was led to adopt a fixed system, and wrote this work in the form of a treatise. It might promote greatly the welfare of mankind, an effort of which he modestly disdained. He illustrated it with numerous engravings and vignettes, and it is superior in respect of paper and typography to any book previously issued from the German press. Lavater had remarkable powers of observation, and skill in detecting character. He differed from all who had preceded him in this science. In order to form an opinion of the character from the face, he required to see the face at rest—in sleep or in an unconscious state. "The greater part of the physiognomists," he says, "judge only of the passions, or rather of the exterior signs of the soul. . . . I endeavor to penetrate into the heart of the muscles. But these exterior signs are only transient circumstances, which are easily discoverable. It has therefore always been my object to consider the general and fundamental character of the man, from which, according to the state of his exterior circumstances and relations, all his passions arise as from a root." Lavater's "Fragmente" gave rise to considerable discussion, and occasioned general excitement. He was visited at Zürich by throngs of eminent and curious persons, whose character he was to judge by the gestures, the physiognomy; at a glance he recognised Necker, Mirabeau, and Mercier. In 1775 he was elevated to the pastorate of the Orphan-house; in 1778 he was elected second pastor of St. Peter's Church in Zürich, and in 1786 he was called to fill a vacant position of chief pastor, made vacant by the death of his predecessor. When the French Revolution broke out Lavater was a zealous partisan of it, but the execution of Louis XVI made him turn in disgust from the Republican party, and in 1788, when the French took possession of Switzerland, he protested against their ravages in a publication addressed to the Directory, entitled "Words of a free Swiss to a great Nation," which, on account of its high-toned courage, gained the applause of all Europe. This work was addressed, under his own name, to Reueb, a member of the French government at that time, but was printed without his cooperation, and ascribed to a brother, which had also been circulated. At the same time he gave a thrilling discourse from his pulpit from the words, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God," etc. (Rom. xiii. 1-4). This, as may be imagined, proved an instance of the intervention of the Swiss Directory at first resolved upon his banishment. Difficulties were in the way of carrying out this rigid measure, and the decree was changed to suspension from his office. This, too, was prevented by his friends, and finally he received only a gentle expression of disapproval. A few months later, however, while away from home for his health, he was seized and carried prisoner to Basel, on the charge of conspiracy against the French government, but was released, after a confinement of several weeks, for want of evidence. On his return to Zürich he renewed his pastoral labors, and opposed with all his energies the oppressive measures of the French Directory. On the 26th of September, 1799, after the French had taken possession of Zürich, as Lavater was standing near his own house and trying to pacify some disorderly soldiers with money, he received a gun-shot from one of them, which, though it healed for a time, finally proved fatal. The last year of his life was one of great bodily suffering, occasioned by his wound, which he bore with Christian patience, praying for the man who had wounded him. He desired that the culprit should not be arrested, for it was more sorrow to him if he knew that any punishment was done to him, for he certainly knew what he did. He at the same time inscribed some beautiful poetical lines to him. During the intervals of suffering his mental activity continued unabated. He was never idle. When travelling or taking daily exercise, and even at his meals, he always had a pencil and paper, that he might write down any new thought that might suggest itself. He wrote, during this period of his life, several small works or poems. Among them were "Zürich at the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century," also "Last Thoughts of a Departing One on Jesus of Nazareth and Memorial Leaves." The latter he desired to be given after his death, as little legacies, to his friends. Lavater's relation to his flock was always of the most intimate character, as is evidenced by his request, not long before his death, to be afforded a mattress on which to read in every one of his features, he seemed to be reflecting the very glory of heaven." When he was no longer able to sit up and hold his pen, he dictated to an amanuensis...
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Lavator at Selby, Yorkshire.

Lavator is an important feature resembling a baptis

tery; it is a separate chamber, square or octagonal,
standing on one side of the cloister-court, with a reser
voir of water or a fountain in the middle, and water
troughs around the sides for washing at.—Parker, Glos
sury, s. v.

Laver (לזרע ולזרע, trope, prop. a basin for boil

ing in, and so signifying a "pan" for cooking, 1 Sam. ii,
14; or a fire-pan, "hearth," Zech. xii, 6; also a pulp
le or "scalding" of similar form for a rostrum, 2 Chron. vi,
13; elsewhere spoken of the sacred wash-bowl of the
tabernacle and Temple, Exod. xxx, 18, 28; xxxi, 9,
xxxv, 16; xxxvi. 8; xxxix, 39; xl, 7, 11, 30; Lev.

viii, 11; 2 Kings xvi, 17; plur. fem. 1 Kings vii, 30, 38,
40, 43; plural masc. 2 Chron. iv, 6, 14; Sept. Antiq.,
Vulg. Isob. fa. i, a basin to contain the water used by
the priests in their ablutions during their sacred minis
trations. This was of two sorts in different periods.

1. The original one was fabricated at the divine com
mand (Exod. xxx, 18) of brass (copper, סערת, see Bähr,
Symbolik, i, 484, 486; Michaelis, Soc. Gott.
comend. iv; Umbrecht, in Studien und Kritiken, 1848, p.
157); out of the metal mirrors which the women brought
from Egypt (Exod. xxxviii, 8). The notion held by
some Jewish writers, and reproduced by Friesius, Bähr
(Symb. i, 484), and others, founded on the omission of the
word "women," that the brass vessel, being polis
ished, served as a mirror to the Levites, is untenable.
(See the parallel passage, 1 Sam. ii, 22, where הָבָה,
yuveinu, is inserted; Gesenius gives the prep. 2, p. 172;
Keller, der Arch. p. 1, c. 1, § 19; Glassius, Phil. Sacr. i,
580, ed. Dathé; Lightfoot, Descr. Temp. c. 37, 1; Jen
Exod. xxxviii; Philo, Vit. Moa, iii, 15; ii, 156, ed. Man
gely). Its size and shape are not given, but it is thought
that it was circular. It contained water wherewith
the priests were to wash their hands and their feet
whenever they entered the tabernacle, or came near to
the altar to minister (Exod. xl, 32). It stood in the
court between the altar and the door of the tabernacle,
and, according to Jewish tradition, a little to the south
(Exod. xxx, 19, 21; Behold, Ant. Heb. p. 1, ch. iv, 9;
Clemens, De Labro Cenovo, iii, 9; ap. Ugozoli Thum. xix).
It rested on a basis (םפ, kem. Sept. βάσις), i. e. a foot,
though by some explained to be a cover (Clemens, ibid.
c. iii, 9), of copper or brass, which was likewise made
from the same mirrors of the women who assembled at
the door of the tabernacle court (Exod. xxxviii, 8).
This "foot," seems, from the distinct mention constantly
made of it, to have been something more than a mere
stand or support. Probably it formed a lower basin to
catch the water which flowed, through taps or other
wise, from the laver. The priests could not have washed
in the laver itself, as all the water would have been
thereby defiled, and so would have had to be renewed for each ablution. The Orientals, in their washings, made use of a vessel with a lose long sponger, and washed the stream which issues from thence, the waste water being received in a basin which is placed underneath. See ABLUTION. It has therefore been suggested that they held their hands and feet under streams that flowed from the laver, and that the "foot" caught the water that fell. As no mention is made of a vessel whereby to wash the parts of the victims offered in sacrifice, it is presumed that the laver served this purpose also. The Jewish commentators state (perhaps referring, however, to the later vessels in the Temple) that any kind of water might be used for the laver, but that the water must be changed every day. They also mention that ablution before entering the tabernacle was in no case dispensed with. A man might be perfectly clean, might be quite free from any ceremonial impurity, and might even have washed his hands and feet before he left home, but still he could by no means enter the tabernacle without previous ablution at the laver. "In the account of the offering by the woman suspected of adultery there is mention made of 'holy water' mixed with dust from the floor of the tabernacle, which the woman was to drink according to certain rites (Num. v, 17)."

Most probably this was water taken from the laver. Perhaps the same 'water of purifying' (Num. viii, 7), which was sprinkled on the Levites on occasion of their consecration to the service of the Lord in the tabernacle. Like the other vessels belonging to the tabernacle, the laver was, together with its "foot," consecrated with oil (Lev. viii, 10, 11). No mention is found in the Hebrew text of the mode of transporting it, but in Num. iv, 14 a passage is added in the Sept., agreeing with the Samaritan Pent. and the Samaritan version, which prescribes the method of packing it, viz., in a purple cloth, protected by a skin covering. See TABERNACLE.

2. In the Temple of Solomon, when the number of both priests and victims had greatly increased, ten lavers were used for the sacrifices, and the molten sea for the personal ablutions of the priests (2 Chron. iv, 6). These lavers were two in number, minute descriptions of each of the tabernacle. Those likewise were of copper ("brass"), raised on bases (וֹבֶּן, from וֹבֵן, to 'stand upright,' Gen. xii, 665, 670, Sept. Greecizes μετακόμης, Vulg. basea) (1 Kings vii, 27, 89), five on the north and south sides respectively of the court of the priests. They were used for washing the animals to be offered in burnt-offerings (2 Chron. iv, 6). Josephus (Ant. viii, 5, 6) gives no distinct account of their form. Azaz mutilated the laver, and removed it from its base (2 Kings xvi, 17). Whether Hezeiah restored the parts cut off is not stated, but in the article of the articles taken by the Chaldeans from the Temple only the bases are mentioned (2 Kings xx, 16; Jer. iii, 17; Josephus omit even these, Ant. x, 8, 5).

"The dimensions of the bases, with the lavers, as given in the Hebrew text, are four cubits in length and breadth, and three in height. The Sept. gives 4 by 4, and 6 in height. Josephus, who appears to have followed a various reading of the Sept., makes them five in length, four in width, and six in height (1 Kings vii, 29; Thessius, ad loc.; Josephus, Ant. viii, 8, 3). There were to each four wheels of one and a half cubit in diameter, with spokes, etc., all cast in one piece. The principal parts requiring explanation may be thus enumerated:

(a) 'Borders' (יוֹבֶּן, Sept. χειλελιπάρα, Vulg. sculpüra), probably panels. Genesius (Theod. 386) supposed these to have been ornamental like square shields, with engraved work.

(b) 'Ledges' (יוֹבֶּנָה, לְדֵּקָה, לְדֵּקֶר), from לְדֵּקָה, 'to cut in notches,' Genesius, p. 1411), joints in corners of bases or fillets covering joints.

(c) 'Additions' (יוֹבֶּנוּ, from יוֹבֶּנָה, 'to twine,' Genesius, p. 746; χεις, lora, whence Thesius suggests λαφος or λαμβ (as the true reading), probably festoons; Lightfoot translates 'margines oblique descendentes.' (d) 'Plates' (יוֹבֶּנָה, προκόχυσα, ares, Genesius, p. 972; Lightfoot, musas arae tetragones), probably axles, cast in the same piece as the wheels. (e) 'Undercutters' (יוֹבֶּנָה, ψαῖν, humeri, Gen. p. 724), either the naves of the wheels, or a sort of handles for moving the whole machine; Lightfoot renders 'columnae fulcientes lavacrum.' (f) 'Naves' (יוֹבֶּנָה, νόμιδοι).

(g) 'Spoke's' (יוֹבֶּנָה, הַדָּרֶד, ἤφαντον, comthi, Gen. p. 256).

(h) 'Chapter' (יוֹבֶּנָה, εἴστατος, summatia, Gen. p. 725), perhaps the rim of the circular opening ('mouth,' 1 Kings vii, 81) in the convex top.

(i) 'Round compass' (יוֹבֶּנָה, בַּצֵּק, Genesius, p. 985, 989, στρόγγυλον κύκλῳ; rotunditas), perhaps the convex roof of the base. To these parts Josephus adds chains, which may perhaps be the festoons above mentioned (Ant. viii, 8, 6).

Conjectural Diagram of the Laver. (After Thennius.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>border</th>
<th>3, ledge</th>
<th>a, additions</th>
<th>d, plates</th>
<th>n, undercutters</th>
<th>f, naves</th>
<th>g, spokes</th>
<th>l, foles</th>
<th>c, chapter</th>
<th>r, round compass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"Thenius, with whom Keil in the main agrees, both of them differing from Ewald, in a minute examination of the whole passage, but not without some transposition, chiefly of the greater part of ver. 31 to ver. 36, deduces a construction of the bases and lavers, which seems fairly to reconcile the very great difficulties of the subject. Following chiefly his description, we may suppose the base to have been a quadrangular hollow frame, connected at its corners by pilasters (ledges), and moved by four wheels or high castors, one at each corner, with handles (plates) for drawing the machine. The sides of this frame were divided into three vertical panels or compartments (borders), ornamented with base-reliefs of lions, oxen, and cherubim. The top of the base was convex, with a circular opening of one and a half cubit diameter. The top itself was covered with engraved cherubim, lions, and palm-trees or branches. The height of the convex top from the upper part of the base was one and a half cubit, and the space between this top and the lower surface of the laver one and a
half cubits more. The laver rested on supports (under-sets) rising from the four corners of the base. Each laver contained 40 'baths' (Gr. χιλιοῦ), or about 300 gal-lons. Its dimensions, therefore, to be in proportion to seven feet (four cubits, ver. 38) in diameter, must have been about thirty inches in depth. The great height of the whole machine was doubtless in order to bring it near the height of the altar (2 Chron. iv. 1; Arias Montanus, De Templo Fabrici, in Cris. Sac. viii, 626; Lightfoot, Deer. Temp. c. xxviii, 3, vol. i, p. 646; Thenius, in Kæry, Exeg. Handb. on 1 Kings vii, and Append. p. 41; Ewald, Geschichte, iii. 318; Keil, Handb. der Bib. Arch. § 24, p. 128, 129)." Mr. Payne, in his work on Solomon's Temple (plate xii, fig. 5), gives the following conjectural view of one of these lavers, which is more compact, less likely to be overturned, and more closely analogous to the form of the great or molten sea.

Form of the "Laver" according to Payne.

Yet in neither of these figures does the "base," with its chest-like form and inconvenient height, seem at all adapted to the above purpose of catching the waste water, or of aiding in any way the ablutions, unless the laver itself were furnished with a spout, and the box below formed a tank with openings on the top for receiving the stream after it had served its ceremonial purpose. The portable form was doubtless for convenience of transportation and emptying.

3. In the second Temple there appears to have been only one laver of brass (Mishna, Middoth, iii. 6), with twelve instead of two stop-cocks, and a machine for raising water and filling it (Mishna, Tumid, iii. 3; compare i. 4, Zoma, iii. 10). Of its size or shape we have no information, but it was probably like those of Solomon's Temple. Josephus, in his description of Herod's Temple (War, v, 5), scarcely alludes to this laver. See H. G. Clemens, De labro aeneo (Utr. 1725; also in Ugo-lini Theur. xix), Lamy, De tabernac. foed. iii, 6, 7, p. 460 sq., and table 16; Vialandius in Ezek. ii, p. 492; L'Empereur in Surenhusius's Vinea, v, 366; Schneitz, Anima. ad lev. an. sq. 297 sq.; Zollig, Ceramion. wagons, p. 50 sq.; Grünstein, in the Stuttgart. Kunsth., 1834, No. 5 sq.; A. Claitz, Scriptio. biblic. (Groningen, 1728), p. 65; Scaccchi, Myth. sacra. elocchir. p. 41; and the various commentators on the passages of Scripture, especially Rosenmüller, and Hengstenberg's Pentat. ii. 133. See Temple.

Laverty, William W., an American Presbyterian minister, was born in Union County, Pa., June 15, 1828; was educated at Washington College, Pa. (class of 1849), and studied theology in Princeton Theological Seminary. In the fall of 1855 he was ordained and installed pastor of Big Spring and New Cumberland churches, Ohio. In connection with his ministerial duties he also filled the position of principal of Hagerstown Academy. In 1857 he accepted the pastorate of the Wellsville and East Liverpool churches, Ohio, and in the spring of 1864 he was elected principal of Morgantown Church, at Morgantown, West Va., where he died Oct. 28, 1865. Mr. Laverty was especially adapted to the training and instruction of youth, and he always devoted himself with utmost assiduity to whatever he undertook.—Wilson, Paule, Historical Discourse, 1866, p. 167.

Lavallee, Pierre Joseph, a Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Mauriac, France, in 1830, and received both a collegiate and theological education in the universities of his native city. In 1849 he came to the United States, and was ordained priest the following year. After a year's service in New York City he was made professor of theology in St. Mary's College, Lebanon, Ky., and in 1855 was appointed president of the same institution. In 1859 he declined the proffered bishopric of Savannah, but in 1866 accepted that of Louisville. He died May 11, 1867. Bishop Lavallee was a man of great zeal and energy. He founded several educational and benevolent institutions in his diocese. His character was such as to win him the esteem not only of his own people, but of the citizens generally.—American Annual Cyclop. 428.

Lavenston, George, an English prelate, noted for his antagonism to Wesley and Whitefield, was born in Wiltshire in 1683; became canon of St. Paul's, London, in 1732, and in 1747 was promoted to the bishopric of Exeter. Shortly after his elevation to the episcopal dignity, Lavestone, who had lived from the first not only unfavourably upon the Methodistic movement, found an opportunity to exert his episcopal jurisdiction upon one of the ministers of his diocese, the Rev. Mr. Thompson, "the tolerant and zealous rector of St. Gemini," who had dared to exhort himself in behalf of a more genuine and active religious spirit among the people of his own parish, and the community in its neighborhood. In this instance the bishop failed utterly of cutting short the evangelizing efforts of an earnest and zealous servant of God, and he gave vent to his feelings by a public attack on the originators of the whole movement.—Wesley and Whitefield,—in a pamphlet entitled The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists compared (London, 1749, 8 parts, 8vo), in which he "exaggerated their real faults, and imputed to them many that were monstrous fictions." The attack was at once taken up by both the persons assailed in the pamphlet, and from the position assumed by Wesley in his answer many of the English Church divines have plucked an arrow in defence of their own Church in Wesley's day. Southey was the first to censure Wesley for the use of intemperate language in his reply to Lavestone, but there is really no good reason for any one, however anxious to shield Mr. Wesley from the odium of defending his harsh treatment of the bishop, when we consider that the provocation was great indeed. Mr. Tyerman, Wesley's latest biographer (London, 1871, 8 vols. 8vo; New York, Harper and Brothers, 3 vols. 8vo, 1872), certainly goes too far when he attempts to clear Wesley's skirts by saying that Lavestone "deserved all he got," and that he was a "baffooning bishop" and "a cowardly calumniator" (ii, 94, 156). But there is no justice in the attacks of modern English writers to praise bishop Lavestone so lavishly at the expense of Mr. Wesley. The bishop made a most unendurable assault on men who were engaged in a work approved and owned of God, and, as his later conduct towards lady Huntingdon and Wesley himself proves, retreated from the position he had taken, apologizing to her ladyship [Huntingdon] and the Messrs. Whitefield in order to avoid the harsh and unjust censures which he was led to pass on them," and even requested them to "accept his unfeigned regret at having unjustly wounded their feelings, and exposed them to the odium of the world!" (Lady Huntingdon's Life, p. 305, ch. viii). How in the face of this position, however hypocritical on the part of Lav- ington, any English writers can afford to defend bishop Lavington's position, as has been done lately in the North British Review (Jan. 1871), seems to us still more
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The higher interests of his spiritual kingdom require. Viewed in this light, miracles not only become possible, but even probable for the furtherance of the divine economy of salvation. (See Bushnell, Nature and the Supernatural.) See MIRACLE.

III. Forms of the Divine Law.—The manner in which God governs rational creatures is by a law, as the rule of their obedience to him, and this is what we call the manifest and moral government of the world. At their very creation he placed all intelligences under such a system. Thus he gave a law to angels, which some of them have kept, and have been confirmed in a state of obedience to it; but which others broke, and thereby plunged themselves into destruction and misery. In like manner he also gave a law to Adam, which was written in that covenant, and in which Adam stood as a covenant head to all his posterity (Rom. v.). But our first parents soon violated that law, and fell from a state of innocence to a state of sin and misery (Hos. vi. 7). See FALL.

1. The Law of Nature is the will of God, relating to human actions, grounded in the moral difference of things, and, because discoverable by natural light, obligatory upon all mankind (Rom. i. 20; ii, 14, 15). This law is coeval with the human race, binding all over the globe, and at all times; yet, through the corruption of man, subject to secular reason, it is the judgment which intellectually determines the moral quality of an act, and this always by a comparison with some assumed standard. With those who have a revelation, this, of course, is the test; with others, education, tradition, or caprice. Hence the importance of a trained conscience, not only for the purpose of cultivating its susceptibility to a high degree of sensitiveness and authority, but also in order to correct the judgment and furnish it a just basis of decision. A perverted or misled conscience is scarcely less disastrous than a hard or blind one. History is full of the miseries and mischiefs occasioned by a misguided moral sense.

2. Ceremonial Law is that which prescribes the rites of worship under the Old Testament. These rites were typical of Christ, and were obligatory only till Christ had finished his work, and began to erect his Gospel Church (Heb. vii. 9, 11; x; i; Eph. ii, 16; Col. ii, 14; Gal. v. 2, 3)."
imperfection. We are not under it, however, as a covenant of works (Gal. iii. 13), or as a source of terror (Rom. vii. 1), although we must abide by it, together with the whole perceptive word of God, as the rule of our conduct (Rom. iii. 31; vii.). See LAW OF MOSES.

IV. Scriptural Use of the Law.—The word "law" (תורה, תורָכָה, νόμος) is properly used, in Scripture as elsewhere, to express a definite commandment laid down by any recognised authority. The commandment may be general or (as in Lev. vi. 9, 14, etc., "the law of the burnt-offering," etc.) particular in its bearing, the authority either human or divine. It is extended to present, past, and future, to duties, sanitary or moral, arrangements ("the law of that has been in childhood," or of those that have had the leprosy, Lev. xiv. 2), or even to an architectural design ("the law of the house," Ezek. xxiii, 12): so in Rom. vii. 2, "the law of the husband," his authority over his wife. But when the word is used with the article, and without any words of limitation, it refers to the expressed will of God, and, in nine cases out of ten, to the Mosaic law, or to the Pentateuch, of which it forms the chief portion.

The Hebrew word (derived from the root יָרָה, "point out," and so "to direct and lead") lays more stress on its moral authority, as teaching the truth, and guiding in the right way; the Greek, from νόμος (assign or appoint) on its constraining power, as imposed and enforced by a recognized authority. But in either case it is a commandment proceeding from without, and distinguished from the free action of its subjects, although not necessarily opposed thereto.

The sense of the word, however, extends its scope, and assumes a more abstract character in the writings of the apostle Paul. νόμος, when used by him with the article, still refers in general to the law of Moses; but when used without the article, so as to embrace any manifestation of "law," it includes all powers which act on the will of man by compulsion, or by the pressure of external motives, whether their commands be or be not expressed in definite forms. This is seen in the constant opposition of ἐναντίων συνόμοι ("works done under the command of law," or "works of faith," that is, works done freely by the internal influence of faith. A still more remarkable use of the word is found in Rom. vii. 23, where the power of evil over the will, arising from the corruption of man, is spoken of as a "law of sin," that is, an unnatural tyranny proceeding from an enmity to God. The same word, in a different sense, is used in the term "law" to denote the Christian dispensation in contrast with that of Moses (James i. 25; ii. 12; iv. 11; comp. Rom. x. 4; Heb. vii. 12, 13; also for the law or precepts established by the Gospel (Rom. xiii. 8, 10).

The occasional use of the word "law" (as in Rom. iii. 27, "law of faith," in vii. 23, "law of my mind" [ῥόου κανόν] ; in viii. 2, "law of the spirit of life," and in James i. 25; ii. 12, "a perfect law, the law of liberty") to denote an internal principle of action does not really militate against the general rule. For in each case it will be seen that such principle is spoken of in contrast with some formal law, and the word "law" is consequently applied to it "improperly," in order to mark this opposition, the qualifying words which follow guarding against any danger of misapprehension of its real character.

It should be noticed that the title "the law" is occasionally used loosely to refer to the whole of the Old Testament (as in John x. 34, referring to Psa. lxxxii. 6; in John xv. 25, referring to Psa. xxxvii. 19; and in 1 Cor. xiv. 21, referring to Is. xxviii. 11, 12). This usage is probably due, not only to desire of brevity and to the natural prominence of the Pentateuch, but also to the predominance in the older covenant (when considered separately from the new, for which it was the preparation) of an external and legal character.—Smith, a. v.

It should be noted, however, that νόμος very often stands, even when without the article, for the Mosaic law, the term in that sense being so well known as not to be liable to be misunderstood. See ARTICLE, GREEK.

LAW OF MOSES (תּוֹרָתָה הָגֵרָה) signifies the whole body of Mosaic legislation (1 Kings ii. 6; 2 Kings xxiii. 20; Ezra iii, 2), the law given by Moses, which, in reference to its divine origin, is called הָגֵרָה הָיֵשָׂ, הַלָּוֶת הַיָּהָּוֶת, the law of Jehovah (Psa. xxx. 8; xxxvii. 31; Is. xlv. 24, xxx. 9). In the latter sense it is called, by way of eminence, הָגֵרָה הָיֵשָׂ, THE LAW (Deut. i. 5; iv. 8, 44; xvii. 18, 19, xxxiii, 3, 8). When not so much the substance of legislation, but rather the external writing made in which it is contained is meant, the following terms are employed: "Book of the Law of Moses" (2 Kings xiv. 6; Isa. xxxiii, viii. 31; xxix. 6); "Book of the Law of the Lord," or "Book of the Law of God" (Josh. xxiv. 26). "Judgments," "testimonies," etc., are the various precepts contained in the law. In the present article (which has been carefully compiled from the most recent codifications, compared with the sacred text, and which strenuously maintains the perpetual obligation of the ten commandments), we propose to give a brief analysis of its substance, without digressing into its main principles, and to explain the position which it occupies in the progress of divine revelation. For the history of its delivery, see Moses; EXODUS; for its authenticity, see PENTATEUCH; for its particular ordinances, see each in its alphabetical place.

The law is especially embodied in the last four books of the Pentateuch, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Leviticus, and Exodus. Formerly there was perceptible some arrangement of the various precepts, although they are not brought into a system. In Deuteronomy the law or legislation contained in the three preceding books is repeated with slight modifications. See each of these books.

The Jews assert that, besides the writings law, תּוֹרָתָה הָגֵרָה, νόμος תּוֹרָתָה הָגֵרָה, which may be translated into other languages, and which is contained in the Pentateuch, there was communicated to Moses on Mount Sinai an oral law, לֶטָנָה תּוֹרָתָה הָגֵרָה, νόμοס ἀνθρώπου, which was subsequently written down, together with many rabbinical observations, and is contained in the twelve folio volumes which now constitute the Talmud, and which the Jews assert cannot be, or at least ought not to be, translated. See TALMUD.

The Rabbins divide the whole Mosaic law into 618 precepts, of which 249 are affirmative and 369 negative. The number of the affirmative precepts corresponds to the 248 members of which, according to rabbinical anatomy, the whole human body consists. The number of the negative precepts corresponds to the 865 days of the solar year, which corresponded to the rabbins to spiegei (which has been published in Jewish German at Cracow and in other places), the negative precepts agree in number with the 865 veins which, they say, are found in the human body. Hence their logic concludes that if on each day each member of the human body keeps one affirmative precept and abstains from one thing forbidden, the whole law, and not the Decalogue alone, is kept. The whole law is sometimes called by Jewish writers Therieg, which word is formed from the Hebrew letters that are employed to express the number 618, viz. 400 + 200 = 600, 10 + 8 = 18. Hence 618 = 400 + 200 + 10 + 8 = 618. Hence 618 = 618. Therieg. Women are subject to the negative precepts or prohibitions only, and not to the affirmative precepts or injunctions. This exception arises partly from their nature, and partly from their being subject to the authority of husbands. According to some rabbinical statements women are subject to 100 precepts only, of which 36 are affirmative and 64 negative. The number 618 corresponds also to the number of letters in the Decalogue. Others are inclined to find that there are 620 precepts according to the numerical value of the word תּוֹרָתָה הָגֵרָה, viz. 400 + 200 = 400 + 20 = 2; and others, again, observe that the numerical value of the letter-
The Law with reference to the Past History of the People.—1. It is of the utmost importance, for the proper understanding of the law, to remember its entire dependence on the Abrahamic Covenant, and its adaptation thereto (see Gal. iii. 17-24). That covenant had a twofold character. It contained the "spiritual promise" of the Messiah, which was given to the Jews as representatives of the whole human race, and as guardians of a treasure in which "all families of the earth should be blessed." This would prepare the Jewish nation to be the centre of the unity of all mankind. But it contained also the temporal promises subsidiary to the former, and requisite in order to prepare for the latter. The promises, though which the race of man should be educated and prepared for the coming of the Redeemer. These promises were special, given distinction to the Jews as a nation, and calculated to separate them from other nations of the earth. It follows, then, that there should be a corresponding duality of nature. There would be much in it peculiar to the Jews, local, special, and transitory; but the fundamental principles on which it was based must be universal, because expressing the will of an unchanging God, and springing from relations to him inherent in human nature, and therefore perpetual and universal in their application.

2. The nature of this relation of the law to the promise is clearly pointed out. The belief in God as the Redeemer and the hope of his manifestation as such in the person of the Messiah, involved the belief that the Messiah, which power must be superior to all carnal obstructions, and that there was in man a spiritual element which could rule his life by communion with a Spirit from above. But it involved also the idea of an antagonistic power of evil, from which man was to be redeemed, existing in each individual, and existing also in the world at large. The promise of the one, the law was the declaration of the other. It was "added because of transgressions." In the individual it stood between his better and his worse self, in the world, between the Jewish nation as the witness of the promise, and the heathen races, which groaned under the power of the flesh. It was intended, by the gift of guidance and the presence of motives, to strengthen the weakness of good, while it curbed directly the power of evil. It followed inevitably that, in the individual, it assumed somewhat of a coercive, and, as between Israel and the world, somewhat of an antagonistic and isolating character; and hence that, viewed without reference to the promise (as was the case with the later Jews), it might actually become a hindrance to the true revelation of God, and to the mission for which the nation had been made a "chosen people." 3. Nor is it less essential to note the period of the history at which it was given. It marked and determined the transition of Israel from the condition of a tribe to that of a nation, and its definite assumption of a distinct position and office in the history of the world. It is on a natural metaphor that we have the well-known analogy between the stages of individual life and those of national or universal existence. In Israel the patriarchal time was that of childhood, ruled chiefly through the affections and the power of natural relationship, with rules few, simple, and unsystematic. The national period was that of youth, in which this indirect teaching and influence gives place to definite assertions of right and responsibility, and to a system of distinct commandments, needed to control its vigorous and impulsive action. The fifty days of their wandering alone with God in the silence of the wilderness represent that awakening to the difficulty, the responsibility, and the nobleness of life, which marks the "putting away of childish things." The law is the sign and the seal of such an awakening.

4. Yet, though new in its general conception, it was probably not wholly new in its materials. Neither in his physical nor his spiritual providence does God proceed per salutum. There must necessarily have been, before the law, commandments and revelations of a fragmentary character, under which Israel had hitherto grown up. Indications of such a growth are easily found, both in the moral and spiritual nature, as, for example, in the penalties against murder, adultery, and fornication (Gen. iv. 6; xxxviii, 24), in the existence of the Levirate law (Gen. xxxviii, 8), in the distinction of clean and unclean animals (Gen. viii, 20), and probably in the observance of the Sabbath (Exod. xxvi, 27-29). But whatever about such indications, our knowledge of the existence of Israel as a distinct community in Egypt would necessitate the conclusion that it must have been guided by some laws of its own, growing out of the old patriarchal customs, which had been preserved with Ontario purity, and gradually becoming methodized by the progress of circumstances. Nor would it be possible for the Israelites to be in contact with an elaborate system of ritual and law, such as that which existed in Egypt, without being influenced by its general principles, and, in less degree, by its minor details. As they approached nearer to the condition of a nation they would be more and more likely to modify their patriarchal customs by the adoption from Egypt of laws which were fitted for national existence. This being so, it is hardly conceivable that the Israelite legislation should have embodied none of these earlier materials. It is clear, even to human wisdom, that the only constitution which can be efficient and permanent is one which has grown up slowly, and so been assimilated to the character of a people. It is the peculiar mark of legislative genius to mould by fundamental principles, and animate by a higher inspiration, materials previously existing in a crude state. The necessity for this lies in the nature, not of the legislator, but of the subjects, and the argument, therefore, is but strengthened by the acknowledgment in the teachings of the wisdom of the Gentile nation. So far, therefore, as they were consistent with the objects of the Jewish law, the customs of Palestine and the laws of Egypt would doubtless be traceable in the Mosaic system.

5. In close connection with this, and almost in consequence of its reference to antiquity, we find an accommodation of the law to the temper and circumstances of the Israelites, to which our Lord refers in the case of the divorce (Matt. xix, 7, 8) as necessarily interfering with its absolute perfection. In many cases it rather should be said to guide and modify existing usages than actually to sanction them; and the ignorance of their existence may lead to a conception of its ordinances not only erroneous, but actually the reverse of the truth. Thus the punishment of filial disobedience appears severe (Deut. xxxi, 15, 21); yet when we refer to the extent of parental authority in a patriarchal system, or (as at Rome) in the earlier periods of national existence, it appears more like a limitation of absolute parental authority by an appeal to the judgment of the community. The Levirate law, again, appears (see Mich. Mts. Reht, bks. iii, ch. vi, art. 98) to have existed in a far more jeraphic form in the early Asiatic peoples, and to have been rather limited than favored by Moses. The law of the avenger of blood is a similar instance of merciful limitation and distinction in the exercise of an immemorial usage, probably not without its value and meaning, and certainly too deep-seated to admit of artificial distinction. Nor is it less noticeable that the degree of prominence given to each part of the Mosaic system
once a moral, a ceremonial, and a political bearing; and in
fact, although in particular cases one or other of these
classes predominated, yet the whole principle of the
Mosaic institutions is to obliterate any such supposed
separation of laws and refer all to first principles, de-
pending on the will of God and the nature of man.
In giving an analysis of the substance of the law, we
will probably be better to treat it, as any other system
of laws is usually treated, by dividing it into (1) Civil;
(2) Criminal; (3) Judicial and Constitutional; (4) Ec-
cleratic; (5) Ceremonial.

I. LAWS CIVIL

1. Of Persons.

(a) Father and Son.
The power of a Father to be held sacred: cursing, or
smiting (Exod. xx, 11, 15; Lev. xvi, 9), or stubborn and
wilful disobedience to be considered capital crimes. But
uncontrolled power of life and death was apparently re-
fused to the father, and vested only in the congregation
(Deut. xix, 18-21).

Right of the first-born to a double portion of the inheritance
which fell by the death of a son (Exod. xix, 3). For an
example of the authority of the first-born, see 1 Sam.
x, 29 ("My brother, he hath commanded me to be there").

Inheritance by Daughters to be allowed in default of
sons, provided (Numb. xxvi, 6-8; comp. xxvii) that he-
nomists should not alienate their own tribe.

Daughters unmarried to be entirely dependent on their
father (Deut. xxii, 15-17).

(b) Husband and Wife.
The power of a Husband to be so great that a wife could
never be put to death, or enter independently into any en-
agement, as regards God (Numb. xxv, 11); or, if she
were divorced, or divorced wife became independent, and
did not again fall under her father's power (ver. 9).

Dissolution of marriage allowed, but to be formal and
irrevocable (Deut. xxxi, 1-4).

Marriage within certain degrees forbidden (Exod. xviii,
etc.).

A Slave Wife, whether bought or captived, not to be ac-
tual property, nor to be sold; if ill treated, to be given
free (Exod. xi, 1-9; Deut. xxi, 10-14).

Slander against a wife's virginity to be punished by fine,
and by a hundred shekels of silver or divorce; on the other
hand ante-nuptial unchastity in her to be punished by death
(Deut. xxi, 20-21).

The right of a Widow (Leviticus) a formal right to be
claimed by the widow, under pain of infamy, with a
view to preservation of families (Deut. xxv, 5-10).

Power of Master so far limited that death under actual
chastisement was punishable (Exod. xx, 20); and maim-
ing was to give liberty (Exod. i, 26).

The Hebrew Slave to be freed at the sabbatical year, and
provided with necessaries (his wife and children to go
with him), and a just wage to be paid to his master out of
his own formal act he consented to be perpetual slave
(Exod. xxi, 1-8; Deut. xv, 12-15). In any case (it would
seem) to be the Jubilee (Lev. xxv, 3, 10), and given to
the children. (a) to a resident alien, to be always redeem-
able, at a price proportional to the distance of the jubilee
(Lev. xxv, 37).

Foreign Slaves to be held and inherited as property for-
ever (Lev. xxv, 39); and fugitive slaves from foreign
nations not to be given up (Deut. xxiii, 13). See SLAV.

(c) Foreigners.

They seem never to have been put to death, or able to pro-
spect themselves, and accordingly protected accordingly
and are therefore also as a body so far as regards them as enjoined as a sacred duty (Exod. xxvii, 21; Lev. xix, 33, 34).

2. LAW OF THINGS

(a) Land and Land (and Property).

(1) All Land to be the property of God alone, and its
holders to be deemed His tenants (Lev. xxv, 23).

(2) Aliens may hold, and therefore to return to its original
owners at the jubilee, and the price of sale to be calculated
accordingly; and redemption on equitable terms to be
allowed on the principle of grace (Lev. xxv, 26).

A House sold to be redeemable within a year; and, if not
redeemed, to pass away altogether (xxv, 39, 40).

But the land of the Levites, or those unvailed vil-
lages, to be redeemable at all times, in the same way as
land; and the Levitical suburbs to be inalienable (xxv, 31-
34).

(3) Land or Houses sanctified, or tithes, or unclean first-
lings, to be the property of God, and of being redeemed at six-fifths value
(calculated according to the distance from the jubilee year
by the priest); if devoted by the owner and unredeemed,
it to be held by the Jubilee forever, and given to the
priests: if only by a possessor, to return to the owner at
the jubilee (Lev. xxv, 16-34).
(4) Inheritance:

(5) Deed

(6) Daughter

(7) Deceased

(8) On the Father's side

(9) Estate

(10) Laws of Deed

(11) Debt

(12) Interest

(13)Canonical law

(14) Tithes

(15) Tithes of produce

(16) Levites

(17) Holy places

(18) Poor

(19) Laws of produce

(20) Slaughter of animals

(21) God's will

(22) Command

(23) Murder

(24) Murderer

(25) Blood

(26) Death by stoning

(27) Idols

(28) Oppression

(29) Against Man

(30) Command

(31) Disobedience to or slaying of parents

(32) Command

(33) Murder

(34) Slaying

(35) Accidental homicide

(36) Assault to be punished by lex talionis

(37) Command

(38) Slaughter of animals

(39) Deceased

(40) Ordinance of the dead

(41) Ordinary sacrifices

(42) The Sin-offering

(43) The Peace-offering

(44) The trespass offering

(45) The burnt offering

(46) The sin offering

(47) The guilt offering

(48) The peace offering
But this theocratic character of the law depends necessarily on the belief in God as not only the creator and sustainer of the world, but as, by special covenant, the head of the Jewish nation. It is not indeed doubted that he is the king of all the earth, and that all earthly authorities are derived from him; but here again, in the case of the Israelites, the intermediate steps are all but ignored, and the people are at once brought face to face with him as their ruler. It is to be especially noticed that God's claim (so to speak) on their allegiance is based, not on his power or wisdom, but on his especial mercy in being their saviour from Egyptian bondage. Because they were made free by him, therefore they became his servants (comp. Rom. vi. 19-22); and the declaration which stands at the opening of the law is, "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt." (Compare also the reason given for the observance of the Sabbath in Deut. v. 15; and the historical preface of the delivery of the second law [Deut. i. 11]; of the renewal of the covenant by Joshua [Josh. xxiv. 1-18]; and of the rebuke of Samuel at the establishment of the kingdom over the heathen and the sojourner (Lev. xxv. 39-46).)

From this theocratic nature of the law follow important deductions with regard to (a) the view which it takes of political society; (b) the extent of the scope of the law; (c) the people by which it is enforced; and (d) the character which it seeks to impress on the people.

(1) The basis of human society is ordinarily sought, by law or philosophy, either in the rights of the individual, and the partial delegation of them to political authorities; or in the mutual needs of men, and the relations which spring from them; or in the actual existence of power of man over man, whether arising from natural relationship, or from benefits conferred, or from physical or intellectual ascendancy. The maintenance of society is supposed to depend on a "social compact" between governors and subjects; a compact, true as an abstract idea, but untrue if supposed to have been a historical reality. The Mosaic law seeks the basis of its polity, first, in the absolute sovereignty of God; next, in the relationship of each individual to God, and through God to his community. It is clear that such a doctrine, while it contradicts none of the common theories, yet lies beneath them all, and shows why each of them, being only a secondary deduction from an ultimate truth, cannot be in itself sufficient; and, if it claim to be the whole truth, which it does, it shows how that doctrine which is insisted upon and developed in the whole series of prophecy, and which is brought to its perfection only when applied to that universal and spiritual kingdom for which the Mosaic system was a preparation. (2) The law, as proceeding directly from God, and

III. Distinctive Characteristics of the Mosaic Law.—

1. The leading principle of the whole is its theocratic character, its reference (that is) of all action and thoughts of men directly and immediately to the will of God. All law, indeed, must ultimately make this reference. But it is on the foundation of human authority, it must finally trace that authority to God's pointment; if on the rights of the individual and the need of protecting them, it must consider these rights as inherent and sacred, because implanted by the hand of the Creator. But it is characteristic of the Mosaic law, as also of all Biblical history, that it passes over all the intermediate steps, and refers at once to God's commandment as the foundation of all human duty. The key to it is found in the ever-recurring formula, "Ye shall observe all these statutes; I am Jehovah." It follows from this that it is to be regarded not merely as a law, that is, a rule of conduct, based on known truth and acknowledged authority, but also as a revelation of God's nature and his dispensations. In this view of it, more particularly, lies its connection with the rest of the Old Testament, with a law, it is definite and (generally speaking) final; as a revelation, it is the beginning of the great system of prophecy, and indeed bears within itself the marks of gradual development, from the first simple declaration ("I am the Lord thy God") in Exodus, to the full and solemn declaration of his nature and will in Deuteronomy. With this peculiar character of revelation stamped upon it, it naturally ascends from rule to principle, and regards all goodness in man as the shadow of the divine attributes, "Ye shall be holy: for I am the Lord your God am holy." (Lev. xix. 2, etc.; comp. Matt. v. 46.)
referred directly to him, is necessarily absolute in its supremacy and unlimited in its scope.

It is supreme over the governors, as being only the delegate of God, and therefore it is incompatible with any despotic authority in them. This is seen in its limitation of the power of the master over the slave, in the restrictions laid on the priesthood, and the ordination of the "manner of the kingdom" (Deut. xxvii, 14-20; comp. 1 Sam. x, 25). By its word, it may bind and side by side with the authority of the heads of tribes ("the princes"), and the subsequent sovereignty of the king, it provides a balance of powers, all of which are regarded as subordinate. The absolute sovereignty of Jehovah was asserted in the earlier part of the book itself, and was more clearly under the kingdom by the spiritual commission of the prophet. By his rebukes of priests, princes, and kings for abuse of their power, he was not only defending religion and morality, but also maintaining the divinely-appointed constitution of Israel.

On the other hand, it is supreme over the governed, recognizing no inherent rights in the individual as pre- vailing against, or limiting the law. It is therefore unlimited in its scope. There is in it no recognition, such as is familiar to us, that there is one class of actions directed against the power of the lawgiver, and another against the acts of the lawgiver; a threat of the judgment of the lawgiver, who could promise or threaten retribution from the providence of God in this life, and submit his predictions to the test of actual experience. The truth seems to be that, in a law which appeals directly to God himself for its authority and its sanction, there cannot be that broad line of demarcation between this life and the next which is drawn for those whose power is limited by the grave. Our Lord has taught us (Matt. xxii, 31-32) that in the very revelation of God, as the "God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob," the promise of immortality and future retribution was implicitly contained. We may apply this declaration even more strongly to a law in which God was revealed as entering into covenant with Israel, and in them drawing mankind directly under his immediate government. His blessings and curses, by the very fact that they came from him, would be felt to be unlimited by time, and the plain and immediate fulfilment which they found in this life would be accepted as an earnest of a deeper, though more mysterious completion in the world to come. But the time for the clear revelation of this truth had not yet come, and the promises of eternal life and its retribution is implied, yet the rewards and penalties of the present life are those which are plainly held out and practically dwelt upon.

(b.) But perhaps the most important consequence of the theocratic nature of the law was the peculiar character of goodness which it is sung of love and peace. Goodness in its relation to man takes the forms of righteousness and love; in its independence of all relation, the form of purity; and in its relation to God, that of piety. Laws which contemplate men chiefly in their worldly relations, enforce by penalty the first two; the Mosaic law, beginning with piety as its first object, enforces most emphatically the purity essential to those who, by their union with God, have recovered the hope of intrinsic goodness, while it views righteousness and love rather as deductions from these than as independent objects. That it neglects these qualities; on the contrary, it is full of precepts which show a high conception and tender care of our relative duties to man (see, for example, Exod. xxi, 7-11, 28-88; xxiii, 1-9; Deut. xxii, 1-4; xxv, 10-22, etc.); but these can hardly be called its distinguishing feature. It is the Moses of Leviticus, referring to the bond of domestic peace (Lev. xix, 16), the contrary, the care for the purity of the people stands...
out remarkably, not only in the enforcement of ceremonial "cleanliness," and the multitude of precautions or remedies against any breach of it, but also in the severity of the laws against self-pollution, a severity which distinguishes the Mosaic code before all others, ancient and modern. In its severity these sine, as committees against a man's own self, without reference to their effect on others, and in recognizing purity as having a substantive value and glory, it sets up a standard of individual morality such as, even in Greece and Rome, probably, in no age was even most exceptionally considered, which has ever anywhere been adopted or proposed. It precludes the possibility of attempting to extort from the people contributions beyond their power, and it renders the taxation of each individual proportionate to his possessions; and even this exceedingly mild taxation was apparently left to the conscience of each person. This we infer from there never occurring in the Bible the slightest vestige either of persons having been sued or goods distrained for tithes, and only an indication of curses resting upon the neglect of paying them. Tithes were paid in kind, and, as the laws prescribed, and, nevertheless they were not recovered by law during the period of the tabernacle and of the first Temple. It is only during the period of the second Temple, when a general demoralization had taken place, that tithes were farmed and sold, and levied by violent proceedings, in which refractory persons were thrown in prison for refusal to pay. There was no condemnation or example of such proceeding occurs in the Bible. This seems to indicate that the propriety of paying these lenient and beneficial taxes was generally felt, so much so that there were few, or perhaps no defaults, and that it was considered expedient on the part of the remissness to harass the neglected.

Besides the tithes there was a small poll-tax, amounting to half a shekel for each adult male. This was paid for the maintenance of the sanctuary. In addition to this, the first-fruits and the first-born of men and cattle were devoted to the revenue. The first-born of men and of unclean beasts were to be redeemed by money. To this may be added some fines paid in the shape of sin-offerings, and also the vows and free-will offerings.

3. In addition to these great moral and liturgical ends of the Mosaic institutes, we must not fail to notice their natural results. The whole plan of the Mosaic legislation was to be so distributed that each family should have a freehold, which was intended to remain permanently the inheritance of that family, and which, even if sold, was to return to the state to be distributed over to the whole community. To the whole community there were, strictly speaking, neither citizens, nor a profane or lay nobility, nor lords temporal. We do not overlook the fact that there were persons called heads, elders, princes, deacons, or leaders among the Israelites; that is, persons who by their intelligence, character, wealth, and other circumstances were leading men among them, and from whom even the seventy judges were chosen who assisted Moses in administering justice to the nation. But we have no proof that there was a nobility enjoying prerogatives similar to those which are connected with birth in several countries of Europe, sometimes in spite of mental and moral disqualifications. We do not find that, according to the Mosaic constitution, there were hereditary peers temporal. Even the inhabitants of towns were freeholders, and their exercise of trades seems to have been combined with, or subordinate to, agricultural pursuits. The only nobility was that of the tribe of Levi, and all the lords were lords spiritual, the descendants of Aaron. The priests and Levites were ministers of public worship, that is, ministers of Jehovah the King, and, as such, they were the most eligible, it seems, for the legislative as well as the judicial power was exercised. The poor were mercifully considered, but beggars are never mentioned. Hence it appears that, as, on the one hand, there was no lay nobility, so, on the other, there was no mendicity.
LAW OF MOSES

Owing to the rebellious spirit of the Israelites, the military injunctions of their law were so frequently transgressed that it could not procure for them that degree of prosperity which it was calculated to produce among a nation of faithful observers; but it is evident that the national legislation, if truly observed, was more fitted to promote universal happiness and tranquillity than any other constitution, either ancient or modern.

We close this part of our discussion by a few miscellaneous observations on minor peculiarities of the Mosaic code.

It has been deemed a defect that there were no laws against infanticide; but it may well be observed, as a proof of national prosperity, that there are no historical traces of this crime; and it would certainly have been preposterous to give laws against a crime which did not occur, except in the cases of general or accidental murder. "Thou shalt not kill," was applicable to this species also.

The words of Josephus (Contra Apionem, ii, 24) can only mean that the crime was against the spirit of the Mosaic law. An express verbal prohibition of this kind is not extant.

There occur also no laws and regulations about wills and testamentary dispositions, although there are sufficient historical facts to prove that the next of kin was considered the lawful heir, that primogeniture was deemed the highest importance, and that, if there were no male descendants, females inherited the freehold property.

We have quoted of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that the Jews disposed of property by wills; but it seems that in the time of Moses, and for some period after him, all Israelites died intestate. However, the word אביהם, as used in Matthew, Mark, Acts, Romans, Revelation, etc., and repeatedly in the Hebrews, implies rather a disposition, arrangement, agreement between parties, than a will in the legal acceptance of the term. See Testament.

There are no laws concerning guardians, and none against luxurious living. The inefficiency of sumptuary laws is now generally recognized, although renowned legislators in ancient times and in the Middle Ages displayed on this subject their wisdom, falsely so called.

Neither are there any laws against suicide. Hence we infer that suicide was rare, as we may well suppose in a nation of small freeholders, and that the inefficiency of such laws was understood.

The Mosaic legislation recognizes the human dignity of women and of slaves, and particularly enjoins not to slander the deaf nor mislead the blind.

Moses expressly enjoined not to reap the corners of fields, nor to appropriate the poor, orphans, widows, and strangers, and even of the beast of the field.

The laws of Moses against crimes are severe, but not cruel. The agony of the death of criminals was never artificially protracted, as in some instances was usual in various countries of Europe even in the present century; nor was torture employed in order to compel criminals to confess their crimes, as was usual in ancient times, and till a comparatively recent period. Forty was the maximum number of stripes to be inflicted. This maximum was adopted for the reason expressly stated that the person punished should not become horrible, or, as J. D. Michaelis renders it, "burnt," which expresses the appearance of a person unmercifully beaten. Punishments were inflicted in order specially to express the sacred indignation of the divine Lawgiver against wilful transgression of his commandments, and to satisfy the wrath of human vengeance, or for the sake of frightening other criminals. In some instances the people at large were appealed to in order to inflict summary punishment by stoning the criminal to death. This was, in fact, the most usual mode of execution. Other methods of capital punishment, as burning, were always public, and conducted with the cooperation of the people. Like every human proceeding, this was liable to abuse, but not to so much abuse as our present mode of conducting lawsuits, which, on account of their costliness, often afford but little protection to persons in narrow circumstances. In lawsuits very much was left to the discretion of the judges, his position greatly resembling that of a permanent jury, who had not merely to decide whether a person was guilty, but who frequently had also to award the amount of punishment to be inflicted.

In the Old Testament we do not hear of a learned profession of the law. Lawyers ( νομοκοι) are mentioned only after the decline of the Mosaic institutions had considerably progressed. As, however, certain laws concerning contract and punishment were administered by the priests, these might be called lawyers. They, nevertheless, did not derive their maintenance from the administration of these laws, but were supported by glebe-lands, titles, and portions of the sacrificial offerings.

It is, indeed, very remarkable that, in a nation so entirely governed by law, there were no lawyers forming a distinct profession, and that the νομοκοί of a later age were not so much remarkable for enforcing the spirit of the law as rather for ingeniously evading its injunctions, by leading the attention of the people from its spirit to a more minute literal fulfilment of its letter. See Law

IV. In considering the relation of the law to the future, it is important to be guided by the general principle laid down in Heb. vii, 19, "The law made nothing perfect" (τοῖς ἐκλεισμοις τοῦ νόμου). This principle will be applied in different degrees to its bearing (a) on the after-history of the Jewish commonwealth before the coming of Christ; (b) on the coming of our Lord himself; and (c) on the dispensation of the Gospel.

1. To that after-history the law was, to a great extent, the key; for in ceremonial and criminal law it was complete and final. In civil and constitutional law, it laid down clearly the general principles to be afterwards more fully developed. It was, indeed, often neglected, and even forgotten. Its fundamental assertion of the theocracy was violated by the constant lapses into idolatry, and its provisions for the good of man overwhelmed by the natural course of human selfishness (Jcr. xxxiv, 12-17); till at last, in the reign of Josiah, its very existence was unknown, and its discovery was to the king and the people as a second publication; yet it still formed the standard from which they knowingly departed, and to which the constantly returned, and to it, therefore, all which was peculiar in their national and individual character was due. Its direct influence was probably greatest in the periods before the establishment of the kingdom and after the Babylonian captivity. The last act of Joshua was to bind the Israelites together as a nation and to provide for the occupation of the conquered land (Josh. xxiv, 24-27); and, in the semi-anarchical period of the Judges, the law and the tabernacle were the only centres of anything like national unity. The establishment of the kingdom was due to an impatience of this position, and a desire for a visible and personal centre of authority, much the same in nature as that which plunged them so often into idolatry. The people were warned (1 Sam. xii, 6-25) that it involved great danger of their forgetting and rejecting the main principle of the law—that "Jehovah their God was their king." The truth of this, as it had been soon shown. Even under Solomon, as soon as the monarchy became one of great splendor and power, it assumed a heathenish and polytheistic character, breaking the law both by its dishonor towards God and its forbidden tyranny over man. Indeed, if the law was looked upon as the expression of an abstraction of abstractions, as a means of knowledge of a personal god, it was inevitable that it should be overthrown by the presence of a visible and personal authority.

Therefore it was that from the time of the establishment of the kingdom the people, without any apparent object, were always at war, and the object was to enforce and to perfect the law by bearing testimony to the great truths on which it was built, viz. the truth of God's government over all, kings, priests, and people alike, and the consequent certainty of a
righteous retribution. It is plain that at the same time the covenant went far beyond the law as a definite code of institutions. It dwelt rather on its great principles, which were to transcend the special forms in which they were embodied. It frequently contrasted (as in Isa. i, etc.) the external observance of form with the spiritual homage of the heart. It tended therefore, at least ideally, at any rate in its anti-Knesa, according to the contrast drawn by Jeremiah, the law written on the tables of stone should give place to a new covenant, depending on a law written on the heart, and therefore coercive no longer (Jer. xxxi, 31-34). In this it did but carry out the predictions of the law itself (Deut. xxxii, 7-29), and prepare the way for the Prophet who was to come.

Still the law remained as the distinctive standard of the people. In the kingdom of Judah, the very division of the monarchy and consequent diminution of its splendor, and the need of a principle to assert against the superior materialism of the gentes, brought out the law once more in increased honor and influence. In the days of Jehoshaphat we find, for the first time, that it was taken by the Levites in their circuits through the land, and the people were taught by it (2 Chron. xvii, 9). We find it especially spoken of in the oath taken by the king "at his pillar" in the Temple, and made the standard of reference in the reformation of Hezekiah and Josiah (2 Kings xi, 14; xxii, 3; 2 Chron. xxx, 14-31).

Far more was this the case after the captivity. The revival of the existence of Israel was hailed by the new and solemn publication of the law by Ezra, and the institution of the synagoge, through which it became deeply and familiarly known. See Ezra. The loss of the independent monarchy, and the cessation of prophecy, both combined to throw the Jews back upon the law alone as their only distinctive pledge of nationality and sure guide to truth. The more they mingled with the other subject-nations under the Persian and Grecian empires, the more eagerly they clung to it as their distinction and safeguard; and opening the knowledge of it to the heathen by the translation of the Septuagint, they based on it their proverbial eagerness to proselytize. This love for the law, rather than any abstract patriotism, was the strength of the Maccabean struggle against the Syrians (note here the question as to the lawfulness of war on the Sabbath in this war [1 Macc. ii, 33-41]), and the success of that struggle, environing a Levitical polity, as the true reflection of the new spirit, from which the Jews were so entered into the heart of the people that open idolatry became impossible. The certainty and authority of the law's commandments amidst the perplexities of paganism, and the spirituality of its doctrine as contrasted with sensual and caroal idolatries, were the favorite boast of the Jews, and the secret of his influence among the heathen.

The law thus became the moulding influence of the Jewish character; and, instead of being looked upon as subsidiary to the promise, and a means to its fulfilment, it was exalted to supreme importance as at once a means and a pledge of national and individual sanctity.

This feeling laid hold of and satisfied the mass of the people, harmonizing as it did with their ever-increasing spirit of an almost fanatic nationalism, until the destruction of the city. The Pharisees, truly representing the chief strength of the people, systematized this feeling; they gave it fresh food, and assumed a predominant leadership over it by the floating mass of tradition which they gradually accumulated around the law as a nucleus. The popular use of the word "lawless" (ἀραγόν) as a term of contempt (Acts ii, 21; 1 Cor. xiv, 21) for the heathen, and even for the uneducated mass of their followers (John vii, 49), marked and stereotyped their principle.

Against this idolatry of the law (which, when imported into the Christian Church, is described and vehemently denounced by St. Paul) there were two reactions. The first was that of the Sadducees; one which had its basis, according to common tradition, in the idea of a higher love and service of God, independent of the law and its sanctions, but which degenerated into a speculative and abstract and anti-theocratic faith, and which probably had but little hold of the people. The other, that of the Essenes, was an attempt to burst the bonds of the formal law, and assert its ideas in all fullness, freedom, and purity. In its practical form it assumed the character of high and ascetic devotion to God; its speculative guise is seen in the school of Philo, as a tendency not merely to treat the commands and history of the law on a symbolical principle, but actually to allegorize them into mere abstractions. In neither form could it be permanent, because it had no sufficient relation to the needs and realities of human nature, or to the personal subject of all the Jewish promises; but it was still a declaration of the insufficiency of the law in itself, and a preparation for its absorption into a higher principle of unity. Such was the history of Judaism, the end of the age, the apogee of the effect and blessing when used as a means; it became hollow and insufficient when made an end.

2. The relation of the law to the advent of Christ is also laid down clearly by St. Paul. The law was the ἐνδοθήμων τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, the servant (that is) whose business it was to prepare the way for the King, as to the promise for him (Deut. xxi, 7-9; Isa. iv, 24); and Christ was "the end" or object of "the law" (Rom. x, 4). As being subsidiary to the promise, it had accomplished its purpose when the promise was fulfilled. In its national aspect it had existed to guard the faith in the theocracy; the unseen God had been the object. The law, as such, was the means to that faith which had been the difficulty of realizing the invisible presence of God, and of conceiving a communion with the infinite Godhead which should not crush or absorb the finite creature (compare Deut. v, 24-27; Num. xv, 12, 18; Josh. vii, 35-37; xiii, 21, 22; Isa. xiv, 15, 16, 17, etc.). From that had come in earlier times open idolatry, and a half-idolatrous longing for and trust in the kingdom; in after times the substitution of the law for the promise. The difficulty was now to pass away forever, in the incarnation of the Godhead in one truly and visibly man. The guardianship of the law was no longer needed, and the personal presence of the Messiah required no further testimony. Moreover, in the law itself there had always been a tendency of the fundamental idea to burst the formal bonds which confined it. In looking to God as especially their king, the Israelites thought of the patriarchs, and consequently of Abraham and father of the faithful. The law became "the father of all mankind, and destined to revert to them. Yet that element of the law which was local and national, now most prized of all by the Jews, tended to limit this gift to them, and place them in a position antagonistic to the rest of the world. It needed, therefore, to pass away before all men could be brought into a kingdom in which there was to be "neither Jew nor Gentile, barbarian, Scythian, bond, or free."

In its individual, or what is usually called its "moral" aspect, the law bore equally the stamp of transitoriness and insufficiency. It had, as we have seen, declared the authority of truth and goodness over man's will, and taken for granted in man the existence of a spirit which could recognise that authority; but it had done no more. Its presence had therefore detected the existence and the sinfulness of sin, as also alike its truth and man's true nature; but it had also brought out with more vehement and desperate antagonism the power of sin dwelling in man as fallen (Rom. vii, 7-25).

It only showed, therefore, the need of a Saviour from sin, and of an indwelling power which should enable the spirit of man to realize the rule of God. This the law declared in testimony to its own insufficiency, and led men to Christ. Already the prophets, speaking by a living and indwelling spirit, even fresh and powerful, had been passing beyond
the dead letter of the law, and indirectly convicting it of insufficiency. But there was need of "the Prophet" which should go before, so far as its doctrine alone dwelt in him, but should have the power to give it to others, and so open the new dispensation already foretold. When he had come, and by the gift of the Spirit implanted in man a free internal power of action tending to God, the restraints of the law, needful to train the childhood of the world, became unnecessary, and even injurious to the free development of its manhood.

The relation of the law to Christ, in its sacrificial and ceremonial aspect, will be more fully considered elsewhere. See SACRIFICE. It is here only necessary to remember that it was essentially an externality, a mere externality of the whole system of sacrifices, upon which alone their virtue depended; and on the imperfect embodiment, in any body of mere men, of the great truth which was represented in the priesthood. By the former declaring the need of atonement, by the latter the possibility of mediation, and yet in itself doing nothing adequately to realize either, the law again led men to him who was at once the only mediator and the true sacrifice.

Thus the law had trained and guided man to the acceptance of the Messiah in his threefold character of king, prophet, and priest; and so prepared the way for the coming of the Saviour. And when he did come, it became, in the minds of those who trusted in it, not only an encumbrance, but a snare. To resist its claim to allegiance was therefore a matter of life and death in the days of St. Paul, and, in a less degree, in after ages of the Church.

It remains to consider how far it has any obligation or existence under the dispensation of the Gospel. As a means of justification or salvation, it ought never to have been regarded, even before Christ: it needs no proof to show that still less can this be so since he has come. But yet the question remains whether it is binding on Christians, even when they do not depend on it for salvation.

It seems clear enough, that its formal coercive authority as a whole ended with the close of the Jewish dispensation. We may indeed distinguish its various elements; yet he who offended "in one point against it was guilty of all" (James ii, 10). It referred throughout to the Jewish covenant, and in many points to the constitution, the customs, and even the local circumstances of the people. That covenant was preparatory to the Christian, in which it is now absorbed; those customs and local features have passed away. It followed, by the very nature of the case, that the former obligation to the law as such must have ceased with the basis on which it is grounded. This conclusion is stamped most unequivocally with the authority of St. Paul through the whole range of his letters, and more especially in Galatians and Romans. That we are "not under law" (Rom. vi, 14, 15; Gal. v, 18); "that we are dead to law" (Rom. vii, 4-6; Gal. ii, 19), "redeemed from under law" (Gal. iv, 5), etc., is not only stated without any limitation or exception, but in many places is made the prominent feature of the contrast between the early and later conditions. It is impossible, therefore, to avoid the conclusion that the formal code, promulgated by Moses, and sealed with the promise of the blessing and the curse, cannot, as a law, be binding on the Christian.

But what, then, becomes of the declaration of our Lord, that he came "not to destroy the law, but to perfect it," and that "not one jot or one tittle of it shall pass away?" what of the fact, consequent upon it, that the law has been reenforced in all Christian churches, and had an important influence on much Christian legislation? Here, as on other points, the apparent contradiction lies in several considerations.

(1.) The positive obligation of the law, as such, has passed away; but every revelation of God's will, and of the righteousness and love which are its elements, imposes a new and true explanation of the apparent contradic-

(2.) A plain distinction of this kind seems to lie on the face of the subject, as to the main question at issue. The ceremonial or ritual department of the Mosaic laws, which stood in meats, and drinks, and carnal ordinances (Heb. xi, 10); which were of a typical character, and a mere shadow of good things to come, was abolished by the introduction of the Gospel, for then they ceased to have any pertinence, the reality having come of which they were the figures. But the kernel of the law, properly speaking, the moral law, which is a transcript of the divine mind, has been reenforced in the Gospel; its obligations and sanctions. It was fulfilled rather than abrogated by the Gospel. It was confirmed by Christ, and explained in its infinite comprehension and spirituality by him and his apostles throughout the New Testament (Matt. v, 17, 18; Luke x, 26-28; Rom. v, 15-18, 9). Hence, its work being done, the law was given in Galatians (Gal. v, 18), the moral law is spoken of as not being the mere rule of life for persons who rely on the grace of God, and who are authorized to expect a salvation not to be purchased by their works, it is so depreciated simply because in that aspect it is regarded as a law according to which new covenant, or spiritual terms (Mark x, 19; Rom. xii, 9). It is true Jesus sums up the spirit of the whole ten commandments in the two of love to God and man (Matt. xxii, 37-40), and St. Paul (Rom. xiii, 10), as well as St. John (1 John iii, 11), substantially do the same. But this is not done with a view to destroy the precise form of the Mosaic commands, much less to abolish them; but rather with a view to re-enforce them by
educing their permanent and universal principle of obligation. Christianity has therefore in all ages justly recognised the paramount and unvarying force of the moral law as preeminent on Mount Pisgah.

The only exception to the above remark of the direct renewal of all these commandments by Christ and his apostles is that relating to the Sabbath, which is never quoted among the rest, but is noticeably omitted, and has even been held to be intentionally discarded, by precept, inference, and example, by them. The exception, however, is only apparent, and is due to the peculiar nature of this observance. It really rests upon an earlier than the Mosaic institute, for it dates from the creation, and was therefore appropriately introduced at Sin. (Gen. 2:1-3.) It is justly called, "Remember the Sabbath day." Moreover, the Jews of our Lord's day were in no need of being reminded of this institution; they were slavishly and superstition observant of it. Finally, as the day of its observance was changed by the very first Christians, there would have been an obvious impropriety in their referring to the institution itself under that name. That the obligation to occupy in religious rest one day in seven was scrupulously recognised by them the historical fact of the "Lord's day" abundantly attests. See SATURDAY.

(4.) Indeed, the same remark as to primeval origin and validity applies to the whole Decalogue, although this cannot be so clearly proved in a historical argument as with regard to the Sabbath. Yet it has been shown above (§ 1, No. 4) that these moral enactments at least were not an assumption; indeed, as all must at once admit, they lie at the very foundation of civil law and social organization; and it could easily be shown that the Hebrews had substantially recognised their force for ages. They were therefore, in fact, but republished on Sinai, under new sanctions, and do not require for their authority the support of any special dispensation.

The argument of the apostle Paul, especially in the epistles to the Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews, invariably is an appeal from the legal bondage of Judaism—not merely, be it observed, the intolerable ceremonial yoke (Acts xix. 10), but still more emphatically the law of "good works," including, of course, especially the moral code (see Rom. ii. 21, 22; vii. 7)—to the antemosaic dispensation, the faith which Abraham had when yet a Gentile (Rom. iv. 10; Gal. iii. 17, 18), and the primitive priesthood of Jesus (Heb. vii). Yet this law of the Ten Commandments from the first, is its one effectual support (comp. John vi. 29); and thus the solution of this question becomes likewise the reconciliation of the doctrine of the law of Moses with that of St. James. See JAMES, ENSIBLE OF.

Laws, Ecclesiastical. —J. D. Michaelis, Mosaiisches Recht (Freiburg, 1770-75), translated by Alexander Smith under the title Commentaries on the Laws of Moses (London, 1814); J. H. Hottinger, Juris Hebreevorum leges codici, ad Judaeorum mentem explicantis (Tiguris, 1655); Selden, De juribus gentium atque hierosolimitanis disciplinarum (Argentina, 1665); Reinhartz, De legisbus Moabiticis et Moassen (Hambur. 1741); D. Hornsvy, De principio legum Mosaicarum (Hafniae, 1792); Statuidius, Commentationes II de legum Mosaicarum (Gottinges, 1760); Purmur, De fontibus et institutionibus legum Mosaicarum (Francoforti, 1789); T. G. Erdmann, Legum Mosaicae praevento esse legibus Lycyrii et Soloni (Vitebergae, 1789); Pastoret, Histoire de la Legislation (Par. 1817), vols. iii and iv; J. Salvador, Histoire des institutions de Moise et du Peuple Hebreu (Paris, 1828, 3 vols.); Mannon, De legislatione iuris Mosaici (namque antiquissimi) (Banz, 1835); Welker, Die ersten Gesetze des Hebraischen Rechts (Berlin, 1826); Squidtldius, Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu, i, 111 sq.; Holberg, Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu, ii, 381 sq.; De Wette, Sittenlehre, ii, 21 sq. Luther's views are given by C. H. F. Biasloblotzky, De Legis Mosaicae Abrogatione (Gottingae, 1824). For other, chiefly older, works on the subject in general, see Winer, Rechtswissenschaft, a. v. Gezetze; Dantz, Worteibuch, a. v. Moses; Volckened, Index Programmatum, p. 37; Darby, Cyclop. Biblical, column 237 sq. Among later discussions we may name Duncan, Charact. of the Laws of Moses (Edinburgh, 1851); an art. in the Suid. u. Krit. 1846, i, 43 sq.; Saalshutte, D. mos. Recht m. Berlicktsch. des spät. Jued. (Berl. 1846); Piccard, De legislatione Mosaicae indele morali (Utr. 1841); Kutel, Das alttestamentl. Gesetz und seine Urkunde (Stuttgart, 1867). See Moses.

Law. Edmund, D.D., a noted English prelate, was born in 1658, near Carenton, in Lancashire, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; he was elected fellow upon graduation, and in 1767 was, by the university, presented with the rectory of Graystock, in Cumberland. To this living was added in 1748 the arch-deaconry of Carlisle. These positions he held until 1748, when he returned to Cambridge as master of St. Peter's College. Later he was appointed librarian of the university and professor of casuistry, was made archdeacon of Stafford, was presented with a prebend in the church of Lincoln, and in 1767 with one of the rich prebends in the church of Durham, and in 1768, finally, his position with the bishopric of Carlisle. He died in 1782. While yet a student at Cambridge, Law published two works which show at once the peculiar turn of his own mind, and secured him a place among the best and wisest instructors of their species. The first of these was his translation of Bishop King's Essay on the Eternity of Evil, with copious notes, in which many of the difficult questions in metaphysical science are considered; the second was his Inquiry into the Ideas of Space and Time. In 1748, while a resident of Salkeld, on the pleasant banks of the Eden, a part of the living of Carlisle, which Law was then holding, he began his third work, Considerations on the Theory of Religion, etc. (Camb. 1745, 1749, 1753, 1765, 1780; London, 1774, 1780, 7th ed., Carlisle, 1784, 1784; new edit. by bishop George H. Law, of Chester, with Life of bishop Edmund Law by William Paley, by E. D. C., 1800, 3 vols., and shrewd observations on the Life and Character of Christ (Camb. 1749, 1780; often reprinted with the Considerations), "a work of singular beauty, not to be read by any person without edification and improvement." In 1777 he published an edition of the works of Locke, with a life of the author. Of this English philosopher bishop Law was ever an ardent follower and able interpreter. Indeed, "the peculiar character of Dr. Law's mind appears to have been acquired in a great measure by a devoted study of the writings of that philosopher. From him he seems to have derived that value which is placed on freedom of inquiry, in relation to theology as well as to every other subject. He took a prominent part in the great controversy respecting subscription, and acted accordingly himself. The most striking proof of this is afforded in the later edition of his Considerations, which contains many important alterations. From Locke also he seems to have derived his notions of the proper mode of studying the sacred Scriptures in order to come at their true sense. He was, in short, an eminent master in that school of rational and liberal divines which flourished in England in the last century, and is adorned by the names of Jortin, Blackburne, Powell, Tertullian, Watson, Paley, and many others." See English Cyclopaedia, a. v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, ii, 1065.


Law, Isaac, a minister of the United Presbyterian Church of Massachusetts, Sept. 5, 1815, at Salem, N. York, was educated at Union College (class of 1808), and became shortly after a student of theology at Canounburg, Pa.
and was licensed March 26, 1840. In 1842 he was ordained missionary by the East Salem Presbytery, and labored in this capacity until 1847, when he was ordained pastor at Cambridge. He died Jan. 29, 1861. Law was a man of the people, a worker in the vineyard of the Lord. He was not a professor, but a worker in the vineyard; he was a man of the people, and he lived for the people.

Law, Joseph, a Methodist minister, was born in Washington County, N.Y., Oct. 10, 1798; was converted in 1815, and admitted to the New York Conference in 1820, after seven years' service as a local preacher. Although he had not enjoyed the advantages of early education, he soon, by unwarried perseverance, taught himself to read and write. He was a native of the city of New York, and quickly gained distinction among his ministerial brethren and among the people, and he was honored with some of the best appointments in the Conference. He was for many years confined in his labors to the cities of New York and Brooklyn, and New Haven (First and Second Church) and Hartford. In the city of Brooklyn he was instrumental in the building of five large churches. He was supernumerary in 1861, and died June 11, 1863. On his dying bed he frequently requested the sorrowing friends around him to sing; and a little before his spirit departed, they were singing one of his favorite hymns—"On Jordan's stormy banks I stand, etc."—his eye kindled with rapture, and he gave the whispered assurance, "All is well."—Smith, Sacred Memories, p. 243.

Law, Samuel Warren, a Methodist minister, the son of the Rev. Joseph Law (q. v.), was born at Marlborough, Ulster County, N.Y., November 2, 1821, was converted in his fourteenth year, and in 1841 entered the itinerancy. He had many excellences, and was an able and successful minister. His death, which occurred April 24, 1857, was such as his life had promised—calm, confiding, and peaceful.—Smith, Loc. Cit., p. 290.

Law, William, an eminent English nonjuror, divine and able religious writer of the mystic school of the last century, was born at Kingscliffe, Northamptonshire, in 1686, and educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where he took his degree of M.A. in 1712, and became fellow in 1718. Shortly after this he began to preach, but was obliged to quit the ministry, and also to give up his fellowship, on the accession of George I, because of his refusal to take the required oath. He now became tutor to his relative and friend, Edward Gibbon, father of the historian, who speaks of his piety and talents with unusual warmth. Later, two of his friends, Miss Hester Gibbon, sister of his pupil, and Mrs. Hutchinson, daughter of a London barrister, having resolved to retire from the world, and devote themselves to works of charity and a religious life, selected Law for their almoner and instructor. He accepted the position, and the three parties retired to a house at Kingscliffe, where Law died, April 9, 1731. Law's writings are tinged with what is commonly called mysticism, as he became an ardent follower of the noted mystic, Jacob Bohme. His principal work, and, indeed, one of the best books of the kind, is his Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life (1729), a treatise that first awakened the religious sensibilities of Dr. Samuel Johnson, who speaks of it in high terms, and from which the brothers Wesley also derived much advantage. Next to the Serious Call, his most important works are his answer to Mende-ville's Fable of the Bees (published in 1726); republished, with an introduction by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, in 1844), his letters to the heirs of Adam West, printed in 1776, and The Fable of the Bees. Of Love, and The Spirit of Love. A collective edition of his works was published at London in 9 vols. 8vo in 1782. It has fallen to the lot of but few English writers to elicit such general commendation and commendation as has been the fate of William Law. He was the friend of Gibbon, the liberal Macaulay, the pious John Wesley, and the m xbox Sam. Johnson, all were of one mind in their praise of William Law. See Richard Tichge, Life and Writings of William Law (1818, 8vo); Local. Gist. Mag., vol. xlii; Theol. Eclectic, Jan., 1868; Contemporary Review, Oct., 1867; Christian Examiner, 1869, p. 157; Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.; Allibone, Dict. of British and American Authors, ii, 1065 sq.

Lawson, Andreas, a distinguished American philanthropist, was born at Groton, Mass., Dec. 16, 1792; was elected to Congress in 1824 and 1825 and appointed commissioner to settle the northeast boundary question with Great Britain; United States minister to England in 1849; and died Aug. 18, 1855. Among his numerous and munificent donations was that of $10,000 to Harvard University, to found the scientific school called for his name, which equated the sum of $50,000 towards erecting model lodging-houses.—Thomas, Biog. Dict. p. 1384.

Lawrence, Amos, a distinguished American philanthropist, was born at Groton, Mass., April 22, 1798. He spent a great part of his immense fortune in various charities and donations to public institutions. He died Dec. 9, 1852. His Life and Correspondence was published by his son in 1855.—Thomas, Biog. Dict. p. 1384.

Lawrence, Sir Henry Montgomery, brother of Sir Thomas Lawrence, the "Saviour of India," is noted for his philanthropy and Christian bearing as a soldier in the British army in India. He was born in Cey- lon in 1806, and after entering the army quickly rose to distinction. In 1857, when the Indian mutiny broke out, chief commissioner of Lucknow, and virtually governor of Oude. While in command of the handful of heroic men who defended the women and children in the residence of Lucknow, sir Henry was wounded by the explosion of a shell, and died July 4, 1857. He was the founder of the Lawrence Asylum for the reception of the children of European soldiers in India. A monument to his mem- ory has been placed in St. Paul's Cathedral. See J. W. Kaye, Lives of Indian Officers (London, 1867); Fraser's Magazine, Dec. 1857; North British Review, May, 1860; Butler, Land of the Vedas, p. 919 sq.

Lawrence, St. See Laurensius, St.

Lawrence, St. Regular Canons of, a religious order, said to have been founded by St. Benedict in the 6th century. When St. Lawrence, Bishop of Viterbo, was performed in the 11th century, under the patronage of Odo, count of Savoy. The bishop of Turin in 1066 conferred many gifts upon it, and several popes enriched it with benefactions.

Lawrence, Laurence, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in 1779; entered the Philadelphia Conference in 1810, and died April 4, 1829. He possessed a strong and generous mind, and deep piety. He was an excellent presiding elder, and preached with distinguished success the word of life.—Minutes of Confer- ence, ii, 58.

Lawyer (royci), relating to the law, as in Tit. iii, 9, "in its general sense, denotes one skilled in the law, as in Tit. iii, 9. When, therefore, one is called a law- yer, this is understood with reference to the laws of the land in which he lived, or to which he belonged. Hence among the Jews a lawyer was one versed in the laws of Moses, which he taught in the schools and synagogues (Matt. xxviii, 55; Luke x, 35). The same person who is called 'a lawyer' (Syl. 28) is in the New Testament (Mark iii, 28) called 'a scribe' (spectator), whence it has been inferred that the functions of the lawyers and the scribes were identical. The individual may have been both a lawyer and a scribe, but it does not thence follow that all lawyers were scribes. Some suppose, however, that the 'scribes' were the public expounders of the law, while the 'lawyers' were the private ex- pounders and teachers of it. But this is a mere conje-
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ture, and nothing more is really known than that the
‘lawyers’ were exponents of the law, whether publicly
or privately, or both’ (Kitto). Hence the term is equiv-
alent to ‘teacher of the law’ (νομοδιδάσκαλος, Acts v, 56).
‘By the use of the word νομοδιδάσκαλος (in Tit. iii, 9) as
a simple adjective, it seems more probable that the title
'scribe' was a legal and official designation, but that the
name νομοδιδάσκαλος was properly a mere epithet signifying
one ‘learned in the law’ (somewhat like the οἱ ἐκ νομοῦ
in Rom. iv, 14)’ and only used as a title in common par-
lance (comp. the use of it in Tit. iii, 18, 'Zenos the law-
yer'). This would account for the comparative unfre-
quency of the word, and the fact that it is always used
in connection with ‘Pharisaee,’ never, as the word 'scribe'
so often is, in connection with ‘chief priesta’ and ‘elders’
('Smith'). See Lillenthal, De νομοδιδάσκαλοι juris utri-
usque apud Hebraeos (Mal. 1740). Consult SCRIBE.

Lawyers. In the Roman and Spanish churches, pleaders before the courts were not eligible to the cler-
ic office. The rule, however, was not universal, for
the Council of Sardica enacted that a lawyer might be or-
dained a bishop if he passed through the inferior grades
of reader, deacon, and presbyter. On the other hand,
clergymen were not allowed to act as lawyers, or to
plead either their own cause or even an ecclesiastical
one. Bribery and extortion were forbidden to lawyers
under severe penalties.

Lay, Benjamin, an eccentric philanthropist, was
born at Colchester, in England, in 1681, and settled in
London in 1700, but became notorious to the people by
his abolition principles, came to the United States,
and settled at Abington, Pa. He was one of the ear-
est and most zealous opponents of slavery in the United
States, and the coadjutor of Franklin and Benezet.
He was originally a member of the Society of Friends,
but so radically opposed was he to the practice of slavehold-
ing then prevalent among them (e. g. he resolutely re-
fused to partake of any food or wear any clothing which
was wholly or in part produced by the labor of slaves)
that he was obliged to leave the society in 1717.
Before his death (in 1760), however, he had the pleasure
of seeing his society take a decided stand against this
abominable abomination. His opposition to slavery was
noticeable on every public occasion where he had any
opportunity to manifest his disapproval. He always
expressed himself in strong terms, and sometimes re-
sorted to writing tracts for expressing sentiments that
prevailed great eccentricity. Says Janney (iii, 246): ‘He
came into the yearly meeting with a bladder filled with
blood in one hand and a sword in the other. He ran
the sword through the bladder, and sprinkled the blood
on the dresses of the Friends, declaring that so the sword
would be abstained in the bosoms of the nation if they
did not leave off oppressing the negroes.’ In 1737 he
wrote a treatise entitled All Slave-keepers that keep the Innocent in Bondage Apologize, which was published by Frank-
lin. See Janney, Hist. of the Friends, iii, 245. (J. H. W.)

Lay Abbots or Abbacomites. Prior to the
period of Charlemagne the court appointed its favorites
to the office of abbot; rich abbots were given to the
higher secular clergy in commendam, i.e. simply to en-
joy its revenues, or else to counts and military chiefs
in reward for their services. These lay abbots occupied
the monasteries with their families, or with their friends
and retainers, sometimes for months, converting them
into banqueting halls, or using them for hunting expedi-
tions or for military exercises. The wealthiest abba-
ses the kings either retained for themselves or bestow-
ed on their sons and daughters, their wives and min-
isters. Charlemagne corrected this abuse: he insisted
on strict discipline, and made it a rule that schools
should be planted in connection with the various monas-
teries, and that literary labors should be prosecuted with-
in their walls. See also Abbots.

Layard, Charles Peter, D.D., an English theol-
gian, grandfather of Austin Henry Layard, the cele-
brated traveller, and himself a descendant of an
ancient French family, was born about 1748. He was
educated at Westminster School and St. John’s College,
Cambridge; was then appointed minister of Oxendon
Chapel, and librarian to Tennyson’s Library, Westminster;
and in 1804 a不必 promotes for his Shrewsbury wills, and to
the royal chancellery. He died Apr. 11, 1805. Bes-
ides an essay on Charity and Dwelling (1774 and 1776),
he published several of his Sermons. Layard was one
of the most popular preachers of his day. See Allibone,
Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, ii, 1071; Hoefer, Nova.

Lay Baptism. See Baptism. Lay.

Lay Brothers, a name for a class of Roman illit-
erate persons who in convents devote themselves to
the service of the monks. They wear a different habit
from the monks, but never enter the choir, nor are present
at the chapters. The only vow they make is of obedience
and constancy. They were first employed in the 11th
century. In the monasteries there are also lay sisters, or
sisters converse, who hold a similar relation in the ser-
vice of the nuns. See Farrar, Eccles. Dict. a. v.

Lay Chancellor. This office is found in
the Church at an early period. Bishops were often appeal-

ed to in civil causes, especially when both parties agreed
to refer any dispute to them; and in this case their sen-
tence was executed by the executioner of the superior civil
power. When civil causes began to multiply, the bish-
ops were compelled to devolve some part of this service
on others, in whose fidelity and integrity they could
repose. Some bishops selected laymen for this purpose,
and this office, according to Bingham, probably originated
the office of lay chancellor.

Lay Elders. See Elder.

Laying on of Hands. See Hands, Imposition of.

Layish. See Lion.

Laymann, Paul, a German Jesuit, was born at
Innsbruck in 1576, and died of the plague at Constance
Nov. 13, 1635. He was distinguished in life for a
remarkable knowledge of canonical law, so that he be-
came an oracle in those matters. His Moralphilosophy,
published first at Munich (1625, 4to), passed through
many editions (one of the best at Mayence, 1723). His
work, Justa defenso Simplicitati Romani Pontificis, etc., in
causa Monasteriorum et bonorum ecclesiasticorum, etc. (Ley-
burg, 1633), was approved by the Benedictine Ro-
man Hay, in Aest ininclusae, and led to an answer by
Laymann, entitled Censura Astrologiae, ecclesiastiae, et As-
tri ininclusae. After his death appeared his Jus canonici
(Dilling, 1643) and Repertorium (Dilling, 1644). See
Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. vi, 995.

Laymen. See Laymen.

Lay Preaching. In order to form just views of
this subject, it is well to consider that primary design
of Christianity which contemplates world-wide diffu-

sion. For the accomplishment of that design, preaching
is the grand and divinely appointed agency. But
the true idea of preaching, as instituted by the Lord
Jesus Christ, is not narrow and exclusive. It is com-
prehensive and manifold. It demands adaptation to all
men and all circumstances. Preaching warns, pro-
claims, invites, teaches. Although made the special
work of certain representative disciples, it is, in fact,
enjoyed upon the Church as a whole, and upon its
members in particular. "As of the spirit which God
giveth" (1 Pet. iv, 10, 11). There is no Christian so
humble as to be beneath the application of the follow-

ing and many kindred precepts: "Let your light so
shine before men that they may see your good works,
and glorify your Father which is in heaven" (Matt.
ii, 16): "Herein is My Father glorified, that ye bear much
fruit; so shall ye be my disciples" (John xv, 8): "Who-
soever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son
of man also confess before the angels of God" (Luke xii,
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8. These declarations of the Saviour have a special significance when viewed in comparison with various other passages which indicate that an important element of preaching consists in bearing witness of things seen, heard, and experienced in reference to Christ and his kingdom (see Luke xxiv, 48; Acts i, 21, 2; ii, 32; iv, 20; xxii, 15).

When considered in the plain light of Christian history as an obligation, the subject of lay preaching becomes relieved from both the difficulties and the technicalities with which it has sometimes been beset by a pretentious eclesiasticalism. None of our Lord's disciples were priests, and yet, from the moment of their call to his discipleship, he proceeded to instruct them in the manner of apostolic preaching. At an early stage of their instruction they were sent out to preach experimentally (see Matt. x, 5-42; Luke ix, 1-6). Not only were the twelve thus sent forth to preach, but “other seventy also.” The number seventy was symbolic both of multiplicity and completeness, and the act of sending out seventy (lay) disciples, “two by two, before his face, into every city and place whither he himself would come,” was in itself significant of our Lord's purpose to employ all his true disciples in spreading the truth and establishing his kingdom upon the earth.

Before the Apostles' time, the Christian Church employed not only the apostles, but its lay members in the preaching of the Word. “At that time (after the death of Stephen) there was a great persecution against the Church which was at Jerusalem, and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles. And so they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the Word” (Acts viii, 1, 4). The same fact is illustrated by the course of Paul, of whom, immediately after his conversion, and long prior to his ordination, it is recorded, “For so straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues” (Acts ix, 20). In this act the regenerated preacher showed that Christian obligations precede ministerial, and that whosoever is born of God not only hath the witness in himself, but is prompted by the Holy Spirit to utter his testimony in the ears and to the hearts of his fellow-men, and the act of sending out seventy (lay) disciples, “two by two, before his face, into every city and place whither he himself would come,” was in itself significant of our Lord's purpose to employ all his true disciples in spreading the truth and establishing his kingdom upon the earth.

But it is unnecessary to dwell upon the lingering evidences of a custom that was destined to be crushed out by increasing perversion of the original spirit of the Gospel. When ritual ceremonies came to supersede not only the very acts, but the very ideas of the Gospels, it is not surprising that preaching itself became a ceremony, and at length a rare and infrequent ceremony. Not merely laymen, but even presbyters of the Church, were inhibited from preaching, except by special permission of bishops; while many of the bishops, who had arrogated to themselves the exclusive right of preaching, either through ignorance or indolence practically abandoned the custom.

“Ther was a time when the bishops of Rome were not known to preach for five hundred years together!—insomuch that, when Pius Quintus was a cardinal, he looked upon it as prodigy, and, indeed, was a greater rarity than the Sacellum Ludh were in old Rome” (Bingham, Orig. Eccles. book ii, ch. iii, § 4). This general abandonment of the great and peculiar work of the Christian ministry had its counterpart of error in monasticism, which, by an equal perversion, sent myriads of the best men in the Church during successive centuries to waste their lives and religious zeal in fruitless prances in desert places and gloomy cloisters. Had the lives and talents which were thus thrown away in monastic idleness been wisely employed in various forms of evangelization, whether by military or by civil means, who can tell how much better the world would have been to-day! In fact, nearly all the real progress made by Christianity during several of the medieval centuries was by exceptional missionary effort among various aboriginal nations of Europe. The general abandonment of preaching had alluded to formed a pretext for the establishment, in the 18th or 14th centuries, of several preaching orders of monks, specially the Franciscans and Dominicans. These monks, in an ecclesiastical point of view, were laymen, and by profession they were also mendicants. Nevertheless, they acquired great influence and great wealth for their several orders. But such results did not relieve the evangelical barrenness of the period, nor render less necessary the great Reformation of the 16th century. In the Reformed churches there was a general breaking away from the trammels of eclesiasticalism, together with an energy of purpose which did not scruple to employ any agencies at its command for the dissemination of truth. Still, under the influence of long-prevailing custom, that great element of Christian power to be derived from the personal activity of devoted laymen was to a large degree suffered to lie dormant and in some cases to disappear. The first formal and greatly effective organization of lay preaching as a system, and as a recognised branch of Church effort, took place under John Wesley at an early period of that great religious movement known as the revival of the 18th century. See Stevens, History of Methodism, l, 178, 174.

V—10*
Not only was great good accomplished by the Wesleyan lay preachers in England, but by persons of this class Methodism was introduced into America. See EMBURY, PHILIP; STRAWBIDGE, ROBERT; WEBB, Capt. In all parts of the world, wherever Methodism has extended its activities, its lay organization has been a leading feature of its evangelical movements. See EXHORTERS; LOCAL PREACHERS; READERS. During the current century other evangelical churches have adopted analogous measures in various forms, and employed lay leaders under such nomenclature as lay preachers, prayer-leaders, colporteurs, etc. In some churches in which official sanction has not been given to lay preaching—e.g. the national churches of England and Scotland, many earnest Christian laymen, including some noblemen, have gone forth independently, under their personal convictions of duty, preaching wherever they could assemble congregations.

The vast Sunday-school enterprises of modern times are themselves at once a grand result and agency of lay teaching in perfect harmony with the design of the Christian ministry, and powerfully auxiliary to its most effective administration by regularly ordained ministers of the Word. The Christian Associations of the present day are chiefly composed of laymen, and the whole weight of their influence is given to encourage the evangelization of the neglected classes of society by all available means, as lay preaching, or under such auxiliary forms of Christian work. By these numerous and multiplying means of Christian teaching and influence the modern Church is approximating the intense activity of the apostolic Church, and at the same time adapting itself to the moral necessities and special conditions of the present age. In this manner the primary design of Christianity is answered, and great good is accomplished among classes of people that would scarcely be reached by the regular clergy of any of the churches. Nor are the just prerogatives of ordained preaching in any way prejudiced by the co-operative action of pious and judicious laymen. On the other hand, all ministers of a truly apostolic type cannot fail to see that their own success is greatly promoted by their imitation of the apostle to the Gentiles in enlisting and encouraging as extensively as possible all worthy helpers in Christ. See YOUNG MEN’S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS. (D. K.)

Lay Representation. The participation of the laity, by their representatives, in the government of the Church, is one of the fruits of the Protestant Reformation, and of their claim to representation in the ecclesiastical government is found, however, in the nature of the Christian priesthood, and the constitution of the Church itself. Christ having satisfied, by his offering of himself, that sense of need which leads men to seek for mediators, there remains to the Christian community the offering of themselves, as a priestly body, in sacrifice and service to their Redeemer. Towards God, all are spiritually equal, and the Church, therefore, as originally constituted, was without an external priestly caste. "As all believers," says Neander, in his Planting and Extension of the Church, "were conscious of an equal relation to Christ as their Redeemer, and of a common participation of communion with God through him, so on this consciousness an equal relation of believers to one another was grounded, which utterly precluded any relation like that found in other forms of religious subjection between a priestly caste and a people of whom they were mediators and spiritual guides. The apostles themselves were very far from placing themselves in a relation to believers which bore any relation to a mediating priesthood; in this respect they always placed the people in a footing of equality." Yet apostolic churches were by means without a distinct method of government. Following the example of the synagogue, elders very soon appear in the Christian community; and the choosing of deacons by the people, with the approval of the apostles, is one of the earliest facts recorded in the New Testament history of the organizing Church. The charisms, or gifts of the Spirit, included that of government (1 Cor. xii); yet this gift was used, not as of exclusive right, but in co-operation with other gifts for the common welfare. The gift of the spiritual gifts was given to the Christian community of the persons fitted for the exercise of this function. The Gentile churches adopted substantially the form of government in use among their Jewish fellow-Christians; "but their government," says Neander, "by the chosen leaders responsible to the Church in the management of their common concerns, as may be inferred from what we have already remarked respecting the nature of the Christian communion, and is also evident from many individual examples in the apostolic Church. The whole Church at Jerusalem took part in the deliberation respecting the relation of the Jewish and Gentile Christians to each other, and the epistle drawn up after these deliberations was likewise in the name of the whole Church. The epistles of the apostle Paul, which treat of various controverted points, address themselves to churches, and he assumes that the decision belonged to the whole body. Had it been otherwise, he would have addressed his instructions and advice principally, at least, to the overseers of the Church."

In the post-apostolic age, with the growth of the ecclesiastical body, the laity gradually disappeared from participation in the government of the Church. As religion became more external, the minister became more a mediating priest, until finally the churches were represented in the provincial and other councils solely by their bishops. See LITY. The hardening process went on till the fabric of medieval Christianity was complete. The laity were held in a state of pupillage, their capability of self-guidance in matters of faith and practice was denied, and the powers of the Church were wholly absorbed by the hierarchy. This continued till the spirit of liberalism began to assert itself in the Church.

The doctrine of justification by faith alone abolished human mediation between man and God. Luther fully recognized the New Testament idea of the priesthood of all believers, and proclaimed it with all the force of his eloquence. His language on this subject is very explicit; "Every Christian man is a priest in the sight of God, every Christian woman a priestess, whether they be young or old, master or servant, mistress or maid servant, scholar or illiterate. All Christians are, properly speaking, members of the ecclesiastical order, and there is no difference in their consecration except in the offices" (see citations in Hagenbuch, Hist. of Doctrines, ii, 24). By the inculcation of this fundamental principle the laity recovered their position in the Church of Christ, and lay representation again became possible. "The restoration," says Latton, in his work on the Church, "in theory at least, of the laity to their proper place in the Church, was an immediate consequence of the Reformation. By reasserting the two great scriptural doctrines of the universal priesthood of Christians, and of the indwelling of the Spirit, not in a priestly caste, but in the whole body of the faithful, Luther and his contemporaries shook the whole fabric of sacramental usurpation to its base, and recovered for the Christian laity the rights of which they had been deprived. The lay members of the body of Christ emerged from the spiritual imbecility which they had been taught to regard as their natural state, and were restored from the yoke of Christ, but from that of the priest." The right of the laity to representation has ever since remained one of the points of difference between Protestantism and Romanism. The Council of Trent reaffirmed the medieval doctrine in the strongest terms, by its decree of "obedience" to the "priest," "And if any one affirm that all Christians indiscriminately are priests of the New Testament, or that they are mutually endowed with an equal spiritual power, he clearly does nothing but confound the ecclesiastical hierarchy, which
is as an army set in array; as if, contrary to the doctrine of the blessed Paul, all were apostles, all prophets, all evangelists, all pastors, all doctors." In the development of Protestantism the lay power was unfortunately absorbed by the state. The State-Church system has hindered the free growth of the Christian community; but wherever Protestantism has had the opportunity of free development its cooperation within a certain district; a synod is a similarly constituted body from a larger district, embracing several presbyteries; and a general assembly consists of an equal delegation of ministers and elders from each presbytery, in a certain fixed proportion. In the General Assembly of the State Church of Scotland, the crown is also represented by a lord high commissioner. The Lutheran Church adheres to the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, as taught by Luther: "The ultimate source of power in the congregation, and synods possess such powers as the Constitution has assigned," and to them in the United States most of the synods are connected with a more general body (the General Synod, the General Council, or the Southern General Synod). Among the Friends, or Quakers, the legislative power is exercised by a yearly meeting, almost the whole church within a certain district. In this the proceedings of the quarterly and monthly meetings are reviewed. There are also "district meetings" for the supervision and care of the ministry, which are composed of ministers and elders. The Congregationalists hold the entire independence of each congregation; the neighboring churches, and, when assembled, are composed of a pastor and a delegate from each church invited. They have, however, no authoritative power. In the United States all the congregational bodies (Baptists, Orthodox Congregationalists, Unitarians, and Universalists) hold general conventions, in which the laity are always represented.

The Established Church of England the lay power has been jealously retained and guarded by the crown and Parliament, but the Disestablished Church of Ireland has reorganized with lay representation. In the councils of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States the laity have an important place. In each diocese the "laymen" (the term is not at present understood to mean the bishop, the clergy, and a lay delegate from each church. This is the governing body of the diocese. The legislative authority of the entire Church resides in a general convention, which meets once in three years, and is composed of the bishops and clerical and four clerical and four lay delegates from each diocese, elected by the diocesan convention. The bishops form one house, and the clerical and lay delegates another. The concurrence of both houses is necessary for the passage of any law, and, if asked for, the concurrence of the three orders becomes necessary. Direct representation of the laity is not established among the Wesleyan Methodists of England. There are, however, preparatory committees appointed by the conference, and composed of ministers and laity, who revise the connectional business in advance of the annual assembling of the conference. These committees shape the measures adopted subsequently by the conference, their recommendations being usually concurred in. Direct lay representation has been proposed by the Rev. William Arthur and Mr. Percival Buntings, and the idea of giving the laity of each diocese a voice in the discussion. The Irish Wesleyans are making steady progress towards lay delegation. The minor Wesleyan bodies in England (the Primitive Methodists, New Connexion Methodists, etc.) have adopted lay representation. Lay representation first went into effect in the Methodist Episcopal Church South in 1869. It also exists in the Methodist Protestant, the Methodist, the African Methodist, and the African Methodist Episcopal Zion churches.

The history of lay representation in the Methodist Episcopal Church resembles that of the Episcopalian, though it is a unique eventful. Originally and for many years the Church was governed by the travelling ministers, through annual conferences and a delegated general conference. Early in this century symptoms of a desire for a change in the form of government appeared. About 1822 the Wesleyan Repository, a paper printed in Philadelphia, was established in Philadelphia. This was followed by a convention of "reformers" in Baltimore in 1824, who established as their periodical organ in that city The Mutual Rights. The objects of attack were the episcopacy and the clerical government of the Church. In 1827 Dr. Thomas E. Bond issued an appeal to Methodists against lay delegation which exerted a great influence in determining the maintenance of the existing system. At the General Conference of 1828 the subject was discussed in the celebrated "Report on Petitions and Methods," a paper addressed to the petitioners. This report was unanimously adopted. By this time Church proceedings had been instituted against some of the "reform party" in Baltimore, which resulted in expulsion. Others withdrew, and in 1830 the Constitution of the Church was changed to meet the new "Methodist Protestant Church" was formed. The controversy continued, and followed with great bitterness on both sides. Looked at from this distance of time, it is apparent that both parties numbered among their leaders good and strong men, who unfortunately stood on extreme and irreconcilable propositions. The controversy was referred to the General Conference on the ground of the right of the people to share in ecclesiastical legislation; this claim was denied by the conservative side chiefly on the ground that the General Conference possessed "no strictly legislative power."

The discussion rested, after the organization of the Methodist Protestant Church, for more than twenty years. Shortly before the General Conference of 1852, a convention of laymen was held in Philadelphia to take measures for bringing the subject before the Church once more. A new convention, however, disclaimed all connection with the principles of the reform of 1828, and asked for lay representation on the grounds of expediency solely. Dr. Thomas E. Bond, the great antagonist of the "radicals," met the members of the convention in the most friendly spirit, and conceded to them that lay delegates could not be put into the composition of the bishop, the clergy, and a lay delegate from each church. This was an open question. While still denying the claim of right, he went so far as to suggest a plan of lay cooperation in the annual conferences. The petition of the convention to the General Conference was denied. In the General Conference of 1854 an appeal for lay delegation was presented again, but received very little attention. By 1860 such progress had been made that the General Conference, assembled in that year, referred the measure to a popular and ministerial vote, to be taken in 1861 and 1862. Both votes were adverse to lay representation, but the vote, though adverse, developed the fact of a growing favor for this important measure. The Methodist, which was established in 1860, devoted itself to the advocacy of it; other papers, especially the Zion's Herald and the North-Western Advocate, urged it upon the Church. A largely-attended convention of laymen was held in New York in the spring of 1863. At this meeting it was resolved to hold another convention, consequently with the session of the General Conference at Philadelphia, in 1864. The convention was so held, and presented through a deputation of its delegates a bill before the Assembly, although without immediate result. A third convention was held, concurrently with the session of the General
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Conference at Chicago, in 1868. At this conference a popular and ministerial vote was ordered for a second time. The vote of the lay members, which was large, showed a majority of two to one for lay delegation, and the necessary three fourths of the ministry were secured. At the session of General Conference which assembled in May, 1872, the new order was fully inaugurated, and the lay delegates already elected were admitted to equal powers. The plan thus adopted provides for two lay delegates for every Annual Conference, with separate votes of the lay and clerical members on any question in case one third of either order demands it.

References.—Neander, History of the Planning and Training of the Christian Church, book i, chapter ii, and book iii, chap. v; Hagenbach, History of Christian Doctrines, ii, 277-288; Litton, History of the Church, book iii, chapter ii; Waterworth, Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, p. 172 sq.; Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S. (publ. by Presb. Board, Philadelphia); Life of Bishop Kinnor, chaps. x, xi; Economy of Methodism Illustrated and Defended, by Dr. T. E. Bond, Introduction and Appendix; Perrine (Prof. W. H.), The "Wesleyan Arminian" exposed; Paine, How to Join a Lay Delegation Thoroughly Scriptural, Wesleyan, and Democratic (N. Y. 1872), attacking the plan adopted by the General Conference of 1868. See LAYT. (G. R. C.)

Layritz, Johann Georg, a German theologian, was born July 15, 1641, at Hof, in Bavaria. In 1667 he entered the Jesuits, in 1672 he graduated M. A., and became in 1678 professor of Church and profane history at the gymnasium of Baireuth; in 1675, librarian and instructor of the margraves Erdmann, Philipp, and Georg Albrecht; in 1683, dean of the court Church; in 1688, superintendent at Neustadt. In 1686 he accepted the call of the duke Wilhelm Ernst of Weimar, and he then became superintendent in general, counsellor of the consistory, first preacher of the Petri-Paul Church, and director of the gymnasium. He died April 4, 1716. He left numerous productions, e. g. Diss de simplici et complexo (Jena, 1668, 4to);—Auszug der Kirchengeschichte des Neuen Testament (Baireuth and Nuremberg, 1678, 12mo);—Synopsis historiae ecclesiasticae Novi Testament. (Ibid, 1678, 12mo)—Der römische Papat-Thron, d. i. gründliche und ausführliche Beschreibung des päpstlichen Ehr- und Macht- und Wachthaus (Ibid, 1680, 4to).

Layritz, Paul Eugen, a general German theologian and Moravian bishop, was born Nov. 18, 1707, at Wunsiedel, in Bavaria; was educated at the university of Leipsic, where, besides theology, he studied philosophy and mathematics. In 1731 he became subrector, and in 1735 rector of the town-school of Neustadt. Through an early acquaintance with the count Zinzendorf, however, he was in 1749 intrusted with the directorship of the Moravian seminary and grammar-school at Marienborn, and henceforth with different capacities on the affairs of the denomination; in 1749 he was sent by them to England; in 1768 to St. Petersburg, to procure permission for the Moravians to settle in the Russian empire; in 1773 to Labrador, to inquire into the progress of their missions there. In 1775, at the Synod of Har- by, he was appointed a bishop, and intrusted with the supervision of the Moravian communities throughout Silesia. In 1782 he undertook also the supervision of the communities in upper Lusatia, especially that of Herrnhut. He died Aug. 8, 1788. Besides his practical activity, of great importance to his denomination, and his extended knowledge of the Oriental languages, and of those of the modern tongues, his productions have earned him a hearty welcome by his contemporaries, and are by no means useless to us, a few of which are here mentioned: Erste Anfangsgründe der Vernunftlehre (Züllichau, 1748, 4to); 2d ed., ibid., 1748, 8vo; 3d ed., ibid., 1755, 8vo; 4th ed., ibid., 1764, 8vo, dedicated to Leibnitz with the title "Elementa Logicæ, Stuttgart, 1766, 8vo."—Betrachtungen über eine vollständige und christliche Erziehung der Kinder (Barby, 1776, 8vo). See Göring, Gedichte Theol. Deutschlands, vol. ii, s. v.

Lazarist, or Priest of the Mission, a society of missionary priests in the Roman Catholic Church. It was founded in 1624 by St. Vincent of Paul, who, while living as tutor and chaplain in the house of count Gondi, general of the royal galleys, was induced by the general confession of sick men to give a mission for the people of the demesne of Montauban. The results of the mission so well pleased the count that he offered a sum of money to any religious congregation which would be willing to give a mission in his dominions. Vincent in vain offered this sum to the members of his own order, the Jesuits, and to the Jesuits. Both were so overwhelmed with business that they could not accept the offer. This refusal, and the wish of the family of count Gondi, as well as that of the brother of the count, the archbishop of Paris, induced Vincent to form a special religious body of the missionary priests, who were chiefly to devote themselves to the religious care of the country people and the lower classes. The new institution soon received the royal sanction, and pope Urban VIII made it a special religious body of the clergy of the mission. In 1692 they received the college of St. Lazarus in Paris, whence their usual name Lazarists is derived. Their more spacious establishment and the increase of their income now enabled the congregation-
to extend their sphere of action. In addition to the revival of religious among the masses of the people, the church continued, as a key part of the Ministry, the reformation of the clergy by means of conferences, and the establishment of seminaries in accordance with the decree of the Council of Trent. Even during the lifetime of St. Vincent nearly all the dioceses of France had been visited by his disciples; and, besides, also Italy, Cornice, Poland, Ireland, Scotland, Algeria, Tunis, and Madлага- nesia, received the missionaries, who, on the coast of Af- rica, vied with the Order of Mercy in the redemption of slaves. To Poland they were called by the queen, Maria, Louisa, wife of King John Casimir II. They established missionary institutions, under the direction of Lambert, while the plague and famine were raging, in particular in Warsaw. Lambert, and his successor, Ozenne, fell victims to the epidemic, but the mission became very prosperous. The first successors of Vin- cent as superiors general were René Almener (1672), Edmund Jolly (1673), and Nicolas Herron; at the time of the first revolution abbe Cayla de la Garde was the head of the congregation. At this time the congregation had reached its zenith; and as in France no less than forty-nine theological seminaries were conducted by them, it was a great influence in the theological views of the French clergy. During the Revolution, the Lazarists, in common with all the other religious denominations, perished; but they were restored as early as 1804, and even received from the public exchequer a support of 15,000 francs. At Paris a hospital belonging to the public domain was given to them for the establishment of a central institution and a novitiate; they also received several houses in the departments beyond the Alps, and the right to accept legacies. But when Napoleon fell from power, in 1815, and all their houses, except four in the atlas, were cancelled, the direction, and confiscated the property which had been given to them or acquired by them. They were legally restored in 1816; but, though they could not recover their original house, St. Lazare, they acquired another house in the Rue St. Pierre, where they also transferred their seminary. They now resided in their former labors, but remained for some time without a regular superior general. After the death of Cayla de la Garde two vicars general had been appointed, but in 1829 the pope appointed a new superior general (Pierre Dewaillie), as the convocation of a chapter general proceeded. While this appointment was anticipated, the board of the committee of the hospital of St. Lazare, in 1828 vom. bell, Aloys, Statisches Jahrbuch der Kirche, Ratisbon, 1862) the Lazarists had 18 houses in France, 27 in Italy, 4 in the British Isles, 6 in Germany, 3 in the Pyrenean peninsula, 10 in Poland (with 145 members). In Asia they had establishments in Asiatic Turkey, in Persia, in Manilla, and in five provinces of China; in Africa, at Alexandria, in Egypt, at Algiers and Mustapha, in Algeria, and at Adowa, in Abyssinia. In America they had 17 establishments. In all, there were in 1862 about 100 establishments, with 2000 members. See Weitser u. Weite, Kirche der Jesuiten, ii, 798; Febr, Grach der Monarchen, (A. S.)

Lazarus (A. S.), an abridged form of the Heb. name Eleazar, with a Greek termination, which in the Talmud is written ילעזר [see Beneus, De morte Chr. i, 180; comp. Josephus, War, v, 13, 7; Simonius, Onomast. N.T. p. 96; Fuller, Miscell. i, 10; Suicer, Theaur. ii, 205]. It is object of much discussion whether the expression which describes Lazarus in Abraham's bosom has been supposed to contain a latent allusion to the name of Eleizer, whom, before the birth of Ismael and Isaac, Abraham regarded as his heir [see Geiger, in the Jüd. Zeitschr. 1866, p. 196 sq.], the name of two persons in the N. T.

1. An inhabitant of Bethany, brother of Mary and Martha, honored with the friendship of Jesus, by whom he was raised from the dead after he had been four days in the tomb (John i. 17-19). This great miracle is minutely described in John xi (see Ro- mit, Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.). The credit which Christ obtained among the people by this illustrious act, of which the life and presence of Lazarus afforded a standing evidence, induced the Sanhedrim, in plotting against Jesus, to excommunicate the man (John xi, 48); but this was forty years after his restoration to life, and thirty years afterwards. Later legends recount that his bones were discovered A.D. 890 in Cyprus (Suicer, Theaur. ii, 208), which discrepancies with another story that Lazarus, accompanied by Martha and Mary, traveled to Provence, in France, and preached the Gospel in Marseilles (Fabricius, Codex Apocr. N. Test. iii, 475, and Luz et cop., p. 888; Thilo, Apocryph. p. 711; see Lumiñol Dissert. de Lazaroi oppulso in Provinciam, in his Opero, ii, 1).

"The raising of Lazarus from the dead was a work of Christ beyond measure great, and of all the miracles he had hitherto performed was not so doubtfully and so no- dously. "If it can be incontrovertibly shown that Christ performed one such miraculous act as this," says Tho- luck (in his Comment. zum Evang. Joh., 284), "much will thereby be gained to the cause of Christianity. One point so peculiar in its character, if irreparably established, may serve to develop a belief in the entire evangelical record." The sceptical Spinoza was fully conscious of this, as is related by Bayle (Dict. s.v. Spino- za). It is not surprising, therefore, that the enemies of Christianity have used their utmost exertions to destroy the credibility of the narrative. The accounts of Woodworth, and his followers were, however, satisfactorily answered by Larmer and others, and the more recent efforts of the German neologists have been at last and successfully refuted by Oertelius, Langius, and Reinhard, and by H. L. Heubner in a work entitled Miraculorum ab Evangelico eruditionem disputat, Commentatione criticalis (Wittenb. 1807), as well as by others of still more recent date, whose answers, with the objections to which they apply, may be seen in Kruhnb. See also Platt, in Mag. für Dogmat. und Moral. xiv, 91; Schott, Opus. i, 210; Kreik, Lazarus für Gebildete Christenw. (Berlin 1790); and the older monograph of J. B. Volbeding, Index Programmat. p. 49; Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 169. The rationalistic views of Paulus (Krit. Kommentar) and Gabel (Journal f. ausser. Theol. III, 256) have been successfully refuted by Strauss (Leben Jesu), and the theological streams of criticism have been entirely dispossessed by a host of later German writers, and the reality of the story triumphantly established (see especially Neander, Das Leben Jesu Christi; Stier and Olshausen, ed loc.). The last modification of Strauss's theory (Die Heiligen und die Gnosis, p. 78 sqq., Berl. 1863) has been demolished by Heusinger (Zeitschr. f. Prot. exist. u. Kirche, p. 79 sqq., 1860); comp. Späth (Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. p. 359, 1868) and Holzmann (ibid. p. 71 sqq., 1889). The views of Paulus have just been revived in the lively romance of M. E. Renan, entitled Vie de Jesus; and the latter's theory of a pious fraud has been completely demolished by Ehrard, Pressense, and Eliott, in their works on our Lord's life. See also the Studien und Krit. ii, 1861; Watson, Lazarus of Bethany (London, 1844). Compare JESUS; MARY.

2. A beggar named in the parable of Dives (Luke xvi, 20-25). The parable is founded upon the story of a beggar who describes Lazarus in Abraham's bosom has been supposed to contain a latent allusion to the name of Eleizer, whom, before the birth of Ismael and Isaac, Abraham regarded as his heir [see Geiger, in the Jüd. Zeitschr. 1866, p. 196 sq.], the name of two persons in the N. T.
LAZARUS

announced; by others, however, he has been considered a real personage, with which accord the old tradition that even gives the name of the rich man as being De-
bruque (see F. Fabri, Evag rat. i, 35 sq.). Some inter-
preters think he was some well-known mendicant of Jeru-
salem (see Seb. Schmid, Fiscus, chapelet, p. 876 sq.),
and his death is only a metaphor to define his disease, Exe-
era, Med. cent. ii, dec. ii, No. 2; Bartoloni, Memb. Boll. cént. xxi) with the success that might be expected (S. G. Feige, De morte Luz. [Hal. 1733]).

The history of Lazarus made a deep impression upon the Church, a fact illustrated by the circumstance to which Fleming's 'callia' allusion in London (see West term in law) should have passed into so many languages, losing alto-
gether its signification as a proper name' (On Parables, p. 459, note). Early in the history of the Church Laz-
arus was regarded as the patron saint of the sick, and es-
specially of those suffering from the terrible scourge of
leprosy. "Among the orders, half military and half
monastic; Zosimi Epistola, a. J. Sirmondo edit. Gal-
lia Christ. vii, i, col. 299; Hist. Lit. de la France, ii, 147;
Hoefner, Nova, Bibl. Générale, xxxix, 43. (J. N. P.)

LEACH. See HORSE-LEACH.

LEACH, JAMES, a Presbyterian minister, was born in
Stafford County, Va., July 15, 1791. He was educated in
Hampden Sidney College, Va., studied divinity in
the Union Theological Seminary, Va., and was licensed by
the Winchester Presbytery Oct. 10, 1818. He was a
proponentist of the order of Augustine and Calvin.
His oration in addition to his presentation took place soon after his
call, Sept. 27, 1819, and in 1824 he was transferred from
Berkeley to Hanover by the Presbytery. At the dis-
ruption of the Church he took sides with those opposed
to the Old-School party, believing the action of the As-
sembly of 1867 unconstitutional as well as injudicious.
He died Sept. 4, 1866.—Wilson, Presbyterian Historical
Almanac, 1869, p. 442.

LEACOX, HAMBLE, a missionary of the Church of England, was born at Cluff's Bay, Barbados,
Feb. 14, 1795. His family was descended from a noble
English ancestry. Slaves were an element of respectabil-
ity in Barbados, and in 1820, when he was 25, Leacox
received his early education at Codrington College,
Barbados. Through Dr. Coleridge, bishop of
Barbadoes and Leeward Islands, he became reader in
his native parish, and in connection studied with his
pastor, Rev. W. M. Hartt, and obtained deacon's orders
in January, 1819. He was received to order by the Presbytery of St. John's Church he became very decided in his religious
views, and extended the privileges of the Church to
all the parish's slaves, at the same time liberating all
his own slaves. The hatred and open reproach of the whites even the bishop could not calm. Leacox
was transferred to the island of St. Vincent, and then to Ne-
via, where he became rural deacon and pastor of St. Paul's
Church, Charlestown. He there fought polygamy with
success. But soon reverses came—difficulty with the
bishop, insurrections of the slaves, and fall of property.
He left for the United States, and settled in Lexington,
Ky., in 1835. His confirmation, neglected in his youth,
here took place on arrival. He fell into the society of
such men as Dr. Coit, Dr. Cooke, Amos Cleaver,
and found many friends in Transylvania University. He
attained a livelihood by teaching until 1836, when he
became pastor of a new congregation, St. Paul's. Diffi-
culty soon arose here also, and led to his removal. His
friends scattered to different parts of the Union. Bishop
Otey stationed him in Franklin parish, Tenn. Soon af-
ter, urged by friends, he preached six months to a new
congregation in western Kentucky, at the head of an old parish. He bought a small farm in New Jersey,
near the city of New Brunswick, and settled on it in
1840. He now preached in different places—for a
few Sundays in and about Bridgeport, Conn.; then he sup-
plied the winter service of the absent pastor of Christ Church, New Brunswick. In 1841 his personal appearance
in the West Indies recovered for him some of his
property there. He returned to the States, and was
appointed to two small stations near his farm. In 1848 he became rector of St. Paul's Church, Perth Amo-
boy. In 1850 he moved to the West Indies again. By a letter from bishop Doane, bishop Parry's reception was such that he decided to
remain, and in 1848 his Perth Amboy congregation ac-
cepted his resignation. He revisited the island of Ne-
via, and, at the peril of his life, contended against some of the immoral practices prevalent there. In 1852 he preached again for one year in St. Peter's Church, Speightstown, Barbadoes. In 1854 he preached in
St. Leonard's Chapel, Bridgetown. On July 13, 1855,
he became the first volunteer to the West Indian Church
Association of New York, and was consecrated by
Africa (recently formed by bishop Parry), sailed for Eng-
land, visited and prepared there, reached Africa, and
landed at Freetown, Sierra Leone, Nov. 10. Aided by
the bishop of Sierra Leone and colonel Hill, its governor, he founded at length a station, the Rio Pongas. At Timizim village he gained over one out of the five hostile negro chiefs. An educated black coming with him from Barbadoes, John H. A. Duport, and a converted negro chief, Mr. Wilkinson, aided him greatly; the latter gave him a site for his dwelling and cultivated the wealth which drove him to Freetown as a recruit. Returning, he opened a school for boys, with an attendance which increased to forty. He was aided with money, books, and clothing from England, and his congregations in Perh Amboy, Kentucky, and Tennessee. His territory soon widened, the natives became favorable, and the school increased. Again sickness drove him to his friends in Sierra Leone. Against their advice, and that of the bishop of Barbadoes, he returned to his post. He seemed to recover, and laid plans for future efforts; but died August 20, 1866. As a result of his labors, a large missionary field was opened. His biography is written by Rev. Henry Caswall, D.D. (London, 1867, 12mo), a friend, and English secretary of the society under which he acted.

Lead (πέλατος), aptē' rēth, from its dusty color, in pause Πέλατος, Exod. xv, 10; Numb. xxxii, 22; Job xix, 24; Jer. vii, 29; Ezek. xxxii, 18, 20; xxvii, 12; Zech. v, 7, 8; Sept. πολύς (πολύς), a well-known metal, generally found in veins of rocks, used as a metal in a state of purity, and most commonly in combination with sulphur. Although the metal itself was well known to the ancients and to the Hebrews, yet the early uses of lead in the East seem to have been comparatively few, nor are they now numerous. One may travel far in Western Asia without discovering the trace of this metal in any of the numerous useful applications which it is made to serve in European countries. We are not aware that any native lead has been yet found within the limits of Palestine. But ancient lead mines, in some of which the ore has been exhausted by working, have been discovered by Mr. Burton in the mountains between the Red Sea and the Nile; and lead is also said to exist at a place called Sheff, near Mount Sinai (Kitto, Phys. Hist. Pal. p. 1332). The ancient Egyptians employed lead for a variety of purposes, but chiefly as an alloy with more precious metals. On the breasts of mummies that have been unrolled there is frequently found in soft lead, thin and quite flexible, the figure of a hawk, with extended wings, emblematical of Re, or Phra, the sun. Specimens of lead have also been discovered among the Assyrian ruins (Layard's X. i. and Bab. p. 357); and a bronze lion is said to have been found attached to its stone base by means of this metal (Bonomi, Nineveh, p. 325).

The first scriptural notice of this metal occurs in the triumphal song in which Moses celebrates the overthrow of Pharaoh, whose host is said to have "sunk like lead" in the waters of the Red Sea (Exod. xv, 10). That it was common in Palestine is shown by the expression in Exclus. xxii, 18, where it is said, in apostrophizing Solomon, "Thou didst multiply silver as lead," the writer having in view the hyperbolic description of Solomon's wealth in 1 Kings x, 27: "The king made the silver to be in Jerusalem as stones." It was among the spoils of the Midianites which the children of Israel brought with them to the plains of Moab, after their return from the slaughter of the tribe (Numb. xxxii, 22). The ships of Tarshish supplied the market of Tyre with lead, as with other metals (Ezek. xxvii, 12). Its heaviness, to which allusion is made in Exod. xv, 10, and Exclus. xiii, 14, caused it to be used for weights, which were either in the form of a round flat cake (Zech. v, 7), or a rough unfinished lump or "stone" (ver. 8); stones having in ancient times served the purpose of weights (comp. 1 Kings x, 27). This fact may explain the substitution of "lead" for "stones" in the passage of Ecclesiasticus above quoted; the commonest use of the cheapest metal being present to the mind of the writer. If Gesenius is correct in rendering τὸ κανέκ, by "lead," in Amos vii, 8, 9, we have another instance of the purpose to which this metal was applied in forming the ball or bob of the plumb-line. See PLUMB-LINE. Its use for weighting fishing-lines was known in the time of Homer (II. xxiv, 80). In Acts xxvii, 29, a plummet (Διάνυκ, in the form Διανυκεῖν, to heave the lead) for taking soundings at sea is mentioned, and this was, of course, of lead.

But, in addition to these more obvious uses of this metal, the Hebrews were acquainted with another method of employing it, which indicates some advance in the arts at an early period. Job (xix, 24) utters a wish that his words, "with a pen of lead and lead, were grave in the rock forever." The allusion is supposed to be to the practice of carving inscriptions upon stone, and pouring molten lead into the cavities of the letters, to render them legible, and at the same time preserve them from the action of the air. Frequent references to the use of leaden tablets for inscriptions are found in ancient writers. Pausanias (ix, 81) saw Heriod's Works and Days graven on lead, but almost illegible with age. Public proclamations, according to Pliny (xiii, 21), were written on lead, and the name of Germanicus was carved on leaden tablets (Suetonius, Augustus, vii, 69). This account of the Roman practice (Dio Cassius, lx, 39) relates that the history of the Seven Sleepers was engraved on lead by the cadi. The translator of Rosenmiiller (in Bib. Cath. xxvii, 64) thinks, however, that the poetical force of the scriptural passage has been overlooked by interpreters. "Job seems not to have drawn his thought from any thing he had actually seen executed: he only wishes to express in the strongest possible language the durability due to his words; and accordingly he says, 'May the pen be iron, and the ink of lead, with which they are written on an everlasting rock,' i.e. 'Let them not be written with a pen of inscribed materials.' The above usual explanation seems to be suggested by that of the Septuagint, 'that they were sculpured by an iron pen and lead, or hewn into rocks.' See Πέλατος.

Oxide of lead is employed largely in modern pottery for the formation of glazes, and its presence has been discovered in analyzing the articles of earthen-ware found in Egypt and Nineveh, proving that the ancients were acquainted with its use for the same purpose. The A. V. of Exclus. xxviii, 30 assumes that the usage was known to the Hebrews, though the original is not explicit upon the point. Speaking of the potter's art of finishing off his work, "he applieth himself to lead it over," the rendering of what in the Greek is simply "he giveth his heart to complete the smearing," the material employed for the purpose not being indicated. See PORTRA.
An allusion to this use of lead is to be found in Theognis (Gnom. 1127 sqq., ed. Welcker), and it is mentioned by I'iny (xxxiii, 81) as indispensable to the purification of silver from alloy. Comp. also Mal. iii. 2, 3. See Metal.

By modern artificers lead is used with tin in the composition of the solder; and in the manufacture of metal objects. Thus the ancient Hebrews were acquainted with the use of tin by the use of solder is evidently from the description given by the prophet Isaiah of the processes which accompanied the formation of an image for idolatrous worship. The method by which two pieces of metal were joined together was identical with that employed in modern times; the substances to be united being first clamped before being soldered. No hint is given as to the composition of the solder, but in all probability lead was one of the materials employed, its usage for such a purpose being of great antiquity. The ancient Egyptians used it for fastening stones together in the rough parts of a building. Mr. Napier (Metalurgy of the Bible, p. 130) conjectures that 'the solder used in early times for lead, and termed lead, was the same as is now used—a mixture of lead and tin.' See Solder.

Leade or Leaddley, Jane, an English mystic, foundress of the Philadelphia, was born in the county of Norfolk in 1623. According to her own accounts she was convicted of sin in her sixteenth year by a mysterious voice whispering in her ear, and found peace in the grace of God three years after. Her parents, whose names are not recorded, were opposed to her remaining in her true faith, and, having decided to withdraw from the parochial roof, she removed in 1643 to London to join a brother of hers living there. She had spent a year in the English metropolis, constantly growing in grace and in the knowledge of Christian truth, when a monastic came to her from her parents to return home, which request was at once obeyed. Shortly afterwards she was married to William Leade, a pious, noble-hearted man, with whom she lived happily, blessed with a family of four daughters, until 1670, when William was suddenly removed at the age of forty-nine. From the time of her earliest conversion she had shown signs of a mystical tendency; she found the greatest delight in seeking private communion with God; now the loss of her husband drew her still further away from the world, and she became a confirmed mystic. As early as 1653 Dr. Pordage (q. v.) and his wife, together with Dr. Thomas Bromley (q. v.), had succeeded in gathering a congregation of mystics of the Jacob Böhme (q. v.) type, but the pestilence of 1655 had necessitated separation, and they were just gathering anew at London when they were deprieved of their leader by the death of their husband. She joined them readily, and soon became one of the leading spirits of this new mystical movement, and rose until she finally became the founder of a distinct mystical school known as the Philadelphia (q. v.). As her motive for joining Pordage, she assigned certain secret divine revelations and visions which she claimed to have had in the spring of 1670, and shortly after she actually brought before the society a set of laws which she professed to have received of the Lord. In the same manner as Moses had been instructed with the Ten Commandments (Exod. 24), she received a complete copy, see Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol. 1865, p. 187 sqq.)—A still stronger hold she gained upon the society and upon the people at large by the publication of some of her writings in 1658, when she was enabled to send them forth by the pecuniary aid of a pious lady who believed in Jane Leade's divine mission. Her great object in publishing her writings (consisting of eight large octavo volumes—very scarce at present—like those of Jacob Böhme, though less original, abounding in emblematic and figurative language, and very obscure in style) was evidently spread her peculiarity, and by the means thereof to form a society of all truly regenerated Christians, from all denominations, which should be the visible Church of Christ upon earth, and be thus awaiting the second coming of the Lord, which she claimed to have been in- formed by revelation was near at hand (for 1700). She did not seek to establish the denomination of a distinct organization by the movements of the German Pietists and Chiliasm at this period. In 1690, Kilner, of Moscow, agitated this subject still further by an effort to establish a paternal organization of English Methodists, and in 1698 Mrs. Petersen, in her Anleitung z. Verständigung d. Offenb. and again in 1698 in De geistliche Kämpf (Halle, Svo), called upon the regenerate Christians to separate from the world and to form a new Jerusalem. In 1695, Jane Leade, together with her friends John, Hind, and Nordley, removed to London to carry out these projects in London, and proposed a new society, to consist only of Christians, who, without separating from the different churches to which they belonged, should form a pure and undisturbed Church of true Christians, to be governed only by the Holy Spirit, and who should hasten the second coming of Christ and the beginning of the millennium. So successful was this effort that by 1702 the Philadelphia, as they now called themselves, were able to send missionaries to Germany and Holland with a view to making proselytes; and, although they failed to accomplish their object immediately, the idea which constituted it took ground and spread, especially in Germany. Conrad Brüseke of Offenbach, a disciple of Beverley, Dr. Horch of Marburg, and Dr. Kaiser of Stuttgart, labored to propagate it; the latter was the author of a book on the subject of the history and progress of the sect, and of a pamphlet on the history of Timothaeus Philadelphia, and established a Philadelphian community at Stuttgart. An approximate estimate of the extent of Jane Leade's influence on Germany and Holland may be obtained by a reference to the extensive list of her correspondents in those countries comp. Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol. 1865, p. 222, note 58). Many, without being outwardly members of this and similar societies, were evidently favorable to them. But some enthusiasts, as Gebhard, Wetzel, Eva von Buttler, etc., caused the movement to fall into discredit. The scattered elements of the divi sects and societies to be governed only by the Holy Spirit, and those of the Moravian institution. But to return to Jane Leade herself. In 1702 she felt that her end was near at hand. She wrote out her funeral discourse, to be read at her grave, and made all manner of preparations for departure. One of the most noted of her works are, The Wonders of God's Creation manifested in the Variety of Eight Worlds, as they were made known to her by the revelations of her soul in the spirit of the Paraclete, comp. Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol. 1866, p. 184 sqq.)—A still stronger hold she gained upon the society and upon the people at large by the publication of some of her writings in 1658, when she was enabled to send them forth by the pecuniary aid of a pious lady who believed in Jane Leade's divine mission. Her great object in publishing her writings (consisting of eight large octavo volumes—very scarce at present—like those of Jacob Böhme, though less original, abounding in emblematic and figurative language, and very obscure in style) was evidently spread her peculiarity, and by the means thereof to form a society of all truly regenerated Christians, from all denominations, which should be the visible Church of Christ upon earth, and be thus awaiting the second coming of the Lord, which she claimed to have been in- formed by revelation was near at hand (for 1700). She did not seek to establish the denomination of a distinct organization by the movements of the German Pietists and Chiliasm at this period. In 1690, Kilner, of Moscow, agitated this subject still further by an effort to establish a paternal organization of English Methodists, and in 1698 Mrs. Petersen, in her Anleitung z. Verständigung d. Offenb. and again in 1698 in De geistliche Kämpf (Halle, Svo), called upon the regenerate Christians to separate from the world and to form a new Jerusalem. In 1695, Jane Leade, together with her friends John, Hind, and Nordley, removed to London to carry out these projects in London, and proposed a new society, to consist only of Christians, who, without separating from the different churches to which they belonged, should form a pure and undisturbed Church of true Christians, to be governed only by the Holy Spirit, and who should hasten the second coming of Christ and the beginning of the millennium. So successful was this effort that by 1702 the Philadelphia, as they now called themselves, were able to send missionaries to Germany and Holland with a view to making proselytes; and, although they failed to accomplish their object immediately, the idea which constituted it took ground and spread, especially in Germany. Conrad Brüseke of Offenbach, a disciple of Beverley, Dr. Horch of Marburg, and Dr. Kaiser of Stuttgart, labored to propagate it; the latter was the author of a book on the subject of the history and progress of the sect, and of a pamphlet on the history of Timothaeus Philadelphia, and established a Philadelphian community at Stuttgart. An approximate estimate of the extent of Jane Leade's influence on Germany and Holland may be obtained by a reference to the extensive list of her correspondents in those countries comp. Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol. 1865, p. 222, note 58). Many, without being outwardly members of this and similar societies, were evidently favorable to them. But some enthusiasts, as Gebhard, Wetzel, Eva von Buttler, etc., caused the movement to fall into discredit. The scattered elements of the divi sects and societies to be governed only by the Holy Spirit, and those of the Moravian institution. But to return to Jane Leade herself. In 1702 she felt that her end was near at hand. She wrote out her funeral discourse, to be read at her grave, and made all manner of preparations for departure. One of the most noted of her works are, The Wonders of God's Creation manifested in the Variety of Eight Worlds, as they were made known to her by the revelations of her soul in the spirit of the Paraclete, comp. Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol. 1866, p. 184 sqq.)—A still stronger hold she gained upon the society and upon the people at large by the publication of some of her writings in 1658, when she was enabled to send them forth by the pecuniary aid of a pious lady who believed in Jane Leade's divine mission. Her great object in publishing her writings (consisting of eight large octavo volumes—very scarce at present—like those of Jacob Böhme, though less original, abounding in emblematic and figurative language, and very obscure in style) was evidently spread her peculiarity, and by the means thereof to form a society of all truly regenerated Christians, from all denominations, which should be the visible Church of Christ upon earth, and be thus awaiting the second coming of the Lord, which she claimed to have been in-
LEADERS' MEETINGS. As an essential part of the Wesleyan system of episcopal superintendency by means of class-leaders, an organized meeting was appointed to be held weekly under the above title. A leaders' meeting is composed of the itinerant ministers of any circuit or station, and all persons residing in the circuit or station. In England, the powers of leaders' meetings have been considerably enlarged since such meetings were instituted by Mr. Wesley. "They have now a veto upon the admittance of members into the society, when appealed to in such cases by any parties concerned; they possess the power of a jury in the trial of accused members: without their consent, no leader or steward can be appointed to office, or removed from it, excepting when the crime proved merits exclusion from membership, in which case the superintendent can at once depose the offender from office, and expel him from the society. Leaders' are charged with the stewardship of the trust attached to the trustees of the chapel in which their meeting is attached, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper cannot be administered in the said chapel; and the fund for the relief of poor and afflicted members of the society is distributed under their direction and management. Regular leaders' meetings have from the beginning been found essential to the pastoral care and spiritual prosperity of our societies, as well as to the orderly transaction of their financial concerns. The ministers are directed attentively to examine, at each meeting, the entries made in the class-books in reference to the attendance of members, in order that prompt and timely measures may be adopted in cases which, on inquiry, shall appear to demand the exercise of discipline, or the interposition of pastoral exhortation and admonition" (G. R. and W. M. of Wesleyan Methodists). In the Methodist Episcopal Church leaders' meetings have no judicial or veto powers as described above. They are held monthly, or at the call of the pastor. Their usual business embraces the following items: a. That the leaders have an opportunity "to inform the minister of any that are sick, or of any that walk disorderly and will not be reproofed." b. That the pastor may examine the several class-books, and ascertain the Christian walk and character of each member of the Church, and learn what members of the flock especially need his watchcare and counsel. c. To inquire into the religious state of the members of the trial, and ascertain who can be recommended by the leader for admission into full connection, and who should be discontinued. d. To examine the several leaders respecting their "method of leading their classes." e. To recommend to the quarterly conference ministers called to office, or other persons acquainted with the duties of the office. The leaders' meeting also becomes to pastors a convenient and appropriate body of men with whom they can take counsel from time to time respecting many minor matters of Church interest in reference to which advice or co-operation may seem desirable. See Class-Meetings. (D. P. K.)

Leaf, a term occurring in the Bible, both in the singular and plural, in three senses. 1. Leaf of a Tree (prop. γλυκεῖς, αλήθη, so called from springing up; Gr. γλυκόν, also γλύκον, όψις, foliage [Ps. civ, 12], or in Chald. the top of a tree [Dan. iv, 11, 18], and τοῖς, τερέμα, a fresh leaf [Ezek. xxvii, 9] "plucked off" [Gen. xii, 11]). The olive-leaf is mentioned in Gen. viii, 11. Fig-leaves formed the first covering of our parents in Eden. The barren fig-tree (Matt. xxii, 19; Mark xi, 12) on the road between Bethany and Jeru- salem "had on it nothing but leaves." The fig-leaf is alluded to by our Lord (Matt. xxiii, 22; Mark xiii, 28): "When his branch is yet tender, and puttheth forth leaves, yet sheweth not that it is a wine- grape." It is mentioned in Isa. v, 8, and vi, 13. Leaves, the organs of perspiration and inhalation in plants, are used symbolically in the Scriptures in a variety of senses; sometimes they are taken as an evidence of grace (Ps. i, 8), while at others they represent the mere outward form of religion without the spirit (Matt. xxii, 18). Their flourishing and their decay, their restoration and their fragility, furnish the symbols of numerous allegories of great force and beauty (Lev. xvi, 36; Isa. i, 30; xxxiv, 4; Jer. viii, 18; Dan. iv, 14, 21; Mark xi, 12, 13; Rev. xi, 9). The bright, fresh color of a leaf of a tree is a symbol of its rich nourishment from a good soil, hence it is the symbol of prosperity (Ps. i, 8; Jer. xvi, 8). A faded leaf, on the contrary, shows the lack of moisture and nourishment, and becomes a fit emblem of adversity and decay (Job xiii, 25; Isa. lxi, 6). Similar figures have prevailed in all ages (see Webster, Symol. Dictionary, s. v.). In Ezekiel's vision of the holy waters, the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom are spoken of under the image of trees growing on a river's bank; there "shall grow all trees for food, whose leaf shall not fade" (Ezek. xxxiv, 12). In this passage it is said that "the fruit of these trees shall be for food, and the leaf thereof for medicine" (margin, for bruises and sores). With this compare John's vision of the heavenly Jerusalem (Rev. xxi, 2, 12): "In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, ... the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations." There is probably here an allusion to some tree whose leaves were used by the Jews as a medicine or ointment; indeed, it is very likely that many plants and leaves were thus made use of by them, as by the old English herbalists. See Tree of Life. 2. Leaf of a Door (πτερόν, a side, in 1 Kings vi, 34 [where the latter clause has, prob. by error, πτέρα, κέρ- μα, a curtain], means the vail of a folding door; so αναπόπτερόν, a door-vail [2 Macc. vii, 13, 14]). As above, hence perhaps a fold of a roll (Jer. xxxvi, 23), like our column of a volume). See Book. League, the plural of a root שד, to contract or covenant; also שׁד, chabad' [Dan. xiii, 23], to join in alliance; פּוּע, karath', to cut, i.e., "make a league," a political confederacy or treaty. That the Hebrews, surrounded on every side by idolatrous nations, might not be seduced to a defection from Jehovah their king, it was necessary that they should be kept from too great an intercourse with these nations by the establishment of various singular rites; but, lest this seclusion from them should be the source of hatred to other nations, Moses constantly taught them that they should love their neighbors, i.e. every one with whom they had intercourse, including foreigners (Exod. xxxi, 21; xxix, 9; Lev. xix, 34; Deut. x, 19; 17, 9; 23, 4; Jer. xxxi, 34). To this end, he showed them that the benefits which God had conferred upon them in preference to other nations were undeserved (Deut. vii, 6; 8; ix, 4-24). But, although the Hebrews individually were debarmed from any close intimacy with idolatrous nations by various rites, yet as a nation they were permitted to form trea-
ties with Gentile states, with the following exceptions: (1.) The Canaanites, including the Philistines; these nations with the Hebrews were not permitted to enter into any alliance whatever (Exod. xxi., 28; xxxiv. 12-16; Deut. vii. 1-11; xx. 1-19). The Phoenicians, although Canaanites, were not included in this deep hostility, as they dwelt on the northern shore of the country, were shut up within their own limits, and did not occupy the land promised to the patriarchs. (2.) The Amalekites, or Canaanites of Arabia, were also destined to hereditary enmity, unceasing war, and total extermination (Exod. xxi., 18; xxii. 19, 21; Deut. vii. 1-5; 1 Sam. xv. 1, 33; xxvii. 8, 9; xxx. 1, 17, 18). (3.) The Moabites and Ammonites were to be excluded forever from the right of treaty or citizenship with the Hebrews, but were not to be attacked in war, except when provoked by previous hostility (Deut. ii. 9-19; xxxii. 4-6; Judg. iii. 12-20; 1 Sam. xiv. 47; 2 Sam. viii. 2; xii. 36). With the Midianitish nation at large there was no hereditary enmity, but those tribes who had conspired with the Moabites were ultimately crushed in a war of dreadful severity (Num. xxx. 17, 18; xxxi. 1-18). Yet those tribes which did not participate in the hostilities then partook of the evil weal of the Hebrews who were included among the nations with whom alliances might be formed, but in later times they acted in so hostile a manner that no permanent peace could be preserved with them (Judg. vi. 1-40; vii. 1-25; viii. 1-21). No war was enjoined against the Edomites (see Gen. xxv. 24); it was expressly enjoined that, in the tenth generation, they, as well as the Egyptians, might be admitted to citizenship (Num. xx. 14-21; Deut. ii. 4-9). The Edomites also, on their part, conducted themselves peaceably towards the Hebrews till the time of David, when their aggressions caused a war, in which they were overthrown. From that time they cherished a secret hatred against the Hebrews (2 Sam. viii. 13, 14). War had not been determined on against the Amorites on the east of the Jordan; but, as they only refused a free passage, but opposed the Hebrews with arms, they were attacked and beaten, and their country fell into the hands of the Hebrews (Num. xxx. 21-35; Deut. i. 4; ii. 24-37; iii. 1-18; iv. 46-49; Judg. xii. 13-23). Treaties were permitted with all other nations, provided they were such as would tend to the public welfare. David accordingly maintained a friendly national intercourse with the kings of Tyre and Hamath, and Solomon with the kings of Tyre and Egypt, and with the queen of Sheba. Even the Maccabees, those zealots for the law, did not hesitate to enter into compact with the Romans. When the prophets condemn the treaties which they made with the nations, they did so, not because they were contrary to the Mosaic laws, but because they were impolitic and ruinous measures, which betrayed a want of confidence in Jehovah their king. The event always showed in the most striking manner the propriety of their rebukes (2 Kings xvii. 4; xviii. 20, 21; xx. 12, 13; 2 Chron. xxvi. 13-17; xxvii. 21; Isa. vii. 2; xxx. 2-12; xxxi. 1-3; xxxvi. 4-7; xxxix. 1-8; Hos. v. 13; vii. 11; xii. 1; Jer. xxxvii. 5-10). See Alliances.

League of Cambrai is the name of the league entered into (A.D. 1506) between pope Julius II, the emperor Maximilian, and the kings of France and Navarre, to make war, by the aid of both spiritual and temporal arms, against the republic of Venice. See Julius II; Maximilian; Venice.

League and Covenant. See COVENANT, SOL.

League and Holy. See HOLY LEAGUE.

League of Smalcald. See SMALCALDE.

Le'ah (Heb. לאה, leah, weary; Sept. Asia, Vulg. Lai), the eldest daughter of the Aramean Laban, and sister of Rachel (Gen. xxv. 19). Instead of the latter, she was named for whom he had served seven years. Jacob took her by a decoit of her father, who was unwilling to give his younger daughter in marriage first, contrary to the usages of the East (Gen. xxix. 22 sq.; compare Rosenmuller, Marg, i. 198 sq.). B.C. 1929. She was less beautiful than her younger sister (comp. Josephus, Ant. i. 19, 7), having also weak eyes (טירש רעב יבש, Tare Sh. Reu, Vulg. lpsius oculis, Auth. Ver. "tender-eyed," Gen. xxix. 17; comp. the opposite quality as a recommendation, 1 Sam. xvi. 12), which probably accounts for the Jacob's preference of Leah before Rachel at first and ever afterwards, especially as he was not likely ever to love cordially one whom he did not voluntarily marry (comp. Gen. xxx. 20). See Rachel. Leah bore to Jacob, before her sister had any children, six sons, namely, Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah (Gen. xxx. 24 sq.), Issachar, Zebulun (Gen. xxx. 22 sq.); compare xxxv. 23; also one daughter, Dinah (Gen. xxx. 21), besides the two sons borne by her maid Zilpah, and reckoned as hers, namely, Gad and Asher (Gen. xxx. 2), all within the space of seven years, B.C. 1919-1918. See Correspondence; Slavery. "Leah was conscious and resentful (chap. xxx) of the smaller share she possessed in her husband's affections; yet in Jacob's differences with his father-in-law his two wives appear to be attached to him with equal fidelity. In the critical moment when he expected an attack from Esau, his discrimination between the several members of his own family was shown by his placing Rachel and her children hindmost, in the least exposed situation. Leah and her children next, and the two handmaids with their children in the front. Leah probably lived to witness the disastrous fate of her father (chap. xxxv.), so early to be cut off by two of her sons, and the subsequent deaths of Jacob at Bethel, and of Rachel near Bethlehem." Leah appears to have died in Canaan, since she is not mentioned in the migration to Egypt (Gen. xlv. 5), and was buried in the family cemetery at Hebron (Gen. lix. 43).

Leesk, Leemir. FORDHAM, a minister of the Presbyterian (O. S.) Church, was born in Chester, Morris County, N. J., and was educated at Princeton College, class of 1814. After graduation he taught two years, then studied theology at Princeton Seminary, was licensed by the New York Presbytery Oct. 7, 1816, and became pastor of the churches of Oxford and Harmony in 1822. In 1825 he resigned this position, and labored for the missionary interests of the Church. In 1831 he was called to Chartriers Church, at Canonsburg, as successor to Dr. M'Millan, and there he labored until 1860, when he became president of Franklin College at Athens, Ohio. Later he removed to Zelienople, Pa.; thence to Waveland, Ind. He died Dec. 1, 1866.—Wilson, Presbyterian Historical Almanac, 1867, p. 168.

Leaming, JeHEMIAH, D.D., an Episcopalian clergyman, was born at Middletown, Conn., in 1717, graduated at Yale College in 1746, and, after entering the ministry, quickly rose to distinction. He was at one time spoken of for the office of first bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. He died at New Haven, Conn., in 1804. Among his publications are A Defence of Episcopal Government of the Church—Evidences of the Truth of Christianity; etc.—Allibone, Dict. British and American Authors, vol. ii. 9, v.

Leander, Sr., a Spanish prelate, flourished towards the close of the 6th世纪. He died March 13, 601 (according to some, Feb. 27, 596). He was a son of Severianus, governor of Carchage, and brother of Fulgentius, bishop of that city, and of St. Isidore of Seville, who succeeded him as bishop of Seville. He was totally distinguished himself by his zeal against the Arians. Among his converts was Hermengild, eldest son of Leovigil, king of the Goths. Upon the defeat of the former by the latter Leander was sent into exile, but he was recalled in the same year, and converted Recaredes, second of the kings. After the death of Leovigil he assembled at once the third Council of Toledo, and caused Arianism to be solemnly condemned. For his services in making Spain an adherent of the faith of
Leaven was specially rewarded by Gregory I. The cathedral of Seville claims to possess his relics, and he is commemorated on the 19th of March. He wrote a number of works, of which there are yet extant De Institutione Virginum et contemptu mundi (to be found in the Codex Regulorum of St. Benedict of Amiens, published by Holsteinus, and in the Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. xiii.). It is a great pity that the remains of admirers of the great monk's devotion and mysticism, such as the laudes Ecclesiae, etc. (Labbé, Concil. vol. v.), a discourse on the conversion of the Goths, pronounced on the third Council of Toledo. Leander is considered as the originator of the Mozarabic rite completed by St. Isidore. St. Gregory the Great dedicated to Leander his dissertation on Job, which he had undertaken by his advice. See St. Isidore, De Viris illustribus, etc.; St. Gregory the Great, Epi. et Dialog.; St. Gregory of Tours, Hist. vol. v.; Baronio, Annales; Dom Mabillon, Annales Ord. Benedict., etc.; Biellet, Vies des Saints, i, Mar. 15.; Dom Collet, Hist. d. Artistes sacrés, xvi, 115, etc.; Dom Rives, Hist. Littéraire de la France; Richard et Gibaud, Bibliothèque Sacrée; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxx; S.; Wetzler u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. vi, 388.

Lea-o-o-Tee, emperor of China, and founder of the Lea-o-o dynasty, usurped the throne about A.D. 542. Through devotion to the doctrines of Fo and mysticism, he destroyed the monasteries and monastics of China (priests killed, monks killed), and neglected the care of the empire. He was deposed by one of his officers, Hsiao-King, and died soon after (549).

Lea'n'oth (Heb. le-monoth, לְמֹנָּה, for usanering, i.e. singing; Sept. τὰ ιωάνεια, Vulg. ad respons.,) a musical direction occurring in the title of Ps. cxvii, 4, denoting that it was to be chanted in the manner indicated by the associated terms. See PALMS, BOOK OF.

Learning, skill in any science, or that improvement of the mind which we gain by study, instruction, observation, etc. An attentive examination of ecclesiastical history will lead us to see how greatly learning is indebted to Christianity, and that Christianity, in its turn, has been much strengthened by learning. "All the useful learning which is now to be found in the world is in a great measure owing to the Gospel. The Christians, who had a great veneration for the Old Testament, have contributed more than the Jews themselves to secure and explain the ancient inspired writings. The Christian churchmen, in ancient times, collected and preserved the Greek versions of the Scriptures, particularly the Septuagint, and translated the originals into Latin. To Christians were due the old Hexapla; and in later times Christians have published the Polyglots and the Samaritan Pentateuch. It was the Christians, in the Church, who preserved and transmitted the Christian works of the Latin Church, and the Latin Church, who preserved and transmitted the Christian works of the Latin Church, and the Latin Church, and the Latin Church, who preserved and transmitted the Christian works of the Christian churchmen of the 3rd and 4th centuries. The Christian Church has been a great benefactor to learning.

Leather ( timeZone, br, 2 Kings i, 6, properly skin, as elsewhere rendered, i.e. on a person or animal, also as taken off, hide, sometimes as prepared or tanned, Lev. xi, 32; xiii, 46 sq.; Numb. xxxi, 25; in the N.T. only in the adj. Ἱκτόρυπας, "leather," Matt. iii, 4; lit. of skin, as in the parallel passage, Mark i, 6). A girdle of leather is referred to in the above passage (2 Kings i, 6) as characteristic of Elias, which, with the mantle of hair, formed the humble attire that the prophets usually wore. In like manner John the Baptist had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leather girdle about his loins (Matt. iii, 4). Strong and broad girdles of leather are still much used by the nomad tribes of Western Asia (see Hackett's Illustr. of Scripture, p. 96). See Skin; DRESS.

Leaven. We learn from the monuments [see cut on page 808] that the ancient Egyptians were well acquainted with the various processes of tanning and working in leather, and from them the Hebrews undoubtedly derived their knowledge of the art of preparing leather for a variety of useful purposes. It appears that the Egyptian tan was prepared in earthen vessels, and that the workmen could preserve skins either with or without the hair. The preparation of leather was an important branch of Egyptian industry (see Wilkinson's Egyptians, ii, 98, 99, 105). Leather appears to have been used by the ancient Assyrians in some cases for recording documents (see Layard's Nineveh, i, 147). See TANNING.

Leaven. In the Hebrew we find two distinct words, both translated leaven in the common version of the Bible. This is unfortunate, for there is the same distinction between resh, seor, and עַשְּנָה, chamets, in the Hebrew, as between leaven and unleavened bread in the English. The Greek θύμα appears to be used only in the former sense, and it is doubtful if it applies to a liquid. Chemically speaking the "fermentation" of bread is the same substance in both cases; but "leaven" is more correctly applied to solids, "ferment" both to liquids and solids.

1. "resh, seor," occurs only five times in the Scriptures, in four of which (Exod. xii, 15, 19; xiii, 7; Lev. iii, 11) it is rendered "leaven," and in the fifth (Deut. xvi, 4) "leavened bread." It seems to have denoted originally the remnant of dough left on the preceding baking, which had fermented and turned acid; hence (accord-
chamets' occur together, and are evidently distinct: "Unleavened bread (matatwich) shall be eaten during the seven days, and there shall not be seen with these fermented bread (chamets), and there shall not be seen with thee unleavened dough (sevor) in all thy borders." See W. W. X.

The organic chemists define the process of fermentation, and the substance which excites it, as follows: "Fermentation is nothing else but the putrefaction of a substance containing no nitrogen. Ferment, or yeast, is a substance in a state of putrefaction, the atoms of which are in a continual motion" (Turner's Chemistry, by Liebig). This definition is in strict accordance with the views of the ancients, and gives point and force to many passages of sacred writ (Ps. lxix, 21; Matt. xvi, 6, 11, 12; Mark viii, 18; Luke xii, 11; xiii, 21; 1 Cor. v, 5-8; Gal. v, 9). Leaven, or fermented, or even some seemingly fermentible substances (as honey), were prohibited in many of the typical institutions both of the Jews and Gentiles. The Latin writers use corruptus as signifying fermented; Tactus applies the word to the fermentation of wine. Plutarch (Rom. Quest. cix, 6) assigns as the reason why the priests of Jupiter Caelestis were not allowed to touch leaven, "that it comes out of corruption, and corrupts that with which it is mingled." See also Julius Gallus, viii, 15. The use of leaven was strictly forbidden in all offerings made to the Lord by fire, as in the case of the peace-offering (Lev. ii, 11), the sin-offering (Lev. vii, 13), the consecration-offering (Exod. xxix, 2; Lev. viii, 2), the Nazarite-offering (Num. vi, 17), and in particular in regard to the feast of the Passover, when the Israelites were not only prohibited on pain of death from eating leavened bread, but even from having any leaven in their houses (Exod. xii, 15, xx, 1) or in their land (Exod. xiii, 7; Deut. xvi, 4) during seven days, commencing with the 14th of Nisan. The command was rigidly enforced by the zeal of the Jews in later times (compare Mishnah, Peah, ii, 1; Schüttgen, Hebr. Hebr. i, 368). It is in reference to these prohibitions that Amos (iv, 5) ironically bids the Jews of his day to "offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven." Hence, likewise, even honey was prohibited (Lev. ii, 11) on account of its occasionally producing fermentation. In other instances, where the offering was to be consumed by the priest and not on the altar, leaven might be used, as in the case of the peace-offering (Lev. vii, 13) and the Pentecostal leavens (Lev. xxiii, 17).

It is to be presumed also that the shew-bread was unleavened, both, a forciors, from the prohibition of leaven in the bread offered on the altar, and because, in the direction given for the making of the shew-bread it is not specified that leaven should be used (Lev. xxiv, 5-9); for, in all such cases, what is not enjoined is prohibited. Jewish tradition also asserts that the shew-bread was without leaven (Josephus, Ant. iii, 6, 6; Tal. Maimoth, v, 2, 8). On Lev. ii, 11, Dr. Andrew Willet observes, "They have a spiritual signification, because ferment signifies corruption, as St. Paul applieth (1 Cor. v, 8). The honey is also forbidden because it had a leavening force" (Junius, Inscript., 1631). On the same principle of symbolism, God prescribes that all shall always constitute a part of the offerings to the Lord (Lev. ii, 31) on account of its antiseptic properties. Thus St. Paul (comp. Col. iv, 6; Eph. iv, 29) uses "salt" as preservative from corruption, on the same principle which leads him to employ that which is unleavened (Nepheus) as an emblem of purity and incorruption. See Passover.

The Greek word ζύμων, rendered "leaven," is used with precisely the same latitude of meaning as the Hebrew sevor'. It signifies leaven, sour dough (Matt. xiii, 33; xvi, 12; Luke xii, 21). Another quality in leaven is noticed in the Bible, viz., its "secretly proceeding, its diffusive power; hence the proverbial saying, "a little leaven leavens the whole lump" (1 Cor. v, 6, Gal. v, 9). In this respect it was emblematic of moral influence generally, whether good or bad, and hence our Saviour
LEBANON

accepts it as illustrating the growth of the kingdom of heaven in the individual heart and in the world at large (Matt. xiii. 33). Leaven, or ferment, is therefore used tropically for corruption, perverseness, of life, doctrine, heart, etc. (Matt. vi. 6, 11; Mark viii. 15; Luke xi. 1; 1 Cor. v. 7, 8; comp. Col. iv. 6; Eph. iv. 29). The idea has been familiar to the Jews; compare Otha, Lex. Rabin. Talm. p. 227. They even employed leaven as a figure of the inherent corruption of man: "R. Alexander, when he had finished his prayers, said, Led of the universe, it is clearly manifest before thee that it is our will to do thy will: what hinders that we do not thy will? The leaven which is in the mass (G.L. the evil desire which is in the heart)" (Babyl. Berachoth, xvii. 1; ap. Meusch. N.T. ex Talmude ill.). We find the same allusion in the Roman poet Persius (Sat. i. 24; compare Casaubon's note, Comment. p. 74). See Wernersdorff, De fermento Herodes (All. 1724). See unleavened bread.

The usual leaven in the East is dough kept till it becomes sour, and which is kept from one day to another for the purpose of preserving leaven in readiness. Thus, if there should be no leaven in all the country for any length of time, as much as a month, the leaven should easily be produced in twenty-four hours. Sour dough, however, is not exclusively used for leaven in the East; the use of wine being in some parts employed as yeast (Kitto, Fictorial Bible, i. 161). In the Talmudic mention is made of leaven fornem of the הבש הceptive הילעוס, leaven "dipped in water" (Pesekh. iii. 1). As the process of producing the leaven itself, or even of leavening bread, when the substance was at hand, required some time, unleavened cakes were more usually produced on sudden emergencies (Gen. xviii. 6; Judg. vi. 19). See Bake; Bread, etc.

Leban'a (Neh. vii. 48). See Lebanon.

Lebanah (Heb. Lebanon', בֵּית הָלָה, the moon as being white, Matt. x. 10, etc.; Sept. in Ezra ii. 44; Sos. 1. 24), Chaldaically written Lebanon, בֵּית הָלָה, in most MSS. in Neh. vii. 48, Sept. Ailunai, Auth. Ver. Lebanon; Vulg. in both passages Lebanon), one of the Nethinim whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel. B.C. ante 536.

Leban'on, the loftiest and most celebrated mountain range in Syria, forming the northern boundary of Palestine, and running thence along the coast of the Mediterranean to the great pass which opens into the plain of Hamath. The range of Anti-Lebanon, usually included by geographers under the same general name, lies parallel to the other, commencing on the south at the mountains of the Jordan, and terminating in the plain of Hamath. The two are separated by the northern part of the great central ridge or back-bone of the entire country. See Palestine.

I. The Name.—In the O. Test. these mountain ranges are always called בֵּית הָלָה, Lebanon', to which, in prose, the art. is constantly prefixed, בֵּית הָלָה; in poetry the art. is sometimes prefixed and sometimes not, as in Isa. xiv. 8, and Psa. xxix. 6. The origin of the name has been variously explained. It is generally assigned to the root בֵּית הָלָה, to be white. בֵּית הָלָה יִהְיֶה is thus emphatically "The White Mountain" of Syria. It is a singular fact that almost uniformly the names of the highest mountains in all countries have a like meaning—Mont Blanc, Himalaya (in Sanscrit signifying "snowy"), Ben Nevis, Joworkem, perhaps also Alps (from aíu, "white," like the Latin albus, and as commonly thought, from aíp, "high"). Some suppose the name originated in the white snow by which the ridge is covered; others derive the name from the whitish color of the limestone rock of which the great body of the range is composed (Schinz, Leitungen des Hochkant, v. 471; Robinson, Biblical. Res. ii. 498). The former seems the more natural explanation, and is confirmed by several circumstances. Jeremiah mentions the "snow Lebanon" (xxvii. 14); in the Chald. paraphrase לְעַבֵּד "mountain," is the name given to it, and this is equivalent to a not uncommon modern Arabic appellation, Jebel ith-Thelj (Gesenius, Thesaurus, l. c.; Abulfeda, Tob. Syr. p. 184). Others derive the name Lebanon from Aīsārāw (aīsārāw, "frankincense," the gum of a tree called Aīsināw (Reland, Palest. p. 312; Herod. i. 183), which is mentioned among the gifts presented by the wise men to the infant Saviour (Matt. ii. 11). This, however, is in Hebrew לְעַבֵּד, Lebanon (Exod. xxx. 34; Isa. i. 6). The Greek name of Lebanon, both in the Septuagint and classic authors, is uniformly Aīsāroŭn (Strabo, xvi. 755; Ptol. v. 10). The Septuagint has sometimes Ἀϊσίνωψις instead of Aīsāroŭn (Deut. i. 7; l. c. 261; Josh. i. 4; ix. 1). The Latin name is Libanus (Vitry, v. 17), which is the reading of the Vulgate. It would appear that the Greek and Roman geographers regarded the name as derived from the snow. Tacitus speaks of it as a remarkable phenomenon that snow should lie where there is sapix in the heat (Hist. 5. 6). Thel, C. Antie., "Libanus λευκώσας — id est, conus interpretatur" (Adererus Jordanum, in Opera, ii. 286, ed. Migne); he also notes the identity of the name of this mountain and frankincense (in One, in Opera, vi. 100). Arab geographers call all the range Jibil il-Liban (Strabo, iv. 372; Hyginus, Strab. p. 168; Edrisi, p. 386, ed. Jaubert). This name, however, is now seldom heard among the people of Syria, and when used it is confined to the western range. Different parts of this range have distinct names—the northern section is called Jebel Akkar, the central Sunus, and the southern J. el-Druze. Other local names are also used.

The eastern range, as well as the western, is frequently included under the general name Lebanon in the Bible (Josh. i. 4; Judg. iii. 8); but in Josh. xiii. 5 it is correctly subdivided and named "Lehem ben edom" or "Lehem ben ir" (Beaufort, The Anti-Lebanon and its Sources, p. 110), and translated in the Vulg. Liban quoque regio contra orientem. The southern section of this range was well known to the sacred writers as Hermon, and had in ancient times several descriptive titles given to it—Sirion, Shenir, Sion; just as it has in modern days as Jebel Akkar (or Thel). See Anti-Lebanon. Greek writers called the whole range Ἀντίλιβανος (Strabo, xvi. p. 754; Pтол. v. 10), a word which is sometimes found in the Sept. as the rendering of the Hebrew Lebanon (ut supra). Latin authors also uniformly distinguish the eastern range by the name Anti-Libano (Pliney). The name is appropriately descriptive, its position, lying "opposite" or "over against" Lebanon (Strabo, l. c.). Yet this distinction does not seem to have been known to Josephus, who uniformly calls the eastern as well as the western range Aīsāroŭn; thus he speaks of the mountains of the Jordan as being near to Libanus (Ant. v. 8. 1), and of Abila as situated in Libanus (xix. 5. 1). The range of Anti-Lebanon is now called by all native geographers Jebel esh-Shurki, "East mountain," to distinguish it from Lebanon proper, which is sometimes termed Jebel el-Chourbi, "West mountain" (Brockmann, Biblical Res. ii. 487; Burchhardt, Travels in Syria, p. 4).

To insure greater definiteness, and to prevent repetition, the name Lebanon will be applied in this article to the western range, and Anti-Lebanon to the eastern.

II. Physical Geography.—1. Lebanon.—(1.) Limits. The mountain range which lies on the left of the valley which connects the Mediterranean with the plain of Hamath (anciently called "the entrance of Hamath," Numb. xxxiv. 8), in lat. 34° 41', and runs in a south-western direction along the coast, till it sinks into the plain of Acre and the low hills of Galilee, in lat. 33° 5', its extreme length is 110 geographical miles, and the average breadth of its base is about 20 miles. The highest peak, called Dahar el-Kudib, is about 25 miles
from the northern extremity, and just over the little cedar grove; its elevation is 10,051 feet (Van de Veide, "Mouve", p. 170). From this point the range decreases in height towards the south. The massive rounded summit of Sunnir, 25 miles from the former, is 6500 feet high. Jebel Kenble, the next peak, is 6824 feet; and Tomat Nha, "the Twin-peaks," the highest tops of southern Lebanon, are about 6500 feet. From these the fall is rapid to the ravine of the river Litâni, the ancient Leontes.

The chain of Lebanon, or at least its higher ridges, may be said to terminate at the point where it is thus broken through by the Litâni. But a broad and lower mountainous tract continues towards the south, bordering the basin of the Huleh on the west. It rises to its greatest elevation about Safed (Jebel Safed), and at length ends abruptly in the mountains of Nazareth, as the northern wall of the plain of Esdraelon. This high tract may very properly be regarded as a prolongation of Lebanon.

Some writers regard the Litâni as marking the southern limit of Lebanon; and it would seem that the ancient classical geographers were of this opinion (Smith, "Diæt. of G. and R. Geog. s. v. Libanus; Kitto, "Physical Hist. of Pal.," p. 52). Diodorus Siculus describes Lebanon as extending along the coast of Tripolis, Byblus, and Sidon (Hist. xix, 59); and the Litâni falls into the sea a few miles south of Sidon. The notices of Ptolemy are somewhat indefinite, and represent the two chains of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon as commencing at the Mediterranean—the former on the north, the latter on the south (Geog. v, 15). Strabo is more definite and less accurate: "There are two mountains which include Cœle-Syrria lying parallel to each other. The commencement of both these mountains, Libanus and Anti-Libanus, is a little way above the sea. Libanus rises from the sea near Tripolis and Theopropos, and Anti-Libanus from the sea near Sidon. They terminate somewhere near the Arabian mountains, which are above the district of Damascus and the Trachones. . . . A hollow plain lies between them, whose breadth towards the sea is 200 stadia, and its length from the sea to the interior about twice as much. Rivers flow through it, the largest of which is the Jordan" (xvi, 754). According to Pliny the chains begin at the sea, but they run from south to north ("N. v, 17; compare Ammian. Marcel. xiv, 26). Cellarius merely repeats these ancient authors (Geog. ii, 439). Reland shows their errors and contradictions, but he cannot solve them, though he derived some important information from Maundrell ("Pilgr. p. 317 sq.; comp. Early Trav. in Pal. Bohn, p. 488"). Rosenmüller ("Bib. Geog. ii, 207, 263"); Wells (Geog. i, 229), and others, only repeat the old mistakes. The source of these errors may be seen by an examination of the physical geography of the district east of Tyre and Sidon. There can be no doubt that the range of Lebanon, viewed in its physical formation, extends from the entrance of Haemath to the plain of Acre; but between the parallels of Tyre and Sidon it is cut through by the chasm of the Litâni, which drains the valley of Cœle-Syrria. That river enters the range obliquely on the eastern side, turns gradually westward, and at length divides the main ridge at right angles. Here, therefore, it may be said, in one sense, that the chain terminates; and though on the south bank of the Litâni another chain rises, and runs in the line of the former, it is not so lofty; its greatest height scarcely exceeding 3000 feet. Ancient geographers thought Lebanon terminated on the north bank of the Litâni; and as that river drains the valley of Cœle-Syrria, which lies between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, they naturally supposed that the chain on the south bank of the Litâni was the commencement of the latter range. Here lies the error, which Dr. Porter was among the first to detect, by an examination of the general conformation of the mountain ranges from the summit of Hermon (see "Bibliotheca Sacra," xi, 52; Porter, "Damascus," 296). Anti-Lebanon is completely separated from this western range by a broad and deep valley. The great valley of the Jordan extends northward to the western base of Hermon, in the parallel of the chasm of the Litâni. From this point a narrower valley, called wady el-Teim, runs northward, till it meets an eastern branch of Cœle-Syrria. These three valleys, forming a continuous line, constitute the western boundary of Anti-Lebanon. No part of this chain crosses them (Robinson, ii, 438). The southern end of the plain of Cœle-Syrria is divided by a low ridge into two branches. Down the eastern branch runs wady el-Teim, conveying a tributary to the Jordan ("Bib. Sac. L. C.; Robinson, iii, 428-430"); down the western runs the Litâni. The latter branch soon contracts into a wild chasm, whose banks are in some places above a thousand feet high, of naked rock, and almost perpendicular. At one spot the ravine is only 60 feet wide, and is spanned by a natural bridge, at the height of about 100 feet above the stream. Over it rise jagged walls of naked limestone, pierced with numerous caves. The scenery is here magnificent; as one stands on this arch of nature's own building, he seems to see clearly repress feelings of alarm. The cliffs almost meet overhead; rugged masses of rock shoot out from dizzy heights, and appear as if about to plunge into the chasm; the mad river far below dashes along from rapid to rapid in sheets of foam. In wild grandeur this chasm has no equal in Syria, and few in the world. Yet, from a short distance on either side, it is not visible. The mountain chain appears to run on in its course, declining gradually, but without any interruption. The ridge, in fact, has been cleft asunder by some terrible convulsion, and through the rift the waters of Cœle-
Syria have forced their way to the Mediterranean instead of the Jordan, which is the natural outlet. It will thus be seen that the ridge on the south bank of the Litani is the prolongation of that on the north, and is a part of Lebanon (Robinson, ii, 483); and that the chain of the Litani, though the drain of Cilicia-Syria, is no part of the Anti-Lebanon. Neither Cilicia-Syria, therefore, nor Anti-Lebanon, at any point, approaches within many miles of the Mediterranean (Handbook for S. and P. p. 571; Robinson, iii, 420 sq.; Van de Velde, Travels, i, 145 sq.).

(2.) Western Aspect.—The view of Lebanon from the Mediterranean is exceedingly grand. On approaching, it appears to rise from the basin of the deep like a vast wall, the wavy top densely covered with snow during winter and spring, and the two highest peaks capped with clouds of ice on the sultriest days of summer. The western slopes are long and gradual, fruited from top to bottom with deep rugged ravines, and broken everywhere by lofty cliffs of white rock, and ragged banks, and tens of thousands of terrace walls, rising like steps of stairs from the sea to the snow-wreaths. "The whole mass of the mountain consists of whitish limestone, or as it is called in modern times, the chalk, which lighthouse, each of its two western hills, is crowned with a lighthouse. The entire Eastern side of the island is a great level plain extending along its base, which is on an average about 3000 feet above the level of the sea (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 175). The ridge resembles a colossal wall, its sides precipitous, and thinly covered, in most places, with oak forests. There are very few—only some one or three—hills or promontories. The summit of the ridge, or backbone, is much nearer the eastern than the western side; and extending in gentle undulations, white with snow, far as the eye can see to the right and left, it forms a grand object from the ruins of Baalbek, and still more so the height of the ancient city of Phoenicia. When the eastern approach to the chain reveals a new feature. A side ridge runs along the base of the central chain from the town of Zahle to its northern extremity, and is thinly covered throughout with forests of oak intermixed with wild plum, hawthorn, juniper, and other trees. A little south of the parallel of Summit this ridge is low and narrow, and the Bukà is a there widest. Advancing northwards the ridge increases in height, and encroaches on the plain, until, at the summit of the mountain (Ain el-Assy), it attains its greatest elevation, and there the plain is narrowest. From this point southwards to where the road crosses from Baalbek to the Cedars, the central chain is steep, and destitute of vegetation, except here and there a solitary oak or blasted pine clinging to the rocks (Porter's Danaeua, ii, 305 sq.; Robinson, iii, 550 sq.).

The side ridge above described sinks down in graceful wooded slopes into wady Khâled, which drains a part of the plain of Hums, and falls into Nahr el-Kebr. The main chain also terminates abruptly a little farther west, and its base is swept by the waters of the Kebr, a river anciently celebrated (Robinson, iii, 561 sq.).

(4.) Rivers.—Lebanon is rich in rivers and fountains, fed by the eternal snows that crown its summit, and the vapoors which they condense. The "streams from Lebanon" were proverbial for their abundance and beauty in the days of the Hebraic prophets (Cant. iv, 15), and its "cold-flowing waters" were types of richness and luxury (Jer. xviii, 14). Some of them, too, have obtained a classic celebrity (see Relland, Palest. p. 209, 487). They are all small mountain torrents rather than rivers. The following are the more important: i. The Eleutherus (now Nahr el-Kebr), rising in the plain of Emesa (Robinson, iii, 550), and west of the plain of Hums, and, at a single spot, seizes the confluence of thousands of small streams and rivers from Lebanon, and falls into the Mediterranean midway between Tripolis and Araradus. Strabo states that it formed the northern border of Phoenicia and Cilicia-Syria (xvi, 755; Robinson, iii, 570). 2. The Kadisha, or "sacred river," now generally called Nabûr, rises in the mountains, and descends through a sublime ravine to the coast near Tripoli. At one spot its gales have perpendicular walls of rock on each side nearly 1000 feet high. Here, on opposite banks, are two villages, the people of which can converse across the chasm without using ropes or ladders, or making a walk of two hours. In a wild cleft of the ravine is the convent of Kanobin, the chief residence of the Maronite patriarch (Handbook for Syr. and Pal. p. 586). 3. The
Adonis (Nahr Ibrahim), famous in ancient fable as the scene of the romantic story of Venus and Adonis. Killed by a boar on its banks, Adonis dyed with his blood the waters, which ever since, on the anniversary of his death, are said to run red to the sea (Lucian, De Syrigia Deo, 6; Strabo, xvi, 750). And so supposed to be identical with Tannum, for whom Ezekiel represents the Jewish women as weeping (xiv, 14). The source is a noble fountain beside the ruins of a temple of Venus, and near the site of Aphec, now marked by the little village of Afka (Eusebius, Vita Constantini, 55; Ptol. iii, 267; Ritter, Pol., 4, 201; and Syr. iv, 588). The Adonis falls into the sea a few miles south of the Biblical Gebal. 4. The Lyкус flumes, now Nahìr el-Kelb, or "Dog River," rises high up on the flank of Sunnu, and breaks down through a picturesque glen. At its mouth is that famous pass on whose sculptured rocks Assyrian, Egyptian, Persian, and French (1) generals have left records of their expeditions and victories (Robinson, iii, 618; Hammond, p. 407 sq.; Strabo, xvi, 755). 5. The Magara of Pliny (v, 17) is probably the modern Nahìr Beyrût. 6. The Tanýyas or Damûras (Strabo, xvi, 756; Polyaenus, v, 98) rises near Deir el-Kâm, the capital of Lebanon. It is now called Nahìr ed-Dammûr. 7. The Bos- trenus of ancient authors appears to be identical with Nahìr el-Awale, though some doubt this. 8. The Leontes has already been mentioned. The lower section of it is known as Khân Kastân, the upper section Liânât. Its chief sources are at Châlic and Ba'albek; but a large tributary flows down from the ravine of Zahleh, and is the only stream which descends the eastern slopes of Lebanon. See Leontes. 2. Anti-Lebanon.—(1.) Peaks.—The centre and culminating point of Anti-Lebanon is Hermon. From it a number of ranges radiate, like the ribs of a half-open fan. The first and loftiest runs north-east, parallel to Lebanon, and separated from it by the valley of Cæle-Syria, whose average breadth is about six miles. This ridge of Anti-Lebanon and that of Hermon it joins. Hermon is broad, irregular, intersected by numerous valleys and little fertile plains, and covered with thin forests of dwarf oak. Its elevation is not more than 4600 feet. Advancing northwards, its features become wilder and grander, oak-trees give place to juniper, and the elevation increases until, above the beautiful plain of Zebelánâ—where lies emboodomed in its very centre—it attains a height of about 7000 feet (Van de Velde, Mem. p. 175). From this point to the parallel of Ba'albek there is little change in the elevation or scenery. It begins to rise to fall, and gradually until at length it sinks down within the great plain of Hamath, eight miles east of Riblah, and sixteen south of Emesa. With the exception of the little upland plains, and a few of the deeper valleys, this ridge is incapable of cultivation. The sides are steep and rugged, in many places sheer precipices of naked, jagged rock, nearly 1000 feet high. They are not so bare or bleak, however, as the higher summits of Lebanon. Vegetation is abundant among the rocks; and though the inhabitants are few and far between, immense flocks of sheep and goats are pastured upon the mountains, and with their bleating and the chattering of their herders, their braying, their foxes—far more abundant than in any other part of Syria (Porter, Damascus, ii, 315). The lowest and last of the ridges that radiate from Hermon runs nearly due east along the magnificent plain of Damascus, and continues onward to Palmyra. Its average elevation is not more than 2000 feet, and it does not rise more than about 700 feet above the plain, though some of its peaks are much higher. Its rock is chalky, almost pure white, and entirely naked—not a tree, or shrub, or patch of verdure is anywhere seen upon it. It thus forms a remarkable contrast with the rich green of the plain of Damascus. From the central range to this ridge there is a descent, by a series of broad, bare terraces or plateaus, supported by long, continuous walls of bare, whitish limestone, varying from 100 to 1000 feet in height. Nothing could be more dreary and desolate than the scenery on these steppes. The gravelly soil, in many places thickly strewn with flints, is as bare as the cliffs that bound them. Yet they are intersected by several rich and fertile glens, so deep, however, that their verdure and foliage can not be seen from a distance. Towards the east these steppes gradually expand into broad upland plains, and portions of them are irrigated and tilled. On them stand the small but ancient towns of Yabrud, Nebk, Jerd, etc., around which is such a scene of wild grandeur as you can nowhere see.
the rock near the ancient Gebal (Roland, Palest., p. 281).

These cretaceous deposits occur along the whole eastern flank of Lebanon, and the lower eastern ranges of Anti-Lebanon are wholly composed of them (D'Arvieux, Mémoires, ii, 393; Elliot, Travels, ii, 257; Volney, ii, 280).

Extensive beds of soft, friable sandstone are met with both in Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon. According to Ando

German, those of vine or oak on the higher parts of the cretaceous strata. This change in the geological struc

ture gives great variety to the scenery of Lebanon. The regular and graceful outlines of the sandstone ridges contrast well with the bold and more abrupt limestone cliffs and peaks, while the wavy line and sombre pine forests of the former relieve the intense whiteness of the latter.

Coal has been found in the district of Metn, east of Beyrut, but it is impure, and the veins are too thin to repay mining. Iron is found in the central and southern portions of Lebanon, and there is an extensive sand

wash on one of the eastern steppes of Anti-Lebanon (Porter, Damacena, i, 161; Handbook, p. 563; Volney, i, 281; Burckhardt, p. 27).

2. The Botany of Lebanon, like the geology, is to a great extent unknown. It appears to be very rich in the Agaroidea, with vine or oak the largest, and the linden, hornbeam, willow, aspen, order of the tree shrubs, and flowers of these noble mountains. The great variety of climate, from the tropical heat of the Jordan valley at the base of Hermon, to the eternal snows on its summit, affords space and fitting home for the flora of the whole globe. The scene of Gilead begins, till about the 20th of September rain never falls, and clouds are rarely seen. At the latter date the autumn rains begin, generally accompanied with storms of thunder and vivid lightning. January and February are the coldest months. The hottest month begins, on the plain of Phoenicia, at the end of April, but in the upper altitudes it is not gathered in till the beginning of August. During the summer, in the village of Shum-lain, on the western declivity of Lebanon, at an elevation of 2000 feet, in the hottest part of the day, the thermometer does not rise above 85° and in the night it usually goes down to 70°. From June 20th to August 20th the barometer often does not vary a quarter of an inch; there are few cloudy days, and scarcely even a slight shower. At Sidon, in Anti-Lebanon, with an elevation of 4800 feet, the air is extremely dry, and the thermometer never rises in summer above 80° Fahr. in the shade. The nights are cool and pleasant. The sirocco wind is severely felt along the coast and on the western slopes of Lebanon, but not so much in Anti-Lebanon. It blows occasionally during March and April here, the day being almost unknown. The mountains rise to the height of 8500 feet, and in some parts of the mountain ridges, but in the low plains, and especially at the base of Hermon, it is very abundant (Ps. cx., xi, 8).

V. Historical Notices. — Lebanon is first mentioned as a boundary of the country given by the Lord in cove

nant to promise to Israel (Deut. i, 7; xii, 24). To the dwellers in this, and to those of the surrounding coun

tries bank of the Nile, the snows, and streams, and verdant forests of Lebanon must have seemed an earthly paradise. By such a contrast we can understand Mo

ses' touching petition, "I pray thee let me go over and see the good land that is beyond Jordan, that good mountain, and Lebanon" (Deut. iii, 22).

The mountains were originally inhabited by a number of warring, independent tribes, some of whom Joshua conquered on the banks of Lake Merom (xii, 2-18). They are said to have been of Phoenician stock (Flint, p. 17; Eusebius, Onom. s. v.; compare 1 Kings v.). Further north were the Hi

vites (Judg. iii, 8), and the Giblites, and Arkites, whose names still cling to the ruins of their ancient strongholds. See Giblites, Arkites. The Israelites never completely subdued them, but the enterprising Phoeni

rians appear to have had them under their power, or in their pay, for they got timber for their fleets from the mountains, and they were able to supply Solomon from the same forests when building the Temple (1 Kings v, 9-11; Ezek. xxvii, 9 sq.). At a later period we find the king of Assyria felling its timber for his military en

gines (Isa. xii, 8 sq.; Ezek. xxvii, 24). The place is mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions (q. v.). Dio

dorus Siculus relates that in like manner Antigonus,
having collected from all quarters hewers of wood, and sawyers, and ship-builders, brought down an immense quantity of timber from Libanus to the sea to build himself a navy (xix, 59). The same fact that this mountain was the famous resort for timber, whether for architectural, naval, or military purposes, appears from the Egyptian monuments, where the name is found in the corrupted form of *Le Monsen* (Wilkinson, *Egyptiâ*, i. 403). It is there represented as a mountainous country, inaccessible to chariots, and abounding in lofty trees, which the affrighted mountaineers, having fled thither for refuge, are engaged in felling, in order to impede the advance of the invading Egyptian army.

During the conquests of David and the commercial prosperity of the nation under Solomon, the Jews became fully acquainted with the richness, the grandeur, and the luxuriant foliage of Lebanon, and ever after that mountain was regarded as the emblem of wealth and majesty. Thus the Psalmist says of the Messiah's kingdom, "The fruit thereof shall shake like Lebanon" (lxxii, 16); and Solomon, praising the beauty of the Bridegroom, writes, "His countenance is as Lebanon, excellent as the cedars" (Cant. v. 15). Isaiah also predicts of the Church, "The glory of Lebanon shall be given to it" (xxxv, 2); compare ix, 13; Hos. xiv, 5, 6). Indeed, in Scripture, Lebanon is very generally mentioned in connection with the cedar-trees with which it abounded; but its wines are also noticed (Hos. xiv, 8); and in Cant. iv, 11; Hos. xiv, 7, it is celebrated for various kinds of fragrant plants. Lebanon is greatly celebrated both in sacred and classical writers, and much of the sublime imagery of the prophets of the Old Test. is borrowed from this mountain (e.g. Psa. xxix, 5, 6; cix, 16-18; Caut. iv, 8, 15; Isa. ii, 3; Zech. xi, 1, 2).

Anti-Lebanon seems to have been early brought under the sway of Damascus, though amid its southern strongholds were some fierce tribes who preserved their independence down to a late period (1 Chron. xi. 19-22; Josephus, Ant. xiii, 11; Strabo, xvi, p. 755, 756).

During the reign of the Seleucidæ several large cities were founded or rebuilt in these mountains, as Laodicea at the northern end of Anti-Lebanon, Chalcis at its eastern base, Abila in the wild glen of the Abana (Luke iii, 1). See ABILA. At the commencement of our era, Lebanon, with the rest of Syria, passed into the hands of Rome, and under its rule great cities were founded and beautiful temples erected. The heights on which Baal-fires had burned in primeval times, and the groves where the rude mountain tribes worshipped their idols, became the sites of noble buildings, whose ruins to this day excite the admiration of every traveller. Greece itself cannot surpass in the beauty of its temples of Baalbek and Chalcis. There are more than thirty temples in Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 454, 457, 557, 411; comp. Robinson, iii, 488, 629).

During the wars of the Seleucidæ, the Romans, and the Saracens, the inhabitants of Lebanon probably remained in comparative security. When, under the Muslim rule, Christianity was almost extinguished from the rest of Syria, it retained its hold there; and the Maronites (q. v.), who still occupy the greater part of the range, are doubtless the lineal descendants of the old Syrians. They originated in the 7th century, and it is said that the monk Maron taught them the Monothelite heresy. In the 12th century they submitted to the pope, and have ever since remained devoted Papists. They number about 200,000. The *Draues* (q. v.), their hereditary foes, dwelt only in the southern section of the range, and number about 80,000. The jealousies and feuds of the rival sects, fanned by a cruel and corrupt government, often desolate "that godly mountain" with fire and sword. Anti-Lebanon has a considerable Christian population, but they are mixed with Mohammedans, and have no political status. The whole range is under the authority of the pasha of Damascus.

The American missionaries have established several schools among the people of Lebanon, and for some years past pleasing success has attended their efforts in the mountain, which, however, were almost wholly interrupted by the violent outbreak among the Druzes in 1860, ending in a wholesale massacre of the Christians. On the suppression of this, a Maronite governor was appointed over the district by the Turkish government, under the protectorate of the five great European powers. V. Literature.—Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, iii, 344, 345, 439; Kitt, *Pictorial History of Palestine*, Intro. p. xxxii—xxxv, iv; Reland, *Palestina*, i, 311; Rosenmuller, *Biblisch. Alterthum*, ii, 236; Raumer, *Palatinus*, p. 29-35; D'Arvieux, *Memoires*, ii, 250; Volney, *Voyage en Syrie*, i, 248; Seyfzen, in *Zach's Monatsh. Correspond.* June, 1853, 21; *C. W. Rich*, *Travel in Syria*, p. 116; *Richtor, Wolfischon*, p. 102, etc.; Irving and Mangles, *Travels*, p. 206-220; Buckingham, *Arab Tribes*, p. 486 sqq.; Fisk, in *Missionary Herald*, 1824; Elliot, *Travels*, ii, 279; Hogg, *Visit to Jerusalem, *Jerusalem, etc., i, 219 sqq., ii, 81 sqq.; Addison, *Palmyra and Damascus*, ii, 45-82; Rit ter's *Erkundung*, xviii, div. 1; Robinson's *Researches*, new edit., iii, 584-625; *Biblisch. Archiv*, 1843, p. 205-255; 1848, p. 1-23, 243-282, 447-480, 668-700; *Schwarz, Pal estina*, p. 55; *Kelly's Syria and Holy Land*, p. 76-165; Porter, *Draues* (Lond. 1865); *H. Thompson, Land and People*, vol. i; *V. F. Lane, Travels, etc.*, vol. ii; *Ch. W. Rich*, *Travel in Lebanon* (Lond. 1853, 1862); also *Draues and Maronites* (Lond. 1862); Tristram, *Land of Israel* (London, 1865); Palmer, in the *Quarterly Statement of the* "Palestine Exploration Fund," April, 1871, p. 107 sqq. See *Pale stine*.

*Leb'aath* (Heb. *Lebath*; *F₁* *m*, i.e. *Lebanon*; Sept. *Aeleva*), a city in the southern part of Judah, i.e. Simeon (Jos. xv. 32); elsewhere more fully *Beth-Le baath* (Josh. xix. 6); also *Beth-ibri* (1 Chron. iv. 31). The associated names in all these passages suggest a location in the wild south-western part of the tribe, possibly on the ruined site marked on van de Velde's *Map of Syria*, on wady Suniyet, not very far from Elara, towards Gaza.
Lebbeus (Ἀββαῖος), a surname of Judas or Jude (Matt. x, 3), one of the twelve apostles; a member, together with his namesake "Isacariot," James the son of Alphaeus whose surname was Thaddaeus; they are mentioned among the three secretions of the apostolic body. The name Judas only, without any distinguishing mark, occurs in the lists given in Luke vi, 16; Acts i, 13; and in John xiv, 22 (where we find "Judas not Iscariot" among the apostles), but the apostle has been generally identified with "Thaddæus" (ὁ Θαδδαίος, Ναζαρηνός) or τὸ Θαδδαίον alone, others introducing the name Ἰοβαίος, ᾿Οδαρικὼς, ᾿Οδαρικῶν, or ζωνοίχος, in Matt., where the Vulgate reads Thaddæus alone, which is adopted by Lachmann in his Berlin edition of 1832. This confusion is still further increased by the tradition preserved by Eusebius (H. E. i, 18) that the true name of Thomas (the twin was Judas) was Iōnās ὁ σαι ὁ θωάμας, and that Thaddæus was one of the "seventy" identified by Jerome in Matt. x with "Judas Jacobi," as well as by the theories of modern scholars, who regard the "Levi" (Αρίστης ὁ Ῥουμαίος) as Jesus of Tiberias, ii, 14: A. L. Hobs (The Date of "Levi") or by rays (Byz. Arch. ii, 438). Brocare mentions it as a very handsome village, by the name of Lebba, four leagues south of Nablus, on the right hand of the road to Jerusalem (chap. vii, p. 178). The identity of this place was again suggested by Maundrell, who regarded it as Lebba (The Dairy, p. 86). Judas Thaddæus is mentioned as being visited by Dr. Robinson on his way from Jerusalem to Nablus (Bib. Researches, iii, 90). He describes the khan el-Lubban as being now in ruins; but near by is a fine fountain of running water. From it a beautiful oval plain extends north about fifteen minutes, with perhaps half that breadth, lying here deep among the high rocky hills. About the middle of the western side, a narrow cleft through the mountain, called wady el-Lubban, carries off the waters of the plain and surrounding tract. The village of Lubban is situated on the north-west acclivity, considerably above the plain. It is inhabited; has the appearance of an old place; and in the rocks above it are excavated sepulchres (comp. De Saucy, Narrative, i, 94, 96; Schwarz, Palest., p. 180; Wilson, ii, 292 sq.; Bonar, p. 568; Mislin, iii, 819; Porter, Handbook, p. 580; Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 380; Trever, Arab. i, 437). Lebria. Eulius Antonius of (or Lebricia, vulgarly Nibrasia, from Lebricia or Lebraxis, the old Nibrassia, on the Guadalquivir), "un humanista de prima nota," the Erasmus of Spain, was born at that place in 1442 according to Munoz (Nichol. Anton and Cavo say 1444). He studied in his native city, and afterwards went to the University of Salamanca. In 1461 he went to Italy to perfect himself in the classics. He visited the best schools, heard the most renowned teachers, and made great proficiency in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, etc., and even in theology, jurisprudence, and medicine. After ten years thus employed he returned to Spain, intending to effect a reformation, and with the special aim of promoting classical learning, in the universities of that country. He first labored in an unofficial way, and as teacher in the college of San Miguel at Seville; but Salamanca was the object of his ambition. His labors, with great success, and his vision became popular throughout Spain. He contributed very largely to the expulsion of barbarism from the seats of education, and to the diffusion of a taste for elegant and useful studies. He also published a large number of philological works, such as Aristotle, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew grammars, and especially a Latin lexicon, which was enthusiastically received by the universities of all countries. He likewise applied philology to theology, and by that means caused it to make a great progress: in order to correct the text of the Vulgate, he compared it with the older texts, the Hebrew and Greek originals, and was one of the chief...
Lebrun was permitted to depart unharmed. He now returned to Friesland, and rebuilt the church of Deventer, where he remained until his death. When Lüdger built a third time the church which had been again destroyed during an invasion of the Saxons in 776, the remains of Lebuin were discovered. Lebuin is not to be distinguished from Lebuin, the minister of the church, to whom his philological talents. The Inquisition interfered, and part of his Biblical works were prohibited. He, however, protested against this measure in his Apologia, addressed to his protector, cardinal Ximenes, and had it not been for the interference of the latter, and of other influyent friends at the court, he would no doubt have suffered severely (compare his Apologia, in Antonii Bibli. Hist. V. ii. 310 sq.) as it was, he was appointed, in 1518, professor of Latin literature at the newly established University of Alcalá de Henares (Complutum), and here he was suffered to end his days in peace. He died July 2, 1522, according to Munoz. Most of his works are still extant, among them a history of the reign of Ferdinand the Catholic, made by order of that prince, under the title Decades due, etc. (posthumously edited, 1645). See Nicolai Antonii Bibliotheca Hispana (Rome, 1629), p. 109. 13: Duc de Mazarin, Bibli. des Antezes Ecles. xiv. 120-125; Guic Cave, Scriptor. eccl. Historia litterar. (Geneva, 1694), Appendix, p. 116 B, 118 A: Hefele, Cardinal Ximenes, p. 116, 124, 129, 148; Munoz, Elonio de Antonio de Lebrua, in the Memorias de la Real Academia de la Historia, iii, 1-30; Harsing, Real. Ensayo, viii. 365; McNair, Reformacion en Espan, p. 61, 75, 105. (J. H. W.)

Lebrun, Pierre, a French theologian, born at Brignollie in 1661, was professor in several colleges, and died June 6, 1727. He wrote, among other works, a Critical History of Superstitious Practices which have Seduced the People (1702).

Lebuin or Liawin, a noted colleague of Gregory in his mission among the inhabitants of Friesland. According to his painstaking biographer, Huncbald, a monk of the convent of Elnon in the 10th century (in Surius, vi, 277, and in Pertz, ii, 380), Lebuin was a native of Brittany, and joined Gregory at Utrecht, having been directed to do so in a dream. Gregory sent him on a mission to the neighboring people, and gave him the Anglo-Saxon Marchelin or Marcellin as assistant. They preached with great success, and soon established a church at Walpen, on the eastern shore of the Yssel, and another at Deventer. These churches afterwards closing by an invasion of the Saxons, Lebuin courageously stayed with his companions as a mission among that nation, and went to Marko, one of their principal cities; later he went further north, towards the Weser, and there was well received by an influential chief named Folkbert, who seems to have been a Christian. Folkbert advised him not to visit Marko during the reunion which was held there yearly to discuss the general interests of the nation, but to conceal himself in the house of one of his friends, Davo. Lebuin, however, did not abide by this counsel, and went to the assembly. Being aware how "omnia cononiam illius multitudin ex diversa parte, omnes superum praeclarumd instituta, numinosum videlicet suis vota solvens ac sacrificia," he appeared in the midst of the assembled warriors dressed in his priestly robes, the cross in one hand and the Gospel in the other, and announced himself as an envoy of the Most High, the one true God and creator of all things, to whom all must turn, forsaking our idols: "but," said he, at the close of his address, "if you wickedly persist in your errors, you will soon repent it bitterly, for in a short time there will come a courageous, prudent, and strong monarch of the neighborhood who will overthrow you like a torrent, destroying all with fire and sword, taking your wives and children to be his servants, and subjecting all who are left to his rule." This discourse greatly excited the Saxons against him; but one of them, Buto, took his part, and
of the various church-services, are chanted or read in many churches. The lection (also called pulpitum, ambo, suggestum, pyx, tribunal, lect., lecturnum), or, most frequently, lectionarium, of very ancient use, is of various forms and of different materials, and is found both in Roman Catholic churches in the cathedrals and college-chaplés of the Church of England. Originally they were made of wood, but later they were frequently also made of stone or metal, and sometimes in the form of an eagle (the symbol of St. John the Evangelist) with the outspread wings of which form the frame supporting the volume.

In Scotland, during the last century, the preconicer’s desk was commonly called by that name, and pronounced letterum. See Chambers, Cyclopaedia, vol. vi. s. v.; Walcott, Sac. Archæol. p. 845. See EAGLE.

Lecticaifi, the same as the copiate. They were called lecticarii from the fact that they carried the corpse or bier at funerals. See Copiatæ.

Lectionarium, or Lessons. Of the many real and supposed meanings of the expression lectio (διαγωμα, διαγωγη), we have here only to consider the liturgical. In this sense it is used to designate the reading, which, together with singing, prayers, preaching, and the administration of the sacraments, constitutes public worship.

This part of worship is adopted from the Jews, and, like that of the synagogues, was at first restricted to the reading of their sacred books (O.T.). The first record we find of the reading of the N-Test. Scriptures in the churches is in Justin, Apol. i, cap. 67. But the fact of the reading of the Bible in general from the earliest times is clearly established by passages of Tertullian (Apolog. cap. 35; De anima, cap. 9); Cyprian (Ep. 34, 38, edit. Oebri. 84), Origen (Contr. Cel. iii. ch. 3), Tertul. (Ad her. 50), etc. It is self-evident that the canonical books and the homologomena were those most generally read. But that lessons were occasionally read also from the Apocrypha and Antilegomena is shown by the yet remaining lists of libri ecclesiastici and ἀνατεκμηκέντα, i.e. of such books as, although not recognised as authorities in matters of faith, are still permitted to be read in the churches. Other writings, especially acta martyrum, and sermons of some of the most distinguished fathers, came afterwards to be also read to the people. The number of pieces (lectiones) read in each service varied; the author of the Apostolic Constitutions (ii, c. 57) mentions four; two was the minimum—one from the Gospels, the other from the epistles or other books, including those of the O.T. See PROVIDÆ.

At first the portions to be read, at least on festal and ordinary Sunday, were taken in succession in the sacred books (lectio continua), but afterwards special portions were appointed to be read on certain Sundays, and the selection was made by the bishop, until at last a regular system of lessons was contrived, which is the base of the one still used at present in churches in which the strictly liturgical service is adhered to. For feast-days, at first, special lessons were appointed (for instance, the account of the resurrection on Easter: see Augustine, Serm.
Lectisternium (Lat. lectus, a couch, and sternere, to spread), a religious festival ceremony among the ancient Romans. It was celebrated during times of public calamity, when the gods were invited to the entertainments, and their statues taken from their pedestals and laid on couches. The lectisternium, according to Livy (v, 18), was first celebrated in the year 884 (on the occasion of a contagious disease which committed frightful ravages among the cattle), and lasted for eight successive days. On the celebration of this festival enemies were said to forget their animosities, and all prisoners were liberated. — Brande and Cox, Dictionary of Art and Sciences, vol. ii, s. v.

Lector (ἀναγιγμός) or Reader was the name of an officer in the ancient Church whose place it was to read the holy Scriptures and other letters (for instance, the letters of Paul) in public worship, and was also intrusted with the keeping of the sacred volumes. This reading of the Word of God formed an important part in the service of the Jewish synagogues (see Luke iv, 16; Acts xiii, 15, 27; 2 Cor. iii, 14), and was introduced into the Church from the Jews. But we do not know at what period the performance of it became a special office. Yet Tertullian, De praes. car. c. 41, expressly speaks of the lector as a special officer in the Church, and Cyprian (Ep. 38, and edit. Obrert. 34) mentions the ordination of two readers. The early Church councils (Council of Chalcedon, a. 451, c. 13, 14; Toledo, 7, 2; Vienne, ii, 2; Valentia, c. 1: A racasid, i, 18) give directions about the duties of readers. Still, although the most eminent fathers laid great stress on the reading of Scripture in the churches, and Cyprian declares their office one of great honor (Epist. 34), it was yet classes among the ordinis inferiores. This is easily accounted for from the fact that the simple reading, without any exegetical or homiletical explanations (which are not in the province of the reader), was a mere mechanical performance, and in after times often intrusted to children. After the form of the service of the mass was finally settled, the lectors were forbidden to read the pericopes occurring in the mass Missal. They were also thereby excluded from the altar, and suffered to read only at the pulpitum, and finally were obliged to leave to the people the exposition of the formula of absolution, probably because the reader was of lower degree in the hierarchy. Yet in some churches the ordination of readers was a very solemn affair, especially among the Greeks, where it was accompanied by imposition of hands. In the monasteries of the Western Church, the lector was the initials of the name of Jerome as the author of the ancient list of lessons known under the name of "comes," and as the originator of the system in the Western Church.

Such lists, indicating the portions of Scripture to be read in public assemblies on the different days of the year, are named lectionaria (see volumina) or lectionaries (libri); Greek, ἑαυτογγαμωτα, εαυτογγαμωτα, ειδογγαμωτα; they are also called evangeliarum et epistolae; evangelia cum epistulae; comes). In Latin the principal are the "Lecti. Romanum," in Malab., Lect. Gall., and the "comes" of Jerome; the "Calendarii Romanum," (edit. Fronto, Par. 1652); the "Tabula antiquarum lectionum," in Paulii, Ad missa, in Gerbert, Monum. literu, Alem. 1, 409. See Auguschi, Denkwiirdigk. vol. vi; Handb. der chr. Arch. ii, 6; Ranke, Das Kirch. Perspektomena; Palmer, Orig. Lit. i, 10; Bingham, Orig. Eccles. xiv, 8, § 2; Procter, History of Book of Common Prayer, p. 216 sq.; Martinie, De Ant. Eccles. Rit. iv, 5, 1 sqq.; Freeman, Principles of Divine Service, i, 125 sq. See Liturgy.

The reading of the lesson in the early ages of the Church was intrusted to the lector (q. v.). At present, in the English Church, when the number of officiating priests is complete, the epistle is read by the subdeacon and the Gospel by the deacon. See Herzog, Real-Enclop. viii, 206; Blunt, Dict. of Doctr. and Hist. Theol. p. 408 sq. See Lesson. (J. H. W.)

Lectisternium (Lat. lectus, a couch, and sternere, to spread), a religious festival ceremony among the ancient Romans. It was celebrated during times of public calamity, when the gods were invited to the entertainments, and their statues taken from their pedestals and laid on couches. The lectisternium, according to Livy (v, 18), was first celebrated in the year 884 (on the occasion of a contagious disease which committed frightful ravages among the cattle), and lasted for eight successive days. On the celebration of this festival enemies were said to forget their animosities, and all prisoners were liberated. — Brande and Cox, Dictionary of Art and Sciences, vol. ii, s. v.

Lector (ἀναγιγμός) or Reader was the name of an officer in the ancient Church whose place it was to read the holy Scriptures and other letters (for instance, the letters of Paul) in public worship, and was also intrusted with the keeping of the sacred volumes. This reading of the Word of God formed an important part in the service of the Jewish synagogues (see Luke iv, 16; Acts xiii, 15, 27; 2 Cor. iii, 14), and was introduced into the Church from the Jews. But we do not know at what period the performance of it became a special office. Yet Tertullian, De praes. car. c. 41, expressly speaks of the lector as a special officer in the Church, and Cyprian (Ep. 38, and edit. Obrert. 34) mentions the ordination of two readers. The early Church councils (Council of Chalcedon, a. 451, c. 13, 14; Toledo, 7, 2; Vienne, ii, 2; Valentia, c. 1: A racasid, i, 18) give directions about the duties of readers. Still, although the most eminent fathers laid great stress on the reading of Scripture in the churches, and Cyprian declares their office one of great honor (Epist. 34), it was yet classes among the ordinis inferiores. This is easily accounted for from the fact that the simple reading, without any exegetical or homiletical explanations (which are not in the province of the reader), was a mere mechanical performance, and in after times often intrusted to children. After the form of the service of the mass was finally settled, the lectors were forbidden to read the pericopes occurring in the missal Missal. They were also thereby excluded from the altar, and suffered to read only at the pulpitum, and finally were obliged to leave to the people the exposition of the formula of absolution, probably because the reader was of lower degree in the hierarchy. Yet in some churches the ordination of readers was a very solemn affair, especially among the Greeks, where it was accompanied by imposition of hands. In the monasteries of the Western Church, the lector was the initials of the name of Jerome as the author of the ancient list of lessons known under the name of "comes," and as the originator of the system in the Western Church.

Such lists, indicating the portions of Scripture to be read in public assemblies on the different days of the year, are named lectionaria (see volumina) or lectionaries (libri); Greek, ἑαυτογγαμωτα, εαυτογγαμωτα, ειδογγαμωτα; they are also called evangeliarum et epistolae; evangelia cum epistulae; comes). In Latin the principal are the "Lecti. Romanum," in Malab., Lect. Gall., and the "comes" of Jerome; the "Calendarii Romanum," (edit. Fronto, Par. 1652); the "Tabula antiquarum lectionum," in Paulii, Ad missa, in Gerbert, Monum. literu, Alem. 1, 409. See Auguschi, Denkwiirdigk. vol. vi; Handb. der chr. Arch. i, 262; Herzog, Real-Enclop. viii, 298.

Lectorium. See LECTORS.

Lectors, an order of preachers in the Church of England, distinct from the incumbent or curate, usually chosen by the vestry or chief inhabitants of the parish, and supported either by voluntary contributions or legacies. They preach on the Sunday afternoon or evening, and in some instances on a stated day in the week. The lectors are generally appointed without any interposition of the incumbent, though his consent, as possessor of the freehold of the Church, is necessary before any lecturer can officiate; when such consent has been obtained (but not before), the bishop, if he approve of the nominee, licenses him to the lecture. Where there are lectures founded by the donations of pious persons, the lectors are appointed by the founders, without any interposition or consent of the rector of the church. This is usual with the leave and approbation of the bishop, and after the candidate's subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles and the Act of Uniformity, such as that of lady Moyer at St. Paul's, etc. When the office of lecturer first originated in the English Church it is difficult to determine. It is manifest from the statute (13 and 14 Car. II, c. 4, § 19), commonly known as the Act of Uniformity (1669), that the office was generally recognised in the second half of the 17th century. Even as early as 1689, however, an evening lecture on Fridays was endowed in the London parish of St. Michael Royal, and at about the same time three lecture-sermons were established in St. Michael's, Cornhill—two on Sundays after evening prayers, and a third at the same time on Christmas day. During the Great Rebellion lecturers used their influence and opportunities for the overthrow of the State Church and the monarchy.—Eden, Theol. Dict. s. v.; Back, Theol. Dict. s. v.; Edie, Eccles. Dict. p. 371.

Lectures, Bampton. See BAMPON LECTURES.

Lectures, Boyle. See BOYLE LECTURES.

Lectures, Congregational. See CONGREGATIONAL LECTURES.

Lectures, Hulsean. See HULSEAN LECTURES.

Lectures, Merchants', a lecture set up in Pinne's Hall in the year 1672, by the Presbyterians and Independents, to show their agreement among themselves, as well as to support the doctrines of the Reformation against the prevailing errors of Popery, Socinianism, and infidelity. The principal ministers for learning and popularity were chosen as lecturers, such as Dr. Bates, Dr. Manton, Dr. Owen, Mr. Baxter, Messrs. Collins, Jenkins, Mead, and afterwards Messrs. Abop, Howe, Cole, and others who were encouraged and assisted by some of the principal merchants and tradesmen of the city. Some misunderstanding taking place, the Presbyterians removed to Salter's Hall and the Independents remained at Pinner's Hall, and each party filled up their numbers out of their respective denominations. The lecture is kept up to this day, and is now held at Broad Street meeting every Tuesday morning.

Lectures, Monthly. A lecture preached monthly by the Congregational ministers of London in their different chapels, taken in rotation. These lectures have of late been systematically arranged, so as to form a connected course of one or more years. A value-
able volume on the evidences of Revelation, published in 1827, is one of the fruits of these monthly exercises.

Lectures, Morning, certain casuistical lectures, which were preached by some of the most able divines in London. The occasion of these lectures seems to be this: During the troublesome times of Charles I., most of the citizens having some near relation or friend in the army of the Earl of Essex, so many bills were sent up to the pulpit every Lord’s day for their preservation that the minister had neither time to read them nor to recommend their cases to God in prayer; several London divines agreed to set apart given times for this purpose, one half to be spent in prayer, and the other in a suitable exhortation to the people. When the heat of the war was over, it became a casuistical lecture, and was carried on till the restoration of Charles II.

These sermons were afterwards published in several volumes quarto, under the title of the Morning Exercises. The authors were the most eminent preachers of the day; among them was, e.g. archbishop Tillotson. It appears that these lectures were held every morning for one month only, and, from the preface to the volume, dated 1678, that the sermons were afterwards continued to an fortnight. Most of these were delivered at Cripplegate Church, some at St. Giles’s, and a volume against popery in Southwark. Mr. Neale observes that this lecture was afterwards revived in a different form, and continued in his day. It was kept up long after the service of the several places in the summer, a week at each place, but latterly the time was exchanged for the evening.

Lectures, Moyer’s, a course of eight sermons, preached annually, founded by the beneficence of lady Moyer about 1720, who left by will a rich legacy as a foundation for the same. A great number of English writers who were engaged in a variety of ways to validate the doctrine of the Trinity, this opulent and orthodox lady was influenced to think of an institution which should provide for posterity an ample collection of productions in defence of this branch of the Christian faith. The first course of these lectures was preached by Dr. Waterland, on the divinity of Christ. These lectures were discontinued about the middle of the last century.

Lectures, Religious, are discourses or sermons delivered by ministers on any subject in theology. Besides lectures on the Sabbath day, many think proper to preach on week-days; sometimes at five in the morning, before the people go to the daughter or son in the evening, after they have done. In London there is preaching almost every forenoon and evening in the week at some place or other.

Lectures, Warburtonian, a lecture founded by bishop Warburton to prove the truth of revealed religion in general, and the Christian in particular, from the comparison of the prophecies in the Old and New Testament which relate to the Christian Church, especially to the apostasy of papal Rome. To this foundation we owe the admirable discourses of Hurd, Halifax, Begot, Aphorp, and many others.

Lecturn. See Lectern.

Ledge (only in the plural דדנה, דדנא, skelabim), from דדנה, to mortisie together; Sept. ı‘דוייסיוו, Vulg. junctura), prop. joint, e. g. at the corners of a base or pedestal; hence perhaps an ornament overlaying these angles to hide the base time (1 Kings vii, 28, 29). In verses 35, 36, the term thus rendered is different, namely יָד, lit. a hand, i. e. a lateral projection, probably referring to side-borders to the same pedestals. The description is too brief and the terms too vague to allow a more definite idea of these appendages to the bases in question. See Laver.

Ledieu, François, abbé, a French ecclesiastic, noted as a writer, was born at Péronne about the middle of the 17th century. In 1684 he became private secretary of the celebrated French pulpit orator Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, and was by this prelate made canon of the church at Meaux. He died at Paris Oct. 7, 1718. He wrote MémOires et journaux de M. l’abbé Ledieu sur les événements et les ouvrages de Bossuet (Paris, 1856-57; 4 vol. 8vo.), upon which the late Saint-Beuve thus comments: "L’abbé Ledieu n’a pas le dessein de diminuer Bossuet, mais il soulève son illustre maître à une épreuve à laquelle pas une grande figure ne résiste; il note jour par jour à l’époque de la malédicé dernièr et du déclin tous les actes et toutes les paroles de faiblesse qui lui échappent, jusqu’aux plaintes et doléances aux quelles on se laisse aller la nuit quand on se croit seul, et dans cette observation il porte un esprit de petite qui se prononce de plus en plus en avancant, un esprit bas, qui n’est pas moins dangereux que ne le serait une malignité subile." (Moniteur, Mar. 31, 1856). Ledieu also left in MS. Mémoires sur l’Histoire et les Antiquités du diocèse de Meaux. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxx, 262.

Ledru, André Pierre, a French priest and naturalist, was born at Chantayen, Main, January 22, 1761. When quite young he entered the priesthood, and during the Revolution adopted its principles, and was appointed curate at Pré-au-Mans. Later he was employed as botanist in Baudin’s expedition to the Canaries and the Antilles (in 1796). He died July 11, 1825. Ledru wrote several books, for a list of which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxx, 267.

Legwric, Edward, D.D., an Irish antiquary, fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, subsequently vicar of Aghabo, Queens County, Ireland, was born in 1739, and died in 1823. He published The Antiquities of Ireland (1794), a very valuable work. He offended many of his countrymen by denying the truth of the legend of St. Patrick.

Lee, Andrew, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born May 7, 1745 (O. S.), at Lyme, Conn.; graduated at Yale College in 1766; entered the ministry in 1768; was ordained pastor at Lisbon, Conn., Oct. 26, 1768; and died Aug. 25, 1842. He was a member of Yale College corporation in 1807. Dr. Lee published An Inquiry whether it be the Duty of Man to be willing to suffer Damnation for the Divine Glory (1786):—Sermons on various important Subjects (8vo, 1803); and several occasional sermons.—Sprague, Annals, i. 688.

Lee, Ann, the founder of the sect of Shakers, was born in Manchester, England, Feb. 29, 1737. She was a blacksmith’s daughter, or was called blacksmith by trade, and a sister of general Charles Lee of Revolutionary fame. When yet a young girl she married Abraham Standley, of like trade as her father, and she became the mother of four children, all who died in infancy. When about twenty-two years of age Jane came under the influence of James Wardley, at this time the great exponent of the millenarian doctrines of the Coniamars and French Prophets. These religious fanatics, after enduring much persecution and great suffering in their native country, had sought a refuge in England in 1755. Gradually they spread their views—communicating inspiration, as they thought—finding ready followers, particularly among the Quakers, and one of this number—James Wardley—in 1747 actually formed a separate society, consisting mainly of Quakers, claiming to be led by the Spirit, and indulging in thesounds of religious excesses, similar to those of the Coniamars (q. v.) and French Prophets (q. v.). Wardley claimed to have supernatural visions and revelations, and as both he and his adherents were noted for their bodily agitations, they came to be known as Shaking Quakers. Of this sect Ann Lee, now Mrs. Standley, became one of the leading spirits. From the time of her admission she seems to have been particularly inspired for leadership and action. Naturally of an excitable temper, her experience in the performance of the peculiar religious
duties of this society—by them termed "religious ex-
ercises"—was most singular and painful. Of a pious
nature, she hesitated not to subject herself to all the
torments of the flesh. Often in her fits or paroxysms,
as she clinched her hands, it is said, the blood would
flow from the veins. As a result of her skin's
sympathetic perspiration, this her followers believed
was a miraculous phenomenon, and they liken it to the
"bloody sweat" of our Saviour in the garden. Her
flesh wasted away under these exercises, and she be-
came so weak that her friends were obliged to feed her
like an infant. Then, again, according to the accounts
given by her followers, she would have "intervals of
releasement, in which her bodily strength and vigor
were sometimes miraculously renewed, and her soul
filled with heavenly visions and divine revelations.
All the mortificating exercises which she embraced by
herself were accepted not only as evidences of great spiritual fervor,
but as proofs of the indwelling of the divine spirit in
Ann in an uncommon measure. She rose rapidly in
the favor and confidence of her brethren, and we need
not wonder that soon she came to have visions and rev-
elations, and that they frequently and gladly "attested"
them as manifestations of God to the believers. By the
year 1770 she had grown so much in favor among her
people that her revelations and visions were looked upon
with more than ordinary interest; and when in this year
she was set on trial for sedition, and her confession by
the secular authorities, her followers claim that the Lord
Jesus manifested himself to her in an especial manner,
and from this time dates the beginning of that "latter
day of glory" in which they are now rejoicing. Imme-
diately after her release from prison she professed su-
pernatural powers in the midst of the little society
gathered about her, and she was acknowledged as their
spiritual mother in Christ. Ann was thereafter accepted
as the only true leader of the Church of Christ—not in the
common acceptance of that term, but as the incarnation
of infinite wisdom and the "second appearing of Christ," as
she was fully as Jesus of Nazareth with the divi-
nation of infinite power, or Christ's first appearing, and
she now hesitated not to style herself "Ann, the Word," signifying that in her dwelt the Word. Among other
things revealed to her at this time was the displeasure
of the Almighty against the matrimonial state, and she
opened her testimony on the wickedness of marriage.
If nothing else could have provoked the secular powers
to put a stop to her fanatic excesses in the garb of
religion, her attack on one of the most sacred institutions
of the civilized state demanded immediate action, and
she was warned, this time in the name of the law. Set
free once more, she began to spread her revelations
more generally, and actually entered upon an open war-
fare against "the root of human depravity," as she
called the matrimonial act, and the people of Manchec-
ter were so enraged that she was shooed up in a wood
house, and was kept there several weeks. Thus harassed
and persecuted on English soil, she finally decided to
seek quiet and peace on this side of the Atlantic, and in
1773 professed to have a "special revelation" to emi-
grate to America. Several of her congregation as-
certed that this revelation was made to them by the
Spirit of God, and she accordingly set out for this country.
She came to America in the ship Maria, Captain Smith, and
arrived at New York in May, 1774, having as her com-
pagnions her brother, William Lee, James Whitaker, John
Hocknell, called elders, and others. In the spring of
1776 she went to Albany, and thence to Niskayuna, now
Watervliet, eight miles from Albany. Here she suc-
cessfully established a congregation, which she called
"the Church of Christ's second appearing," formally dis-
solved her connection with the man to whom she had
in her youth given her hand and heart, and became
their recognised head. It was not, however, until 1780
that Ann Lee succeeded in gathering about her a very
large flock. At the beginning of this year an unusually
great religious revival occurred at New Lebanon, and,

improving this opportunity, she went prominently be-
fore the people, taking an active part in the religious
communion. This proved to her cause a fine harvest
indeed, and the number of her deluded followers greatly
increased, and resulted in the establishment of the new
Church of New Lebanon, which she herself was
looked upon as the maternal agency upon whose
head was subjected, that affected the nerves suddenly and forcibly
like the electric fluid, and was followed by tremblings
and the complete deprivation of strength. When the
good mother had somewhat established her authority
with her converts, she was threatened with the gravest
sin of following the vain customs of the world, and, hav-
ing seized them of their ear-rings, necklaces, buckles,
and everything which might nourish pride, and hav-
ing cut off their hair close by their ears, she admitted
them into her Church. Thus metamorphosed, they were
shamed to be seen by their old acquaintances, and
would be induced to continue Shakers to save them-

selves from further humiliation." But whether it was
the success of their unworthy cause, or their religious
excesses, or their unwillingness to take the oath of al-
legiance and allegiance, or the pressure of the state,
the Church of Christ, having become obnoxious here also to the secular authorities,
and, as in her native country, Ann Lee was subjected to imprisonment,
and escaped trial and punishment only by the kind offices of the govern-
ment of the United States, in the course of which societies were founded
at Harvard, Mass., and sundry other places. She
had always asserted that she was not liable to the
assaults of death, and that, when she left this world, she
should ascend in the twinkling of an eye to heaven;
but, unluckily for her claim, the "light of God,
the second heir of the covenant of promise" and
the "Lamb's bride," or, as she styled herself, "the spiri-
tual mother of the new creation, the queen of Mount
Zion, the second appearing of Christ," died a natural
death at Watervliet, September 8, 1784.

Strange as must ever appear the fanatical excesses
of Ann Lee, and her willingness to lead men to acts of
deprivacy, to blasphemous religious pretensions, it must
be conceded that she was certainly a wonderful woman.
Deprived of all the advantages of education, she never-
theless possessed a remarkable perception of human
mind of no common order, succeeded in establishing a
religious sect, by which, at present consisting of more
than four thousand people, some of them of marked in-
telligence and superior talents, possessing, in the aggre-
gate, wealth to the amount of more than ten millions of
dollars, she is considered as the very Christ—standing
in the Church as God himself, and at whose tribunal
the world is to be judged. Over this society her influ-
ence is spoken of as complete. Her word was a law
from which there was no appeal. Obedience then,
as of old, was the only lesson she taught, and she
learn perfectly—an obedience unquestioned and entire,
and all this when the very foundation upon which they
rested their faith, namely, her divine mission, was no-
toriously antagonized by a life accused, and not without
some show of truthfulness, as she grievously
implore. See H. P. Andrews in the "Ladies' Repository,
1858, p. 646 sq.; Marden (Rev. J. B.), Hist. of Christian
Churches and Sects., ii, 820 sq.; Galazy, 1872 (Jan. and
April). See Shakers.

Lee, Charles, Presbyterian minister, was born
near Paris, Kentucky, Ky., May 12, 1818; was converted
while about twenty years of age, and, though hitherto
a farmer by employment, he decided at once upon the
ministry, entered the college at Hanover, Ind., and, after
graduating in 1835, studied theology with the president
of his alma mater. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Madison in 1855, and became pastor at Graham, Ind. He died May 27, 1863. "With fair talents, and yet amid many discouragements both in himself and from without, he was still not only a faithful, but a successful pastor. He not only won the respect of his flock, but he gave them the witness of approval in the conversion of many under his ministry." —Wilson, Prob. Hist. Alumnae, 1864, p. 169.

Lee, Chauncey, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Salisbury, Conn., 1783; graduated at Yale College in 1794; entered the ministry June 5, 1798; and was the second minister in Sunderland, Vt., March 15, 1798, where he remained a few years, and in Jan., 1800, became pastor in Colebrook, Conn. This connection he dissolved in 1827, to become pastor at Marlborough, Conn., Nov. 18, 1828, which place he held until Jan. 11, 1837. He died in Hartwick, N. Y., Dec. 14, 1849. Lee published the American Accomplished: an Arithmetic (1797) —The Trial of Virtue: a metrical Version of the Book of Job (1807) —Sermons especially designed for Relaxation (1820) —Letters from Aristarchus to Philemon (1835) and two or three occasional sermons. —Sprague, Amasa ii, 286.

Lee, Edward, an English prelate, was born in Kent in 1482; was educated at Oxford and Cambridge; became chaplain of Henry VIII, and was finally employed by him in several diplomatic missions. In 1529 he was sent to Rome to negotiate for the divorce of the king, and in 1531 was appointed archbishop of York. He opposed the Reform doctrines of Luther, but favored the innovations which Henry VIII made in the Church. Lee died in 1544. He wrote, Apologia adversus quos revocamus calumniae (Louvain, 1520) —Epistola nuncupatoria ad Des. Erasmum (Louvain, 1520) —Annotated Letters also in comitationes Novi Testamenti Erasmii (Bâle, 1520) —Epistola apologetica qua respondet D. Erasmii Epistolis. —Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.

Lee, Jason, a Methodist Episcopal minister, pioneer missionary to Oregon, was born at Stanstead, Lower Canada, in 1808; labored with the Wesleyan missionaries there until 1833; joined the New England Conference in that year, and was ordained missionary to Oregon. Here he labored nobly, buried two wives, and in 1844 returned to New York to raise funds for the Oregon Institute, for which he was made agent by the New England Conference, but he died at his birthplace, March 12, 1846. When Lee was a boy in New England, it is to his glorious monument for two worlds —Minutes of Conferences, iii, 617. (G. L. T.)

Lee, Jesse, one of the most eminent preachers in the early history of the American Methodist Church, and recognized as the founder of Methodism in New England, was born in Prince George's County, Virginia, March 12, 1758. He received a fair education, was diligently instructed in the Prayer-book and Catechism, and early acquired skill in vocal music, which served him in all his subsequent labors. His early life was moral. I believe I never did anything in my youth that the people generally call wicked, " is the record in his journal. His father was led to a more serious mode of life than prevailed generally in that community chiefly by the influence of Mr. Jarrett, an Episcopal clergyman. Jesse's parents, however, finally, in 1776, joined the church and then a state of grace which he was called "perfect love." " At length I could say, 'I have nothing but the love of Christ in my heart," is his record. In 1777 he removed from his home into the bounds of Boanoke Circuit, North Carolina, where the next year he was appointed a class-leader. He preached his first sermon November 17, 1779, and for a time supplied the preacher's place. In the summer of 1780 he was drafted into the militia to meet the approach of the British army in South Carolina. Excused from bearing arms on account of his religious scruples, he rendered various other services, especially foraging. Soon obtaining a discharge, he was earnestly solicited to enter the itinerant ministry, but shrank from the responsibility, "fearing lest he should injure the work of God. At the tenth Conference, held at Ellis Meeting-house, Sussex County, Virginia, April 17, 1782, Lee was deeply impressed with "the unmitigated, unquenchable love" prevalent among the preachers, notwithstanding the warm difference that had of late existed among the Methodist preachers on the subject of the administration of the sacraments, and at a quarterly meeting in November he was prevailed upon to take charge, together with Mr. Drongeole, of a circuit near Edenton, North Carolina —the Amelia Circuit. At the Ellis Meeting-house Conference, May 6, 1786, he was received on trial. This year he preached with marked success. He writes, "I preached at Mr. Spain's with great liberty. . . . the Spirit of the Lord came upon us, and we were banded in tears." "I preached at Howel's Chapel from Ezek. xxxiii, 11. . . . I saw so clearly that the Lord was willing to bless the people, even while I was speaking, that I began to feel distressed for them. . . . After stopping and weeping for a good time, I began again, but a little while before the crisis of the people overcame me, and I wept with them so that I could not speak. I found that love had tears as well as grief." Under appointment of the Conference, which began at Ellis Preaching-house, Virginia, April 20, 1786, and ended at Baltimore May 28 following (see minute for that year), he labored in different circuits with like success, and was now regarded as an important man in the connection. December 12 he was invited to meet Coke, Whatecoat, and Vasey at the celebrated Christmas Conference of 1784 at Baltimore, where, with the aid of these persons, ordained and sent out for the purpose by Mr. Wesley, the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized. Lee could not attend the Conference from his distant circuit on so short a notice and at that season of the year, but was immediately after requested by bishop Asbury to travel with him in a Southern tour. This was an important event for Lee. He preached with the bishop at Georgetown and Charleston. At Cheraw he met with a merchant who gave him such information of New England as awakened in him an eager desire to transfer his field of labor to that region. At the South Carolina Conference held in Charleston, Carolina April 20, 1785, Lee, in ardent controversy with Cooke, who was still in the country, sought the abrogation of certain stringent rules on slavery adopted in 1784, which required of each member of the society the gradual emancipation of his slaves. His views soon prevailed. He preached, 1786, in Kent Circuit, Maryland; 1787, in Baltimore; 1788, in Flanders Circuit, embracing a portion of New Jersey and New York. Previously to the General Conference of 1786 there were no prescribed limits to the several conferences, but they were held at the discretion of the bishop and at times a number of the preachers being sometimes appointed from different Conferences in the same year. At the Conference held in New York, May 28, 1789, Lee was appointed to Stamford Circuit, in Connecticut, and now began his career in New England, which continued for eleven years. By this time, the natural temperament of its inhabitants, and their previous theological education, was a hard field for the introduction of Methodism, into which —though spread into all the other Atlantic States, far into the West, to Canada and Nova Scotia—it had not a territorial basis, a sort of a mere temporary occupancy. The death of earnest religious interest which succeeded the revivals under Edwards, Whitefield, and Tennant, as well as the prevalent reactionary tendency to rationalism, furnished sufficient demand for the real-
ous preaching of the Methodists. They felt themselves called to a mission in which their form of doctrine concerning entire sanctification in this life; but their views on the subject of free will were greatly misunderstood, the Methodist Arminianism being confounded with Pelagianism. "The argument," says John Edwards, "most constantly used against Arminianism in those days, was the tendency to popery or popery (as being a doctrine of salvation by good works). The dominant theology, therefore, gave the Methodist preachers but a cold reception. Lee preached at Norway first in the street, but was subsequently allowed, both in his hand books, the use of the court-house, and sometimes of the meeting-house. Thomas Ware, who heard Lee about this time, writes, "When he stood up in the open air and began to sing, I knew not what it meant. I drew near, however, to listen, and thought the prayer was the best I had ever heard... When he entered upon the subject-matter of his text, it was with such an easy, natural flow of expression, and in such a tone of voice, that I could not refrain from weeping, and many others were affected in the same way. When he was done, and we had an opportunity of expressing our sentiments on the other, we all agreed that such a man had not visited New England since the days of Whitefield." At Stratfield he formed the first class, consisting of three women, September 26, 1787. At Reading, December 28, he formed another class of two. Thus, at the end of seven months' labor, he had secured five classes in five towns, in which the religious labors appears in his journal as follows: "I love to break up new ground, and hunt the lost souls in New England, though it is hard work; but when Christ is with me, hard things are made easy, and rough ways made smooth." After preaching to a large congregation on one occasion, he was, as usual, left to find shelter where he could, and, as he recorded, rode through storm, "my soul transplanted with joy, the snow falling, the wind blowing, prayer ascending, faith increasing, grace descending, heaven smiling, and love abounding." In February, 1788, he received three helpers, Brush, Roberts, and Smith, and formed the New Haven Circuit. He passed through Rhode Island, and appeared in Boston July 9. Boardman and Garretson had been before there, but no permanent fruit remained of their labors. Lee, finding no house opened, preached on the Common to 3000 hearers. Though Lee often returned to the city, no society was formed there till July 13, 1792. He had better success elsewhere, and constantly labored throughout New England in supervision of the work, till the General Conference of 1796. Soon after this date, however, he was called to labors at large with a large work. In the latter part of 1798, he formed an assistant in preaching and in holding Conferences. Thus employed, he revisited the scenes of his former labors in the South, and travelled also through New England. The period of his labors in that section closed in 1800. It had continued for eleven years, amid great difficulties, frequent theological controversies, and no small degree of persecution. The statistical result at this date was 50 preachers and 6000 members. At the General Conference held May 6, 1800, at Baltimore, Lee was nearly elected a bishop, Whatchoat being chosen over him by four votes. The subsequent portion of his life was spent mostly in the South, in earnest and successful labor as pastor and presiding elder. He preferred, says his biographer, the former position. At the Virginia Conference of 1807 his influence defeated, from an opinion of its unconstitutionality, the proposition to call an extraordinary General Conference, in order to elect a bishop in place of bishop Whatchoat, deceased. He had, for like reason, opposed his own ordination as assistant bishop in 1796. In the Virginia Conference of 1808 he advocated a petition to the following General Conference of May, 1809, to establish a Synod of Virginia. Lee was not present at the Richmond Conference. This proposition had been urged by Lee as early as 1792. Such action was taken by the Conference of 1808, and the powers of the General Conference, as the supreme authority of the Church, were defined in a manner which formed the Rules of Order. In the same year Lee made a last visit and journey throughout New England, which was "an humble but exultant religious ovation." In the summer of 1807 he published at Baltimore his History of Methodism in America, which was the first work of the kind. During that year he served at the High School in New London with equal zeal the principle of advancing local preachers to elders' orders. He continued his faithful career as circuit preacher and as chaplain to Congress till 1816. He was present at the funeral services of his veteran collaborator, bishop Asbury, held by the General Conference of 1816 at Baltimore, and did not long survive himself, but died at the age of fifty-eight, Sept. 2, 1816. Dr. Stevens closes his history of the Methodist Episcopal Church with the following characterization of Jesse Lee: "A man of vigorous, though unpolished mind, of rare popular eloquence and tireless energy, he became one of the British Provinces to Florida for thirty-five years, a chief counselor of the Church in its annual and general conferences, the founder of Methodism in New England, . . . he lacked only the episcopal office to give him rank with Asbury and Coke. Asbury early chose him for the great order of bishop. Some other ministers were very likely that he would be elected to it, but his manly independence and firmness of opinion in times of party strife were made the occasion of his defeat." In public services he may fairly be ranked next to Asbury, and as founder and apostle of Methodism he is above any of his official rank. In this respect his historic honor is quite unique; for, though individual men have in several other sections initiated the denomination, no other founder has, so completely as he, introduced, conducted, and concluded his work, and from no other man's similar work have proceeded equal advantages to American Methodism" (ii, 501). The same author, in another place, thus presents his qualities as a preacher: "Pathos was natural to him. Humor seems, in some temperaments, to be the natural counterpart, or, at least, reaction of pathos. Lee became noted for his wit; we shall see it uniting him with a felicitous advantage in his encounters with opponents, especially in the North-eastern States. It flowed in a genial and permanent stream from his large heart, and played most vividly in his severest liturgical hardships; but he was full of tender and affectionate kindness, and far more susceptible of the finer emotional and intellectual pleasures, rather than any remarkable intellectual powers, made him one of the most eloquent and popular preachers of his day. One of his fellow-laborers, a man of excellent judgment, says that he possessed uncommon colloquial powers and a fascinating address; that his readiness at repartee was scarcely equaled, and by the skillful use of this talent he often taught those who were disposed to be witty at his expense that the safest way to deal with him was to be civil. He was fired with missionary zeal, and, moreover, was a man of great moral courage" (i, 418). "It was a kind of fixed principle with him," says his biographer Lee (p. 380), "never to let a congregation go from his preaching entirely unaffected. He would excite them in some way. He would make them weep if he could. If he failed in this, he would essay to alarm them, or to astonish them by the telling of words of great power; and, if all failed, he would shake their sides with some pertinent illustration or anecdote, and then, having moved them, seek, by all the appliances of truth, earnestness, and affection, to guide their stirred-up thoughts and sympathies to the fountains of living waters." See Lee's History of a United General Conference. Lee M. Lee (Richmond, Va., 1848); Stevens, History of the M. E. Church; Memoirs of Rev. T. Warr. (E. B. O.) Lee, Robert, D.D., a noted Scotch Presbyterian...
Lee, Samuel (1). D.D., a distinguished English Orientalist and Biblical scholar, was born at Longnor, in Shropshire, May 14, 1788; was educated but moder-ately, and apprenticed to a carpenter. His aptitude for learning, however, led him to continue his studies pri- vately, and so, in 1810, he was admitted to the divinity course at Cambridge. He next mastered the Greek, and from that he advanced to Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Samaritan, all of which he acquired by his own unaided efforts before he was twenty-five years of age. By this time he had married, and exchanged his former occupation for that of a scholar. Interestingly, the notice of archdeacon Corbet and Dr. Jon. Scott, he was, by their aid, enabled to add to his other acquisitions a knowledge of Arabic, Persian, and Hindustanee, as well as some European and other tongues. In 1816 he accepted an engagement with the Church Missionary Society, and became a student of Queen's College, Cambridge, where he took his degree of B.A. in 1817. At this time he edited portions of the Scriptures, and of the Prayer-book, in several Ori-ental languages. In 1818 he took orders, and preached at Shrewsbury, still carrying on his Oriental studies; at this time he is said to have had the mastery over eighteen languages. In 1819 he was honored, as his talents certainly deserved, with the professorship of Arabic, and in 1834 he was made regius professor of Hebrew at Cambridge University, besides receiving some pieces of land in Church prebends. In 1840, he became Poet of the University of Halle, and then from that of Cambridge. Shortly before his death, Dec. 16, 1852, he was made rec- tor of Barley, in Somersetshire, where he died. Besides the editions of the Scriptures which he carried through the press, he published several valuable linguistic works, of which the following are the most important: A Grammar of the Hebrew Language, compiled from the best authorities, chiefly Oriental, which has passed through several editions:—A Lexicon, Heb., Chald., and Eng. (Lond. 1840): —The Book of the Patriarch Job translated, with Intro- duction and Commentary (Lond. 1837): —An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy (Camb. 1849): —Propogomena in Bib. Polygl. Londin. Minor (Lond. 1828). He also published an edition of the controversy tracts of Martyr and his opponents; edited Sir Wil- liam Jones's Grammar of the Persian Language, with an addition of the Persian grammar and translated and annotated the travels of Ibn-Batuta from the Arabic. A minor work of his, Dissent Unscriptural and Unreasonable, led to a controver-sy with Dr. J. Pye Smith (in 1848; the pamphlet of the same title was published in 1850). Dr. Lee has been recognised not only as a great scholar, but also as the greatest British Orientalist of his day, and his writings bear evident traces of a vigorous, earnest, and independent mind, loving truth, and boldly pursuing it. See Lond. Genl. Magazine, 1835, pt. i. 400 sq.; Blackwood's Magazine, xlix. 89 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. Bib., vol. ii. s. v.; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii. s. v.

Lee, Samuel (2), a minister of the United Presbyteri-an Church, born at Jericho, Vt., July 20, 1805, was converted at the age of nineteen, and educated at Ver-mont University. He studied theology at Auburn Seminary, and was licensed, and ordained by Oneida Congregational Council Sept. 23, 1834. He spent one year of his ministry at Cazenovia, N. Y., and then went to Northern Ohio, and took charge of the Church in Me-dina, Ohio. Afterwards his labors were divided between the Church in Medina and Streetsburgh, Ohio, where he died Jan. 26, 1886. —Wilson, Proph. Hist. A.S., vol. ii., p. 810.

Lee, Wilson, an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Sussex County, Del., in 1761; entered the itinerancy in 1784; labored extensively in the West, mostly in Kentucky, until 1794, when he was appointed to New London, Conn.; to New York in 1795; to Phil-adelphia in 1796-7; in 1807, to Baltimore District in 1807-8; superannuated in 1804, and died in Arundel County, Md., Oct. 11 of the same year. Mr. Lee was one of the most laborious and successful Methodist preachers of his time. He was eminently shrewd and circumspect, and deeply pious. He was a witness of the perfect love of God for many years before he died. He was an excel-lent presiding elder, and an eloquent, argumentative, and often overpowering preacher. His labors in the West were very heroic, and contributed largely to the evan-gelization of Kentucky and Tennessee. —Minutes last session, 1827; St. Johns Memorial of Methodist, ch. xviii; Bangs, Hist. Meth. Episc. Ch. vol. i. (G.L.T.)

Leech. See HoAR-LEECH.

Leech ("chit", chaste''), from "khit", to enclose, also to grow green; occurs in several places in the Old Testament, where it is variously translated, as grass in 1 Kings xvii, 5; 2 Kings xxiv, 26; Job xii, 15; Psa. xxxix, 2, etc.; Isa. xxv, 10, etc.; Jer. Heb. xxiv, 12; Rom. in Prov. xxv, 25, and in Isa. xxxv, 15; but in Num. x, 5 it is translated "looc", Sept. tr. πίπιον, Vulg. porri. Hebrew scholars state that the word signifies "greens" or "grass" in general; and it is no doubt clear, from the context of most of the above
The Romans employed it much as a seasoning to their dishes (Horace, Ep. i, 12, 21; Martial, iii, 47, 8), and it is an ingredient in a number of recipes in Apicius referred to by Celsius (Hierobot. ii, 263; comp. Pliny, Hist. Nat. xix, 6; Hiller, Hierophyl. pt. ii, p. 86; Dioscor. ii, 4; Athen. iv, 157, 170). The leek (Allium porrum) was introduced into England about the year 1562, and thence, in due time, into America; and, as is well known, it continues to be esteemed as a seasoning to soups and stews in most civilized countries.

There is, however, another and a very ingenious interpretation of chateir; first proposed by Hengstenberg, and received by Dr. Kitto (Pictorial Bible, Numbr. xi, 5), which adopts a more literal translation of the original word, for, says Kitto, "among the wonders in the natural history of Egypt, it is mentioned by travellers that the common people there eat with special relish a kind of gross similar to clover." Mayer (Risse nach Agrippa, p. 236) says of this plant (whose scientific name is Trigonella Pannum-gracum, belonging to the natural order Lepidumoa) that it is similar to clover, but its leaves more pointed, and that great quantities of it are eaten by the people. Forskål mentions the Trigonella as being grown in the gardens at Cairo; its native name is Halbeh (Flor. Aegypt. p. 81). Sonnini (Voyage, i, 879) says, "In this fertile country the Egyptians themselves eat the fenn-grce so largely that it may be prop-

The Leek (Allium Porrum).

eties of succulent plants as food, in India zulaif, from sula, "green," as used as a general term for herbs cooked as kitchen vegetables. It is more than probable, therefore, that chateir is here similarly employed, though this does not prove that leeks are intended. Ludolphus, as quoted by Celsius (Hierobot. ii, 264), supposes that it may mean lettuce, or radishes in general, and other that the succory or endive may be the true plant. But Hoffmiller states, "The most ancient Greek and the Chaldean translators unanimously interpret the Hebrew by the Greek ψαρά, or leek." The name, moreover, seems to have been specially applied to leeks from the resemblance of their leaves to grass, and from their being conspicuous for their green color. This is evident from minerals even having been named from ψαραν on account of their color, as prasias, prasites, and chryspannum. The Arabs use the word kiraz, or kirath, as the translation of the ψαραν of the Greeks, and with them it signifies the leek, both at the present day and in their older works. It is curious that of the different kinds described, one is called kirazal-bukli, or leek used as a vegetable. That the leek is esteemed in Egypt we have the testimony of Hasekelquist, who says (Travels, p. 291). The kind called karrat by the Arabs must certainly have been one of those desired by the children of Israel, as it has been cultivated and esteemed from the earliest times to the present time in Egypt."
By comparing Judg. iii. 15; xx. 16, with 1 Chron. xii. 2, we may gather that the persons mentioned in the two former texts as "left-handed" were really ambidexter-
tera. In the latter text we learn that the Benjamites who joined David at Ziklag were "mighty men, helpers of the war. They were armed with bows, and could use both the right hand and the left in hurling [sling-
ing] and in shooting arrows out of a bow. There was no part of them; and as they appear to have been all of one family, it might almost seem as if the greater common-
ess of this power among the Benjamites arose from its being a hereditary peculiarity of certain families in that tribe. It may also partly have been the result of cultivation of the bow, although the left hand is not naturally an equally strong and ready instrument as the right hand, it may doubtless be often rendered such by early and suitable training. See Hand.

Leg is the rendering of several words in the A. V. Usually the Heb. term is מסה, kara' (only in the dual מטה, the lower limb or shank of an animal (Exod. xii. 9; xxix. 17; Lev. i. 9, 18; iv. 11; viii. 21; ix. 14; Amos iii. 12) or a locust (Lev. xi. 21); the πόδιον of a man (John xix. 31, 92, 93), πόδι, πόδι (Chald. מנה, of a man Deut. x. 4), is properly the shin or lower part of the leg, but used of the whole limb, e.g. of a person (Deut. xxvii. 15; Psa. cxxvii. 10; Prov. xxvi. 7; "thigh," Isa. xxiv. 2; in the phrase "hip [q. v. and thigh," Judg. xv. 7; spoken also of the drawers or leggings, Cant. v. 15) also the "beaves shoulder" (q. v. of the sacrificial (Exod. xxix. 25, etc.; Sam. i. 9. 24). Once by an extension of מנה, re'gol (1 Sam. xvii. 6), properly a "foot (as usually rendered). Elsewhere improperly מנה for מנה, shol'el, the train or trailing dress of a female (Isa. xlvii. 2); and מנה, trud'ah, a step-chain for the feet, or perh. bracelet for the wrist (ornament of the leg, Isa. iii. 20). See THIGH.

Goliath's greaves for his legs doubled extended from the knee to the foot (1 Sam. xvii. 6). See GAVRAYS. The bones of the legs of persons crucified were broken to hasten their death (John xix. 31). See CRUCIFIXION.

LEGALISTS. Properly speaking, a legalist is one who "acts according to the law;" but in general the term is made use of to denote one who seeks salvation by works of law (not of the law, but of "law" generally, whether moral or ceremonial, ἡ ἐρωταίαν, Rom. v. 20) instead of the merits of Christ. They are alive to the truth that it is impossible to do anything that can purchase salvation, and who desire that this doctrine should be earnestly and constantly inculcated by Christian ministers in their teaching, conceive that there is a standard also in the opposite direction, that while plain Antinomian teaching would disgust most hearers, there is a kind of doctrine scarcely less mischievous in its consequences, that which only incidentally touches on good works. They think that whatever leads or leaves men, without distinctly rejecting Christian virtue, to feel little anxiety and take little pains about it; anything which, though perhaps not so meant, is liable to be so understood by those who have the wish as to leave them without any feeling of real shame, or mortification, or alarm on account of their own faults or failings, deficiencies, so as to make them anxiously watchful only against seeking salvation by good works, and not at all against seeking salvation without good works—all this (they consider) is likely to be much more acceptable to the corrupt disposition of the natural man than that which urges the necessity of being "saved out of the body, and the soul made perfect by the blood of Jesus, " and "to take such a view of the danger of the case think that Christian teachers should not shrink, through fear of incurring the wrongful imputation of "legalism," from earnestly inculcating the points which the apostles found it necessary to dwell on with withness and frequent repetition. But in general the term is made use of to denote one who expects salvation by...
his own works. We may further consider a legalist as one who has no proper conviction of the evil of sin; who, although he pretends to abide by the law, yet has not a just idea of its spirituality and demands. He is ignorant of the great benefits of salvation. Grace is proud of his own fancied righteousness, he submits not to the righteousness of God; he derogates from the honor of Christ by mixing his own works with his; and, in fact, denies the necessity of the work of the Spirit by supposing that he has ability in himself to perform all things which God has required. Such is the character of the legalist, a character diametrically opposite to that of the true Christian, whose sentiment corresponds with that of the apostle, who justly observes, “By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast” (Eph. ii. 8, 9) — Eden, Theol. Dict. s. v.; Buck, Theol. Dict. s. v.; Buchanan, Doctrine of Jusification, Lect. vi, especially p. 158 sq.

Legates and Nuncios of the Roman Catholic Church. With reference to the endeavors of that Church to unite all the congregations into one vast system, and to rule over them successfully, prevailing all heresy and division, the Council of Sardica (343) expressly stated: “Quod si is, qui rogat casuam suam iterum audiri, deprecatione sua moventem episcopum Romanam, ut de laudio suo prepararetur (si est) in potestate ejus,” etc. (Conc. Sard. 7, can. ii. 80). In 367, G makes it plain that the Roman clergy was therefore sent abroad everywhere. In the African churches, however, they refused to admit into fellowship those “qui ad transmarina (concilia) putatevi ret apellantur” (Codex eccles. Afric. c. 125), and wrote to Celestine at Rome, “Ut aliqui tanganum tue sanctitatibus latere mittantur, nulla invenimus patrum synodum constitutum” (ibid. c. 136). Thoburn (Vetus ac nova ecclesiae disciplina, p. 1, lib. ii. cap. 117) has collected instances of delegations having been sent in various cases during the 4th and 5th centuries. But, as vicar of the bishops of Western Europe, the popes tried to bring the bishops of Thessalonica after Damascus (a. 867); in Gaul, the bishops of Arles after Zosimus (a. 417); in Spain, the bishops of Seville after Simplicius (a. 467) (Constant, De antiquis canonum collectionibus, No. 23—25; Gallande, De vetustis canonum collectionibus dissertationi, i. 23 sq.; Petrus de Marca, De concordia aecordiit ac usurpi, lib. v, cap. 19 sq., 30 sq.). Among the delegates of the bishop of Rome we must also put the Apostoliciarii [see APOCRHIALIUS] sent to the imperial court at Constantinople. Leo I, and particularly Gregory I, carefully considered and shaped by higher and greater, and created more, in order to improve the condition of the churches, and to increase the influence of Rome. Gregory appointed bishop Maximus of Syracuse over all the cities of Sicily (“super cunctas ecclesias Sicilies et... vicis ecclesiarum”) (Gregor. VII, Ep. lib. iv, ep. 26). The pope the title of Legatus, and the pope to whom the title was given the title of Legatus. The title became merely a nominal one, the metropolitan not being even entitled to have the cross borne before him where there was a legatus a latere (c. 28, X. De privilege legati, v. 89; Innocent III, in c. 5, Conc. Lateran. a. 1215).

Legati missi or dati. These are divided into, (1) Delegates, appointed for one specific object. It was already forbidden in the Middle Ages to appoint members of the clergy in their place. (2) Nuncio apostolici, who are empowered to receive the commands contained in their mandates. In order to effect this object they were given a right of jurisdiction until the 16th century. To enable them to legislate in reserved cases, they were invested with a mandatum specialis, making the reservations general for them. They could grant indulgences for any period not exceeding a year. All other legates were subject to them except such as had special privileges granted them by the pope. The insignia of the nuncio comprised a red dress, a white horse, and golden spurs. (3) Legati ab a latere. Special delegates of the papacy. They were appointed to the pope, and who possessed all the highest prerogatives. Their plenary power is thus expressed: “Nos nostra, corrigenda sunt corrigat, quae statuenda constituant” (Gregor. VII, Ep. lib. iv, ep. 26). The pope exercit at the jurisdic- diction ordinaria in the provinces, had power to suspend the bishops, and to dispose of all reserved cases. The manifold complaints which arose in the course of time led the popes to alter some points of the system. Leo X, in the Lateran Council of 1515, caused it to be ruled that the cardinal legate should have a settled residence; and he fixed the process by which the legates had prescribed the resolutions of the councils so as to make them very favorable to the bishops.

The Reformation gave occasion for the sending of a large number of legates, and also for the nomination of permanent nuncios. Leo X sent one to the Council of Pisa (1557); Clement VIII, to the Council of Villanova, 1582; Brussel, 1588: this, however, gave rise to fresh disturbances in the Church. The troubles caused by the nuncios were the cause of the adoption of a new article under the gramina nationis Germanicorum. In the mean time the French Revolution broke out, disturbing all preconceived plans. After the restoration of order in the hierarchy the system of legations was revived, but with many modifications, altering its Middle-Age features. The second article of the French Concordat of 1801 states expressly: “Aucun individu se diazanne legat, vicaire ou commissaire apostolique, ou se prévient de toute autre dénomination, ne pourra, sans l’autorisation du gouvernement, exercer sur le sol Français ni ailleurs, aucune fonction relative aux affaires de l’église Gallicane.” This clearly removed the original foundation of the intercourses formerly existing between the papacy and the courts. It has also been a practical aid to the various Roman Catholic governments, such as Austria, France, Spain, etc., reserved to themselves the right to point out the parties who should be accredited to their courts as nuncios (Kléber, Europäisches Völker. § 186, Anm. a.). The formula of the oath of obedience to the pope,
which, since Gregory VII, is taken by bishops at their ordination, says: "Legati apostolici sedes. Prima, horti- rificis minister, ille missae scienti, adjuvauit" (c. 4, X. De jurisprud. ii. 24). This involves the duty of supporting the procurations. But the state is also enrolled on account of its power.

The usual envoys of the popes have now the titles of, 1. Legati apostolici, conferred with an inherent right to the management of ecclesiastical affairs. 2. Legati, missi, which are divided into (1) Legati a latere or de latere, who, it is stated, are entitled to be canonically designated as cardinals a latere or legati de latere. This is incorrect, for cardinals are now seldom sent as legati a latere, but, as the contrary, other members of the clergy, cum potestate legati a latere. (2) Nuncios apostolici, bearers of apostolic mandates. While the former are looked upon as ambassadors, it is a nice question whether the latter occupy the second position, that of envoys. They are either ordinary permanent legates, as in Germany, or extraordinary, sent for some special purpose. (3) Intermediarii (residentes), considered by some as forming a third class, by others as belonging to the second. At the Congress of Vienna, 1815, it was decided by the first article of the Règlement sur le rang ecclésiastique that "Ambassadeurs, Legats, Nuncios, and Legates a latere, in article fourth, that no change would be made in regard to papal representatives. See Klüber, Völkerrecht; Heff- ter, Völkerrecht; Mirus, Die Europäische Gesellschaftskriege; Ketteler, Kirchenrecht (Glessen, 1856); W. Walter, Kirchenrecht (11th ed., Bonn, 1894); Herron, Eccl.-Encyclop. viii. 269 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen- Lexikon, iv. 409 sq. Legend (Lat. legenda, "things to be read," "lessons") was the name given in early times, in the Roman Cath- olic Church, to a book of the daily lessons which were wont to be read as part of divine service. This name, however, in process of time, was used to designate the lives of saints and martyrs, as well as the collection of such narratives, from the fact that these were read by the monks at matins, and after dinner in the refectories. Among numerous theses of the origin of the le- gendes, the following is the most probable. Before col- leges were established in the monasteries where the schools were held, the professors in rhetoric frequently gave their pupils the life of some saint for a trial of their talent as essayists. From this the popular legends of saints were written at the behest of the religious superiors, the simplicity was not inferior to their devotion, were so delighted with those florid stories that they were induced to make a collection of these miraculous compositions, not imagining that at some distant period they would become matters of faith. Yet, when Jacob de Vor- ragine, Peter de Natallibus, and Peter Ribadehenera wrote the lives of the saints, they sought for their materials in the libraries of the monasteries; and, awakening from the dust these manuscripts of amplification, imagined they made an invaluable present to the world by laying before them these voluminous abridgments. The people received these pious fictions with all imaginable sim- plicity, and, as few were able to read, the books containing them were amply illustrated with cuts which rendered the story intelligible. Many of these legends, the production of monastics, were invented, especially in the Middle Ages, with a view to serve the interests of monasticism, particularly to exalt the character of the monastic orders, and to represent their voluntary austerities as purchasing the peculiar favor of heaven. For this purpose they un- scrupulously ascribed to the patrons and founders of monasteries the power of working miracles on the most trying oc- casions. Many of these miracles are blaspheous paro- dies on those of our blessed Lord; not a few are bor- rowed from the pagan mythology; but some are so ex- quisitely suited that no one but a monarch could have dreamed of imposing such nonsense on the most besotted of mankind. "It would be easy to accumulate proofs of the ready belief which the lower orders of Irish Ro- mainists give to tales of miracles worked by their priests; but it is rendered more certain still that the earlier the earlier Christian ages, the more rarely find supernatural powers attributed to the secular ecclesiastics; the heroes of most of the tales are monks and hermits, whose voluntary poverty seemed to bring them down to a level of sympathy with the lower or- ders. Indignant alms, which have often been demon- strated to be a mere fiction, is, in fact, a prevalent as a secular, with the uninstructed, and hence we find that many of the heroes of the legends are celebrated for the prodigality of their benevolence. The miracles attributed to the Irish saints are even more extravagant than those of the Continental martyrologists. We find St. Patrick performing the miracle of raising the dead to life in less than seventeen times, and on one occasion he restores animation to thirty-four persons at once. Gerald, bish- op of Mayo, however, surpassed St. Patrick, for he not only resuscitated the dead daughter of the king of Con- ombhaire, but also made the dead king live, and it is said that he might inherit the crown of the province, in which the Salic law was then established. We find, also, in the ecclesiastical writers, many miracles specially worked to support individual doctrines, particularly the mystery of transubstantiation. Indeed, a miracle appears to have been without unusual resource of a puzzled controversialist. On one occasion the sanctity of the wafer is stated to have been proved by a mule's kneeling to worship it; at another time a pet lamb kneels down at the elevation of the host; a spider, which St. Francis d'Arienzo acci- dentally swallowed while reciting the sacrament, came out of his thighs; and when St. Elmo was pining at being too long excluded from a participation in the sacramental mysteries, the holy elements were brought to him by a pigeon. But the principal legends devised for the general exaltation of the Romish Church refer to the exercise of power over the devil. In the south of Ireland nothing is more common than to hear of Satan's appearance in proper person, his resistance to all the e- fforts of the Protestant minister, and his prompt obed- ience to the exorcisms of the parish priest. In general, the localities of the stories are not at some remote village; yet, easy as this renders refutation, it is won- derful to find how generally such a tale is credited. From the archives of the Sisilian Church, we find that some German Protestants seem to believe in the exor- cizing powers of the Romish priests. Next to the le- gends of medieval monastics, the stories of the contests of the saints, the most popular, such as that of St. Polyceroun always took up a huge tree on his shoulders when he went to pray; that St. Barnadatus shut himself up in a narrow iron cage; that St. Adhelm exposed himself to the most stimulating temptations, and then defied the devil to make him yield; and that St. Macarius undertook a penance for sin six months, because he had so far yielded to passion as to kill a flea. It is unnecessary to dwell upon these, because they are manifestly derived from the habits of the Oriental fanatics, and are evident exaggerations made without taste or judgment. See History of Pop- erty (Lond. 1888, 3vo).

The most celebrated of these popular medieval fic- tions is the Legenda Aurea, or Golden Legend, origi- nally written in Latin, in the 13th century, by Jacob de Voragine (ca. 1260-1316), a Dominican friar, who afterwards became bishop of Genoa, and died in 1298. This work was the great text-book of legendary lore of the Mid- dle Ages. It was translated into French in the 14th century by Jean de Vigny, and in the 15th into Eng- lish by William Caxton. It has lately been made more accessible to the present generation by the late Father Dore del, traduit de la Latin, par M. G. B. (Par. 1850). There is a copy of the original, with the Gestas Longobardorum
appended, in the Harvard College Library, Cambridge, printed at Strasburg in 1496. Longfellow, in a note to his beautiful poem, says, "I have called this poem the Golden Legend, because the story upon which it is founded seems to me to surpass all other legends in beauty and truth. It is found in the Marienleben of the Middle Ages, the virtue of disinterestedness and self-sacrifice, and the power of Faith, Hope, and Charity sufficient for all the exigencies of life and death." The story is told, and perhaps invented, by Hartmann von der Aue, a Minnesinger of the 13th century. The original may be found in the Marhbach's Volksbücker, No. 32. We may mention also, among other productions, the Kaiserschronik (Imperial Chronicle), where the legendary element forms a very important part of the whole, and Werner's veridified Marienleben (Life of Mary), written in 1178, etc. The authors of these works were ecclesiastics, but in the following age, when the mediaval poetry of Germany was in its richest bloom, and the foysters of the poetic art were emperors and princes, the legend was employed by laymen on a grand scale, and formed the subject-matter of epic narratives. Thus Hartmann von der Aue worked up into a poem the religious legends about Gregory; Conrad von Fusselbrunn those concerning the childhood of Jesus; Rudolph von Ems those about Barlaam and Josaphat; and later von Dunzel those about Sir Peter and Sir George. Between the 14th and 16th centuries legends in prose began also to appear, such as Hermann von Frislar's Von dem Heiligen Leben (written about 1348), and gradually supplanted the others.

Much of this legendary rubbish was cleared away by Tillern, Fleury, Bailett, Launni, and Bollusand, but the faith in many of them still remains strong in the more ignorant minds of the Romish Church. The repeated and still continued editions of the Acta Sanctorum (q. v.) afford sufficient evidence of this.

The influence and value of this activity on the subject of the legends is that commenced by the Bollandists in the 17th century, Acta Sanctorum, and still in process of publication. Legends are found not only in the Roman Catholic, but also in the Greek Church. They also found an entrance into the national literature of Christian nations. Among the Germans especially was this the case, particularly in the 12th century, although specimens of legendary poems are not altogether wanting at an earlier period. In Great Britain, also, the legends of King Arthur and his Round Table have sprung anew, after centuries of comparative obscurity, and have once more become the treasure-house from which poet and painter draw subjects for their pictures, and in which essayists, weary of the old heathen classics, seek for illustrations and allusions. The first of the recent poets, however, who clearly apprehended the poetic and spiritual elements of the old Christian legend was Herder, and his example has been followed by other poets, for example, the romantic school in Germany, and Bulwer and Tennyson in England. The tendency to mythic embellishment showed itself more particularly in regard to the Virgin Mary, the object of the men and women. Of all these, the most captivating, as an amiable weakness, was the devotion to the Virgin. The denial of the title "The Mother of God" by Nestorius was that which sounded most offensive to the general ear; it was the intelligible, odious point in his heresy, and contributed, no doubt, to the passionate violence with which that controversy was agitated; and the favorable issue to those who might seem most zealous for the Virgin's glory gave a strong impulse to the worship; for, from that time, the worship of the Virgin became absolutely integral part of Christianity. Among Justinian's splendid edifices arose many churches dedicated to the Mother of God. The feast of the Annunciation was celebrated both under Justin and Justinian. Heraclius had images of the Virgin on his masts when he sailed to Constantinople to overthrow Phocas, and before the end of the century the Virgin is become the tutelar deity of that city, which is saved by her intercession from the Saracens. "The history of Christianity," says deane Milman, "cannot be understood without passing at stated periods to survey the progress and decay of the corruption which, since the birth of the Church, gradually growing up, and springing as it did from natural and universal instincts, took a more perfect and systematic form, and at length, at the height of the Middle Ages, was as much a part of Latin Christianity as the primal truths of the Gospel. This religion gradually moulded toward the Christian Church out of the natural instincts of man, the undying reminiscences of all the older religions—the Jewish, the Pagan, and the Platonist—with the few and indistinct glimpses of the invisible world, and the future state of being in the New Testament, into a vast system, more sublime, perhaps, for its indefiniteness, which, being necessary in that condition of mankind, could not but grow up out of the kindled imagination and religious faith of Christendom. The historian who should presume to condemn such a religion as a vast plan of fraud, or a phalanx which should venture to disintegrate it as a fabric of folly only serving to be forgotten, would be equally unjust, equally blind to its real uses, assuredly ignorant of its importance and its significance in the history of man; for this, the popular Christianity—popular, as comprehending but the first four chapters of the Bible; the real Christianity—the intellectual estimation—turns the whole history of man for many centuries. It is at once the cause and the consequence of the sacerdotal dominion over mankind, the groundwork of authority at which the world trembled, which founded and overthrew kingdoms, bound together or set in antagonistic array nations, classes, ranks, orders of society. Of this, the parent, when the time arrived, of poetry, of art, the Christian historian must watch the growth and mark the gradations by which it gathered into itself the whole activity of the human mind, and through that activity till at length the mind outgrew that which had been so long almost its sole occupation. It endured till faith, with the schoolmen, led into the fathomless depths of metaphysics, began to aspire after higher truths; with the Reformers, attempting to refine religion to its primary spiritual simplicity, this even yet prolific legend of Christianity, which had been the accessory and supplementary Bible, the authoritative and accepted, though often unwritten Gospel of centuries, was gradually dropped, or left but to the humblest and most ignorant, at least to the more imaginative and less practical part of mankind. "But the mind that these legends exerted on the medieval mind," says Harwick, "was deep and universal. While they fed almost every stream of superstition, and excited an unhealthy craving for the marvellous and the romantic, they were nearly always tending, in their moral, to enliven the affections of the reader on the side of gentleness and virtue, more especially by setting forth the necessity of patience, and extolling the heroic energy of faith. One class of these biographies deserve a high amount of credit; they are written by some friend or pupil of their subject; they are natural and holy pictures of the times, and an instructive portrait of the missionary, the reclusse, the bishop, or the man of business; yet most commonly the acts and sufferings of the mediaval saint have no claim to a place in the sphere of history, or at best they have been so wantonly embellished by the fancy of the author that not even a few of the particles of truth from an innumerable mass of fiction. As these 'Lives' were circulated freely in the language of the people, they would constitute important items in the fireside reading of the age; and so warm was the respect, they were felt by every great man, notwithstanding feeble efforts to reform them or at least to eliminate a few of the more monstrous and absurd, they kept their hold on Christendom at large, and are subsisting even now in the creations of the mediaval artists' (Ck. Hist. Middle Ages).
On the origin of these legends there is a great diversity of opinion among the learned. Some trace it to the northern Scyths, who, accompanying the army of Bello in his warlike migrations southward, carried with them the lays of their own mythology, but replaced their pagan heroes by Christian kings and warriors. Salmasius adopted the theory, which was indorsed by Warton, that the germ of romantic fiction originated with the Saracens and Arabianus, and ascribes its introduction into Europe to the effects of the Crusades, or, according to Warton himself, to the Arab conquests in Spain; that from thence they passed into France, and took deepest root in Britain. Others, again, have seen in the tales of chivalry only a new development of the classic legends of Greece and Italy. As Christianity unquestionably borrowed and modified to its own use many of the outward ceremonies of paganism, so they held that the Christian tramps only adopted and transmuted the heroes of classical poetry. The researches of Count Villemarque and lady Charlotte Schreiber, however, to which the attention of the learned world had been directed before by Leyden, Douce, and Sharvon Turner, conclusively prove that the true theory as to their origin is that they are Cymric or Armorican, or both. The wealth of the old Cymric literature in this particular respect was never even suspected until lady Charlotte Schreiber, with the aid of an eminent Welsh scholar, the Rev. Thomas Price, brought to light in their original form, accompanied by an English version, the collection of early Cymric tales known as the Mabinogion. M. de la Villemarque, for his own side of the Channel, not only confirms the evidence of lady Schreiber, but brings forward additional items of proof, from fragments of Breton songs and poems, that the roots of their renowned fiction lie deep in their literature also. Their very form—the eight-syllabled rhyme, in which the French metrical version is written—he claims, and apparently with justice, as Cymric. See Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.; Cyclop. Brit. s. v.; Herzog, Real-Encyk. viii. 274 sq.; Vogel, Verrass. einer Gesch. u. Würdigung der Legenden, in Ilgen's Hist. theol. Abhandl. (Lips., 1824), p. 141 sq.; Mrs. Jameson, Legends of the Mosanic Orders, and her Legends of the Madonna. See Myth.

Legend, Golden. A renowned collection of legends written in the 15th century by Jacob de Voragine (q. v.). See Art.

Léger, Antoine (1), a French Protestant divine, was born in Savoy in 1584. He was professor of theology and Oriental languages at Geneva from 1645 until his death in 1661. He edited the Greek text of the New Testament (1658).

Léger, Antoine (2), son of the preceding, was born at Geneva in 1652. He also became a Protestant minister, and afterwards filled the chair of philosophy for twenty-four years at Geneva with eminent success. He died in 1719. He published several scientific treatises and many sermons.

Léger, Jean, a French Protestant minister, was born in Savoy in 1615. He was pastor of a Church of the Waldenses, but fortunately escaped from the massacre of 1655. He afterwards went to France, and solicited the intervention of the court for his countrymen. In 1688 he went to Holland, and became pastor of a Walloon Church in Leyden. He died in 1670. Léger wrote a History of the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont (1669). See Waldenses.

Légerdemain. See Magic.

Le'gion (Lexign, Graecized from the Latin legio), a main division of the Roman army, corresponding nearly to the modern regiment. It always comprised a large body of men, but the number varied so much at different times that there is considerable discrepancy in the statements with reference to it. The legion appears to have originally contained about 8000 men, and to have risen gradually to twice that number, or even more. In and about the time of Christ it seems to have consisted of 6000 men, and this was exclusive of horsemen, who usually formed an additional body amounting to one tenth of the infantry. As all the divisions of the Roman army are noticed in Scripture, we may add that each legion was divided into ten cohorts or battalions, each cohort into three maniples or bands, and each maniple into two centuries or companies of 100 each. This smaller division into centuries or hundreds, from the form in which it is exhibited as a constituent of the larger divisions, clearly shows that 6000 had become at least the formal number of a legion. See Smith's Dict. of Class. Ant. s. v. Army, Roman.

The word legion came to be used to express a great number or multitude (e. g. of angels, Matt. xxvi, 53). Thus the unclean spirit (Mark v, 19; compare 15), when asked his name, answers, "My name is Legion, for we are many." Many illustrations of this use of the word might be cited from the Rabbinical writers, who even apply it (אֶלֶף) to inanimate objects, as when they speak of "a legion of olives," etc. (see Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. et Talm.; Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. s. v.)—Kitto.

See Army.
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the remainder of his army. Another account, giving substantially the same version of this event, embellishes it by what seems to have taken place about the year 286, although it mentions a pope Marcellinus as having advised the emperor not to submit to the dictates of the heathen against the dictates of their conscience, while this Marcellinus only became pope ten years after the above time. This second version appears to be but a rearrangement of the legend of Eucherius, just as there have been others until the time of the Reformation (by Petrus Canisius and Gulielmus Baldeus). This legend was first treated as untrue in Magdeburg; then Jean Armand Dubourdieu, a French Reformed minister at London, undertook to prove that the number of the legion did not by any means amount to 6666 (the figures given in the second version). This led to a protracted controversy. The silence of the leading early ecclesiastical historians—Eusebius, Lactantius, Sulpicius Severus, and Orsoius—over the event some have advanced to prove that it is simply a fable, but their silence does not, in our mind, go far to disprove it Eusebius says little of the Western martyrs, yet mentions that an officer picked out the Christians in the Roman army before the beginning of the great persecution, and gave them the choice of renouncing their religion or of leaving the army, adding that many Christians were killed by his orders. The others either do not mention the martyrdom of the Christians or were of a different opinion from that of the Christians themselves, or were prevented from becoming acquainted with much of their history. On the other hand, Ambrose (+397) says, "Every city prides itself that it has had one martyr; how much more, then, can Milan pride herself, who had a whole army of divine soldiers?" Eucherius takes this as an allusion to the Theban legion. Another testimony to the same effect is contained in St. Victorius's work, De laudibus martyrum (380). The third is the discovery of a shield in the bed of the Arve, near Geneva, representing the Thebans, with the inscription "Largus D. M. Valentinianus Aequum," which is found in the life of St. Romanus (393), who mentions, among others, his journey to Aquamin (Cuatra martyrum), probably between the years 460 and 470. It also corroborates Eucherius's figures (6800). The fifth is that of Avitus, archbishop of Vienna, a breastplate originally belonging to whom is yet kept in the convent: this dates from the year 517. A sixth is given in the Vita of Victor of Marseilles. It is most probable, however, that while the legend rests on a foundation of facts, these facts have been generalized and amplified, so that a number of Christian soldiers in the Roman army became a legion first of 6600, then of 6666. Those who deny the truth of the legend take their stand on its similarity with that of a certain Simeon Metaphrastes, according to whom, also, one Mauritius, under the same emperor, is said to have had the same adventure with another Theoderus, Theophorus, Philippus, and sixty-seven others, all of the military order. But, aside from the name of Mauri tius, all the others have different names, while the details of the event also vary. Among the writers who have contested the worthlessness of the legend concerning the Theban legion, the most important are Dubourdieu, Hottinger, Mohynt, and Moshiem; it has been defended by George Hickes, M. Felix de Baltaslar (Defence de la Legion Thebaine, Lucerna, 1763, 8vo), Dom Joseph de Lisle (Defence de la Verite du Martyre de la Legion Thebaine, 1737, 8vo), Rosegnoli (Historia di Som Maurizio), and P. de Rivaz (Etat des Martres de la Legion Thebaine, Paris, 1779, 8vo). See Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, vol. ix, s. v. Mauri tius. See MAURUS.

LEGION, Thundering (Legio fulminatrix), the title of a Roman legion in the time of the emperor Marcus Aurelius, which, after the expulsion of the Marcomanni and Quadi from Hungary, while the emperor Aurelius was pursuing these German tribes with a detachment of his forces (A.D. 174), was shut up in a valley surrounded on every side by high mountains, and both by the heat of the weather and the want of water was suffering more cruelly than from the attacks of the enemy, when suddenly, in this crisis, a shower of rain reanimated the Roman soldiers, while at the same time a storm of hail, the thunder, and the lightning, as it were, young the enemy, who were then easily repulsed and conquered. Both heathen and Christian authors agree in their relation of the principal circumstances of this event. The adherents of each religion saw it in the influence of the prayers of their brethren. According to Dio Cassius (Ecclesiastica Historia), Lucilius, cap. 8, the miracle was wrought by an Egyptian sorcerer in the train of the emperor; according to Capitolinus (Vita Marci Aurelii, cap. 24), it was the effect of the emperor's prayers; but according to Tertullian (Apologet. cap. 5; Ad Scopul. cap. 4) and Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. I, iv, cap. 9), it was brought about by the prayers of the Christians in his army; hence the legend to which these Christians belonged was denominated fulminatrix. The letter of the emperor Marcus Aurelius, commonly printed in Greek in the first Apology of Justin Martyr, gives the same account with the Christian writers, but it is spurious. The marble pillar erected at Rome in honor of Marcus Aurelius, and still standing, represents this deliverance of the Roman army—the Roman soldiers catching the falling rain, and a warrior praying for its descent. It is not, however, to be considered as a memorial of any influence exercised by the Christians that the Milan, History of Christians, ii, 145 sq.; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. I, bk. i, part ii, chap. i, § 9; Pressense, History of Early Christianity, p. 129. (J. H. W.)

Legiasts and Decretists, the interpreters and editors (glossatores) of the Roman law. See Glossas and Decretals.

Legrand, Antoine, a French writer and monk, born at Douay, lived about 1650-80. He was professor of philosophy and theology in Douay, and was a disciple of the Cartesian philosophy, on which he wrote several treatises. He published A Sacred History from the Creation to the Foundation of the Great (1685), and other works. —Thomas, Biog. Dictionary, s. v.

Legrand, Joachim, a French historian and abbé, born at Saint-Lo in 1653, was a person of great erudition. He was secretary of legation in Spain about 1702, and was afterwards employed in his foreign office. He died in 1738. He published a History of the Decease of Henry VIII of England (1688), and a few other historical works.

Legrand, Louis, a French theologian, was born in Burgundy in 1711, became professor in the seminary of Saint-Sulpice, Paris, and died in 1780. He published, besides other works, a Treatise on the Incarnation of the Word (1711). He composed the censures which the faculty of theology published against Rousseau's Émile (1762) and Boffon's Époques de la Nature (Diedin, 1780). —Thomas, Biog. Dict. s. v.

Legris-Duval, René Michel, a French priest, who was born at Bretagne in 1705, and died in 1816, is noted as a zealous and efficient promoter of benevolent institutions.

Legros, Antoine, a French scholar and writer, who was born in Paris about 1680, and died in 1751, published, besides other works, The Works of the Fathers who lived in the Time of the Apostles, with Notes (1717).

Legros, Nicolas, a French Jansenist theologian, was born at Rheims in 1675. He passed the last twenty-five years of his life in Holland, to which he retired for refuge from persecution. He died in 1721. Among his works are a French translation of the Bible (1729), which is esteemed for fidelity; and a Manual for the Christian (1740).

Le'habim (Heb. Lehābīm, 'lehabim', pr. for lehabim, lubím; Sept. Arabis; F. in Chron. Arab. Volg. Lachm), a people reckoned among the Midianitic stock (Gen. x. 2; I Chron. xii. 11). See Ethnology.
The word is in the plural, and evidently signifies a tribe, doubtless taking the name of Lehi, Moroni's third son (Gen. x. 18). Bochart affirms that the Lehabim are not, as is generally supposed, identical with the Libyans. His reasons are, That Libya was much too large a country to have been peopled by one son of Mizram; and that in other parts of Scripture Libyans is either called Liby, Jer. xxxii. 19 (for Exe. xxx, 6), or Libym, 2 Chron. xxii. 3; Nahum iii. 9, and Phut was a brother, and not a son of Mizram (Gen. x. 6; Bochart, Opera, i. 579). These arguments do not stand the test of historical criticism. Phut and Lubim are not identical (Nahum iii. 9), and the Libyans may have been joined by other tribes in colonizing Libya. It is quite true that there is no direct evidence to identify the Lehabim with the Libyans; yet there seems a high probability that the words are only different forms of the same name—the former being the more ancient, the middle radical H being afterwards softened (as is not unusual in Hebrew, Gesenius, Thesar. p. 743, 360) into a quiescent. The Lehabim are not again mentioned in Scripture, but we find the Lubim connected with Mizram (2 Chron. xii. 8), and the tribes of Ethiopia and Somalia (3 Sam.) may therefore safely infer that the Lehabim were the ancient Lubim or Libyans, who perhaps first settled on the borders of the Nile, among or beside the Mizram; but, as they increased in number, migrated to the wide regions south-west, and occupied the vast territory known to classical geographers as Libya (Kaliouby, etc., see Journ. x. 18; see also Michaelis, Spicileg. Geogr.; Knobel Völkerkunde des Pents.). Dr. Beke maintains that the Lehabim, as well as the Mizram, were a people of north-western Arabia; but his views are opposed alike to the opinions of ancient and modern geographers, and his arguments do not appear of sufficient weight to command acceptance (Origines Biblicae, p. 167, 198 sq.). There can be no doubt that the Lubim are the same as the Reub or Lebû of the Egyptian inscriptions, and that from those Libyans and the Libyans derived their name. These primitive Libyans appear, in the period at which they are mentioned in these two historical sources, that is from the time of Memph, B.C. 1250, to that of Jeremiah's notice of them late in the 6th century B.C. and probably in the case of Daniel's, prophetically to the earlier part of the second century B.C. to have inhabited the northern part of Africa to the borders of Egypt, though latterly driven from the coast by the Greek colonists of the Cyrenaica, as is more fully shown under Libu. Geographically, the position of the Lehabim in the enumeration of the Mizrimates immediately before the Naphath-dairim suggests that they had retired to the westward of Egypt, and nearer to it, or not more distant from it than the tribes or peoples mentioned before them. See Mizram. Historically and ethnologically, the connection of the Reub and Libyans with Egypt and its peoples suggests their kindred origin with the Egyptians. See Liwa.

Lehi (Heb. Lechi, לְחֵि; in pause Lechi, לְכֵי; a dock or jaw-bone (usually with the art. יְרָה; Sept. Arx v. r. Arx), a place in the tribe of Judah where Samson achieved one of his single-handed victories over the Philistines (Judg. xv, 14, 19, in which last passages the Sept. translates σατυρος, Vulg. marrella). It contained an eminence—Ramath-lehi, and a spring of great and lasting repose (see Sir: 2, De fonte Scaronis, Lips. 1760)—en hak-kore (ver. 17). The name of the place before the conflict was evidently Lehi, as appears from verses 9 and 14; perhaps so called from the form of some hill or rock (Gesenius, Thesar. p. 782). After the slaughter of the Philistines, Samson, with a characteristic play upon the name, makes it descriptive of his signal and singular victory. Lehi is possibly mentioned in 2 Sam. xxxiii, 11—the relation of another encounter with the Philistines hardly less disastrous than that of Samson. The Heb. there has רָאָה, as if רָאָה, from the root רָאָה (Gesenius, Thesar. p. 470). In this sense the word very rarely occurs (see A. V. of Ps. lxxvii, 10, 30; lxxvii, 19). It else has the sense of "living, dwelling," the name of wild animals, which is adopted by the Sept. in this place, as remarked above. In ver. 18 it is again rendered "troop." In the parallel narrative of 1 Chron. (x, 13), the word דָּבָר, a "camp," is substituted. In the passage 2 Sam., it is rendered in the A. V. "a troop;" but in 1 Sam. xiii, 17, the root-definition becomes "to live;" which gives a new and certainly an appropriate sense. This reading first appears in Josephus (Ant. vii, 12, 4), who gives it "a place called Siagona"—the jaw—the word which he employs in the story of Samson (Ant. v, 6, 9). It is also given in the Complutensian Sept., and among modern interpreters by Bochart and Lubim; yet there seems a high probability that the words are only different forms of the same name—the former being the more ancient, the middle radical נ afterwards softened (as is not unusual in Hebrew, Gesenius, Thesar. p. 743, 360) into a quiescent. The Lehabim are again mentioned in Scripture, but we find the Lubim connected with Mizram (2 Chron. xii. 8), and the tribes of Ethiopia and Somalia (3 Sam.) may therefore safely infer that the Lehabim were the ancient Lubim or Libyans, who perhaps first settled on the borders of the Nile, among or beside the Mizram; but, as they increased in number, migrated to the wide regions south-west, and occupied the vast territory known to classical geographers as Libya (Kaliouby, etc., see Journ. x. 18; see also Michaelis, Spicileg. Geogr.; Knobel Völkerkunde des Pents.). Dr. Beke maintains that the Lehabim, as well as the Mizram, were a people of north-western Arabia; but his views are opposed alike to the opinions of ancient and modern geographers, and his arguments do not appear of sufficient weight to command acceptance (Origines Biblicae, p. 167, 198 sq.). There can be no doubt that the Lubim are the same as the Reub or Lebû of the Egyptian inscriptions, and that from those Libyans and the Libyans derived their name. These primitive Libyans appear, in the period at which they are mentioned in these two historical sources, that is from the time of Memph, B.C. 1250, to that of Jeremiah's notice of them late in the 6th century B.C. and probably in the case of Daniel's, prophetically to the earlier part of the second century B.C. to have inhabited the northern part of Africa to the borders of Egypt, though latterly driven from the coast by the Greek colonists of the Cyrenaica, as is more fully shown under Libu. Geographically, the position of the Lehabim in the enumeration of the Mizrimates immediately before the Naphath-dairim suggests that they had retired to the westward of Egypt, and nearer to it, or not more distant from it than the tribes or peoples mentioned before them. See Mizram. Historically and ethnologically, the connection of the Reub and Libyans with Egypt and its peoples suggests their kindred origin with the Egyptians. See Liwa.

Lehmann, Christian Abraham, a German theologian, was born at Tittenbock Jan. 4, 1735, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg (1754–98). In 1760 he became deacon, in 1764 pastor at Lockwitz, and in 1766 senior of the district of the Dresden diocese. He died Dec. 30, 1813. He spent his life in practical activity. He was remarkably successful in an attempt to hold prayer-meetings, connected with Bible instruction, thus influencing and affecting the heart in a time when the great majority of the pulpits of Germany were occupied by rationalism. Of the few books he composed, we mention Kunst Entwurf der Glaubenlehre für er- wachsene Kinder, etc. (1772, 8vo; new and enlarged edit., 1797, 8vo).—Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl. vol. ii, s. v.

Lehnberg, Magnus, a Swedish poet, noted as a pupil of the organ, was born in 1758, and became bishop of Linköping. He died in 1809.

Lehnin, Hermann von, a monk of the convent of that name, who has discussed about the history of the 13th century, as the author of a prophetic poem, in 100 Latin hexameter verses, concerning his convent and the house of Brandenburg, entitled Vaticinium Lehni- num. According to the legend, the MS was discovered in an old wall in the 17th century, by the elector; on the latter intended to build a palace on the site of the convent. The poem is written in the interest of the
LEIBNITZ

hierarchy; it deploys the heresy of the former house of Brandenburg in the ascendant house of Hohenzollern (the latter family adhering to Protestantism), and prophesies the downfall of the now ruling family, to be followed by the restoration of the unity of Germany and the reestablishment of the Jesuits. (The context of this poem is not, however, to be traced with any certainty further back than the year 1693.) It was first published in Lillienthal (Konigseb. 1723, 1741), then at Berlin and Vienna, 1745; Berlin, 1758; Leipzig, 1807; also in France, in 1827 and 1860, by W. Meinhold, with a metrical translation by Klopstock, 1844; C. Riosch, Stuttgart, 1849; Giebel, Die Lehensweise Weisung (Erfl., 1849); Guhrauer, Die Weisungen u. Lehnen (Bresl., 1850); M. Hefter, Geschichte des Klosters Lehnin (Brandenburg, 1881). Those who consider this poem a mere mystical-ly shaped narrative of past events, namely its author M. F. Seidell, assessor of the privy council († at Berlin in 1689); or Andrew Fromm, counsellor of the consistory († at Prague in 1688); or Nicolas von Zitzewitz, abbott of Huyseburg, who, they say, composed it about 1692; or the Jesuit Frederick Wolf, chaplain to the Austrian embassy at Berlin in 1685-86 († 1708); or Oliven, captain of cavalry at Stettin († 1727). See L. de Bouvoir, Extrait d'un manuscrit relatatif à la prophétie du frère St. de Lehnin (German transl, by W. von Schitzl, Wirzburg, 1847); J. A. Hoost, Die Weisungen des Manche H. z. Lehnin (Augusta, 1848); Plocher, Universal-Lexicon, viii, 273; Hamb. Archiv, Real-Encyklopädie, v, 757.

Leibnitz, Gottfried Wilhelm, Baron von—philosopher, theologian, jurist, historian, poet, mathematician, mechanician, naturalist, and votary of all arts and all sciences—was the most brilliant, profound, and versatile scholar of the century following the death of Des Cartes—perhaps of modern times. He is among the few who have earned the honors of all-embracing erudition—ultra progresi seftis est. As the opponent of Spinoza, Bayle, and Locke; as the conciliator of Plato and Aristotle; as the reverential follower of the discredited schoolmen; as the precursor of Kant, and as the vindicator of the "ways of God to man," Leibnitz occupies an equally eminent and important position in the history of philosophical opinion. His metaphysical speculations were, however, but a small portion of his labors. His greatest achievements in nearly all cases were the liberal recreations of his idle hours. He rendered all learning and nearly all knowledge tributary to his genius, and deserved the happy eulogy of Fontenelle, that "he drove all the sciences abreast." He reformed and enlarged old systems of doctrine, he added new parts, and considerably improved the old, he supplied them with keener instruments, he discovered new continents of study, and delineated them for future occupation and culture. Whatever region he visited in the wide circuit of his explorations was quickened into bloom and fruitage beneath his feet.

Sauebel Ddela tellas

Summiti foress.

Life.—Leibnitz was the son of Frederick Leibnitz, professor of ethicus in the University of Leipsic, and was born there on May 14, 1646. He was early placed at school. At six years of age he lost his father from whom he inherited a small fortune and an extensive library. This library inspired, moulded, and furnished forth his career. He buried himself in his young years amidst its volumes, and delighted in the unaided perusal of the ancient classics. His attention was not confined to the great masters of style, nor to linguistic pursuits. He read with like diligence poets, orators, jurists, travellers—works of science, medicine, philosophy, and general information. Nothing came amiss to his inappetible appetite, and his industrious industry. At fifteen he entered the University of Leipsic, and was directed by Jacobus Thomasius to mathematical and philosophical studies. He applied himself assiduously to the writings of Plato and Aristotle, and already, at the age of eighteen, was endeavoring to harmonize and combine their antagonistic systems. One year he spent at the University of Jenus, but he returned to his own city to prosecute his professional studies. Applying for the degree of doctor of law when he had scarcely attained his twentieth year, he was refused the diploma on the pretext of his youth. From the Church of St. Peter, in the diocese of Altstadt, which tendered him a professorship; but this was declined. To this period belong his Ars Combinatoria—a curious adaptation of Raymond Lully's Art of Meditation and Logical Invention—and his Mathematical Demonstration of the Existence of God. His estimate in declining life of the greatness of the universe may be seen from his fourth letter to Remond de Montmort in 1714.

From Altstadt Leibnitz proceeded to Nuremberg, where, in consequence of an application filled with cabalistic terms, unmeaning to himself and to every one else, he was admitted into an association for the pursuit of the philosopher's stone, and was appointed its secretary. Half a century before, Des Cartes had been similarly seduced in the same regions. From these visionary occupations the young alchemist was soon withdrawn by the baron De Boineburg, chancellor of the elector of Mayence, who recommended him to prosecute history and jurisprudence, and invited him to Frankfort, with the promise of preferment. He illustrated his change of abode by publishing Nova methode discendi docenbre jurisprudentiae (1667), in which was appended a Catalogus Declaratorum. The uncomfortable treatment and lack of juridical knowledge led to needed reforms. Leibnitz continued his efforts in this direction by an essay, De Corporis Juris recognoscendo. He contemplated at this time a new and enlarged edition of Alstot's Encyclopaedia, and never abandoned, but never commenced his devotions to the vocation of a lawyer.

Leibnitz came to Boineburg, at whose instance he composed a diplomatic exposition of the claims of Philip William, duke palatine of Neuburg, to the vacant throne of Poland. He declined an invitation to the duke's court, remained at Frankfort, and brought out a new edition of the forgotten work of Marius Nitzius, De Veris Principis et Veras Rationes Philosophic平. He added notes, and prefixed two dissertations; one on The Philosophical Style of Composition, the other On Writing the History of Philosophy. In the latter he treated of Des Cartes, Aristotle, and the schoolmen, and on the mode of harmonizing the Peripatetic with later philosophy. All his writings exhibit pronounced Cartesianism. His first approaches to physical science were made in his Theorin Motus Absci. In 1677 the famous Academici Trinibus per nova argumentum defensae, directed against Wis- sowsatius, a Polish Unitarian. Thus, say the writers in the Biographie Universelle, "each year brought a new title of glory to Leibnitz, and gave him rank among the masters of the different sciences." He was already a counsellor of the chancery of Mayence. At length his desire of seeing Paris was gratified. Boineburg sent him thither as tutor to his sons, and in charge of some public affairs. He was at once admitted into the most brilliant circles of society. He became a favorite of the reign of Louis XIV. Here he made the acquaintance of Huysgens, and improved the calculating machine of Pascal. He was also induced to aid in preparing the Latin classics in usum Delphiini. On the death of Boineburg (1679) he passed to England, where he was received with distinction by Boyle, Oldenburg, and other members of the recent Royal Society. Intelligence of the demise of the elector of Mayence reached him in London. He was thus deprived of the means of support. Flattering proposals had been made to him to return to the Continent, but he had been diverted from them by his father's wishes. In his anxiety and distress, he was appointed by the duke of Brunswick a counsellor, with an adequate pension, and with the privilege of remaining abroad. He re-
turned to Paris, and remained there fifteen months. In 1676 he revisited England, and thence proceeded to Hanover by way of Holland. Here he entered upon his duties as a councillor, and with a new confidence for a man of state!—employed himself in arranging and enlarging the library of his protector, and improving the drainage of his mines. His services were rewarded with a considerable salary, but the duke soon died (1679). He found other employment, for he was never idle, and composed a treatise on The Rights of Ambassadors, arguing the question of States' Rights, which has assumed such prominence in Germany in recent years. The new duke of Brunswick engaged Leibnitz to compose the History of the House of Brunswick. To prepare for the task, he went to Germany, and studied in the leading universities, learned, exploring monasteries, ransacking libraries, examining old charters, deciphering mouldy manuscripts, and transcribing worm-eaten documents. Whatever he undertook he projected on a scale proportionate to his own vast comprehension and various knowledge, with little regard to the legitimate magnitude of the subject, or to the brevity of human life. He brought back from his wanderings an abundant supply of diplomatic materials, which he arranged, and from which he extracted extensive works, sometimes having little direct connection with the theme, others, the close and intimate connections of the events and the men. These collections were the Codex Juris Gentium Diplomaticus, of which the first volume was issued in 1680, in folio; the second in 1700, with the title Missiones Codizæ. Valuable as were the documents, the most valuable part of the work was the Introduction. In the same year, the principium and principles of natural and international law, and sketching the reform of civil jurisprudence ultimately achieved by Napoleon. Other works of wide comprehension were due to these archaeological researches: the demonstration of the descent of the Guepach line from the Italian house of Este; the Annales Historiae (1688, 2 vols. 4to, containing a multitude of unpublished papers), and the Scriptores Rerum Brunensis. The first volume of this historical collection appeared in 1707, folio; the second in 1710; the third in 1711. These extensive accumulations were only materials to be employed for The History of the House of Brunswick. In the Introduction to the Corpus Scriptorum Leibnitz discussed everything connected with the family, the realm, and the country of the Guepach, investigating the traditions of the early tribes that dwelt on the Elbe and the Weser, traces of the migration of the Germanic peoples, the names of the ancient authors in which they were mentioned, and examining their language and the mixture of their dialects. It inaugurated ethnological science and comparative philology. His inquiries, however, stopped short in the Thracians, and mainly about the tribes that inhabited the primitive condition of the abode of the race. This preliminary outline is given in the Protogaea (1683), which founded the modern sciences of geology and physical geography. It is interesting to compare this fragmentary sketch with the Vulgar Errors of Sir Thomas Browne, and to note the immense stride which was made by Leibnitz. Of the main work, to which this essay was to be introductory—the History of the House of Brunswick—only a brief and imperfect outline was ever drawn by the accomplished author. It was published after his death by Ecard, in the Acta Eruditorum, in 1717.

These historical labors were the real task of the life of Leibnitz. But the long years of plodding industry were abundantly filled with other enterprises, and it is to them that his reputation is mainly due. For in his other enterprises—philosophical, mathematical, and scientific—he was a true and skilful discoverer. The Annales Scientiarum et Historiarum—a scientific and philosophical periodical—was established (vol. i, Leipzig, 1682). To this he contributed largely, and in its pages appeared many of his most luminous discoveries and suggestions. In it was published his Meditâtiones De Veritate et Ideâ (1684), proposing his modifications of the Cartesian concept of knowledge. In the same year, and in the same work, he appeared his rules for the Differential Calculus, the germ of which had been indicated in his Theoria Motus Astræi thirty years before. He gave no demonstrations: these were inferred directly. The formulae were promulgated by the Bernoulli brothers. In 1687 the world was enriched by Sir Isaac Newton's Principia Mathematica Philosophica Naturalia, which employed a mathematical device closely analogous to the Calculus of Leibnitz. A bitter controversy in regard to priority of discovery and originality of invention sprung up between the partisans of these great mathematicians. It is scarcely yet terminated. The rigorous and repeated examination of the question justifies the conclusion that both had independently discovered corresponding procedures.

The conception of dynamical science continually occupied the mind of Leibnitz, and was the natural tendency of his philosophical method. The Acta Eruditorum for 1683 contained his Specimen Dynamicum; and the following year, 1684, appeared his great essay—Principes et Principia of the Systema Naturæ, his Systema Naturæ et Communicatio Substantiarum, tenuique Unio inter Corpus et Animam intercedente. In the latter he propounded his celebrated dogma of Pre-established Harmony. The connection between mind and body, between force and matter, between the nature naturae and the nature naturata, is still an insoluble enigma, after all the speculations of transcendental philosophy, and all the researches of modern philosophy and modern chemistry. We still grope for life in the dust and ashes of death. The veil of Isis has not been raised. Spencer, and Huxley, and Tyndall, and à la genæ omne, are compelled to acknowledge their inability to penetrate the mystery of the connection. However untenable, however hazardous, however absurd, the Pre-established Harmony of Leibnitz may be, it was a beautiful dream, generated in some sort by the atmosphere of the time having the characteristics of an ingenious attempt to escape from the brutal mechanism of Des Cartes, the pantheism of Spinoza, the puppetry of Malebranche, and the materialism of the Sensationalists.

The doctrine was illustrated, explained, and expanded in the Theses Philosophicae, and in many other works. So much, indeed, of the philosophy of Leibnitz was communicated only by occasional papers and correspondence, so little by systematic works, that it is impossible to trace the course and development of his views in any brief notice. His two formal metaphysical works belong to the last period of his life. The Nouveau Esprit, in reply to Locke, answering the English philosopher chapter by chapter, and section by section, were completed in 1704, but were not published for more than half a century. They were withheld from the press in consequence of Locke's death in that year, and were first published by Rospé in 1763. The Théodicée, which was designed as a refutation of Bayle, and was undertaken at the request of the queen of Prussia, was completed two years after the death of that princess and of Bayle, but was not published till 1710, six years before Leibnitz's own death. Like the Nouveau Esprit, the Théodicée was composed in French, of which language Leibnitz was a perfect master. It is exquisitely written, and is the finest specimen of philosophical literature since the Dialogues of Plato. A very large portion of the metaphysical and physical writings of Leibnitz have been transmitted to us only by the voluminous correspondence of the philosopher.
treatises, his philosophical and scientific labors were multi-
titudinous and multifarious. He was a diligent and laborious man in
his mind ranged with equal rapidity and splendor over the whole domain of knowledge. Noth-
ing was too vast for his comprehension, too dark for his penetration, too humble for his notice. He corresponded
with Pelisson on the conciliation and union of the Protestant and
Catholic Churches, and transferred the society he had formed in
the court of Louis XIV, which had been established in Paris, to
bringt in connection with Bossuet. With Burnet he discussed the project of uniting the Anglicans and
the Continental Protestants. He expended much time over the invention of a universal language. He wrote
extensively on etymology, and the improvement of ciphers and
languages. He was moreover a prolific author, and his books were
severely employed. Medicine, botany, and other branches of natural history at-
tracted his earnest regards. He addressed a memoir to Louis XIV on the Conquest and Colonization of Egypt,
with the view to establishing a Supremacy over Europe.
The age of chivalry and the Crusades was not over with
him. He certainly pointed out the road to Napoleon.
He was deeply interested in the accounts of the Chi-
nese, and in the Jesuit missions for their conversion.
He wrote much upon the philosophia sinensis, in accord-
crance with the delusions of the age, he engaged in an
arduous controversy with Samuel Clarke, in
which the highest and most abstruse riddles of meta-
physics were discussed. From his historical researches he
drew the materials for an instructive essay, De Ori-
gine Francorum (1710); and so various was the range of
to his mind that he was able to assume the attitude of
attention to the political position and rights of English freehold-
ers. His mind, like the sun, surveyed all things, and
brightened all that it shone upon. This enumeration of his
inquiries gives a very imperfect view of either the number or the variety of his productions. The cata-
ologue of his writings fills thirty-three pages in the 4th
dition of his works by Dutens.
The literary fecundity of Leibnitz was equalled by his activity in promoting the practical interests of intel-
ligence. His correspondence linked together the schol-
ars of all countries, furnished a bond of connection be-
teen all learning and science, and created for the first
time a universal republic of letters. He thus communi-
cated an impulse to the dissemination of knowledge not
less potent than that given by Bacon's New Atlantis,
and by the institution of the Royal Society of England.
Of this society he was for many years the president, and
the chief of the foreign associates of the Academy of
Sciences of France. He suggested to the first king of
Prussia the foundation of the Royal Academy of Berlin,
aided in its establishment, and became its first president.
The society was at first very active, and Leibnitz was like
institution, but the project was frustrated by the wars in Poland, for his zeal for
liberal studies was contemporaneous with the conquer-
ing campaigns of Charles XII of Sweden. When the Berlin Academy was endangered by the death of its
royal founder, Leibnitz thought to open a new home for
learning by establishing a similar society at Vienna
(1713). The design was not carried into effect. The
exhaustion of the finances by the War of the Spanish
Succession, which was scarcely cleared, was unfavorable
to the scheme. Leibnitz was warmly received, was
encouraged by prince Eugene, was created a baron of
the empire, and was appointed aulic counsellor, with a sal-
ary of 2000 florins. Two years previously he had been
consulted at Torgau, in regard to the civilization of
Russia, by Peter the Great, who had made him a coun-
seller of the Russian empire, and had conceded a hand-
some pension to him. All the while he retained his histo-
igrapher of Brunswick. It is reported that the elector of
Brunswick was much dissatisfied with the slow pro-
gress of the history of his house. When the elector became
king of England (1714), Leibnitz hastened from Vienna
to pay his respects to the monarch, but his new majesty had
departed for his new dominions. He met the sovereign,
however, on his return to his paternal domain. The
years of Leibnitz were now drawing to an end. He suf-
fered from acute rheumatism and other painful disor-
ners. Having much acquaintance with medicine, he
tried novel remedies upon himself, with no good result.
He prolonged his studies almost to his last days, and
died tranquilly, with scarcely a word, on Nov. 14, 1716,
reaching the age of "three score and ten years."
His monument at the gates of Hanover, erected by king
Georges, is celebrated. Leibnitz was then forty years old.

Leibnitz was of medium height, and slender. He
had a large head, black hair, which soon left him bald,
and small eyes. He was very short-sighted, but his
vision was otherwise sound to the end of his days. His
contribution was remarkable. He had reached old
age without serious malady, notwithstanding the strain
to which it was subjected. He drank moderately, but
ate much, especially at supper, and immediately after
this heavy meal retired to rest. He was wholly irregu-
lar in eating. He took his food wherever he was hun-
gry, usually in his library, without abandoning his
books. Frequently he took his only repose in his chair,
and occasionally pursued his reflections or researches,
without change of place, for weeks—Fontenelle says for
months. He read everything—good books and bad books, masterpieces as well as trash. He
tracted largely from the authors perused, and made co-
pious annotations upon them. His memory was so te-
nacious that he rarely recurred to these Adversaria.
He sought intercourse with men of all occupations and
of all grades of intelligence. Every work of God or
to man was a little comment of Leibnitz. He деятельly
stretched forth his hand to everything—the election of
a king of Poland, the revival of the Crusades, the con-
version of the heathen, the reunion of the churches, the
codification of laws, the history of a dynasty and people,
the constitution of the new sciences, the derivation of words, the invention of a cal-
culating machine, the projection of a universal language,
the construction of windmills, or the improvement of
pleasure carriages. The extent of his correspondence
was amazing, and may be conjectured from the list of
distinguished correspondents called by Brucker from the
simpler catalogues of Feller and Ludovici. The
courtesy of his epistles was as notable as their multitude.
They were scattered over all civilized nations, and were
on an endless diversity of topics, but they were uni-
formly marked by deference for the person and opin-
ions of the addressee, as he was a man of an amiable
and cheerful nature. It was cultivated and refined by
intercourse with princes, and statesmen, and philoso-
 phers, and scholars, and also with the humblest classes of
society. It was confirmed by his belief that no hon-
or was to be procured without labor; and that no
thing was easy and abundant—as full of charm as of instruc-
tion. It may be conceded to Gibbon that completeness
was sacrificed by Leibnitz to universality of acquire-
ment; but, when all his gifts and accomplishments are
embraced in one view, he may be justly destined to merit
the eulogy of his French editor, Jacques: "In point of
speculative philosophy he is the greatest intellect of
modern times; and had but two equals, but no superior,
in antiquity."

Leibnitz was never married. He contemplated the
experiment once, when he was fifty years of age ("de
e quo semel tantum in vita, e Gate jam provecto, sed
frusta cognitavit"). The lady asked time for reflection. The
opportunity for reflection cooled the ardor of the
philosopher—the match was not decreed by any pre-
established harmony, and the suit was not presented.
The religious view of Leibnitz was orthodox, but he
was negligent of the offices of religion. In his efforts
to promote Christian unity, and to recognise only "one
Lord, one faith, one baptism," he may have felt too keenly
the defects of rival creeds, so as to accept from none the
truth which he held as the only possible. His words
were not always his thoughts.

Philosophy. — The mathematical and scientific, the
historical and juridical, the linguistic and miscellaneous speculations of Leibnitz have been noticed very inade-
quately, but as fully as comports with the design of this Cyclopædia. His philosophy awaits and merits more precise critical censure. It cannot be praised that all his labors, however remote in appearance from philosophical speculation, were inspired and animated by his own peculiar scheme of doctrine, and were really fragmentary applications of his distinctive principles. Hence proceedings toward the organization of a mathematical science manifestly found in all the departments of knowledge handled by him, and which was rewarded by numerous great triumphs in so many and such dissimilar directions. When details are neglected, the whole body of his writings is found to be connected by many lines of interdependence, and indirectly, by many lines of interdependence, and is seen that the system in the general scheme of the Leibnitzian philosophy. Leibnitz nowhere presents a symmetrical exposition of his whole doctrine. His Monodology, or Principia Philosophiae, seu Theses in Gratiam Principiis Ergaestis, furnishes a clue to his system, but it is only a slender clew. Even if the Principia de la Nature et de la Grâce be added as a supplement, the great subject matter is still the very substance of the system, and must be painfully gathered from elaborate treatises, from occasional essays, from scientific papers, from passing hints, from explanations of controverted points, from elusions of obscure or misprinted statements, from implicit arguments in his particular writings. Here a principle is thrown out, there its applications are illustrated; in one place an erroneous conclusion or a mistaken inference is corrected, in another, or in many others, fresh limitations or further expansions of a hypothesis are proposed. These different members of the imperfect whole are scattered over months or years in the life of the author, or by hundreds of pages, or whole volumes in his collected works. It required the patient diligence of Christian Wolff to combine, complete, and organize in cumbrous quartos leaves scattered like the leaves of the Sibyl. Leibnitz had, indeed, no system to propound; he had no thought of promulgating a system or of establishing a sect. Yet his mind was thoroughly systematized. The system which resulted from perfect coherence of thought was latent in his own mind from the beginning, and was consistently evolved as the occasion demanded. The system was spread over the greater part of his several parts. The highest intellect attaches itself instinctively to a principle, and allows accident to determine how far and when its consequences shall be unraveled. Leibnitz only desired to reconcile the opinions of his various predecessors; to correct the errors and to supply the deficiencies which he saw to be in the theory of his chief leader, Des Cartes, and to redress the evils which had flowed logically from those errors. The main design of his profound investigations was to give precision, harmony, and veracity to the immense stock of his own acquisitions and meditations. Had he reached the years of Methuselah he might have proposed a system, but it would have been simply the reiteration of Cartesianism, or the conciliation of Plato and Aristotle, of Buenaventura and Aquinas. It must be remembered that, of his two systematic treatises, one was published towards the close of his life, the other not till half a century after his death. His natural disposition apparently inclined him to accumulate knowledge for its own sake, and to reflect upon his acquisitions for his own satisfaction. He seemed to be impelled to publication only by some accidental stimulus. His whole life was a discipline and preparation for what he never found time to execute—never, perhaps, seriously thought of executing—a vast encyclopedia embracing all that could be known by man. The hints thrown out in his long career, apt as they are for the instruction of a conscientious and contemplative mind, are scattered over the whole globe of speculative knowledge in an undeveloped system, which is revealed by glimmerings as the need or provocation of the moment inspired.

Leibnitz was essentially a Cartesian. He was Cartesian in his method, and Cartesian in his fundamental principles. He never revolted from his great teacher. He pursued the Cartesian mode of analysis and abstraction, he employed the Cartesian procedure by mathematical demonstration, he rejected from presumptive principles, he accepted the Cartesian invicuum of truth; but he rendered them more precise, and was not wholly negligent of experience. He also rehabilitated the Scholastic or Aristotelian logic. He endeavored to combine with the dominant doctrine all that seemed capable of elucidation, all that seemed not false in all the schemes that he rejected. His imagination was too bold and too active to permit him to be the servile follower of any master, and his perspicacity was too acute to overlook the fatal defects of the principles and conclusions of Des Cartes. The main errors to be corrected sprung from the distinction made by the French reformer between mind and matter. According to his theory, the one could not act upon the other. The intelligent and the material universe were thus hopelessly divorced. Mind was pure thought; matter was mere extension; the very substance of the two in the phenomena of existence was due to divine assistance. See Des Cartes. Beasts were machines galvanized into the semblance of voluntary action by the intervention of divine power. Every movement or act of the mind was a mental motion of the mind. All thought, all mental action must be an effusion, an effect, or a manifestation of the one sole Intelligence.

The distinction of minds was an impossibility. To Leibnitz the want of any principium individuationum—that old war-cry of the schoolmen—was apparent. He discussed this topic in a public thesis before he was seventeen (May 30, 1668, Opera, tom. ii, part i, p. 400, ed. Dutens). He ascribed entitativae activity to matter, and a distinct entity to each individual mind. He regarded the human mind as an assemblage of dormant capacities (naturalia), to be called into action by the stimulation of sensations from without, and of promptings from within. He departed so far from the teachings of Des Cartes that he ascribed soul and reason to brutes, and in some sort to all matter also (Leibnizianus, c. Opera, t. vi, part i, p. 315; comp. § clxxxii, p. 331; see Bayle, Dict. Hist. Crit. His own theory, though intended to correct the errors and improve the deficiencies which he found in the theory of his chief leader, Des Cartes, and to redress the evils which had flowed logically from those errors, was the result of the most profound investigations to give precision, harmony, and veracity to the immense stock of his own acquisitions and meditations. Had he reached the years of Methuselah he might have proposed a system, but it would have been simply the reiteration of Cartesianism, or the conciliation of Plato and Aristotle, of Buenaventura and Aquinas. It must be remembered that, of his two systematic treatises, one was published towards the close of his life, the other not till half a century after his death. His natural disposition apparently inclined him to accumulate knowledge for its own sake, and to reflect upon his acquisitions for his own satisfaction. He seemed to be impelled to publication only by some accidental stimulus. His whole life was a discipline and preparation for what he never found time to execute—never, perhaps, seriously thought of executing—a vast encyclopedia embracing all that could be known by man. The hints thrown out in his long career, apt as they are for the instruction of a conscientious and contemplative mind, are scattered over the whole globe of speculative knowledge in an undeveloped system, which is revealed by glimmerings as the need or provocation of the moment inspired.

From such broken and dispersed lights his philosophy must be divined.
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LEIBNITZ

The motion attributed to these primordial particles is
due to an indwelling force. Thus, from his definition
of matter as the union of motion with extension, Leib-
nitz was led to recognise as the primary units of the
universe an infinity of simple elementary substances
or forces, which he designated monads. These monads
have some of the characteristics of Plato, of Democ-
ritus and Epicurus, and also to the Idea of Plato; but,
unlike the Epicurean atoms, they are not solidus, though
they are eterna. They are not material, but they are
the souls of matter. This vaporous dematerialization
of matter may be illustrated by Plotinus' definition of
matter by the 'subtraction' of the aggregation of all the pro-
properties of specific body. Is not the theory of Boesvich,
that matter is only an assemblage of points of force, an
adaptation of Leibnitz's conception? Has not the the-
ory of Boesvich won admiration and hesitating ap-
proval from many distinguished men of science?
The consequences of the rectification of the Cartesian
conception of matter do not end here. As the motions
or manifestations of force constitute the difference be-
 tween the several simple substances or monads, when
there is no diversity of motion there is no difference of
properties, and no distinction of nature. Hence follows
another dogma of Leibnitz, the identity of indiscerni-
bles. The monads are infinite in number, but they are
unlike, and present an infinite diversity of forces. There
is also an infinite variety of gradations, from the lowest
atoms of matter up through human souls to the supreme
monads. In fact, the image of the universe is the mirror
of the universe of things; each possesses spontaneous
energy or life within itself, and, in consequence of these
characteristics, each has its own peculiar kind of reason,
passive in matter unorganized, rudimentary in crystals
and vegetable existence, unreflecting and instinctive in
brutes, self-conscious and introspective in man, and
ascending through numberless orders of angelic intelli-
gences. As motion is the principle of quickness ("the
ghosts of defunct" terms must be evoked), force is an es-
cential quality of all existence, and is as imperishable
as the monad is indestructible, unless both are annihi-
lated by the same Power by which they were created.
Here is another anticipation of recent scientific deduc-
tions. As these forces are immutable, their separate
spheres of action must be exempt from intrusion. There
may be composition of motions, or equilibrium of au-
tagomisms, but there can be no interaction or reciprocal
influence.
Here presents itself the ancient insoluble enigma,
How can bodies act upon other? How can matter
be moulded or modified by vital action? How can it be
made to bend or be the instrument of the will of God?
How can it be conjoined with spirit in any form of
animate existence? Des Cartes so completely con-
tradistinguished mind and matter that it was impossi-
bile for mind to act upon matter or matter upon mind—
"frustra fero dicere nemo, Leibnitz so completely
assimilated material to spiritual existence, giving
body to spirit, and spirit to body (Thkod. § 124), that
they were indistinguishable except by their properties
—the one possessing perception only, the other having
operation alone. There could be no intercommunication,
no reciprocal influence between them, or between any
monads. To cut rather than to lose the intellectual
knot, which was only rendered more intricate, Leibnitz
proposed an explanation in his Systema Naturae (1688).
It is his celebrated doctrine of Pre-established Harmony.
The monads are forces, sometimes active, sometimes
suspended, παθητικός and ἐνεργητικός, governed by their
own inherent tendencies, and without power of acting
upon each other; but their separate actions are so fore-
known on one side, and predetermined on the other, in
the moment of creation, that their concurrent evolutions
reciprocally correspond, and effectuate all the phenomena
of the universe. Mind, therefore, does not cohere
matter, nor does one form of matter control another, but
the inclination of the will and the disposition of the
matter, or the diverse evolutions of different monads,
conjoin independently and without connection in the
production of one result, in consequence of the pread-
saption of all the elementary forces to that particular
change, at that particular moment, in that particular
composition, and with that particular consequence. Du-
navie, which is Leibnitz's name for the escape of
one of two clocks so regulated and adjusted as to
strike the hours in unison. It may be an illustration; it is
scarcely an elucidation of the doctrine. The agreement
is only in time and performance: there is no concord-
ance of dissimilar processes. The machinery of Divine
Assistance, which Des Cartes used to harmonize the ex-
planation of the phenomena of animal life, was general-
ized by Leibnitz, applied to the whole order of things,
and transferred to the original of all creation. There is
thus much more than a poetic symbolism—there is a
distinctive philosophical fact involved in his fine ex-
pression that "the universe is the knowledge of God."
This coordination of concurrences, apt for each occa-
sion, between monadic developments, each of which is
determined by its own inherent force, which is will in
intelligences and nature in material things, makes the
whole machine of the universe self-contained, self-
seen and prearranged correspondences. It is the con-
tinual evolution of the immeasurable plan entertained
by the Creator before the beginning of the ages, and
brought into act at the appointed time and in the ap-
pointed order, with mathematical precision, though be-
Yond this, the task of science and the resource of
Leibnitz. Certain fabrics are curiously woven with colors so arranged in
the yarn that when the weaving is performed each col-
our falls with exact propriety into its due place, and con-
tributes accurately to form, to tint, to perfect the com-
pletion of the whole. So this is the system of pre-established
harmony, "the web of creation is woven in the loom of
time," with threads prepared from the beginning to fall
into the requisite connections, and to produce a fore-
known design. Each concurrent movement arrives at
the appropriate time and place in consequence of the
whole antecedent series of changes in each case, for no-
where is there any solution of continuity, and he prese-
nt is always the progeny of the past and the parent of
the future. The innumerable lines of evolution conten-
tinuous intercirculate with each other, but never are blend-
ed together. It will readily be perceived that the whole
intricate phantasmagoria of these unconnected monads
is only a grand and beautiful variation of the Cartesian
hypothesis, and is neither more valid nor more satisfac-
tory than the fantasy it was designed to supplant.
This doctrine of pre-established harmony is in per-
fect concert with the intimate intuition of man,
how the will of God to man, if it did not necessitate his theological
expositions. The Théodicée is the most exquisite, the
most brilliant, the most profound, the most learned, and,
in some respects, the most satisfactory of all treatises of
philosophical theology. Many of its conclusions are
either true, or as near the truth as the human intellect
can attain in such inquiries. Others are merely con-
jectural, and are sometimes fantastic, as they lie beyond
the domain of possible knowledge. Several of its posi-
tions have furnished pretexts for sweeping censures;
but in such speculations error is inevitable, and the
error opens the way for a host of pernicious and unde-
signed heresies. The most notable and characteristic
of Leibnitz's theological dogmas, which provoked the
malicious wit of Voltaire's Candide, is intimately asso-
ciated with the explanation of the constitution of
monads. This is the theory known as Optimism. With-
out absolutely asserting that "Whatever is, is best," it
alleges that the actual world is the best of all possible
worlds, despite of acknowledged evils and defects. This
is supposed to be proved, among other evidences, by the
Leibnitzian principle of the best of all possible worlds, if
any better world had been possible, it is reasonable to
suppose that it would have been selected by God in
preference to that which He actually created. The acute
conceptions, the ingenious arguments, the various illustrations, the abundant analogies by which this thesis is maintained, elaborated, and adorned, can receive here only their merited tribute of admiration. When God looked upon the work of each of the six days of creation, "He saw that it was good." More than this it is not given man to know: "that which is wanting cannot be numbered." But, if all the conceptions, if all the actions occur by divine preadaptation, it must be presumed that this is the best of worlds. There is wonderful coherence in the views of Leibnitz, interrupted and fragmentary as they are their exposition. This dialectical consistency is so perfect, and in its evolution so splendid and imposing; that even the last and highest in the subsequent construction and in its structure, the charm of a dream of the imagination. Nothing approaches it in magnitude but the ideal universe of Plato.

Of course, if this is the best of possible worlds, and if its phenomena are determined by the divine preordination or preorganization, evil, too apparent everywhere, must be merely contingent—a negative characteristic, a monopoly in itself. Leibnitz accordingly regards evil simply as imperfection—the privation of good. God is perfect: anything less than God must be imperfect. All limits are within the God; imperfection is defect of the good—is evil. The evil increases in quality and in degree with each remove from the perfection of the Supreme Existence. Hence, in this best of worlds, the taint of evil is over the whole creation:

"The trall of the serpent is over it all."

All this may be admitted, but it affords only an inadequate explanation. It does not justify the retribution which is merited by all evil: it does not recognize the positive character of evil as the violation of the divine law and order; it hardly permits the notion of such violation. Leibnitz denies the existence of physical evil except as a consequence of moral evil; and moral evil consists in voluntary increase of imperfection, in wilful estrangement from the Supreme Monad. Even thus, no sufficient reason can be assigned for ascribing sin, and for attaching a material or moral penalty to what is the result of a natural and inevitable imperfection. This defect in the system is clearly pointed out by Kant.

The unfathomable immensity of the creation can be but dimly apprehended by the finite and fallible mind of man. The mighty plan and purpose of God cannot be comprehended within the compass of human intelligence. "We see as through a glass darkly." Schemes of the universe framed from broken and darting glimpses become more delusive as they become more systematic. Leibnitz's intuitive principles, abstract analysis, and scholastic reduction were peculiarly apt to produce hallucinations.

Analysis for the discovery of ultimate abstractions; intuition for the acceptance of clear, distinct, and adequate ideas; the principle of contradiction as the test of verity; the principle of the sufficient reason as the canon of actuality—these are the metaphysical principles or postulates of Leibnitz. The resulting philosophy, both in conception and in construction, is exposed to "such tricks as hath strong imagination," and wants firm and assured foundation. It is a complex fantasy, a mathematical romance, a universe of shadows. Still, it is marked by wonderful acuteness, logical coherence, and purity of spirit. It preludes, if it does not anticipate, the main doctrines of Kant, and is the fruitful parent of all the subsequent philosophy of Germany.

This exposition presents the leading tenets, the ideas most celebrated in the philosophy of Leibnitz, but it affords no image of the splendid completeness of the entire theory, in which God is presented as the first beginning and the last end—the Alpha and Omega of the whole order of things in time and out of time. Nor does it do justice to the vigorous thought, the depth, the penetration, the comprehensive intelligence, the keen penetration, the exhaustless learning, the wealth of knowledge, the variety of illustration, the fervent and lofty morality, which give grace, and dignity, and grandeur to the whole and to all its parts. \textit{Edids. quae a me ita censurata retinui.} Fuller information must be sought from his own extensive works, and from the elucidations afforded by the numerous commentators on them.


\textbf{Leidradt}, a noted Roman Catholic prelate, probably a Bavarian, flourished in the 8th century. He was librarian to Charlemagne until 798, when he was made archbishop of Lyons. He was sent soon after by Charlemagne, together with the bishop of Orleans and other prelates, into the southern provinces of France, to suppress by moral means the spreading heresy of Adoptionism, and they succeeded in bringing the chief teacher of this doctrine, Felix, to acknowledge his error before the council held at Aix in 798. In 800 he was again successful with his co-laborers in restoring 20,000 Adoptionists. The zeal which he everywhere displayed appears in a letter written to Charlemagne not long before the latter's death. He writes: "I have done my best to increase the number of those who have established the Psalm service after the model of that observed in your palace, and have erected singing-
schools by which the instruction may be continued. I have reading-schools where not only the appointed services are repeated, but where the holy Scriptures in general are studied and explained, and in which are those who understand the spiritual meaning not only of the Gospels, but also of the prophets, the books of Samuel, and the Psalms. I have also, as far as possible transcribed for the churches in Lyons, procured vestments and other necessary appointments for divine service, and have repaired the churches." After Charlemagne's death, in the subscription to whose will the name of Ledre flick appears, he resigned the bishopric and continued the character of Masterlandis, where he died. Neither the year of his death nor of his birth are known. He wrote in a clear and concise style some works which have since been edited. Of special value is a treatise of his on baptism, which was published by Malon (Amser, vol. ii). See Herzog, Real-Encyclop. art. Baluze; Wetzer u. Wetzer, Kirchen-Lex. vol. vi, s. v.

Leifchild, John, D.D., an eminent English Independent minister, was born in 1780 of Methodist parentage, and was brought up, and began to preach among the Methodists; but afterwards embracing Calvinistic opinions, it was impossible for him to continue preaching among them, so he was advising by John Bunting, then the junior preacher in the circuit, to seek other associations. Accordingly, in 1804, he entered Hoxton Academy, but he retained through life a friendly feeling for the friends of his youth, and profited largely by what he learned among them. He died in June, 1863. Without possessing any very extraordinary natural endowments, he attained by faithful, earnest, and diligent labor a most successful and honorable career, and his life is a noble example of what may be effected by the right cultivation of the powers a man possesses within himself. He was remarkable in character, which he cultivated with great fidelity in pastoral attention, powerful in the pulpit, he filled every chapel he occupied, built up every Church he was the pastor of, and, when enfeebled by age, retired from his work laden with honors, and not without very substantial love and gratitude of those whom he had served in the Gospel. One of the deacons of Caverham Chapel states that, during the twenty-three years of his ministry there, more than a hundred persons had been brought to decision and added to the church through his faithful ministry. The catholic spirit of Dr. Leifchild was almost as pronounced in his character as his intense and pervading earnestness. He was well known and well liked by Christians of various denominations, with whom he mingled freely, and whom he loved for his truth's sake. See J. B. Leifchild, John, D.D., Memorials (1878), 1876; Leifchild, Personal Characteristics (Lond, 1860); Leifchild, Metropolitan Pulpit (1839), ii, 152; Pen Pictures of Popular English Preachers (1852), p. 130; Allibone, Dict. of British and Amer. Authors, vol. iii, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Leigh, Edward, a learned English layman, was born in 1602; and was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford. He was a member of the Long Parliament, but was expelled on account of his intercession in behalf of the life of King Charles. He was also a member of the Assembly of Divines, and held the office of parlimentary general. He died in 1671. Edward Leigh wrote largely. Of his Greek works, one of the best is Critic Sacra (1689, 4to, and often reprinted). His Latin works, which not only gives the literal sense of every word in the Old and New Testaments, but enriches the definitions with philological and theological notes. It was held in high esteem until supplanted by the more fundamental works of later Hebrew and exegiographers. He also wrote Annotations on the New Testament, in which sound and judicious, and other theological works of considerable value, See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, ii, 1079.

Leigh, Sir Egerton, an English nobleman, who flourished towards the close of the last century, is noted for his pietistic and charitable acts. He was a member of the "London Missionary Society" from its very infancy (1795), as he was, indeed, the friend of every cause connected with the glory of God and the good of souls. "He devoted," says Morison (Fathers and Founders of the London Miss. Soc. p. 584), "much of his time, property, and influence to the spread of evangelical religion both at home and abroad." He was so zealous in the cause of his divine Master as necessarily to merge the baronet in the humble preacher of the cross of Christ.

Leigh, Ezekiel, D.D., an eminient minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Perquimans County, N. C., Nov. 23, 1795, was converted in 1817, joined the Virginia Conference in 1818, was set off with the N. C. Conference in 1836, was a delegate to every conference from 1824 to 1855, and died in Mecklenburg Co., Va., Sept. 18, 1858. He was also a member of the Louisville Convention at the organization of the M. E. Church South, and as one of the founders and first agents of Randolph Macon College, and one of the organizing committee of Woman's Male College, N. C., he rendered long and very important service to the cause of education in the Church. He received a good academical education while young, and throughout his life was a diligent general student. Most of his ministry was spent in the office of presiding elder in Virginia and Carolina. His character was gentle and attractive, and his mind full of lofty ardor for the welfare of Christianity. His influence was wide and controlling for many years. He was an earnest and useful minister of the Gospel, and will long be remembered in Virginia, Kentucky, and Carolina.—Summer's Biograp. Sketches, p. 166. (G. L. T.)

Leighlin, Synod of, was held in Campo-Lene, Ireland, near Old Leighlin, A.D. 683, with the purpose of settling the time as to the observance of Easter. A few years before (680), Honorius I addressed an envoiery, postal letter to the Irish clergy on the paschal question; and it is worthy of remark that this was the first notice taken by the bishops of Rome in regard to the Church founded by St. Patrick, and was about 300 years after its commencement. At this period the Irish were divided on the time of keeping Easter, some advoking the Roman practice, others the Irish way of observing the 14th day of the first vernal month (if a Sunday), instead of adopting its celebration on the Sunday following the 14th, and the matter even resulted in a controversy. Laurentius of Canterbury relates that Du-can, an Irish bishop, when in North Britain, declared that he would neither eat, drink, or sleep under the same roof with those who held to the Roman practice. Cummanus, who died in the year 688, is said to have written a treatise upon the subject of Easter, Iona, was greatly troubled about it, and in its investigation he said, "I turned over the holy Scriptures, studied history and all the cycles I could find. I inquired diligently what were the sentiments of the Hebrews, Greeks, Latins, and the Egyptians concerning this solemnity." A debate was sent from this synod, of which most probably Cummanus was one, to ascertain from personal inspection whether, as they had heard in Ireland, other nations kept Easter at the same time that the Romans did. The object of this debate has been greatly perverted by the interest of Romanism. It was not to get a decision from the pope, for this they had had for years, and had not obeyed it; but it was, as before stated, simply to determine for themselves. They remained at Rome or in the East about two years. On their return they reported that all they had seen in Ireland they had seen in Rome—even (cadle corri-ona) than they had heard. But even this report was not decisive, for the Venerable Bede says, "Though the south of Ireland partially conformed, the northern provinces and all Iona adhered to their former practices. This argument was of no consequence, and it was a long time pressed and resisted. In A.D. 664, when Theodore, the Italian archbishop of Canterbury, by order of the pope, came to establish the entire regime of Roman
Catholicism in North Britain, the paroch and many other questions were again so fiercely urged that Col- man, during his stay for his health, returned to Ireland. Again, in 1670, when Malcolm Canmore brought Margaret, his Saxon wife, to Scotland, she was shocked to find the faith and public worship of her new subjects so different from the Catholic Church of England. After laboring long to induce her husband to adopt the rites and order of the Saxon Catholics, she had a three days' discussion with the existing clergy and the Culdees of Iona, speaking in Saxon and her husband interpreting in Irish. See Tod, Irish Church, chap. vi; Usber, Brit. Eccles. Antiq. cap. xvii (Works, vi, 492-510).

Leighton, Alexander, a Scottish divine, was born at Edinburgh in 1658. He was professor of moral philosophy in that city for several years prior to 1613, when he removed to London, and obtained a lectureship. For libellous or offensive expressions against the king, queen, and the bishops, in his book called Zion's Plea (1629), he was punished by the Star Chamber with mutilation, the pillory, and long imprisonment. He was released in 1640, and died in 1646. Archbishop Laud was no doubt responsible for the cruel and inhuman treatment of Leighton. See LAUD.

Leighton, Robert, a Scottish prelate, one of the most distinguished preachers and theologians of the 17th century, was born in Edinburgh, or, as others think, in London, in the year 1611. He was educated at the university of Edinburgh, took the degree of M.A. in 1631, when he went to the Continent to study, especially in France. Here he resided with some relatives at Douay, and formed the acquaintance of several Roman Catholic students, whose Christian virtues made him a charitable Christian towards all who bore the name of his Master. "Noble, tender, and pious from his earliest years, he shrank from all violence and intolerance; but his intercourse with men whose opinions were so different from his own convinced his reason of the folly and sinfulness of 'thinking too rigidly of doctrine.'" He returned to Scotland in 1641, and was immediately appointed to the parish of Newbattle, near Edinburgh; but as Leighton identified himself with the cause of Charles I when the latter was confined, by the commissioners of the Parliament, in Holmby House, he brought upon his head the displeasure of the Presbyterian Church. Yet when Bishop Burnet, "he soon came to dislike their Covenant, particularly their imposing it, and their fury against all who differed from them. He found they were not capable of large thoughts; theirs were narrow as their tempers were sour; so he grew weary of mixing with them and his heart was pacified. For this change, however, there were serious obstacles in Leighton's case, and it has therefore been a matter of general disapprobation. Certainly the facility with which he fraternized with the party that had inflicted such horrid cruelties on his excellent father, Dr. Alexander Leighton, in 1630, for merely publishing a book in favor of Presbyterianism, cannot be altogether approved." (Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, iv, 463 ss.) In 1652 he resigned his charge, and in the following year was elected principal of the University of Edinburgh, a dignity which he retained for ten years. Earnest, spiritual, and utterly free from all selfish ambition, he labored without ceasing for the welfare of the students. He delivered lectures especially to the students of theology, and occasionally supplied the place of divinity professor. His theological acquirements were so learned that the Scotchmen have been translated into English. For pure Latin, sublime thought, and warm diction, they have never been surpassed, and seldom equalled. In that office Dr. Leighton was truly the ornament and delight of the university, and a blessing to studious youth. After the restoration of Charles II and the re-establishment of the episcopacy in Scotland, Leighton, after much reluctance, accepted the bishopric of Dunblane, a small and poor diocese, and was consecrated at Westminster Dec. 15, 1661. Unfortunately for his health, he was now allied were even more intolerant and unscrupulous than the Presbyterians. The despotism of Sharpe and Laudoulder sickened him. Twice he proceeded to London (in 1665 and 1669) to implore the king to adopt a milder course—on the former of these occasions declaring "that he could not concur in the planting of the Christian religion in such a manner, much less as a form of government." Nothing was really done, though much was promised, and Leighton had to endure the misery of seeing an ecclesiastical system which he believed to be intrinsically the best, perverted to the worst of purposes, and himself the sufferer of the worst of men. In 1670, on the resignation of Dr. Alexander Burnet, he was made, quite against his personal wishes, archbishop of Glasgow, and he finally accepted this great distinction only on the condition that he should be assisted in his attempts to carry out a liberal measure for "the comprehension of the Presbyterianists." But finding, after a time, that his efforts to unite the different parties were all in vain, and that he could not stay the high-handed tyranny of his colleagues, he finally determined to resign the ecclesiastical dignity (in 1678). After a short residence in Edinburgh, he went to live with his sister at Broadhurst, in Sussex, where he spent the rest of his days in a retired manner, devoted chiefly to works of religion. He died at London June 25, 1684. Leighton published nothing during his lifetime. His works include A Preface to the First General Epistle of St. Peter; not a learned exposition by any means, for the writer hardly notices questions of philology at all, but perhaps no more remarkable instance is extant of the power which sympathy with the writer gives in enabling an expositor to bring out and elucidate his meaning. Another able work of his is Prefaces to the Works, of which an edition was published a few years ago by the late professor Scholefield of Cambridge; also some sermons and charges. There is an edition of his work in 4 vols., 8vo, Lond. 1819; but the best edition is that of Pearson (Lond. 1828; N. Y. 1859, 8vo). Another good edition was published in 1871, in 6 vols. 8vo. All of Leighton's writings have received the highest commendations because of the lofty and evangelical spirit that pervades them. They present the truths of Christianity in the spirit of Plato, and it is generally recognized that Leighton's influence is due to Coleridge, whose Aids to Reflection are simply commentaries on the teachings of archbishop Leighton. "Few uninspired writings," says Dr. Doddridge, "are better adapted to mend the world: they continually overflow with the spirit of God. Leighton, Ch. of Scotland, ii, 22 sqq., 70 sq.; Burnet's History of his Own Times; Burnet's Pastoral Care; Doddridge's Preface to Leighton's Works; The Remains of Archbish- op Leighton, by Jerment (1808); his Select Works, by Chesever (Boston, 1822); Pearson, Life of Robert Leighton (1822); Kitto, Cyclop. Ecc. Lit., vol. ii, s. v.; Chambers, Cyclop. vol. vi, s. v.; Chambers, Bible, Dict. of Eminent Scotchmen, s. v.; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.

Leipsic, Colloquy of, in 1631. The disputes which occurred in the 16th century, when the two evangelical churches framed their confession of faith, had produced great bitterness between the Lutherans and Calvinists. Attempts at reconciliation had already been made by pious individuals in the 16th century, and still others in the 17th, as, for instance, by the indefatigable Zwingli and Calvin, but with little success. It was the trial which the evangelical churches of Germany underwent during the Thirty Years' War that really first made the two sister confessions forsake their former hostility. They saw that they were both standing on the brink of a precipice, and the ties which bound them to each other were strengthened. Both the authorities and the people
now used their utmost efforts to secure, if not unity, yet at least peace and harmony between the two churches. In the early part of 1631, after Gustavus Adolphus, the champion of evangelical liberty, had already come to Germany, the landgrave William of Hesse and the elector Christian William of Brandenburg had decided that the elector General of Saxony at Leipzig, and they proceeded to oppose, by main force if necessary, the carrying out of the Edict of Restitution. The landgrave William had brought with him the professor of theology Crocius and the court preacher Theophilus Neuberger; the elector Christian William was accompanied by the court preacher John Bergius. The theologians of Hesse and Brandenburg invited those of Leipzig to a conference in order to attempt a reconciliation between the evangelical churches, or, at least, to promote a better understanding between them. It was intended that this conference should be of a private character, yet with the hope that the other parts of Germany would follow the example. The Reformed party demanded only that the court preacher Matthias Hoe, of Hohenegg, should, in the discussions abstain from the vehemence which distinguished his writings, and the theologians of Leipzig should not argue against this request, that Hoe was very gentle in conversations. The elector George having sanctioned the plan of a private conference, the meetings commenced, March 3, at the residence of the upper court preacher, and under his presidency, daily, and continued until March 23. On motion of the Reformed party the Conference of Augsburg was taken as a basis, they announcing their willingness to sign it, such as it then was in the Saxon form (published by order of the elector George, in 1629). They also thought that the princes of their different provinces were ready to do the same, without however, undertaking to vouch for it. They stated furthermore that they would neither reject the altered edition of the Colloquy of Worms (in 1650) nor that of Bingenburg (in 1541); they referred to the position taken at the convention of Naumburger in 1651, and by the Saxons in the preface to the Book of Concord. The Conference of Augsburg being thus adopted as a whole, every article was taken up separately and examined. They thus found that both parties fully coincided in the articles v-vii and xii-xviii, while their differences on the articles i and ii were comparatively unimportant. With regard to the iij article, they all agreed as to the interpretation of the words, but the Saxons theologians maintained that not only the divine, but also the human nature of Christ possessed omniscience, omnipotence, etc., in union of the two natures in his personality, and that all the glory which Christ received was only received by his human nature. The Reformed theologians, on the contrary, denied that Christ, as man, was omnipresent, or that in him the human nature had become omniscient and omnipotent. They agreed also in the iijx article, and the Reformed theologians affirmed that they did not believe Christ had come to save all men. They also agreed in the iijxith article, to which they made some addition on the necessity of baptism, and on infant baptism. The xiiith and thirteenth articles, concerning the Eucharist, caused great discussion. March 7. Here they could not agree, the Reformed theologians denying the physical participation in the body and blood of Christ, and asserting a spiritual participation through faith; of unworthy communicants, they asserted that these partook only of simple bread and wine. The Reformed theologians, however, maintained that if it was impossible to agree on this point, it was at least possible for the two parties to bear charitably with each other, and to unite in opposing Romanism. The Saxons, who did not wish to bind themselves by any promises in a private conference, said that this proposition would have to be further considered in the fear of the Lord. After all the remaining articles had been agreed to, they came to the question of election, although this doctrine is not expressly presented in the Confession of Augsburg. Both Lutherans and Reformed agreed in the doctrine that only a part of mankind will be saved, the Reformed theologians basing election on the absolute will of God, and reproduction on the unbelief of man. The Lutherans, on the other hand, considered election as the result of God's predestination of the elect of mankind. It was decided that the electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, one to the landgrave of Hesse, and one to the theological faculty of Leipzig. A full account, however, was subsequently published in England, France, Switzerland, Holland, and Sweden. The suspicions of both parties made any decided advance impossible, and resulted finally in greater estrangement of both, and in renewed attacks by the able Lutheran polemic Hoe (q.v.), of which a new and brief account is given in the works of Oehler, see C. W. Hering, Gesch. d. Kirchl. Unionversammlung, etc. (Lpz. 1836), i. 327 sqq.; Alex. Schweitzer, D. protestantischen Centralboden, partii, p. 525; Kurzter Dissert von d. z. Leipzig 1631 memit Martini angestellt religiosen, etc. (Cassel, 1836); C. H. Hitzig, Theol. confes. in ecclesia reformata publicaturum (Lpz. 1840), p. 638 sqq.; Mosheim. Eccles. Hist. book iv, cent. xvii. sect. ii, pt. ii, ch. i, § 4; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, viii. 286.

Leipsic, Discussion of. See Eck; Calv.-Stadt, etc.

Leipsic, Interim of. See Interim (III).

Leight, William, D.D., a Scotch divine, was born in 1814 in the town of Hothesay, a famous watering-place on the island of Bute, Scotland, and was educated at the University of Glasgow, which he entered at the age of eighteen, and graduated as master in 1836 with the highest honors in the departments of mathematical and physical science. While a student he also lectured in the University on astronomy and as a result of his studies in this department we have from him a work entitled God's Glory in the Heavens; or, Contributions to Astro-theology, which contains the most recent astronomical discoveries stated with special reference to theological questions. In 1839 he was appointed as a preacher in the Church of Scotland by the Presbytery of Dunbarton. In 1843 he received a presentation to the parish of Monimail. He continued minister of this parish until 1859, when he was selected as principal of Queen's University. He is well known to have been the author of certain articles in which he has most carefully and masterly manner, the views of the late Dr. Warlaw, of Glasgow, on the subject of miracles, are controverted. For several years he conducted a series of investigations on the subject of parthenogenesis and alternate generations, as illustrated by the phenomena of animal and vegetable development in hynemoptery. The results of these researches, which conflicts with that of the German physiologist Siebold in the same field, is given in the Transactions of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, and in the Annals of the Botanical Society of Canada. Several separate publications of his also appeared on the subject of education. In 1860 he became principal of Queen's University, and this connection afforded him a seat in the Presbytery of Kingston, and, in consequence, in the synod also. His position also gave him a seat in the senate of the University. In 1866 he was appointed an examiner of that university. He died in 1862. See Appleyard's Amer. Ann. Cyclop. 1864, p. 625.

Leitomysal or Leitomysalchel, John, a Bohemian prelate noted for his energetic character and his unrelenting hostility to the Hussites, flourished in the latter
part of the 14th and the early years of the 15th century. He first comes under our notice as one of the two prelates—the archbishop of Prague being the other—before whom John Huss was to be cited for heresy. His position and influence in Bohemia were such that Stephen Palaet, writing against Huss, dedicated to him his Dialogus Volatarius. As the troubles at Prague increased, he was one of those to whom the archbishop of Prague applied for advice, and his response was in accordance with his notorious stern and unbecoming character. When the Council of Constance in 1414, he was present as a member, and took a leading part in its proceedings. He was the first to denounce the Council practice, recently introduced by Jacobel at Prague, and he was commissioned by the council to take measures for its suppression. His enmity to Huss was signalized by the language used by him in the council, and excited the deep indignation of the friends of the Reformer, who did not hesitate to reprehend his course publicly in severe terms. His persistent energy, however, merited the eulogiums of the council, and by them he was appointed to bear the onerous burden of the Bohemia, in which he attempted to terrify the followers of Huss into submission. The mission, however, proved a failure. The person of the bishop was no longer safe in his own country, and he returned to the council. The first reward of his diligence was his promotion, about A.D. 1416, to the see of Olmutz, in Moravia, the see of Conrad, archbishop of Prague, to the C că limines a short time afterwards, he was promoted to the vacant dignity. This, however, he was not destined to enjoy. The ascendancy of the Călimines must have excluded him from Prague, if not from Bohemia; and perhaps among all the enemies of the Hussites, during the period of their religious wars, there was no one who could have been sooner made the victim of their vengeance than the obnoxious bishop. But as no mention is made of him at a subsequent date, and as he does not appear to have fallen into the hands of the Hussites, we may presume that his life must have closed soon after the dissolution of the Council of Constance. He was eminently a martial prelate, and was known by the sobriquet of “John the Iron.” Notices of him will be found in many histories of his times. See Von der Hartz, Authorities on the Council of Constance; Lenfant, Council of Constance; Gillett, Life and Times of John Huss, vols. i and ii; F. Polacky, Mag. J. Hus Documenta.—Neander, Ch. Hist., v 296 sq. (E. H. G.)

Lejajy, Gui-Michel, a noted French scholar in exegetical theology, was born in Paris at 1588. While at the high school he paid particular attention to the Christology of the New Testament, and in 1615 published a treatise on the Divinity of the Saviour, entitled Le Divin Character of the Son of God. This work was highly esteemed by the Church, and Lejajy was appointed a professor in the Sorbonne. In 1632, and died Aug. 7, 1664. He published a descriptive work on Canada and its native tribes (7 vols., 1640).—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen., xxx, 518.

Leland, Aaron, a Baptist minister, sixth in descent from Henry Leland, the Puritan ancestor of all the Lelands in America, but in a different line from his more noted contemporary, Rev. John Leland, was born in Hallow, Mass., May 28, 1761. Of a naturally vigorous and inquisitive mind, he grew up with a lively thirst for knowledge, which intelligence than his limited means of early culture would have indicated as probable. He united in 1785 with the Baptist Church in Bellingham, by which Church he was licensed to preach, and subsequently ordained. He was removed to Chester, Vt., where he gathered a small Church, which in thirteen years had become five—in Chester, Andover, Grafton, Wethersfield, and Cavendish. From Chester he visited Jamaica, in the same county, guided through the wilderness by marked trees: these visits resulted in the formation of several churches in that vicinity. He was not only an active and successful minister, but had important civil trusts committed to him by the suffrages of his fellow-citizens. He sat in the state legislature several years; three years he was speaker of the House; four years a member of the council; five years successively lieutenant governor, and nothing but his own conviction of its incompatibility with the duties of his higher calling prevented his election to the governorship of the state. He refused to permit any civil engagements to hinder his usefulness and success as a Christian minister, and he continued to fulfill his calling with great energy, zeal, and success, until worn out with toil. He died Aug. 25, 1838. He was a popular and effective preacher. His commanding form and countenance; his musical and sonorous voice; his ready and fervid, often impassioned utterance; his vigorous intellect and great tenderness of spirit, gave him unusual power over congregations. He was often sought as an orator on public occasions, and called to give counsel in ecclesiastical questions. His zeal was enlisted in the temperance cause, insisting on total abstinence from intoxicating beverages, and in promoting ministerial education and all liberal culture. He was the model of his fellow churchmen, and the leader of his church. He died in his house in Barnet, Vt., aged 84 years.
LELAND, John (2), a Baptist minister, distantly related to Aaron Leland (see above), was born in Grafton, Massachusetts, May 14, 1764, in an age of eighteen he had strong and painful religious impressions; he entered into light and peace gradually, and, after the lapse of several months, was baptized in June, 1774, in Bellingham, and was regularly licensed by the Church. He removed in 1776 to Virginia, where for above fourteen years he was exercised in an itinerant ministry, preaching over all the eastern section of the state, sometimes extending his tours southward into North Carolina, and northward as far as Philadelphia. He was ordained in Virginia, somewhat irregularly, in May, 1784; and again in 1788, with more regard to form and customary usage. His evangelical labors were attended with large success. He baptized seven hundred persons, and gathered churches at Orange and Louisa, one of three hundred and the other of two hundred members. He made the acquaintance of Mr. Madison, with whom he maintained a pleasant correspondence for many years, effectively co-operating with him to secure the ratification by Virginia of the Constitution of the United States. In 1791 he returned to New England, and the year following settled in Cheshire, where he resided till his death. Though acting for a limited period as pastor of the Church in Cheshire, he was always an itinerant, making extensive tours over western Massachusetts, often into the adjacent parts of New York, and into more distant sections of New England; twice visiting Virginia, and, wherever he went, preaching and baptizing—these two items of "the great commission" (Matt. xxvii, 19, 39) being all to which he felt himself called. His last record of baptism was Aug. 17, 1834, when he was over eighty years of age, which brought up the number of baptisms in his ministry to 1524. He still continued to preach, and died in the work at North Adams, Mass., Jan. 14, 1841. He recorded, when at the age of sixty-six, that he had then preached eight thousand sermons, and in order to do it had travelled distances which would tire girdle the globe. His *Life and Remains*, edited by his daughter, including an autobiography, additional memoirs, and eighty pieces—sermons, tracts, public addresses, and essays—on religious, moral, and political topics—most of which had been printed in pamphlet form during his life, were published not long after his decease, forming a work of great size. See *Elders* Leland, as he was commonly styled, was in theology a Calvinist of the old school. He was always popular as a preacher and writer, especially among the less-cultivated class. The elements of his success were a strikingly-original, often eccentric cast of thought; a terse, telling expression, abounding in compact, apothegmatic, easily-recallable sentences; a vigorous Saxon-English diction; slightly provincial ("Yankee"); homey illustration, often a spice of humor, and his sermons were never wanting in earnest appeal. These qualities were aided by his tall figure, the compass of his voice, and a peculiar business and effective action. His singular views as to the limits of his ministerial duty, leading him to baptize converts without gathering them into churches, caused his success as an evangelist to leave less durable traces than might otherwise have been looked for. The relations of Church and State in Virginia and in most of New England, during the earlier period of his ministry, led him into a habit of political activity which was sometimes censured by persons unable to appreciate a state of society which had passed away. Two hymns, published anonymously in most hymn-books—one the popular evening hymn, "The Saviour standeth pleading"—are ascribed to his pen, and not improbably the simple melodies in which they are oftenest sung. His productions, consisting of several sermons, essays, and addresses, were published after his death, with a memoir of the author by Miss L. F. Greene (1845, 8vo). See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpite, vi, 174. (L. E. S.)

Leland, Thomas, D.D., an English divine, was born at Dublin in 1722, and was educated at Trinity College in that city. He became senior fellow of the college, and was made a professor of poetry there in 1763; after the death of Dr. Bray, and of the lord lieutenant of Ireland. He died in 1780. Leland was a profound scholar and a most eloquent preacher. He published the Orations of Demosthenes, Latin version and notes (London, 1754, 2 vols. 12mo), in conjunction with John Stokes—the Orations of John Stokoe,—Demosthenes, in English (1756-61-70, 3 vols. 4to; last ed. 1831, 12mo):—Hist. of the Life and Reign of Philip, King of Macedon (1758, 2 vols. 4to; last ed. 1820, 2 vols. 8vo):—Discertation on the Principles of Human Eloquence, etc. (1764, 4to), edited by bishop Warburton's Discourse on the Doctrine of Grace: answered (anonymously) by Hurd, on behalf of Warburton, in a very pertinent letter. Answer to a letter to him, etc., 1764, 4to. This is a reply to the Hurd. Leland answered for himself, and, in the opinion of all the world, completely demolished his antagonist. See Allibone, Dict. of Br. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.

LELONG, Jacques, an eminent French bibliographer, was born at Paris April 19, 1665. In 1677 he was sent by his father to Malta, to be educated as a member of the order of Knights, but not liking the severity with which he was treated, he obtained permission to return to Paris. Here he continued his studies, and, as he had taken the vows of the Order of St. John of Malta, he entered the Congregation of the Oratory in 1686. He became successively professor of mathematics in the College of Julii, and afterwards in the seminary of Notre Dame des Vertus, near Paris. Later he was appointed librarian of that institution, and in 1699 was transferred into the same capacity to the library of the Oratory St. Honore, at Paris, one of the richest in that city, especially in Oriental books and MSS. This position he occupied for twenty-two years, rendering the greatest services to the scientific world by his valuable bibliographical researches, and by a threefold catalogue. He died Aug. 17, 1721. His most important work, which is yet highly prized by students, is his *Bibliotheca Sacra* (Paris, 1709, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1723, 2 vols. fol.—this latter ed. is by far the best). Another augmented edition was published after his death by his son, Paul Lelong, a priest of the Oratory (Paris, 1728, 2 vols. fol.). A valuable supplement was afterwards added to it, and the whole work carefully revised, by Chr. Fr. Bomert (Lips. 1709); another enlarged and extended edition was published by A. G. Masch (Halle, 1778-1790, 5 vols. 4to). As a historian, Lelong distinguished himself by his *Dictionnaire historique de la France*, containing the catalogue of the ouvrages imprimés et manuscrits, qui traitent de l'histoire de ce royaume (Paris, 1719; 2d ed. by Fretout de Fontette, Paris, 1768, 5 vols. fol.). This was to have been followed by notices on the author of these works. Lelong wrote *Discours historiques sur les principales editions des Biblia Polygolettes* (Paris, 1713):—*Supplement à l'histoire des dictionnaires* Hébreux de Wolff (Paris, 1707):—*Nouvelle méthode des langues Hébraique et Chaldéenne* (Paris, 1708), etc. See Dictionnaire, Vol. VI. Lelong, in the 2d and 3d edition of the *Bibliotheque Sacree*; Herzog, Real-Encyclopaedie, viii, 290: Hoefer, Nouv. Bibl. Generale, xxx, 540 sqq., Kiito, Bibl. Cyclop. s. v.

LEMAISTRE DE SACI (or Saci), Isaac Louis, a noted French Jansenist theologian, a nephew of Antoine Arnauld de Grand, was born in Paris March 29, 1618; was ordained a priest in 1656, and became confessor or principal of the College de la Croix in Paris, about 1657. He was in a controversy with the Jesuits, he was persecuted by the authorities, both civil and ecclesiastical, in 1661, and, after having vainly sought refuge among friends, was confined in the Bastile in 1666. During his imprisonment, which lasted two years, he made a French transla-
LE MERCIER

LÉON

iation of the Old Testament. He had previously been one of the translators of the New Testament of Mons (1667), which was often reprinted. In consequence of renewed persecution, he left Fort Royal in 1679, seeking peace and quiet at the country seat of a friend of his. The Genevan government, he published several works on several classical works, and of valuable theological treatises; also of Thomas à Kempis’s Imitation. See Hoefer, Nour. Biog. Générale, xxx, 568; Ste. Beuve, Fort Royal, ii, 1, 2; Kittto, Bibl. Cyclop. s. v. Sacry, de.

Le Mercier, Jacques, a French architect, born at Pontoise about 1600, is noted as the builder of the Church of the Ursulines at Paris, the seat of Cardinal Richelieu about 1685. Le Mercier obtained the title of chief architect to the king. Among other admired works of his are the Church of the Annunziade at Tours, and that of Saint Roch in Paris. He died in 1690.—Thomas, Biog. Dict. p. 1401; Hoefer, Nour. Biog. Générale, xxx, 568.

Lemoine, François, a celebrated French painter of the 18th century, was born at Paris in 1688. He was the pupil of Louis Galloche, early distinguished himself, and in 1718 was elected a member of the Royal Academy of Painting. His great reputation at this time is due mainly to his painting, in oil, of the Transfiguration of Christ on the ring of the Church of the very rich patrons of the chapel of the Virgin in St. Sulpice, in fresco, which he commenced in 1729—a work of three years labor. His masterpiece, however, is the Apotheosis of Hercules, painted in oil on canvas pasted on the ceiling of the Salon d’Hercule at Versailles, commenced in 1732, and finished in 1736. He committed suicide June 4, 1737. See Hoefer, Nour. Biog. Générale, xxx, 617, English Cyclop. s. v.

L’Empereur, Constantine, a celebrated Dutch Orientalist, was born at Oppyck, in the Netherlands, about 1570. He was professor of Hebrew at Harlewyn until 1627, when he was called to the university of Leyden as professor of Hebrew, and some time after was made professor of theology in that high school. He died in 1648. L’Empereur edited the Commentaries of Aben-Ezra, etc. Aeschyn. on Isa. iii, 19, 20, with notes (Leyden, 1633), and the Paraphrase of Joseph ben-Jachja on Daniel, with translation and notes (Amsterdam, 1633), also the Mishna tract Bab Kama and Middoth (Leyden, 1637, 4to). He wrote himself De Dignitate et Utilitate Hebraeorum (1627, 8vo) —Clara Talmudicon, compeltae formularum, locis dialectico et logico praecordum Judaorum (Leyden, 1634, 4to).—De leg. Hebr. formae, (Leyden, 1637, 4to); and Disputationes theologicae (Leyden, 1648, 8vo). See Kittio, Cyclop. Bibl. Lat. s. v.; Hoefer, Nour. Biog. Gen. xxx, 642; Fürst, Bibl. Jud. i, 245 sq.

Lemprére, John, a distinguished English biographer, was born in Jersey about 1760. He was educated at Winchester and at Pembroke College, Oxford, and subsequently became first head master of Abingdon Grammar-school, and later of the school at Exeter. In 1810 he resigned the latter, and the following year was presented to the living of Meeth and Newton Petrok, in Devonshire, which he retained until his death, Feb. 1, 1824. Lemprére was a man of extensive learning, and thoroughly acquainted with antiquity. His Bibliotheca Classica (1788, 8vo; subsequently reprinted, with additions by himself) is still in general use in the universities. He wrote also a translation of Herodotus, with notes (1792), of which the first volume only was published, and a Universal Biography (1808, 4to and 8vo).

This last work, compiled with great care, has run through several editions. The name of Lemprére was once well known to every English-speaking classical student, but the rising generation is forgetting it, and it will soon become vox et praeterea nihil. A Classical Dictionary (Bibliotheca Classica, 1788) of his was for many years the English standard work of reference on all matters of ancient mythology, biography, and geography. See Davenport, Nour. Biog. Gen., xxx, 648; Chambers, Cyclopædia, s. v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.

Lem’uël (Hebrew Lemuel), יְמֻעֵל, Prov. xxxi, 1; Sept. v. Vulg. Lemuel, μειέλλον, Prov. xxxi, 4; Sept. πωλέτα πωλέτα, Vulg. Lemuel), an unknown prince, to whom the admonitory apothegms of Prov. xxxi, 2-9 were originally addressed by his mother. Most interpreters understand Solomon to be the actual author of the book (the name signifying to God, i. e. created by him) or by a pleasing epithet (see Rosenmüller, Scholia ad Prov. p. 746). The Rabbinical commentators identify Lemuel with Solomon, and tell a strange tale that when he married the daughter of Pharaoh, on the day of the dedication of the Temple, he assembled musicians of all kinds, and passed the night awake. On the morrow he slept till the fourth hour, with the keys of the Temple beneath his pillow, when his mother entered, and upbraided him in the words of Prov. xxxi, 2-9. Others (e. g. Grotius) refer it to Haggai, by a parallelism); and others (e. g. Gesenius) think that no Israelite is referred to, but some neighboring petty Arabian prince. On the other hand, according to Eichhorn (Einleitung, t. 1061), Lemuel is altogether an imaginary person (so Ewald; comp. Duhm, 2196 sq.). Prof. Stuart (Comment. on Prov. p. 400 sq.) renders the expression “Lemuel, king of Massa,” and regards him as the brother of Agur, whom he makes to have been likewise a son of the queen of Massa, in the neighborhood of Duham. See Agur; Ithiel. In the reign of Hezekiah, a roving band of Syrian or Arabian ghosts or spirits haunted the mountains of Mount Seir and settled in their stead (1 Chron, iv, 38-43), and from these exiles of Israelitic origin Hitzig conjectures that Lemuel and Agur were descended, the former having been born in the land of Israel; and that the name Lemuel is an older form of Nemuil, the firstborn of Simeon (Die Sprache Salomo’s, p. 810-314). But this interpretation is far-fetched; and none is more likely than that which fixes the epiphany upon Solomon. See Proverbs.

Lemures, the general designation given by the Romans to all spirits of departed persons, of whom the good were honored as Larves (q. v.), and the bad (Larves) were supposed to walk about in the forms of ghosts or spirits of those who had undergone superstitious. The common idea was that the Lemures and Larves were the same, and were said to wander about during the night, seeking for an opportunity of inflicting injury on the living (Horat. Epist. ii, 2, 209; Pers. v, 180). The festival called Lemures was held on the 9th, 11th, and 13th of May, and was accompanied with ceremonies of washing hands, throwing black beans over the head, etc., and the pronunciation nine times of these words: "Begone, you spectres of the house!" which deprived the Lemures of their power to harm. David describes the Larves as the Amalekites in the battle with Saul and the Israelites (1 Sam. 31:2-13). See De Do Doer, p. 237, ed. Bib.; Servius, ad Æn. iii, 63; Varro, op. Nat. p. 135; comp. Hartung, Die Religion der Römer, i, 50, etc., Smith, Dict. of Greek and Rome. Biog. and Myth. vol. ii, s. v.; Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.

Lend (represented by several Heb. words which in other forms likewise signify to borrow, e. g. עָלוּ, וָלַחַ, maschah; לֶפַח עַבָּר; Gr. ἔλοικος, χοιλός). Among the Israelites, in the time of Moses, it must have been very common to lend on pledge, in the strict sense, according to the meaning of the word in natural law, which allows the creditor, in case of non-payment, to appropriate the pledge to his own behalf, without any authoritative interference of a magistrate, and to keep it just as rightfully as if it had been bought with the sum
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which has been lent for it, and which remains unpaid. But while pledges are under no judicial regulation, much extortion and villainy may be practiced, when the poor man who wishes to borrow is in straits, and must of necessity yield a quarter of the principal to the lender. It will not be imputed to Moses as a fault that his statutes contain not those legal refinements, which probably were not then invented, and which even yet may be said rather to be on record in our statute-books than to be in our practice. They would have been dangerous to introduce into a spirit of commerce, and to impress let pledge remain in its proper sense, pledge, and thus facilitate the obtaining of loans, satisfying himself with making laws against some of the chief abuses of pledging (Michaelis, Mos. Recht.). See Pledge. These laws may be found in Exod. xxii, 22; Deut. xxiv, 6, 10-18. By the analogy of these laws, other sorts of pledges equally, if not more indispensable, such as the utensils necessary for agriculture, or the ox and ass used for the plough, must certainly, and with equal, and even greater reason, have been restored. The law in Deut. xxiv, 12, 13, is expressed in such general terms, that we cannot but see that the pledge under which the debtor must sleep is merely given as an example, and conclude, of course, that, in general, from the needy no pledge was to be exacted, the want of which might expose him to an injury. More especially, if, as we find in the lawyer here declaring that God would regard the restoration of such pledges as almsgiving, or righteousness. So it was in fact, and at the same time it was attended with no loss whatever to the creditor; for he had it in his power, at last, by the aid of summary justice, to lay hold of the whole property of the debtor, and if he had none of his person; and in the event of non-payment, to take him for a hired servant. The law gave him sufficient security; but with this single difference, that he durst not make good payment at his own hand, but must prosecute (Lev. xxv, 39-55; Neh. v, 9). See Dunn.

In the book of Job, the character of a lender upon pledge is thus depicted: "He extorts pledges without having lent, and makes his debtors go naked" (xxii, 6; xxiv, 7): "He takes the widow's ox for a pledge" (xxii, 3): "He takes the infant of the needy for a pledge" (xxiv, 9-11).

On this subject our Saviour exhorting his disciples to the most liberal and forbearing course towards all whom they could aid or who were indebted to them (Luke vi, 30-35). See Loan; Usury.

Lenfant, Alexandre-Charles-Anne, a French priest of note, was born at Lyons Sept. 6, 1726, and was educated by the Jesuits of his native place. In 1741 he entered the Order, and became professor of rhetoric at Paris. Endowed with great talent as a speaker, he became one of the most popular pulpit orators of his order. After its suppression Lenfant combated the doctrines of the philosophical antagonists of Christianity, particularly Diderot. In 1792 he was arrested by the Revolutionists, and subjected to capital punishment at Paris Sept. 3, 1793. His works are an Oraison funèbre on Belzunce, archbishop of Marseille (1756, 8vo), and another on the father of Louis XVI (Nancy, 1760): Sermon pour l'Avent et pour le Carné (Paris, 1818, 2 vols., 12mo). See Hoeft, Nouv. Biog. Gén., xxx, 656.

Lenfant, Jacques, a very noted French preacher and theologian, the son of Paul Lenfant, the Protestant minister of Châtillon-sur-Seine, was born at Beaune, in Beauce, a district of the ancient province of Orléanais, in France, April 13, 1601. Intended for the same profession as his father, he was sent to prosecute his studies at Saumur; and during his residence at that university he lived with the learned Jacques Cassel, the professor of Hebrew, with whom he formed a friendship which he continued during their lives. He completed his theological education at Geneva and Heidelberg, in which latter town he was admitted to the ministry of the Protestant Church in 1684. Soon after his ordination he obtained the appointment of minister of the French Church at Heidelberg, and chaplain to the dowager electress Palatine. The invasion of the Palatinate by the French troops, under marshal Turenne, compelled Lenfant to leave Heidelberg in 1688, and he settled at Berlin. The year after he had taken a vow not to marry until he had rendered himself obnoxious to the Jesuits by two letters which he had written against that society, and which are appended to his work, entitled A Préservative against a Reunion with the Church of Rome.

Though the Protestant French church of that city had already a sufficient number of pastors attached to it, the reigning elector of Brandenburg, Frederick, afterwards king of Prussia, who knew Lenfant by reputation, appointed him to that church, where for upwards of thirty-nine years he performed duty. In 1707, on a visit to England, his devotion to him was so illustrious that he said that he so pleased the queen that she desired him to enter the Church of England, and offered him the appointment as her chaplain. In 1710 he obtained the situation of chaplain to the king of Prussia, and counsellor of the High Consistory. Lenfant was suddenly attacked with paralysis, while in the apparent enjoyment of perfect health, July 29, 1728, and died on the 7th of August following. His disposition is represented as having been extremely amiable, and his manner simple and modest. Of a reflective turn of mind, he spoke but little, and smiled often; yet, when he wrote for himself, he was fond of society, and opened himself without reserve to the confidence of his friends. As a preacher, his manner was pleasing and persuasive; the matter of his discourse was chiefly of a practical nature, and his eloquence was rather chaste than energetic. The style of his writing is elegant, though never florid; it has less force than that of Jurieu, and less eloquence than that of Saurin, but the French is purer, and the diction more refined. It is not certain whether he was the first to form the design of the Bibliothèque Germanique, which was commenced in 1720, but he took a very active part in its publication, and the acknowledged author of the preface. Lenfant's first work, which appeared in 1683, was a review of one of Bruyés, who, though a celebrated French dramatist, has written several theological works in defence of the Roman Catholic faith. In 1688 he published a translation of a selection from the letters to St. Cyprian; in 1690, a defence of the Heidelberg Catechism, which is generally annexed to his Préservatif, etc., a work we have before alluded to; and in 1691, a Latin translation of the celebrated work of the père Malebranche, La Recherche de la Vérité. His history of the life of his countryman, Jean Appo, in which he employed himself, is a work which contains a complete account of the arguments in it are drawn from the Latin dissertation on that subject of Spanheim. It is said, however, that in after life Lenfant discovered and acknowledged the absurdity of this fiction. See Jean, Popes. In 1708 appeared his remarks on the Greek edition of the New Testament by Mill, which are in the Bibliothèque Choisie de Le Clere, vol. xvi.

The following works afterwards appeared in succession: 1. Réflexions et Marques sur la Depute du Père Martyon avec un Juff; 2. Mémoire Historique touchant la Comission sur les langues étrangères; 5. Critique des Remarques du Père Vissou; 7. Sur les Réflexions de Royin touchant la Poétique; 8. Réponse de Mons. Lenfant à Mons. D aur au sujet du Socianisme. The above short works are to be found in the Nouvelle de la République des Lettres, a review to which Lenfant was a frequent contributor. In 1714 was published his learned and interesting Histoire du Concile de Constance (Amsterdam, 1714, 2 vols. 4to; 1727, and an Engl. transl. Lond. 1780, 2 vols. 4to). Two years after he wrote an apology for this work, which had been severely attacked in the Journal de Trévoux, the year after, in 1716, in conjunction with Benich, he published a new translation of the New Testament, with explanatory notes, and a long and most learned introduction. It is by this work (Le Nouv. Text. traduit en Français sur l'original Grec, Amsterdam, 1718, 2 vols. 4to), perhaps, that he is best known to English-speaking students.
Among the most important of his other productions are *Le Chrestien; or the 1St. Character*, and *Marina* of the celebrated Florentine Writer Poggio (Amsterdam, 1728):—*A Precaution against Reunion with the See of Rome, and Reasons for Separation from that See* (Amsterdam, 1728), a work which continues to enjoy great popularity among Protestants:—*Histoire du Concile de Pise* (Amsterdam, 1728):—*A volume containing sixteen Sermons on different Tracts of Scripture* (1728):—*A small volume of Remarks on the Treatise on Pulpit Eloquence*, a work which has greatly added to his already high reputation:—*Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites et du Concile de Bâle* (Amsterdam, 1781, 2 vols. 4to), for which he had been many years collecting materials, and in the preparation of which, through the influence of the king of Prussia, he had access to the archives of the corporation of Bazel. *See English Cyclopaedia, a.; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Générale, xxx, 657; Biblioth. Germanique, xvi, 115 sq.*

**Leng.** John, an English prelate, was born in 1656, and, after having completed his studies at Cambridge, became chaplain to king George I. In 1723 his royal majesty made him bishop of Norwich. He published editions of the Plutus and Nubes of Ariophanes (1695):—an excellent edition of Terence (Cambridge, 1701):—*Sermones de Boyle’s Lectures* (1717-18), and twelve separate *Sermones* (1698-1727). *See Nichols’ *L. A. Lysons’ Encyclopaedia.*—*Allibone, Dictionary of British and American Authors,* ii, 1084.

**Lengerke, Caspar, a noted German theologian,** was born at Hamburg March 30, 1606. He was educated at the University of Königsberg, and became a professor of theology and Oriental languages at that high school in 1629. He died Feb. 8, 1655. His most important works are, *De Ephraimi Syri arte kermissement liber* (1811);—*De Dux Denuil (1852);—Kensaz, Volks und Religionsgesch. Israels, vol. i (1814).*

**Lencir, John, a French Jansenist priest,** was born at Alençon in 1622. He became theological canon of Sees in 1652, and acquired great reputation as a preacher both in Normandy and at Paris. He was accused of Jansenism, and by his quarrelseome disposition was made the subject of persecution by the Marquis de Medavy, bishop of Sees, who had issued a charge for the publication of the Formulary, accused him of various errors, namely, of having permitted the publication of a work entitled *Le Christen Charnière* by a layman, who said expressly that "there are four divine persons," and who denounced the thought of a Jansenist character. He was tried by the bishop of Sees, St. Joseph, St. Anna, and St. Joachim; and that our Lord is present in the sacrament of the altar like a chicken in an egg-shell." Lenoir presented then a petition to Louis XIV, together with an attack on some propositions which he considered as heretical. His writings on these subjects were exceedingly violent: he attacked Rouxel de Medavy, who was then archbishop of Rouen, and even De Harlay, the archbishop of Paris. A commission was appointed to judge him, and he was condemned, April 24, 1694, to make a public apology in front of the cathedral at Paris, and to work for life on the galleys. The sentence was not fully carried out; but he remained a prisoner successively in the prisons of St. Malo, Brest, and Nantes until his death, April 22, 1692. He wrote, *Aragones incalculables de l’Eglise sur les Confraternises* (Paris, 1717, 12mo);—*Nouvelles Lumières politiques, ou l’Evangile nouveau* (1656 and 1697, 12mo): this work arrested the publication of a French translation of the History of the Council of Trent by Pallavicini, and went through a third edition under the title of *Politique et Intrigues de la cour de Râme* (1697, 12mo):—*L’origine de cour opposé à Perrégue Apothéose* (Lotte, 1692, 2 vols, 12mo);—*Lettre à Mme. la duchesse de Guise sur la domination écopiale,* etc. (1678, 12mo). *See Suppléments au Néerloog, de Port Royal, 1715; Dict. Hist. des diverses écoles; Gen. Hist.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Bio. Gén.* xxxviii. 398. (J. N. P.)

**Lent.** The forty days' fast, is the preparation for Easter in the Western, Eastern, and Lutheran churches, and in the Church of England, and was instituted at a very early age of Christianity. In most languages the name given to this fast signifies the so-called *forty* days—*Forty,* but our word Lent signifies the Spring Fast, for "Lenten-Tide" in the Anglo-Saxon language was the season of spring, in German Lent. (For another etymology, see LENTI.) It is observed in commemoration of our Lord's fast in the wilderness (Matt. iv), and although he did not impose it on his disciples as an express commandment, yet he showed plainly enough by his example that fasting, which God had so frequently ordered in the old covenant, was also to be practised by the children of the new. The observance of Lent was doubtless strongly confirmed by those words of the Redeemer in answer to the disciples of John the Baptist:—"Can the children of the Bridegroom mourn as long as the Bridegroom is with them? But the days will come when the Bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast" (Luke vii, 46, 50). Hence we find the Acts of the Apostles, according to *The martyrdom of St. Peter,* § 1, the disciples, after the foundation of the Church, applied themselves to fasting. In their epistles, also, they recommended it to the faithful. The primitive Christians seem to have considered Christ, in the above-mentioned passage, as the institution to the institution of the annual season of fasting and prayer in his future Church, and it was therefore only natural that they should have made this period of penitence to consist of forty days, seeing that our divine Master had consecrated that number by his own fast, and before him Moses and Elijah had done the same; it was even deduced from the forty years' stayings of the Israelites in the desert (Augustine, *Ser. cxxvii,* c. 5). *See Fasting,* vol. iii, p. 489 (11).

1. Practice of the Early Church.—In the age immediately succeeding that of the apostles, it does not appear that much value was attached to the practice of fasting. In the *Shepherd of Hermas* it is spoken of in disparaging terms. Very little notice was taken of fasting by the writers of the first centuries, which may be accounted for by the discouraging influence of the doctrines of Montanus, the tenets of the new Platonic school, and the progress of libertinism. It is only in the 200th year that the observance of fasting was introduced into the Church slowly and by degrees. We learn from Justin Martyr that fasting was joined with prayer at Ephesus in the administration of baptism, which is worthy of being noted as an early recognition of the original institution. In the 2nd century, in the times of Victor and Zephyrinus, the custom had become usual to fast before Easter, yet it consisted not in a single fast, but rather in a series of solemnities, which were deemed worthy of celebration. It was therefore the custom of several congregations to prepare themselves by mortification and fasting, inaugurated on the afternoon of the day on which they commemorated the crucifixion, and it was continued until the morning of the anniversary of the resurrection. The whole interval would thus be only about forty hours (Chrysostom, *Orat. ad Evang.* Silos, iii, 4, vol. i, p. 611: *oi ιερα και πανελπιεια των τεσσαρεων πασχαλην.* *Her.; Luc.; I Tim.* iv, p. 8; *Irenæus, Epist. ad Victoriam. Pompæ; Eusebius, Hist. Eccle. iv, 24; Dionysis. Alex. Epist. Canen.; Beveridge, Symodo.* Clement of Alexandria, however, speaks of weekly fasts. Tertullian, in his treatise *De Jejunio,* complains bitterly of the little attention paid by the Church to the practice of fasting; by which we may see that even orthodox Christians exercised in this matter that liberty of judgment which had been sanctioned by the apostles. Origen adverts to this subject only once, in his 10th Homily on Leviticus, where he speaks in accordance with the apostolic doctrine. Eusebius, however, from his observations, that at Alexandria Wednesday and Fridays were then observed as fast-days, on
the ground that our Lord was betrayed on a Wednesday, and crucified on a Friday. The custom of the Church at the end of the 4th century may be seen from a passage of Epiphanius: “In the whole Christian Church the fasts observed throughout the year are regularly observed: On Wednesdays and Fridays we fast until the ninth hour,” etc.

But even at this comparatively late date there was no universal agreement in the practice of the Church in this matter, neither had fasts been established by law. Only later was the number of days (namely, forty) fixed according to the Greek and Latin names (resepsius, οὐσία = quadragesimae). But for a long time the Oriental and Occidental churches differed. As the former did not permit its members to fast on the Sabbath, their fasts began with the Lord's Supper on Monday. See: Euseb. H.I., 3, 23; Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. v, 24; Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. vii, 19. The custom, so far as it existed, had been silently introduced into the Church, and its observance was altogether voluntary at first. This fasting consisted in abstinence from food until three o'clock in the afternoon, but at a later period a custom was introduced, probably by the Montanists, affecting the kind of food to be taken, which was limited to bread, salt, and water.

Some, however, who had become subject to the rules of the Church, were compelled to keep the fasts for their privation during the fasts by banqueting on the days preceding them (Chrysostom, De pomienite, hom. v, § 5, vol. ii, p. 315). Others adhered literally to the rules of fasting by avoiding strictly the prohibited food, but prepared from that which was permitted costly dainties (Augustine, Sacram., cii, § 1). The fathers and teachers of the Church of this period, as Chrysostom, Augustine, Maximus of Turin, Caesarius of Arles, etc., spoke often against this hypocritical fasting, and showed that abstinence would then only be of service when avoidance of the habitable, etc., as well as a contrition of heart, was connected with it. The general design, then, of the primitive Church in fasting forty days, we may give in the words of Chrysostom: “Many heretofore were used to come to the communion sedulously and incontinentely, especially at that time, when Christ first gave it to his disciples. Therefore our forefathers, considering the mischief arising from such careless approaches, met together, appointed forty days for fasting and prayer, and hearing sermons, and for holy assemblies; that all men in these days, being carefully purified by prayer, and alms, and fasting, and with fasting, and confession, and with all other exercises, might come, according to their capacity, with a pure conscience, to the holy table.”

“The rule of fasting for Lent varied greatly. It was usual to abstain from food altogether until evening, change of diet not being accounted sufficient. St. Ambrose exhorts men: ‘Differ aliquantulum, non longe fines est diei’ (Sermo. viii in Psalm. cxxvii). The food, when taken, was to be of the simplest and least delicate kind, animal food and wine being prohibited. St. Chrysostom (A.H. te on Statu) speaks of Christians who are two days accustomed to fast from food, and of others who refused not only wine and oil, but every other dish, and throughout Lent partook of bread and water only. The Eastern Church, at the present day, observes a most strict rule of fasting. Wine and oil are allowed on Saturdays and Sundays, but even these days are only partially excepted from the restrictions of Lent. The discipline of Holy Week is exceedingly rigorous. During Lent corporal punishment was forbidden by the laws of Theodosius the Great: ‘Nulla supplicia sint corporis quibus (diebus) absolutae expulsione animarum’ (Cod. Theod. vi, tit. xxi, leg. v.). Public games, and the celebration of the spring festivals, were also interdicted (Concil. Laodic. ii, iii). It was the special time for preparing catechumens for baptism, and most of St. Cyril's catechetical lectures were delivered during Lent. St. Chrysostom's celebrated Homilies on the Statutes were preached during this season. Daily instruction formed a part of the service, and holy communion was celebrated at least every Lord's day. The last week, the Holy or Great Week, was kept with still greater strictness and solemnity” (Blunt, Dict. of Doctrine and Church History, p. 285).

II. Practice of later Times. — Fasting, after a time, ceased to be a voluntary exercise. By the second canon of the Council of Orleans, A.D. 581, it was decreed that any one who should neglect to observe the stated times of abstinence should be treated as an offender against the laws of the Church. The eighth Council of Toledo, in the 7th century (canon 9), condemns any one who should eat flesh during the fast before Easter, and says that such offenders should be forbidden the use of it throughout the year. In the 8th century fasting began to be regarded as a religious duty in the Eastern Church. In the 13th century a cold collision in the evening of fast-days was permitted.

The following are the fasts which generally obtained in the Church: 1. The usual fast of forty days before Easter, or the Season of Lent. The duration of this fast at first was only forty hours (Tertull. De Jejun. c. 2, 18; Ireneaus, ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. i, v, c. 34). By the time of Gregory the Great (in the 8th century) it had extended to thirty-six days, and it had been so accepted by the Council of Niæum; but by Gregory the Great, or by Gregory II, it was extended to forty days, the duration of the proper fasts of Moses, Elias, and the blessed Saviour (Exod. xxxiv. 28; 1 Kings xix. 8; Matt. iv, 2). Hence the term Quadragesimae (q. v.), which had already been used to denote this period, became strictly applicable. Socrates (Hist. Eccl. vii, c. 19), Basili the Great, Ambrose, and Leo the Great speak of this quadragesimal fast as a divine institution but this can mean no more than that the fast was observed in imitation of the example of the divine Redeemer (Concil. Genonienses, c. 7 — in canone apostolorum, 68: "Si quis Episcopos, aut Presbyteros, etc., quadragesimam in mortem Christi, aut in festa, aut in die natalis, aut in die laetiarii, etc.:" Concil. Colonienses, ii, pt. 9, can. 6). 2. Quarterly fasts, no traces of which occur before the 6th century, although Bellarmino (De bonis operibus, lib. ii, c. 19) says that the first three of these fasts were instituted in the times of the apostles, and the last by pope Calixtus, A.D. 294. "A fast of three days before the festival of the Ascension," introduced by Maimerius, bishop of Vienne, in the middle of the 8th century. In some places it was not celebrated until after Whitsun. It was called Jejunium Rogationis, or Jejunium Litanies, "a fast of arrangements or Litanies," on account of certain litanies sung on those days. The words Annunciation and lauda, "litanies," in Latin Suppllicationes et Rogationes, in their original signification, are but another name for prayers in general, of whatever kind, that either were made publicly in the church or by any private person. (See Euseb. Fl. Const. i, i, c. 14; i, v, c. 65; Chrysostom. Hom. antependiurn in eculum; Cod. Theod. lib. xi, tit. v, "De hereticus," 1, 30, 1.) 4. Monthly fasts, a fast-day in every month except July and August (Concil. Illebriz. 83, 29; 33, 29; 39, 39), the 5th, the 13th, and the 19th, in the place of the ancient vigils which were abolished in the 8th century. 6. Weekly fasts, on Wednesdays and Fridays, entitled stationes, from the practice of soldiers keeping guard, which was called stabio by the Romans ("Stationum dies," Tertullian, De Orat. 23; "Stationibus quattuor et sexitem Sattibi dicunt," Idem, De...
Lentile (only in the plural ἐνέπτειν, odakshim), prob. from an obsolete root signifying to fodder; see φακάς, Vulg. lena) is probably a correct rendering of the plant thus designated (Gen. xxxv, 84; 2 Sam. xxvii, 28; xxiii, 11; Ezek. iv, 9). In Syria lentiles are still called in Arabic addas (Russell, N. H. of Aleppo, i, 74). They appear to have been chiefly used for making a kind of pottage. The red pottage, for which Essau hurried his birthright, was of lentiles (Gen. xxx, 29-34). The term red was, as with us, extended to yellowish-brown, which must have been the true color of the pottage if derived from lentiles, being that of the seeds rather than that of the pods, which were sometimes cooked entire (Mishna, Shabb. vii, 4). The Greeks and Romans also called lentiles red (see authorities in Celsius, Hierobotanic, i, 165). Lentiles were among the provisions brought to David when he fled from Absalom (2 Sam. xvii, 28), and a field of lentiles was the scene of an exploit of one of David's heroes (2 Sam. xxiii, 11). From Ezek. iv, 9, it would appear that lentiles were sometimes used as bread (comp. Athen. iv, 158). This was doubtless in times of scarcity, or by the poor (compare Aristoph. Plat. 1065). Sonini (Tertullian, p. 603) assures us that in southernmost Egypt, where the market is comparatively scarce, lentiles mixed with a little barley form almost the only food in use among the poorer classes. It is called betlim, is of a golden yellow color, and is not bad, although rather heavy. In that country, indeed, probably even more than in Palestine, lentiles anciently, as now, formed a chief article of food among the laboring classes. This is repeatedly noticed by ancient authors; and so much attention was paid to the culture of this useful pulse that certain varieties became remarkable for their excellence (comp. Dioscor. ii, 129). The lentiles of Pelusium, in the Nile nearest to Palestine, were esteemed both in Egypt and foreign countries (Virgil, Georg. i, 228), and this is probably the valued Egyptian variety which is mentioned in the Mishna (Ket. viii, 8) as neither large nor small. Large quantities of lentiles were exported from Alexandria (Augustine, Comm. in Pet. zvii). Plyn, in mentioning two Egyptian varieties, incidentally lets us know that one of them was red (compare Diog. Laertius, vii, 8), by remarking that they like a red soil, and by speculating whether the pulse may not have thence derived the reddish color which it imparted to the passage made with it (Histor. Natur. xvii, 12). This illustrates Jacob's red pottage. Dr. Shaw (i, 257) also states that these lentiles easily dissolve in boiling, and form a red or chocolate-colored pottage much esteemed in North Africa and Western Asia (see Thomson, Land and Book, i, 409). Dr. Kitto also says that he has often partaken of red pottage, prepared by seething the lentiles in water and then adding a little suet to give them a flavor, and that he found it better food than a stranger would imagine; "the mess," he adds, "had the richness which gained for it the name of adom" (Jub. iv, 80, 84). Putting these facts together, it is likely that the reddish lentile, which is now so common in Egypt (Descrip. de Egypte, xix, 65), is the sort to which all these statements refer. The tomb-paintings actually exhibit the operation of preparing pottage of lentiles, or, as Wilkinson (Anc. Egyptians, ii, 287) describes it, "a man engaged in cooking lentils."

Ancient Egyptian cooking lentils.
Lentiles for a soup or porridge; his companion brings a bundle of fagots for the fire, and the lentiles themselves are seen standing near him in wicker baskets." The lentiles of Palestine have been little noticed by travelers (e.g. Burchardt, Arab. p. 51). Nau (Voyage Nouveau, p. 18) mentions lentiles along with corn and peas, as a principal article of traffic at Tertura; D'Arvieux (Mem. ii, 257) speaks of a mosque, originally a Christian church, over the patriarchal tomb at Hebron, connected with which was a large kitchen where lentile pottage was prepared every day, and distributed freely to strangers and poor people, in memory of the transaction between Esau and Jacob, which they (erroneously) believe to have taken place at this spot. When Dr. Robinson was at Akaba, he says: "The commissary in the castle had also a few stores for sale at enormous prices, but we bought little except a supply of lentiles, or small beans, which are common in Egypt and Syria under the name of addus (the name in Hebrew and Arabic being alike)—the same from which the pottage was made for which Esau sold his birthright. We found them very palatable, and could well conceive that, to a weary hunter faint with hunger, they might be quite a dainty" (Bib. Res. i, 146). Again, when at Hebron, on the 24th of May, he observes: "The wheat harvest here in the mountains had not yet arrived, but they were threshing barley, addus or lentiles, and also vetches, called by the Arabs kersuna, which are raised chiefly for camel feed" (Bib. Res. ii, 439).

The lentile (Ervum lena of Linnaeus, class xvii, 8) is an annual plant, and the smallest of all the leguminous which are cultivated. It rises with a weak stalk about eighteen inches high, having pinnate leaves at each joint composed of several pairs of narrow leaflets, and terminating in a tendril, which supports it by fastening on to some other plant. The small flowers, ripen in July. When ripe, the plants are rooted up if they have been sown along with other plants, as is sometimes done, but they are cut down when grown by themselves. They are threshed, winnowed, and cleaned like grain. There are three or four kinds of lentiles, all of which are still much esteemed in those countries where they are grown, viz., the south of Europe, Asia, and North Africa. The red lentile is a small kind, the seeds of which, after being decorticated, are commonly sold in the bazaars of India. To the present day a favorite dish among the Portuguese and Spaniards is lentiles, served with their unflinching oil and garlic, and flavored with the aromatic herb. The preservation of animal food, it is a great resource in Catholic countries during the season of Lent, and some say that from hence the season derives its name. It is occasionally cultivated in England, but only as fodder for cattle; it is also imported from Alexandria. From the quantity of gluten the ripe seeds contain, they must be highly nutritious, though they have the character of being heating if taken in large quantities. Under the high-sounding name "Revalenta Arabicae," we pay a high price for them, and in various culinary preparations are unawares repeating Jacob's mistake (Plut. Alexander; Hogg, Peg. Kingdom, p. 275). In Egypt the haulm is used for packing.

Lentulus, Epistle Of (Epistola Lentulii), is the well-known title of an epistolary work on the physical aspect of Christ, which the only extant Greek which receives as authentic, and as having been written by Publius Lentulus, a Roman of Palestine, and perhaps of Jerusalem, to Rome. Manuscript copies of it are to be found, according to Joh. Albert Fabricius (Cod. apocryph. No. 2 Testamenti, i. 302), in several libraries of England, France, and Italy (viz., in those of the Vatican and of Padua), Germany (at Augsburg and Jena, where two copies formerly existed, one of which was embellished with a fine image of Christ, and had been presented to the elector Frederick the Wise by pope Leo X). A librarian of Jena, Christopher Mylius (Memorab. librioth, academ. Jenensis, Jen. 1746, 8vo, p. 301 sq.), states that this copy was written in golden letters upon red paper, very richly bound, and beautifully illustrated. This copy, however, is lost. The work was first printed in the Magdeburg Centuries (q.v.) (Basil. 1559), i, 344; it was then reproduced in Mich. Neander, Apostrophia (Basil. 1567), p. 410 sq., afterwards in Joh. Jac. Grynaei Monumenta s. Patrum orthodoro-graphica (Basil. 1569, fol.). Joh. Reiske, in Ecerocrit. histor. de imaginibus Jes. Chr. ref. (Jen. 1685, 4to), gave a twofold version of it, one after the other, the latter a reproduction of the former ascribed by Mylius. This epistle was highly regarded in former times; the papal legate, Jerome Xavier, translated it into Portuguese (in his history of Christ, a work full of legends and fables), and from this language it was subsequently translated into Persian; Reiske and Fabricius translated it into German, and published it at Nuremberg and at Erfurt. It is also to be found in a condensed form in the introduction to the works of archbishop Aneslin of Canterbury, which, though without date or name of place, are, from internal evidence, supposed to have been published at Paris about the close of the 16th or the beginning of the 17th century; in this work it is accompanied by a description of the personal appearance of the Virgin Mary. In the earliest ages of the Church the question of the personal appearance of Christ while on earth had begun to attract considerable attention. Had there been anything positively known on the subject then, it would certainly have been eagerly received. Yet, although the Church fathers Justin, Tertullian, Hegesippus, and Eusebius mention a letter of Pilate to Tiberius, one of Abgarus to Christ, and one of Jesus to Abgarus, they make no mention of any letter of Lentulus concerning the point. On the contrary, during the first century, while the Christian Church was suffering persecution, the impression prevailed, derived from Is. lii, 2, 3, that the
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Lord's personal appearance was very unprepossessing. But as the Church grew in prosperity and power this idea underwent a complete change. Eusebius and Aegidius agree that Juba was a very handsome man, which opinion was only based on the passage Ps. xlv. 2. In the works of the Greek historian Nicophorus (surnamed Callistus Stathouphu-
lus), who lived in the 14th century, and whom Weis-
mann considers a credulous, uncritical writer, we find a
description of Christ's personal appearance, for which,
however, the writer gives no authority, saying only that
it is derived from the ancients. As it greatly resembles
that of Lentulus, and perhaps served as its basis, we give
it here as a curiosity: "H. münno diapilase tis mophes
tou eunou ous ous Christou, os ier árkhion pa-
erelifimos, toiai di teis os wv tín paralhénin, ó
ou thisi an ean wv ákra.

The very contents of the letter are sufficient evidence of
its spuriousness. Had it really been written by a Ro-
mman, it would not have been addressed to the senate,
but to the emperor, who was the immediate master of
the Syrian provinces, and it seems to have been already
noticed in former times, for in the Magde-
burgh Centuries it is said to have been addressed to
the emperor Tiberius. A fact of still greater importance
is that Lentulus is designated as Hierosolymitana
prose. No such office existed. There was a Praise
Syria and a Procurator Judea but no Prose of the
Roman inhabitants at Jerusalem. For this reason he
is called in the Manucri. Jen. i, Proculion in partibus
Judea, and in the Manucri. Vatic. and Jen. ii, in a thor-
oughly Roman Catholic manner, officialis in provincia
Judea, which is repeated in the Ann. iuv. et leg. 37 of
that period. But he is nowhere represented as a
friend of Pilate, as Zimmermann attempts to make him
in his Lebenge schichte d. Kirche Christi, p. 70. We know
most of the procurators or presides of Syria, and all the
procurators of Judea, but no such procurator as Lentu-
lus. In the classics there are forty-three persons of
that name mentioned, but four only belonged to the
times of Tiberius. One of them only, Enneas Lentulus
Getulicus, was, according to Tacitus (Ann. iv. 46), in
the year 26, consul with Tiberius, and in 44 was the chief
of the legions in upper Germany (Tacitus, Annal. vi. 90);
he may, indeed, according to Suetonius (Calig. c. 8) and
Pliny (Epist. v. 8), have been in Judea during the year
26 to 38, but there is no proof of it. On the other hand,
the Lentulus who wrote the epistle is expressly called in
the MS. Jen. i, Publics. Moreover, there is no mention
at all made of the epistle by any of the ancient writers,
whilst other epistles, even some of an apocryphal nature,
are mentioned by them, and this one, if it had been known,
would certainly have attracted the attention of the
apologists at a time when the general impression
was so strong in favor of the first epistles by the hand
of the Lord. Nicophorus Xanthopoulos, whose description
of Christ's personal appearance we gave above, states only
that it is based on old traditions, while, if such a descrip-
tion as that given in the Epistle of Lentulus had been
known in the Church, it is evident that such an author
would certainly not have failed to quote it as an author-
ity. Regarding the literary merits of the work, it must be
confessed that it is written in old Latin; but as it is
full of expressions which would not naturally be used by
a Roman citizen—as the whole tenor of the work, more-
over, is thoroughly unliterary and anachronistic, it is to be supposed that
its writer aimed to imitate the style of the ancients, and
pass it off as a work of their age. A Roman would nev-
er have used the expression propheti cerisitiae, fili homi-
num, at the beginning and at the end of the epistle. So
also the appellation Christus Jesus is evidently taken
from the New Testament, for the Redeemer was never thus
designated during his lifetime. Jesus himself declined
the name of Christ, forbade his disciples calling him thus,
and he never was called so by his enemies. How
then, could a heathen have come to call him Christ, and
even to propose the appellation to the Jewish church?
A change which only took place after his claim to be con-
sidered as the Messiah had been established beyond
cavil. If it is claimed that Christ was called by the
heathen the prophet of truth, yet, as Christ's activity
in Judea was not directed during his lifetime to the red
the epistles are addressed to people of different names,
"fere omnes alli: "imperubern", capitolium coloris, non
longam sed bifurcatum [omnes addunt: "ad spectum
habet simplex et maturum"], oculi varia et claris
existentibus. In incoreponen terribilis, in admonitio-
ne placidaux [plurimi ali: "blandus"] et amabilis, hilaris
epervitas gentium, quae namque ad finem circulavit et
fere autom semper. Sic in statura corporis propagatáus
[plurimi ali addunt: "et rectus"] manus habens et membra
[eterni omnes: "brachia"] visu detectabilis in eloquio
rectus ceteri: "colloquentio" gravia, rarus et modestius
pietatis inter filios hominum. Vatelest [Hoc Vatele des-
set in religiis MSS. et edd."

The same tendency prevailed also in the Western
Church until the Reformation, when Luther took a more
reasonable view of the question, saying, "It is very
possible that some may have been handsome, physi-
cally, as Christ. Perhaps some were even handsome,
for we do not see it mentioned that the Jews ever won-
dered about them. The more we see of the Roman Catholic
writer (In libro de forma Christi, Paris,
1649), who said that the Redeemer was not either ill
favored nor more handsome than other men. In other
cases, however, the Roman Catholic Church has re-
tained the somewhat fanciful description of Lentulus.
If we now look more closely into this episode of Lentu-
lus, we find in the edition of Grynew (Monum. ortho-
doxographia) that it reads, "Lentulus, Hierosolymitana
proseus, S. P. Q. Romano S. Apparuit temporibus
nostris et adiuvit homo magnus virtutis, nominatus
Christianus Jesus, qui dicitur a gentibus pro pheta veritatis,
quem ejus discipuli vocant filium Dei, sustineat mortuos
e sanzet angustos [MS. Vatic. "langechtes"].

Quo quidem staturae proceri [Goldast. addit, "scilicet
in palmorum et medi"], spectabilis, vultum habens vene-
rabilium, quem intuentes possunt et diligere et formi-
dare: Capillos vero ciro ciro, crinas aliquantulum ceru-
ilios et fulgentiores [MS. 1 Jen. "Capillos habens co-
loris nucis aevulame prematur et planos usque ad
auras, ab auribus vero ciro ciro, crinas aliquantulum
ceruillios et fulgentiores"], ab hibemus volitantes [om-
nes ali: "ventilantes"], discrimen habens in medio cap.
mita juxta morn Nazarenorum [Centur. Magd. et An-
selmi opp. "Nazarenorum"]: frontem planam et sereni-
samum, cum facie sine nuga (ac) macula aliqua, quam
rubor moderatus venustati. Naer et oris nulla proseus
eca. Ait item: "Quirine condatur ante me, et non
[ferve omnes ali: "imperubern"], capitorium coloris, non
longam sed bifurcatum [omnes addunt: "ad spectum
habet simplex et maturum"], oculi varia et claris
existentibus. In incoreponen terribilis, in admonitio-
ne placidaux [plurimi ali: "blandus"] et amabilis, hilaris
epervitas gentium, quae namque ad finem circulavit et
fere autom semper. Sic in statura corporis propagatáus
[plurimi ali addunt: "et rectus"] manus habens et membra
[eterni omnes: "brachia"] visu detectabilis in eloquio
rectus ceteri: "colloquentio" gravia, rarus et modestius
pietatis inter filios hominum. Vatelest [Hoc Vatele des-
set in religiis MSS. et edd."]
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igned as heathen, but as Romans; and they did not interest themselves enough in the wandering Rabbi to return in the style of the inhabitants. Now it was otherwise with the heathen residing on the frontiers of Palestine. "His disciples called him the Son of God." Though they gave him occasionally that name, it was so far from being a general custom that the governor himself knew nothing of it. So this like the following sentences on the raising of the dead and healing of the sick, is all taken from the Gospel. It also says that his hair was parted after the manner of the Nazarites: we find the substitution of Nazarene for Nazarite, which only took place afterwards. Now a Roman officer would know little or nothing about these; moreover, Christ could not properly be called a Nazarene, for he drank wine, touched the dead, and did many other things contrary to the customs of the Nazarites. The remark that he was never seen to laugh, but often to weep, proves him to have led a solitary life, such as we have no example of at the supposed time of the writing of this epistle, and is only an idea derived from the Gospel, and from the state of things in the Middle Ages. The last words also, "beautiful among the sons of men," are quite unsuited to the mouth of a Roman, who, when there was a need of use made of Hebrews, and it is clearly taken from the 11th Psalm, which is the basis of the whole description. This consequently could not apply to our Lentulus, but only to a monk of the Middle Ages.

Having thus seen how this epistle carries within itself the proofs of its spuriousness, the question arises, When was it written? If it was included in the works of Anselm, we would have to consider it as having been composed in the 11th century. Yet it is simply appended to the works of this author, and was never made use of until the 15th century, to give favor to an opinion which the monks had an interest to propagate. Laurentius Vallis, who lived in the 15th century, was the first who made any mention of it in his argument against the pseudo donation of Constantine. A postscript of great interest is appended to the 2d Jena MS, and it, in our estimation, tends to reveal the true character of the work: "Explicit epistola Jacobi de Columpano anno Domini 1421 reperit eam in annulaibus Romae, in libro antiquissimo in Capitolo ex dono Patriarchae Constantinopolitanorum." If this postscript is to be relied on, this epistle was sent to Rome in the 14th century by a patriarch of Constantinople, at a present time's worth, to the pope; and the text before us, as a very old one, it is most likely that this description is a Latin translation of that of Nicophorus, which we gave above, that the translator added the postscript with the intention of rendering his spurious work more credible, and that consequently both epistle and postscript are spurious. The imitator or translator of Nicophorus, who gives ample proofs in his work of the source whence he drew when he speaks of the stature of Christ (in a copy in Goldast we find, after statura procerus, "esticet ex palmarum et mediul"), gave the work the form of an epistle, and gave it the name of Lentulus, taken from some tradition, or which otherwise seemed suitable to him. It is now evident that the epistle could only have been written at some time after Nicophorus, and before the year 1500, consequently in the 14th century. Dr. Edward Robinson, after carefully examining all the evidence for and against the authenticity of this work, thus presents the results of his inquiry: "In favor of the authenticity of the letter we have only the purport of the inscription. There is no external evidence whatever. Against its authenticity we have the great discrepancy of the inscription; the fact that no such official person as Lentulus existed at the time and place specified, nor for many years before and after; the utter silence of history in respect to the existence of such a letter; the foreign and later idioms, and the manner of its style in the epistle as well; the absence of the epistle stand with established historical facts; and the probability of its having been produced at some time not earlier than the 11th century." See Joh. Beud. Carpzov, Theologoi Hellenastici sermones: de oris et origine ecclesiae (Paris, 1539); Joh. Phil. Gahler, Theologiae Aristotelicae nova et 1822 in Auctentiam epistolas Pauli Lentuli ad Semitum Romanae de Jure Christo scriptas; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, viii, 222 sq.; Dr. Robinson in Biblical Repository, ii, 967; Schaff, Ch. Hist. iii, 368; Jameson, Our Lord, i, 86; Smith's Biblical Repository, March 2, 1867, p. 769 sq. See Jesus Christ.

LEO OF ACHRIUS OR ACHRIEDA (now Okhrida, in Albania), was so called because he held the archbishopric of Achria, in the Greek Church, among the Bulgarians. He joined about A.D. 1053, with Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople, in writing a very bitter letter against the pope, which they sent to John, archbishop of Trani, in Apulia, to be distributed among the members of the Latin Church—prelates, monks, laity. A translation of this letter is given by Baronius (Annales Ecclesiae ad ann. 1058, xxvi, etc.). Pope Leo IX replied in a long letter, which is given in the Concilia (vol. ix, col. 94, ed. Labbe; vol. x, col. 297, ed. Mansi; vol. xix, col. 635, ed. Mansi), and the following year both Cerularius and Leo of Achria were excommunicated by cardinal Humbert, the papal legate (Baronius, ad ann. 1054, xxv). Leo wrote many other letters, which are extant in MS. in various European libraries, and are cited by Athanasius, in his De Comnenis Eccles. Orient. et Occident.; by Beveridge, in his Codex Canonum; by Alexius Athenaeus, in his Synopsis Epistolarum Canonicae; and by Comnenus Popadopoli, in his Promotio Mystagogica. See Fabricius, Biblioth. Graec. iv, 715; Cave, Hist. Lit. ii, 194, ed. Oxon. 1740; Ortolani, De Scripturis et Scriptis Eccles. ii, 600—Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog., ii, 741.

LEO EGYPTIUS, OR THE EGYPTIAN. The early Christian writers, in their controversy with the heathen, refer not unfrequently to a Leo or Leon as having admitted that the deities of the ancient Gentile nation had originally been men, agreeing in this respect with Ewe-merus, with whom he was contemporary, if not necessarily a pupil. This name was after一世, Leon, which stems from the Greek λιον (lion), and is most explicit in his notice of him, says he was an Egyptian priest of high rank, "magnum antiquus," and that he expounded the popular mythology to Alexander the Great in a manner, that with him it became a trifle to be written down in an epitome. The explanations received in Greece, accorded with them in making the gods (including even the major gentium to have originally been men. Augustine refers to an account of the statements of Leo contained in a letter of Alexander to his mother. It is to be observed, though Leo was high in his priestly rank at the time when Alexander was in Egypt (B.C. 882-881), his name is Greek; and Ammianus (adv. Gentes, iv, 29) calls him Leo Pelleus, or Leo of Pella, an epithet which Fabricius does not satisfactorily explain. Worth (Not. ad Timian. p. 56, ed. Oxford, 1700) would identify our Leo with Leon of Lampraceus, the husband of Themistia or Themistio, the female Epicurean (Diog. Laert. x, 5, 29); but the husband of Themistia was more correctly called Leontius, while the Egyptian is never called by any other name than Leo. Ammianus speaks in such a way as to lead us to think that Alexander had in mind the Egyptian priest in whose words the human origin of the gods were extant and accessible, but it is possible he refers, like Augustine, to Alexander's letter. The reference to Leo in Clemens Alexandrinus is not more explicit (Strat. Out, 1, 21, § 106, p. 189, Sylburg; p. 387, ed. Pott; ii, 76, p. 183, ed. Pott; 12mo). But Athanasius's distinct mention of the 'Yorwqil-ματα, or Commentaries of Leo, shows that this system
had been committed to writing by himself; and Tertullian (De Coron., c. 7) directs his readers "to unroll the writings of the Egyptian Hyginus," (Pseudo-Sel-

luvnicosmovos, c. 29) to refer to Leo as though he wrote a history of Egypt ("Qui res Egypticus scriptus?""). The scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius (iv, 262) gives a refer-
ence here to what Leon had said respecting the antiq-
ity of the author of the "Hymn to the Sun." The copy of the Latin version and notes to the text of Leo, and illus-
trated it by engravings from ancient gems: this ed-


tion is, however, scarce and dear, the greater part of the copies having been lost by shipwreck, but his text, pref-
ace, "version, and notes (not only the scholia) were
reprinted in the Bonn ed. of the Corpus Histr. Byzantinae

Leo Diaconus, or the Dracoon, a Byzantine histo-
rian of the 10th century, of whose personal history but
little is known, except the incidental notices in his prin-
cipal works (collected by C. B. Hase in his Prospicio to his edition of Leo), was born at Caloût, a town of Asia, beautifully situated at the side or foot of Mount Timolus, near the sources of the Caystius, in Asia Minor, and was at Constantineople pursuing his studies A.D. 966, where he was an admiring spectator of the firmness of the em-
peror Nicephorus II, Phocas, in the midst of a popular tumult (iv, 7). Hase places his birth in or about A.D. 966. He was in Asia in or about the time of the depos-
tion of Constantine I, patriarch of Constantinople, and the election of his successor, Antonius III, A.D. 978 or 974, and relates that at that time he frequently saw two
Cappadocians, twins of thirty years' age, whose bodies were united from the umqua to the flanks (x, 5). Hav-
ing once met the aged leon, he served as a secretary to the emperor Basilus II in his unfortunate expedition against the Bulgarians, A.D. 981, and when the emperor raised the siege of Trylitsa or Triaditsa (the ancient Sardica), Leo barely escaped death in the headlong flight of his countrymen (x, 6). Of his history after this nothing is known; but Hase observes he must have written his history after A.D. 998, as he adverts to the rebellion and death of Phocas Bardas (x, 9), which occurred in that
year. He must have lived later than Hase has remark-
ed, and at least till A.D. 998, as he notices (x, 10) that the emperor Basilus II restored "in six years the cus-
pola of the great church of St. Sophia's" at Constantinople, which had been overthrown by the earthquake (comp. Cedren, Compend. ii, 498, ed. Bonn) of A.D. 987. His works are, Τετρακία ήτοι ού, ou, Ηθοδωρια άδεκα, or Historia Libra decem:—Oratio ad Basilium Imperatorum:—and, unless it be the oratio imperator Leo, or the Ηθοδωρια of Nicke-

lew Archeogaleon. The last two are extant only in MS.

The history of Leo includes the period from the Cretan expedition of Nicephorus Phocas, in the reign of Romanus II, A.D. 959, to the death of John I, Tris-
mieces, A.D. 975. It relates the victories of the em-
peror Nicephorus Phocas, and Trismieces over the Moesians in Cilicia and Syria, and the recovery of those coun-
tries, or the greater part of them, to the Byzantine empire,

and the wars of the same emperors with the Bul-
garians and Russians. According to Hase, Leo employs unusual and unappropiate words (many of them bor-
rowed from Homer, Agathias the historian, and the Sep-
trosgiast) in the place of simple and common ones, and abounds in tautological phrases. His knowledge of ge-

ography and ancient history is slight, but with these de-
fects his history is a valuable contemporary record of a
stirring time, honestly written. His修vities and Cedrenus are much indebted to Leo, and Hase

considers Zonaras also to have used his work. The Historia was first published at the cost of count Nicho-

las Romanoff, chancellor of Russia, by Car. Benedict Hase (Paris, 1816).—Combe had intended to publish it in the

Paris ed. of the Corpus Histr. Byzantinae, with the Historia of Michael Psellus, but was prevented by death, A.D. 1679. The Latin version which he had pre-

pared was communicated by Montfaucon to Pagi, who
insered some portions in his Crítico in Burevus (at end, No. 149). No. 161 contains the Historia, with a facsimile of the Latin text, for many years after, committed to Michael le Quien, that he might publish an edition of Psellus and Leo, and part

of the latter's work was actually printed. In the disor-
ders of the French Revolution the papers of Combes

were finally lost or destroyed. In 1828, a Latin version

was added with notes to the text of Leo, and illus-

trated it by engravings from ancient gems: this ed-

tion is, however, scarce and dear, the greater part of the copies having been lost by shipwreck, but his text, pref-

ace, version, and notes (not only the scholia) were
reprinted in the Bonn ed. of the Corpus Histr. Byzantinae

Leo the Great. See Leo the Thracian (emperor) and Leo I (pope).

Leo the Isaurian is the name which is commonly

given in his Historia to Leo III or Flavius Leo Isau-

rianus, emperor of Constantinople from the year 718 to

741, a man remarkable on many accounts, but who, from

his connection with the great contest about image-wor-

ship in the Christian Church, became one of the most

prominent historical names among the emperors of the

East.

1. Early History. —He was born in or on the borders

of the rude province of Isauria, and his original name

was Comos. He emigrated with his father, a wealthy

farmer or graziar of that country, to Thrace. Young

Comon obtained the place of saptarhan or broadwords-

man, in the court of Justinian II, and soon, by his mili-

tary talents, excited the jealousy of the emperor, as he
drew the eyes of the people, and especially of the sol-
diers, towards him as one fitted to command, and com-

petent even for the empire. He was sent forward, there-

for, with a few troops against the Alani, and then ab-

doned by the emperor without success, in the hope that

he would be cut off and destroyed, but from this critical

position Leo extricated himself with consummate dext-

terity and courage. Anastasius II (A.D. 718–716) gave

him the supreme command of the troops in Asia, which

was exposed to the terrible onslaughts of the Arab or

Saracen hordes, by whom it had already been half over-

run and conquered. This command was still in his

hands when Theodosius III, at the beginning of 716, rose

against Anastasius, deposed him, and seated himself

upon the throne. Leo, being summoned to ac-

knowledge Theodosius, at once denounced him as a

usurper, and attacked him under pretext of restoring

the rightful sovereign to the throne, but probably with

the design of seizing for himself the imperial dignity.

He secured the support of the principal leaders in

the army, reached the imperial throne before he could

be gathered in sufficient force to resist him, and slew

them. At Nicomedia he met the son of Theodosius, whom he

defeated and captured. He next marched direct upon

Constantinople, and Theodosius, seeing no hope of resis-

tance, quietly resigned his sceptre in March, 716, and

retired into a convent, while the vacant throne was fort-

with occupied by Leo himself, by the suffrages of the

troops.

2. Imperial History. —No sooner was Leo arrayed in

the purple than the caliph Soleiman, together with the

noted Moelins, appeared before Constantinople with an

immense and an insatiable army, supported by an

cerful fleet, determined to retrieve their sulfamed fame.

The city was invested by sea and land, and its capture

was considered certain; but the indefatigable energy,

military skill, and fearless courage of Leo, aided by the

new invention of the Greek fire, saved the capital from

falling, five years in the siege, but cost the lives of

the Moelins. The superstitions people ascribed their
deliverance to the constant interposition of the Virgin,

in which they gave the greatest possible praise to the

genius of Leo. This third (Gibbon calls it the second)
isegue of Combon was uniform to the Saracens last two years (Gibbon calls it thirteen months) from the

15th of August, 718. On the 15th of August, 720, the

caliph (now Omar, who had succeeded Soleiman shortly
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after the commencement of the siege) was compelled to raise the siege, losing in a storm the greater part of the remnants of his third fleet before reaching the harbors of Syria and Egypt. So close had been the investment of the city, so enormous the preparations, and so loud the alarms, that in the opinion of Constantinople was given up as lost, notwithstanding all the splendid victories of Leo, for the very news of those victories had been intercepted by the vigilant blockade of the besieges. The whole empire was in consternation, and in the West the rumor was credited that the caliph had actually assaulted the throne of Byzantium. Accordingly, Sisigius, governor of Italy, took measures to make himself independent, and to secure the crown for himself in case of complete success; but Leo immediately dispatched a small force to Sicily, which soon crushed the rebellion. Meanwhile, Bishop Anastasius, also, was tempted to plot the recovery of the throne, and in the attempt lost his life. In spite of his defections before Constantinople, Omar continued the war for twenty years; and though, in 726, he captured Cesarea in Cappadocia, and Neo-Cesarea in Pontus, yet Leo maintained an acknowledged superiority. The great work of ecclesiastical reform occupied the attention of the empire, without any considerable interruption from the infidels, until the year 734. What belongs to this chapter of domestic history, though it includes elements and facts of military and political significance, is reserved for the next head. During the last twenty years of Leo's reign (from 724) falls the protracted life-struggle with the Saracens. The caliph Hisham instigated the Syrians to support an adventurer who pretended to be the son of Justinian II, and who, under the protection of the caliph, entered Jerusalem arrayed in the imperial purple. This proved a mere farce. But something more serious happened when, in 729, the Arab general Soleiman invaded the empire with an army of 90,000 men, distributed into three bodies. The first entered Cappadocia, and ravaged it with fire and sword; the second, commanded by Suleyman and Beni, penetrated into Libya; the third, under Soleiman, covered the rear. Leo was actually taken by surprise; but he soon assembled an army and defeated the second body, in Phrygia, in a pitched battle, and obliged Soleiman to withdraw hastily into Syria. The Saracens had, in the meantime, been routed in their invasion of Europe by Charles Martel in 726, and the progress of their conquests seemed now for some time to be checked both in the East and in the West. The remaining great event of Leo's reign was the terrible earthquake of October, 746, which caused great loss of life and property.

8. The Iconoclastic Controversy. In this business Leo would seem to have begun of his own motion, and almost single-handed. No party of any account against image-worship existed in the Church, but he believed that by taking the side of iconoclasts he could hasten the conversion of the Jews and Mohammedans, and though at first very cautious, he finally, after some nine or ten years of his reign, issued his edict prohibiting the worship of all images, whether statues or pictures, of Christ, the Virgin, or the saints. Christendom was astounded by such a revolution in the belief of images. See of this in the following usages. See ICONOCLASM. Leo, in fact, found arrayed against him not only the bigoted and exasperated monks, but the superstitious masses of the people of the East and West, and almost all the clergy, with all the bishops, excepting Claudius, bishop of Nocinaria in Phrygia, and Theodosius, metropolitan of Ephesus, and perhaps two or three more. Even Germansius, bishop of Constantinople, joined with Gregory II of Rome in the universal outcry against the emperor's attempt, and thus, almost for the first time, the bishops of the two Romes were (like Pius and Hesiod) united in the interest of a common cause. Whether provoked by the violence, and unreasonableness, and rebellious spirit of the opposition, or prompted by a growing zeal for the purity of religion, or by the obstinacy of personal pride and arbitrary power, or guided by considerations of presumed policy, or from whatever motives, the emperor soon after issued a second edict far more stringent and decisive. It commanded the total destruction of all images (or statues intended for worship) and the effacement of all pictures by the whitewash. The consequences were the same. The worshippers were maddened. The officer who attempted, in Constantinople, to execute the edict upon a statue of Christ renowned for its miracles, was assaulted by the women and beaten to death with clubs. The emperor sent an armed guard to suppress the tumult, and a frightful massacre was the consequence. Leo was regarded as no better than a Saracen. Even his successes against the common foe were ingeniously turned against him. A certain Cosmas was proclaimed emperor in Leo's stead, a fleet was armed, and Constantinople itself was made ready; but the news of the explosion in the fire, the insurrection was suppressed, the leaders either fell or were executed along with the usurper. A second revolt at Constantinople was not suppressed till after much bloodshed. Everywhere in the empire the monks were busy instigating and fomenting rebellion. Germansinus, bishop of Constantinople, already an octogenarian, as he could not conscientiously aid in the execution of the imperial decree, quietly retired, or suffered himself to be removed from his see. Quite so peaceful was the position pope Gregory II of Rome assumed. Following the example of his two predecessors, he seized the opportunity when the emperor had his hands full with seditious tumults and disturbances at home, and, confidently relying upon the support of the ignorant, and monk-ridden, and half-Christianized population of the West, dispatched to the emperor the two most arrogant and insolent letters, and condemned in unmeasured terms his war upon images as a war upon the Christian religion itself. The emperor ordered the execution of Ravnena to march upon Rome; but the pope, by the aid of the Lombards, compelled him to retire, and he had enough to do to maintain himself even at home. In fact, he was reduced to live in one quarter of Ravenna as a sort of captive; and finally Gregory III, the successor of Gregory II, in 731 held a council at Rome in which the Iconoclasts were anathematized. The emperor hereupon sent a formidable expedition against Italy, with special orders to reduce Ravenna. The expedition, however, failed, and Ravenna, with the Exarchate, fell into the hands of the Lombards, and thus Italy and the pope became practically independent of the Eastern empire. Leo now only sought the accomplishment of one object, viz., the detachment of Greece, Illyria, and Macedonia from the spiritual authority of Ravenna, and consequently annexed them to that of the patriarchs of Constantinople, and this created the real effective cause of the final schism of the Latin and Greek churches (784). The pope henceforth never submitted to the emperor, nor did he ever recover the lost portions of his patriarchate. Meantime, from the East, another voice joined in the fray—John of Damascus. He issued his fulminations against the emperor securely from under the protection of the caliphs, who were more pleased with the attacks upon Leo than scandalized by the defiance of the spiritual head. It was in the midst of this wild and protracted controversy that Leo died of dropsy in 741, and left to his son the accomplishment of a task which he had hoped he would himself effect.

As to the controversy itself, one of the strongest points ever made against the position of Leo is that he attacked the fine arts, and sought to destroy and abolish all the beauty and ornamentation of the Christian edifices. On this ground an earnest appeal has been made against him, and against all opponents of image worship, in the interests of a good cause. Even Neanthes, it is quite to take sides with Gregory against the barbarian emperor in this point of view. But, in the first place, it is by no means historically certain that Leo proceeded to any such lengths, or with such motives, in his
iconoclast. He proposed simply to destroy objects of worship. He made no war upon beauty or art. If, in accordance with his plan, in the face of the furious opposition he met with, he was carried further, it was not for such, especially considering his education, the great difficulty of making nice distinctions in such cases and under such circumstances, and the known propensities of human nature and taste, by the enemies of the Church, to become, like the impious and discordant, especially the object of the Church, to become, like the impious and discordant, especially intolerant to the religious reverence for images. With the development of Grecian art Grecian idolatry lost its hold. It is a remarkable fact that the oldest and most important, and hideous ideals among the heathen are the widest and intense devotion; and among the Christian, it is the same, of the sacred, and the stained and bleeding figures, rudely imitating the human form, and not some Sistine Madonna, that has bent the knees of adoring multitudes. The image whose toe is now devoutly kissed by the faithful at St. Peter's, in Rome, is not remarkable for its artistic claims. If it was a barbarian, Gregory was hardly less so, as is evident from the letters of the latter to the emperor. The ignorance of the pope is almost as remarkable as his impudence. He expressly and repeatedly confounds the pious Hezekiah, who destroyed the brazen serpent, with his own apostate Arias, and under this card name pronounces him a self-willed violator of the priests of God. He apparently confounded them both with Ahasuerus, who was the grandson of the one and the father of the other. It is true, he prefers to quote the passage from the former's to ruin it than it should have been, so that the Pope, both of which he gave it, it could not have been in that edict; and if it had been, he did not know enough to correct the blunder. It is said that Leo was cruel in the execution of his decree. It may be so. He was a soldier, a Byantine emperor, and lived in the 6th century. "The history of the Ammonius, and the populace, which they controlled, had not violently resisted the imperial decree, there would have been no cruelty. It is said that Leo acted arbitrarily, as if he had been the master of the minds and con-science of men, to make and unmake their religion for them. This is too true, and this was his mistake; but all his predecessors, with Constantine the Great, had made the same mistake. It was a Byzantine tradition. It was the theory of the age. Protestantism, with the same creed in regard to images, has proceeded upon a different theory, and has succeeded. It is said that the Church, in her general councils, has decided against Leo. If so, it was not till after, in his son's reign, a council styling itself eccumenical, and regularly convoked as such, consisting of no less than 548 bishops, had unanimously decided in his favor. It is said that, at all events, there was no historical evidence of the iconoclasts in the succeeding history of the Church; that iconoclasts was crushed and brought to naught in the East and in the West, and images achieved a complete triumph. Iconoclasts was indeed crushed by the unnatural revolution of the Arian heresy. The Arian heresy was so baseless, that it could hardly be regarded as superior to that of Leo. In fact, the images are distinguished from pictures, Iconoclast has thus far triumphed in the East; and in the West it was not until after the earnest and manly resistance of Charlemagne and the Council of Frankfort that the image-worshiping pope and priestess finally, or rather for a time, carried their point.

4. Character of Leo. — Almost all we know of Leo comes to us through his enemies — his prejudiced, bigoted, unprincipled, enemies. So little of his most odious acts alleged against him, as the burning of the great library at Constantinople, are purely their malignant inventions. His motives are seen only through their jaundiced or infuriated eyes. His very words come to us for the most part, only through their garbled versions of his dados enemies, they have not been able so to distort, or blacken, or hide his true lineaments, but that he still stands out to an impartial observer one of the ablest, purest, manliest, and most respectable sovereigns that ever occupied the Constantinopolitan throne. His rapid rise from obscurity to the pinnacle of power, his firm and successful administration amid foreign assaults and domestic plots, and his resolute prosecution of the reformation of the Church, all indicate a wise and provident policy, grand vigor, and decision of will. His early military life may have rendered him cruel and obstinate; but the clueness and severity of his manners. He was in many respects, and particularly in a certain rugged and straightforward honesty and strength of purpose, just the man needed for the times. How much better and wiser he was than he appears we cannot say, but there is every reason to believe that a full and fair view of his history, if it could now be unearsted from the monkish rubbish, and rottenness, and filth that have overwhelmed it, would present him in a vastly more favorable light than that in which he has been left to stand. (D. R. G.)

5. Literature. — See Henke in Ehrh. a. Gruber, Allgemeine Encyklopaedie, sect. ii, vol. xvi (1889), 119 sq.; Smith, Dict. Greek and Roman Biog. vol. ii, s. v.; Marsden, Hist. Christian Churches and Sects, ii, 153; Milman, Hist. Latin Christiinity, ii, 305 sq.; Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, v, 10 sq.; Reicheil, See of Rome to the Middle Ages, p. 46 sq.; Leeser, Hist. of Morale, ii, 292; Fouleau, Christendom's Divisions, vol. i and ii; Hefele, Conciliumgesch. (Freiburg, 1855); English transl. History of Councils (Lond, 1872, 8vo), vol. i; Baxmann, Politik der Päpste (Elbsd., 1868), vol. i; Hergenrother, Photius (Regensburg, 1867), vol. i; and the references in the article ICONOCLASM.

LEO THE MAGNENTUS (Μαγνήτου ή Μαγνητικός), a commentator on Aristotle, flourished during the first half of the 14th century. His name, Leo, is frequently omitted in the MSS. of his works. He was a monk, and after the death of Methodius of Morafa, the editor of Ammonius, he was elected to the See of Nicaea. His Commentary on Aristotle's "Posterior Analytics" has been preserved, and his Commentary on the "Prior Analytics" has been translated into Latin and published by Aldus, Venice, 1608, folio, with the commentary of Ammonius, from which Leo borrowed very largely, and the paraphrase of Paellus on the same book of Aristotle, and the commentary of Ammonius on Aristotle's Categoriae s. Prædicamentis. In the Latin title of this edition, by misprint, the author is called Margen-tinus. A Latin version of Leo's commentary, by J. B. Kasarius, has been repeatedly printed with the Latin version of Ammonius. Another Latin version by Jerome Leustrius has also been printed: — Ἐκλεξίας εἰς τὰ Πεπρομενα Ἀριστοτέλεα, Commentarius in Aristotelis De Interpretatione Librum (published by Aldus, Venice, 1608, folio, with the commentary of John Philopenus on the same work) by Trincavellus [Venice, 1586, fol.]; and a Latin version of the same commentary by Kasarius, has been repeatedly printed, either separately or with other commentaries on Aristotle. The following works in MS. are ascribed, but with doubtful correctness, to Leo Magnenetus: — "Commentarius in Categoriae Aristotelis (exstant in the King's library, Paris); — "Aequa Res (Mistriii, 1533, fol.); — Minuta Historia; — Prior Aristo-tes Aristotelis De Sophisticis Elenchis; and Aristo- teli de cænis epistomata. These two works
are mentioned by Montfaucon (Bibl. Coelest., p. 235): the latter is perhaps not a distinct work, but a portion of the above. In the MS. the author is called Leonis Magen-
tenus: — Commentarius in Isagogam quinque Voces Por-
pagys. Buille doubts if this work, which is in the Me-
dicane library at Florence (Bandini, Catalog. Codic. Lau.
Mons., p. 275), is properly to be considered Leonis Magn.
tenus: — Commentarius in Isagogam quinque Voces Por-
Paghys. Buille conjectures, and with some reasons, that Isagoge is a cor-
ruption of Magnenatus or Magenatus: if so, and the works are assigned to their real author, we must add the commentaries on Topica and Analytica Posteri-
oria to the works already mentioned. Nicolaus Commes-
popodi speaks of many other works of Leo, but his au-
thority is of little value. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, iii, 210, 218, 218, 428, vii, 717, viii, 143; xii, 208; 
giae (Paris, 1740, fol.), l. c. — Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. 
Biogr. (ed. 1771).

Leo of Mouza. See Leo da Modena.

Leo the Philosopher (Sapiens or Philosophus), a 
surname of Flavius Leo VI, emperor of Constantinople, 
named on the publication of the Basilica, was born A. D. 866. His father was the Magenatus, an uninterrupted series of wars and conquests. In 887 and 888 the Arabs invaded Asia Minor, landed in Italy and Sicily, plundered Samos and other islands in the Archipelag, and until 892 did away with imperial authority in the Italian dominions. By Cyril, his father-in-law and prime minister, Leo was subjected to a bloody war with the Byzantines; but, by involving them, through intrigues, in a war with the Hungarians, he succeeded in bringing the war with himself to a speedy termin-
ation. The following years were rendered remarkable by several conquests against the Arabs. That of 892 proved nearly fatal; it was fortunately discovered in time, and quelled by one Simons, who, in reward, was created patriarch, and enjoyed the emperor's favor until 910, when, suspected of treachery, and accused of abuse of his position, he was sentenced to perpetual imprison-
ment. At the opening of the 10th century, the Arabs and
northern neighbours of the empire made another at

tack on the imperial possessions. The former once 
more invaded Sicily, and took Tarquinium, and in 
904 appeared in the harbor of Tarsdolonicus with a nu-
menious force; but they were repulsed by the inhabitants of the splendid city, destroyed a great portion of it, plundered the inhabitants generally, and left laden with booty and captives. Leo died in 911. He was married four times, in consequence of which he was excluded from the com-

munion with the faithful by the patriarch Nicocas, as 
the Greek Church only tolerated a second marriage; it 
censured a third, and condemned a fourth as an atrocious 
sin.

How Leo came by the exalted name of Philosopher it is difficult to understand, except it be taken in an 
ironical sense. Gibbon, with a few striking words, gives 
the following character to this emperor: "His mind 
was tinged with the most puerile superstition; the in-
fuence of the clergy and the efforts of the people were 
consacrated by his laws; and the oracles of Leo, which 
reveal in prophetic style the fates of the empire, are 
found in the arts of astrology and divination. Even 
still inquire the reason of his sage appellation, it can 
only be replied that the son of Basil was only less igno-
rant than the greater part of his contemporaries in 
Church and State; that his education had been directed 
in the learning of Roscinius, and that he was addicted to 
the fantastic and ecclesiastical science were composed by the 
pen or in the name of the imperial philosopher."

In speaking of Leo's literary merits, it is necessary to 

say a few words of his legislation. In his time the Latin 
language had long ceased to be the official language of 
The Eastern empire, and had gradually fallen into such 
disuse as only to be known to a few scholars, merchants, 
or navigators. The original laws, being written in Lat-
in, opposed a serious obstacle to a fair and quick admin-
istration of justice; and the benefit of government. 

The new Greek version is known under the title of Basilid 
Moriae, of which the chief works are: Basilid Lectorum, 
Basilid, and Basilid, the name of the editor, which means "Imperial Constitutions" or "Laws." It 

is divided into sixty books, subdivided into titles, and 
contains the whole of Justinian's legislation, viz. the 
Institutes, the Digest, the Code, and the Novellae: 
also such constitutions as were adduced by 

judges of Justinian down to Leo VI. There are, however, many 

laws of the Digest omitted in the Basilics, while they 

contain, on the other hand, a considerable number of 

laws, or extracts from ancient Jurists, not in the Digest. 
The Basilics likewise give many early constitutions not in 

Justinian; and they were afterwards confirmed or made 

by the son of Leo, Constantine Porphyrogenitus. For 

the various editions published of the Basilics, see Smith, 

Dict. of Greek and Roman Biogr., ii, 741.

The principal works written, or supposed to be written, 
by Leo VI or of special interest to him, were written in an 
verse, and accompanied by marginal drawings, on the 
fate of the future emperors and patriarchs of Constantinople, showing the super-

Lio if he believed in his divinity, and that 

of the people if they believed in the absurd predictions. 

The seventeenth oracle on the restoration of Constanti-
nople, was published in Greek and Latin by John Leunc-
chias (ad, clem. Const. Manasse, Basil. 1578, 8vo). 
Janus Rutgerus edited the other sixteenth, with a Latin 
version by George Dousa (Leyden, 1618, 4to). Other 
editors, Epitome dell' Oraclio di Leoni imperatore, by 
T. Pacinius (Brixen, 1568), by Petrus Lycnus, with a 
 revised text from an Amsterdam codex, also notes 
and new translation (Par. 1655, fol., ad clem. Codini). 
A German and a Latin translation by John and Theo-
dre de Dry appeared (Frankf. 1597, 4to). It is doubt-
ful whether Leo is actually the author of the Oracle. 
Fabricius gives a learned disquisition on the subject: 

2. Orationes, mostly on theological subjects: one of them 

appeared in a Latin version by F. Metius, in Baronius' 

Annales: nine others by Garestius, in the 14th volume 
of his Opera (Ingoletad, 1660, 4to): three others, to-

gether with those of other emperors, are found in 

Combes, in the 1st volume of his Biblioth. Patr. Graeco-

Italian. Acta. (Paris, 1648, folio); Oration of St. Nicola, 

Greek and Latin, by Petrus Possime (Toulouse, 1654, 
4to); Oration of St. Chrysostomos, restored from the 

life of that father by Georgius Alexandrinus in the 8th vol-

ume of the Savilian ed. of Chrysostom (Antwerp, 1614, 

fourto): some others in Combes, Biblioth. Conciliarior-

atorum, in the Biblioth. Patrum Legum, and dispersed in 

other works; Leo Imp. Rom. nec primum vulgus Greek 

and Latin edition of qua Philosophia est Confutarior, 

Stipendium M. Fidje (Paulin, 1721, 4to): — 3. Epistola 

ad Oratianum Saracensem de Vida Christi Veritatem et Sar- 

acoernorum Erroribus (in Latin [Lyons, 1609]) by 

Champeius, who translated a Chaldean version of the Greek 

original, which seems to be lost: the same in the differ-

ent. Biblioth. Patrum, and separation by Prof. Schwarz 

in the 2nd volume of his Acta Ecumenica (Leipzig, 1816). 

of A. Eichhorn, in his .

In spectaculum Unius Dies, an epitaph of little valuable, 

with notes by Brodus and Oropsius, in Epigr. libri 

vi, edit. Wechel (Frankfort, 1600). See Zonaras, ii, 174,
LEO I

LEO I, emperor of Constantinople, was born in Thrace of obscure parents, entered the military service, and rose to high rank. At the death of the emperor Marcian in A.D. 457, he commanded a body of troops near Scyllyria, and was proclaimed emperor by the soldiers, at the instigation of Aspar, a Gothic chief, who commanded the auxiliaries. The senate of Constantinople confirmed the choice, and the patriarch Anatolius crowned him. This has been said to be the first instance of an emperor receiving the crown from the hands of a bishop, a ceremony which was afterwards adopted by all other Christian princes, and from which the clergy, as Gibbon justly observes, have derived the most formidable consequences. See Invevtiture. Leo followed the measures of Marcian against the Eutychians, who had been condemned at Chalcedon, and who had recently excited a tumult at Alexandria, had kept the peace, and placed one Amphilochius in his stead. Aspar, at a time screened Alaric; but Leo at last had him exiled, and an orthodox bishop put in his place. The Huns, having entered the province of Dacia, were defeated by the emperor at Tolbiac and a son of Attila was killed in the battle. Soon after, Leo, in concert with Anthemiuser, emperor of the West, prepared a numerous fleet, with a large body of troops on board, for the recovery of Africa, which was occupied by the Vandals. Part of the expedition attacked and took the island of Sardinia; the rest landed in Libya, and took Tripolis and other towns; but the delay and mismanagement of the commander, who was Leo's brother-in-law, gave time to Genseric to make his preparations. Coming out of the harbor of Carthage by night, with fire-ships impelled by a fair wind, he set fire to many of the imperial ships, dispersed the rest, and obliged the expedition to leave the coast of Africa. Leo died in January, 474.—Enl. Cyclopædia, a. v.; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, i, 734.

LEO, saint and pope, surnamed the Great, noted as the real founder of the papacy, was born about the year 396, though the exact date is not ascertained. We have also no precise information as to his parentage, while the liber pontificum describes him as a Tuscan, and names Quintianus as his father. Quesnel, on the authority of an expression in one of Leo's own letters (xxxiii, 4), and an account of his election by a certain Pros- per, stated that he was born at Rome, and this opinion has been accepted without further inquiry by most subsequent ecclesiastical writers. While yet an acolyte, Leo was dispatched, in A.D. 418, to Carthage, for the purpose of conveying to Aurelius and the other African bishops the sentiments of Zosimus concerning the Pelagian doctrines of Celestius (C. v.). Under Celestine (C. v.) he discharged the duties of a deacon; and the reputation even then (481) enjoyed by him is clearly indicated by the terms of the epistle prefixed to the seven books De Incarnatione Chri- sti of Cassianus, who at his request had undertaken his work against the Mani- cies. About this time he was applied to by Cyril of Alexan- dria to settle a difficulty between Juval, bishop of Jerusalem, and the primate of the ecclesiastical prov- ince of Jerusalem. Having obtained a great reputation for his knowledge, energy, and untiring activity, he failed not to seize every opportunity for his noble purposes (c. 440), to whom he rendered valuable service, in several important offices intrusted to him. Attesting the notice of Valentine III, he undertook, by request of this emperor, a mission to Gaul, to soothe the formidable dissensions existing between the two generals Alboin and Albinus. While Leo was engaged in this delicate ne-
gotiation, which was conducted with singular prudence and perfect success, Sextius III died, Aug. 8, 440, and by the last will of the clergy the abbot of the descon Leo was chosen to fill the vacant seat. Envoyes were at once sent to Gaul to apprise him of his election, and having returned to Rome he was duly installed, Sept. 29, 440. Both the State and the Church were then in a critical position; the former in consequence of the frequent invasions of barbarians; the Church through its inner dissensions and quarrels. From the earliest ages until this epoch no man who combined lofty ambition with commanding intellect and political dexterity had presided over the Roman see; and although its influence had greatly increased, and many of its bishops had sought to extend and confirm that influence, yet they had merely availed themselves of accidental circumstances to augment their own personal authority, without acting upon any distinct and well-develo ped scheme. But Leo, while he zealously watched over his own peculiar flock, concentrated all the powers of his energetic mind upon one great design, which he seems to have formed at a very early period, and which he kept steadfastly in view during a long and eventful life, following it out with consummate boldness, perseverance, and success. This was nothing less than the establishment of the "apostolic chair" as a spiritual supremacy over every branch of the Catholic Church, and the exclusive appropriation for its occupant of the title of Papa, or father of the whole Christian world. Leo may therefore be regarded as the precursor of Gregory the Great, and in this respect certainly deserved the surname of Great, which was given him. The evil days amid which his lot was cast were not unfavorable, as might at first sight be supposed, to such a project. The contending parties among the orthodox clergy, terrified by the rapid progress of Arius, were disposed to refer their disputed disputes to arbitration. Leo, who well knew, from the example of his predecessor Innocent I, that the transition is easy from instruction to command, in the numerous and elaborate replies which he addressed to inquiries proceeding from various quarters, studiously adopted a tone of absolute infallibility, and assumed the right of enforcing obedience to his decisions as an unquestionable prerogative of his office, deriving authority for such a position from the relation of Peter to Christ and the apostles. He represented Peter as most intimately connected with Christ: "Petrum in unum cum Christo coniunctum, sed primum, qui proxime unitas assumit" (Sermo, viii, ii, 2). Here, finding dogmatical arguments unavailable for his purpose, Leo turns to history, which he arranges to suit himself. With regard now to the relation existing between the bishop of Rome and the other bishops, Leo says expressly, "All the bishops have not the same voice among his brethren. Again, those who occupy more important seats (the metropolitans of dioceses) have still greater power. But the direction of the Church must be indulgent, and no one can take anything away from him who is the head of all." Potent but unconscious instruments in forwarding Leo's ambitious schemes were found in the barbarian chiefs whose power was not yet consolidated, and who were eager to propitiate one who possessed such weight with the priesthood, and through them could either calm into submission or excite to rebellion an ignorant and fanatic multitude. But, though the minds of men were in some degree prepared and disposed to yield to such domination, it was scarcely to be expected that the effort should not provoke jealousy and resistance. A strong opposition was speedily organized both in the West and in the East, and soon assumed the attitude of open defiance. In the West the contest was brought to an issue by the controversy with Hilary of Arles (see HILARIUS ARLESIENSIS) concerning the deposition of Beneventi, bishop of Beneventum (Beaseno), who had married a widow, which was forbidden by the canons. Chelidonius appealed to Leo, who reinstated him in his see. Hilary was summoned to Rome upon several charges brought against him by other bishops of Gaul, and his see was intruded upon with their mission—in him they are all saved; and it is for this reason that the Lord takes special care of him, and that his faith is prayed for specially, "tanquam allo- rum status certior sit futuros, si mens principis victa non fuerit." After identifying the Church with the manifestation of Christ, Leo identifies Peter with Christ. This primacy of Peter continues, therefore, for while the faith of Peter is retained, all the privileges attached to this faith in Peter remain also. This primacy continues among the bishops, for they hold the same relation towards Peter that Peter held towards Christ; as Christ was in Peter, so is Peter in his successors; it is still Peter who, through them, fulfills the command of Christ, "Feed my sheep." - "Christus tantum potentiam dedit ei, quem totius ecclesiae principem fecit, ut si quid exemptum a statu principalis sibi disponeat, iulius operius, iulius sit gubernaculis depo- tantum, cui dictum est: Et tu conversa cursum fratern tuae" (Sermone, iv, 4). While affecting the utmost humility when speaking of himself personally as unworthy of his high office, he speaks of that office itself as the most exalted station. It was more difficult for Leo, however, to prove that the bishop of Rome is the successor of St. Peter. Rome, says Leo, has been glorified by the death of the two greatest apostles, Peter and Paul, who brought the Gospel to Italy. He introduced the idea of special Providence in this coming of Peter to Rome, so that that city should through him and in him become the centre of the Christian world. "Ut hujus eterna- bilis gratiae (incarnations) per totum mundum diffun- dereter effectus, hujus aeternum regnum divinitatis secundum ad eos limites incrementa perdu- centur, quibus cunctarum undique gentium vicina et con- tigua esse universitas." Disposito namque divinitas operi maxime congruenter, ut multa regna uno confoede- rarantur imperio et cito pervos habitares populos predictos - ut plurimum manus ad esse munera Christianarum (Sermone, lixxii, 2). Here, finding dogmatical arguments unavailable for his purpose, Leo turns to history, which he arranges to suit himself. With regard now to the relation existing between the bishop of Rome and the other bishops, Leo says expressly, "All the bishops have not the same voice among his brethren. Again, those who occupy more important seats (the metropolitans of dioceses) have still greater power. But the direction of the Church must be indulgent, and no one can take anything away from him who is the head of all." Potent but unconscious instruments in forwarding Leo's ambitious schemes were found in the barbarian chiefs whose power was not yet consolidated, and who were eager to propitiate one who possessed such weight with the priesthood, and through them could either calm into submission or excite to rebellion an ignorant and fanatic multitude. But, though the minds of men were in some degree prepared and disposed to yield to such domination, it was scarcely to be expected that the effort should not provoke jealousy and resistance. A strong opposition was speedily organized both in the West and in the East, and soon assumed the attitude of open defiance. In the West the contest was brought to an issue by the controversy with Hilary of Arles (see HILARIUS ARLESIENSIS) concerning the deposition of Beneventi, bishop of Beneventum (Beaseno), who had married a widow, which was forbidden by the canons. Chelidonius appealed to Leo, who reinstated him in his see. Hilary was summoned to Rome upon several charges brought against him by other bishops of Gaul, and his see was intruded upon with their mission—in him they are all saved; and it is for this reason that the Lord takes special care of him, and that his faith is prayed for specially, "tanquam allo- rum status certior sit futuros, si mens principis victa non fuerit." After identifying the Church with the manifestation of Christ, Leo identifies Peter with Christ. This primacy of Peter continues, therefore, for while the faith of Peter is retained, all the privileges attached to this faith in Peter remain also. This primacy continues among the bishops, for they hold the same relation towards Peter that Peter held towards Christ; as Christ was in Peter, so is Peter in his successors; it is still Peter who, through them, fulfills the command of Christ, "Feed my sheep." - "Christus tantum potentiam dedit ei, quem totius ecclesiae principem fecit, ut si quid exemptum a statu principalis sibi disponeat, iulius operius, iulius sit gubernaculis depo-
pension, however, does not appear to have been lasting, although the fact has been taken hold of by controversial writers as a stretch of jurisdiction in the see of Rome. Quensted published a dissertation upon this controversy in his edition of the works of Leo (Paris, 1675).

The total defeat and severe punishment of the Gallican bishop filled his supporters with terror, and the edict of Valentinian served as a sort of charter, in virtue of which the Roman bishops retained for centuries undisputed jurisdiction over France, Spain, Germany, and Britain. In the East the struggle was much more complicated and the result much less satisfactory. The archimandrite Eutyches (q. v.), in his vehement denunciation of Nestorius, having been betrayed into errors, very disgracefully preserved his name to posterity. Eutyches was anathematized, deposed, and excommunicated, in A.D. 448, by the synod of Constantinople. Against this sentence he sought redress by soliciting the interference of the bishops of Alexandria and Rome. His cause was eagerly espoused by the former. As for Leo, he wrote to the patriarch Flavianus (q. v.), telling him that he had been informed of the disturbances which had taken place in the Church of Constantinople by the emperor, and was surprised that Flavianus had not at once written to him about it, and informed him thereof before the synod. In a letter preserved to us by Eutyches, Leo also informed Flavianus that he had received a letter from Eutyches complaining that his excommunication had been without just cause, and that his appeal to Rome had not been considered. Flavianus was sent to Rome as a competent envoy, with full information of all the particulars of the case, to render final judgment in the matter. In a case like the present, says Leo, in his conclusion, the first thing of all to be attended to is "ut sine strepitu concertantur et custodiat curiae et veritas defendatur." In a letter of the same date to the emperor, Leo reaffirms that Theodosius has not only been a royal, but also a priestly, heart, and carefully guarded against schism, for the state also is in the best condition when the holy Trinity is worshipped in unity." Meanwhile a general council was summoned to be held on the 1st of August, 449, at Ephesus, and thither the ambassadors of Leo repaired, for the purpose of reading publicly the above letter to Flavianus. But a great majority of the congregated fathers, acting under control of the president, Dioscurus of Alexandria, refused to listen to the document, passed tumultuously a series of anathemas, presuming that Leo had been influenced by the most zealous of his opponents, and not only treated the Roman envoys with indignity, but even offered violence to their persons. Hence this assembly, whose acts were all subsequently annulled, is known in ecclesiastical history as the Synodus Latrocinivialis. The vehement denunciation of Eutyches, and from posterity, have identified the men- chieves, and from posterity, have identified the men-chit for their own advantage. In the meantime, the orthodox leaders proved fruitless, and the triumph of their opponents was for a time complete, when the sudden death of the emperor, in 450, again awakened the hopes and called forth the exertions of Leo. In consequence of the pressing representations of his envoys, Anatolius, the successor of Flavianus, together with all the clergy of Constantinople, was induced to subscribe the Confession of Faith contained in the Epistle to Flavianus, and to transmit it for signature to all the dioceses of the East. Encouraged by this success, Leo solicited the new monarch, Marcellus, to summon a grand council for the final adjustment of the question concerning the nature of Christ, which still proved a source of discord, and strained every nerve to have it held in Italy, where his own adherents would necessarily have preponderated. In the end, the request was granted, and the council met at Chalcedon in October, 451. Although the Roman legates, whose language was of the most imperious description, did not fail broadly to assert the pretensions put forth by the representatives of St. Peter, at first all went smoothly. The Epistle to Flavianus was adopted, together with all the conclusions if the general council if the universal Church, and no protest was entered against the spirit of arrogant assumption in which it was conceived. But when the whole of the special business was concluded, at the very last sitting, a formal resolution was proposed and passed, to the effect that while the obscure see was, in virtue of its antiquity, entitled to take formal precedence of every other, the see of Constantineople was to stand next in rank, was to be regarded as independent from every other, and to exercise full jurisdiction over the churches of Africa.

The resistance of Leo was all in vain. The obvious canons were fully confirmed, and thus one half of the sovereignty at which he aimed was lost forever, at the very moment when victory seemed no longer doubtful. Leo made another and last effort on the 22d of May, 452, when the emperor, Marcellus, was at Constantinople, opening, but in vain, to excommunicate Anatolius. In 457, after the death of Marcellus, the party of Eutyches made a last effort, and besought the new emperor to assemble a council to condemn the decrees of that of Chalcedon, but the emperor refused to yield to this request.

In the mean time serious events were occurring place at Rome. In 452 the dreaded king of the Huns, Attila, invaded Italy, and, after sacking and plundering Aquileia, Pavia, and Milan, he marched against Rome. Valentinian, proving himself unfit for his high position, fled to Athens and leave Leo to manage the affairs of the state. In 452 Leo also secured the flight only. The Roman senate assembled to deliberate on what should be done in this emergency, and resistance being considered impossible, Leo was chosen as a mediator and sent to Attila. What the arguments employed by the eloquent suppliant may have been is history has failed to record; but the Huns spared Rome, and in consideration of a sum paid by the inhabitants, withdrew from Italy and retired beyond the Danube. This action of Attila appeared so strange that it was considered impossible to account for it except by a miracle. According to the legend, Attila confessed to his officers that during the address of Leo a venerable old man appeared to him, holding a sword with which he threatened to slay him if he resisted the voice of God. When again in 455 Rome lay at the mercy of the Vandals, who, taking advantage of the disturbance which followed the death of Valentinian, had invaded Italy, the senate had a second time recourse to Leo, and sent him to Genseric. But this time his eloquence did not prove so successful. Genseric consented only to promise not to burn the city, and to spare the life of the inhabitants, but to depart from the city and from the surrounding country. Of the disturbance the most zealous of his opponents, and not only treated the Roman envoys with indignity, but even offered violence to their persons. Hence this assembly, whose acts were all subsequently annulled, is known in ecclesiastical history as the Synodus Latrocinivialis. The vehement denunciation of Eutyches, and from posterity, have identified the men-chit for their own advantage. In the meantime, the orthodox leaders proved fruitless, and the triumph of their opponents was for a time complete, when the sudden death of the emperor, in 450, again awakened the hopes and called forth the exertions of Leo. In consequence of the pressing representations of his envoys, Anatolius, the successor of Flavianus, together with all the clergy of Constantinople, was induced to subscribe the Confession of Faith contained in the Epistle to Flavianus, and to transmit it for signature to all the dioceses of the East. Encouraged by this success, Leo solicited the new monarch, Marcellus, to summon a grand council for the final adjustment of the question concerning the nature of Christ, which still proved a source of discord, and strained every nerve to have it held in Italy, where his own adherents would necessarily have preponderated. In the end, the request was granted, and the council met at Chalcedon in October, 451. Although the Roman legates, whose language was of the most imperious description, did not fail broadly to assert the pretensions put forth by the representatives of St. Peter, at first all went smoothly. The Epistle to Flavianus was adopted, together with all the conclusions if the general council if the universal Church, and no protest was entered against the
pope only punished himself for having conferred orders on a man who proved unworthy. All state that his hand was finally restored to him by a miracle. He died April 11, 461.

The works of Leo consist of discourses delivered on the great festivals of the Church, or on other solemn occasions, and of letters. 1. Sermo 21, Of those, the first three, delivered while he was bowed down to posterity, we possess 96. There are 5 De Natali ipsius, preached on anniversaries of his ordination, 6 De Collecta, 9 De Jejurnali Decimi Mensis, 10 De Nativitate Domini, 8 In Epiphania Domini, 19 De Psalmone Domini, 8 De Reversione Domini, 3 De Ascensione Domini, 3 De Pentecoste, 4 De Jejurnali Pentecostes, 1 In Natali Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, 1 In Natali S. Petri Apostoli, 1 In Octavia Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, 1 In Natali S. Laurentii Martyris, 9 De Jejurnali Septimi Mensis, 1 De Gratia Anomolius ad Basiliadam, 1 Tractatus contra Herrenan Eutychis. Milman (Hist. Lat. Christianity, i, 258) thus comments on these productions of Leo: "His sermons singularly contrast with the florid, declamatory, and often imaginative and impassioned style of the Greek preachers. They are brief, simple, severe; without oratory, metaphysics, or enthusiasm; without passion; it is the Roman censor animadverting with nervous majesty on the vices of the people; the Roman prator dictating the law, and delivering with authority the doctrine of the faith. They are singularly Christian as dwelling almost exclusively on Christ, his life; his death, and his resurrection. They are so far as called upon by the prevailing controversies to assert with special emphasis the perfect deity and the perfect manhood of Christ." II. EPITOLA.—These, extending to the number of 178, are addressed to the reigning emperors and their families, to synods, to religious communities, to bishops and other dignitaries, and to sundry individual persons connected with the ecclesiastical history of the times. They afford an immense mass of most valuable information on the prevailing heresies, controversies, and doubts on matters of doctrine, discipline, and Church government. Besides the 96 Sermones and 178 Epitola mentioned above, a considerable number of tracts have from time to time been ascribed to this pope, but their authenticity is either so doubtful or their spuriousness so evident that they are now universally set aside. A list of these, and an investigation of their origin, will be found in the edition of the brothers Ballerini, more particularly described below. In consequence of the reputation deservedly gained by Leo, his writings have always been eagerly studied. But, although a vast number of MSS. are still in existence, the whole do not exhibit anything in a complete form, and no attempt seems to have been made to bring together any portion of them for many hundreds of years after his death. The Sermones were dispersed in the Lectionaria, or select discourses of distinguished divines, employed in places of public worship until the 11th century, when they first began to be picked out of these cumbrous handwritten and transcribed separately, while the Epitola were gradually gathered into imperfect groups, or remained embodied in the general collections of papal constitutions and canons. Of the numerous printed editions of Leo I's works, the first was published by Sweeneyhm and Pannartz (Rome, 1470, fol.), under the inspection of Andrew, bishop of Aloria, comprising 92 Sermones and 8 Epitola. The best two editions were published at Paris (1675, 2 vols. 4to) by Fasquier Quanuel and by the Ballerini (Verona, 1755-57, 8 vols. fol.). Of these last, it is due to say that, by the aid of a large number of MSS. preserved chiefly in the libraries of France, he was enabled to introduce such essential improvements into the text, and by his erudite industry illustrated so clearly the objections in which many of the dogmatists were involved, that the works of Leo now for the first time assumed an unintelligible, intelligible, and satisfactory aspect. But the admiration excited by the skill with which the arduous task had been executed soon received a check. Upon attentive perusal the notes and dissertations were found to contain such free remarks upon many of the opinions and usages of the primitive Church, and, above all, to manifest such unequivocal hostility to the despotism of the Roman see, that the volumes fell under the ban of the Inquisition very shortly after their publication, and were included in the Index Librorum Prohibitorum of 1682. Notwithstanding these denunciations, the book enjoyed great popularity, and was reprinted, without any suppression or modification of the onoxious passages, at Lyons, in 1700. Hence the heads of the Roman Church anxiously to supply an antidote to the poison so extensively circulated. This undertaking was first attempted by Peter Caccari, a Carmelite monk of the Propaganda, whose labors (S. Leontia Magi Opera omnia [Rome, 1786-1785, 2 vols. fol.]; Excursus in Universa S. Leontia Magi Opera [Rome, 1751, fol.] might have attracted attention and praise had they not been, at the very moment when they were brought to a close, entirely thrown into the shade by those of the brothers Peter and Jerome Balle- rini, presbyters of Verona. Their edition, indeed, is entitiled "first printed," and, by the careful accuracy of the text, corrected from a great number of MSS., chiefly Roman, not before collated, the arrangement of the different parts, and the notes and disquisitions. A full description of these volumes, as well as of those of Quonell and Caccari, is to be found in Schenmann (Bibl., 6, 3, p. 360). This edition is, however, still unequal to usual care upon this section. See Maimbourg, Histoire du Pontificat de Leon (Paris, 1876, 4to); Arndt, Leo d. Grosse (Mainz, 1885, 8vo); Gesch. d. Rom. Literatur. (Suppl. Band. 2d part, § 159-162); Alex. de Saint-Ché- ron, Histoire du Pontificat de Leon (Paris, 1612, 12mo, p. 71); Bruya, Hist. des Popes (La Haye, 1782, 2 vols. 4to), i, 218; Baronius, Annales Ecclesiastici (Lucques, 1788, 19 vols. fol.), vi, 353-368; viii, 1-240; U. Bertazzolo, Breve Descrittione della Vita del santo Leone primo et di Attilio. Firense di Dio (Mantua, 1614, 4to); Gruyter, Kirchengesch. ii, 1: E. Perthal, Pape Léon Ier et le peuple (1848); C. T. Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, vol. ii; Milman, Hist. Latin Christianity, vol. i, ch. iv.; Neander, Church History, ii, 104, 189 sq., 608 sq., 706 sq.; Dumoulin, Vie et Religion de deux des Papes Liberius et Grégoire (1650); Bp. Magnum, Politique de Pape, 11, 12; Leon, Studies in Ch. Hist. (Phil., 1869, 8vo; see its Index); Riddle, Hist. Popacy, i, 171 sq.; Schöckl, Kirchengesch. xvii, 90 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encycl. viii, 286-311; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Myth., ii, 746 sq.; Migne, Paters lat., xxxvi, exhibition, based on a complete text, and published by Smith, and J. T. Smith, Theol. iv, 94 sq.; Hoefer, Novum. Biog. General., xxx, 794-708; Eng. Cyclop. s. v.; Christian Remembrance, 1854, p. 291 sq.

Leo II, Pope, was born at Cedelle, in Sicily, in the early part of the 7th century. He became first canon regular, then cardinal priest, and finally pope, as successor of Agatho. Although his predecessor had died in January of the same year, he was installed as late as August, 682, by the emperor Constantine V, as the "most holy and blessed archbishop of old Rome, and universal pope." The reasons of this delay are unknown. Soon after his election Constantine requested him to send to Constantinople an ambassador, with full authority to decide at once on all questions of dogmas and canons, and other ecclesiastical interests. But Leo, perceiving the aim of the request, sent only a sub-deacon, who was not a Lat., but a native of Constantinople. The reasons for this were that it was the pope's first consulting with Rome. He also immediately assembled a synod to approve of the acts of the sixth ecumenical council held at Constantinople in 681, which had been brought to Rome by the legates of Agatho. On May 28, 683, the council met, and among other things, they anathematizing the heresy of the Monothelitians, and also pope Honorius (625-686), "who, instead of purifying the Apostolic Church by the doctrines of the apostles,
has come near overthrowing the faith by his treason" (Labebe, Conc. vi. 1246). Leo sought to induce all the churches to accept the decisions of that council, and for that purpose translated them from Greek to Latin, sending a copy of them in the latter language to the Spanish bishops. He appears also to have given his ambassador four letters, somewhat similar as to their contents (see Mansi, xi. 1060-1068), addressed to the bishops of Ostrogorgia, count Simplicius, king Erwig, and the metropolitan bishop Quiricus of Toledo, expressing his wish that all the bishops of Spain would induct the acts of the Council of Constantinople. In these letters he says: "Honoriaus has falsified the inviolable rule of apostolic succession which he had received from his predecessor, Simplicius, and his son, the abbot of Lucena, denies the authenticity of these letters, while Pagi attempts to uphold it; Größer (Kirchenresep. vol. iii. pt. i. p. 397 sq.) also maintains their genuineness, and adds in proof of it their corresponding precisely with the decisions of the fourteenth Council of Toledo. Leo also obtained from Pope Gregory a promise that after the death of the titular archbishop of Ravenna his successors should, according to an old custom fall into disuse, come to Rome to be consecrated. In exchange for this concession, Leo relieved the see of Ravenna from the obligation of paying the taxes formerly levied on the see of Rome, according to an ancient privilege, as a great friend of Church music, and did much towards improving the Gregorian chant. He built a church to St. Paul, and is said to have originated the custom of sprinkling the people with holy water. He died in July, 668: the Emperor Maurice ordained that on every Sunday the Catholic Church commemorates him on the 29th of June. See Dupin, Biblioth. des Acta. Eccles. v. 105; Platina, Historia della Vite dei Sommi Pontefici; Ciaoniu, Vita et Res Gestae Pontificum Romanorum (Rinum. 1677, 4 vols. folio), i. 478; Herzog, Real-Enclop. viii. 811; Hoeft, Nuntius, Geschichte der pätisch, 708; vol. iv. 185; Bower, History of the Popes, iii. 184 sqq.; Riddle, Hist. of the Popes, i. 800.

Leo III., Pope, who brought about the elevation of the Frankish king to the position of emperor of the West, and thus relieved the Roman pontificate of further claims of the Lombards, was a native of the Eternal City, and was elected after the death of Adrian I., Dec. 26, 795. Immediately after his election he communicated the intelligence to Charlemagne, and, like his predecessor, acknowledged allegiance. Charlemagne then asked of Pope Leo who should be consecrated pope, in which he intrusted the abbot Angilbertus, whom he commissioned to confer with the new pontiff respecting the relations between the see of Rome and the "Patrician of the Romans," for this was the title which Charlemagne had assumed. In 796 Leo sent to Charlemagne the keys of St. Peter and the standard of the city of Rome, requesting the king to send some of his nobles to administer the oaths of allegiance to the people of Rome, and thus the dominion of Charlemagne was extended over the city and duchy of Rome. In the year 799, an atrocious assault, the motive of which is not clearlyascertained, was committed on the person of the pope. While Leo was riding on horseback, followed by the clergy, and chanting the liturgy, a canon by the name of Paschal and a sacerdote called Campus, accompanied by many armed ruffians, fell upon him, threw him from his horse, and dragged him into the convent of St. Sylvester, when they stabbed him in many places, endeavoring to put out his eyes and cut out his tongue. Leo, however, was delivered by his friends from the hands of the assassins, and taken to Spoleti under the protection of the duke. After some time he returned to Rome, and travelled as far as Paderborn in Germany, where Charlemagne then was, by whom the pope was received with the greatest honors. Charlemagne sent him back to Rome with a numerous escort of bishops and counts, and also of armed men. The pope was met outside the city gates by the clergy, senator, and people, and ac- companied in triumph to the Lateran palace. A court composed of the bishops and counts proceeded to the trial of the conspirators who had attempted the life of the pope, and the two chief, Paschal and Campus, were exiled to France. From this very event and other concomitant circumstances, it appears that Charlemagne had greatly at heart the conciliation of the Romans in general, in order to deter them from betaking themselves again to the protection of the Greek emperors. In 800 Charlemagne himself, as Leo vii., was met at Nomentum, outside of Rome, by the pope, and the next day he repaired to the Basilica of the Vatican, escorted by the soldiers and the people. After a few days Charlemagne convoked a numerous assembly of prelates, abbots, and other persons of distinction, Franks as well as Lombards. In this assembly the certain indulgence against the pope by the partisans of Paschal and Campus, but no proofs were elicited, and Leo himself, taking the book of gospels in his hand, declared himself innocent. On Christmas-day of that year the pontiff offered in the Basilica of the Vatican, in presence of Charlemagne and his numerous retinue. As Charlemagne was preparing to leave the church, the pontiff stopped him, and placed a rich crown upon his head, while the clergy and the people, at the same moment, cried out "Carolo piisimo," "Augusto magni imperator," with much enthusiasm. In many capitals, in both sides of the Alps, were worn in proclaiming Roman emperors. Three times the acclamations were repeated, after which the pope was the first to pay homage to the new emperor. From that time Charlemagne left off the titles of king and of himself Augustus and emperor of the Romans, and he addressed himself to Charlemagne by the title of Constantinople by the name of brother. Thus was the Western empire revived 825 years after Odoacer had deposed Romulus Augustus, the last nominal successor of the Cæsar on the throne of the West. From that time all claims to the title of emperor of the Romans on the side of the Eastern Empire were discarded, and the Roman emperors, from this time, bore the title of Roman patriarch. In the year 802 the dominion over the duchy of Rome was at an end, and the popes from the same date assumed the temporal authority over the city and duchy, in subordination, however, to Charlemagne and his successors; they began, also, to coin money, with the pontiff's name on one side and that of the emperor on the other side. The emperor, while visiting the pope's residence, during Christmas, visited Charlemagne at his court at Aquignara (Aix-la-Chapelle). In the division which Charlemagne made by will of his dominions among his sons, the city of Rome was declared to belong to him. After his death the title of Roman emperor was afterwards invested with that title by Charlemagne himself, and we find him accordingly, after the death of his father, assuming the supreme jurisdiction over that city on the occasion of a fresh conspiracy which broke out against Leo, the heads of which were convicted by the ordinary courts of Rome, and put to death. Louis found fault with the rigor of the sentence and the haste of its execution, and he ordered his nephew, Bernard, king of Italy, to proceed to Rome and investigate the whole affair. Leo, who seems to have been alarmed at this proceeding, sent messengers to the court of Louis to justify himself. Meanwhile he fell seriously ill, and the people of Rome broke out into insurrection, and pulled down some buildings he had begun to construct on the confiscated property of the conspirators. The duke of Spoleti was sent for with a body of troops to suppress the tumult, when Leo suddenly expired in 816, and Stephen IV was elected in his place. Leo is praised by Anastasius, a biographer of the same century, for the many structures, especially churches, which he raised or repaired, and the valuable gifts with which he enriched the churches. In his lifetime he was held to have been more moderate and prudent than his predecessor, Adrian I., who was perpetually soliciting Charlemagne in his letters for fresh grants of territory to his see. Thirteen letters of Leo are published in Labebe's Concilia, vii. 1111-1127. He is also considered the author of the Epistola ad Carolum Magnam imp., etc. edit.

**Leo IV.** Pope, was a native of Rome, and succeeded Sergius II in 847. He was hastily elected, and consecrated without waiting for the consent of the emperor Leo, because Rome was then threatened by the Saracens, who occupied part of the duchy of Benevento, and who a short time before had landed on the banks of the river, and plundered the basilica of St. Peter's on the Vatican, which was outside of the walls. Leo's consecration, however, was undertaken with the express reservation that the emperor's right was not interfered with, in order to prevent a recurrence of the violence of the Saracens. Leo undertook to surround the basilica and the suburb about it with walls, the emperor sent money to assist in the work. The building of this Roman suburb occupied four years, and it was named after its founder, *Carthusia Leo.* Leo also restored the town of Porta, on the Tibur, near its mouth, settling there some thousands of Coriscans, who had run away from their country on account of the Saracens. Towers were built on both banks of the river, and iron chains drawn across to prevent the vessels of the Saracens from ascending to Rome. The walls and the town of Centum Cellae being forsaken on account of the Saracens, Leo built a new town on the coast, about twelve miles distant from the other, which was called Leopolis; but no traces of it remain now, as the modern Civita Vecchia is built on or near the site of old Centum Cellae. Leo IV held a council at Rome in 853, in which Anastasius, cardinal of St. Marcelli, was deposed for having remained five years absent from Rome, notwithstanding the orders of the pope. Leo died in July, 855, and fifteen days after his death Benedict III was elected in his place, according to the most authentic text of Anastasius, who was a contemporary: but later writers introduce between Leo IV and Benedict III the fabulous pope Joan (q. v.). Leo has left us two entire epistles, as also fragments of several others, and a good homily, which are contained in Labbe's *Conc. See Baroniuc, *Annal. 11*, 340; Cluzaunus, i, 614; Gfrörer, Kirchengeschichte, iii, 1, 2; Bachmann, *Politik d. Papste*, i, 281, 352; Lees, *Studies in Ch. History*, li, 61, 91; Riddle, *Hist. of the Popes*, i, 336 sq.; Rechel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 96; Labbe, *Conc. 11*, 995; Gieseler, *Codex. Hist., ii, 790 sqq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. viii, 312; *Corrivert, *Hist. des Popes*, ii, 77; Hoefer, *Nova. Biogr. Général.* xxx, 711; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.

**Leo V.** Pope, was born at Prispi, near Ardeia (according to some at Arezzo). He entered the order of Benedictines, became cardinal, and was finally elected to the papal chair Oct. 29, 903. A few days afterwards, Christopher, cardinal priest of St. Lorenzo, in Damaso, and chaplain of Leo, instigated an insurrection at Rome, and made the pope prisoner, under the plea that he was incapable of governing. Christopher himself did not remain long in the papal chair, as a new revolt of the Romans drove him from the usurped see, and put in place Sergius III, who was the favorite of the celebrated Marozia, a powerful but licentious woman, who disposed of everything in Rome. The 10th century may well be termed the era of the papacy. See Platina, *History of Vitii Pontificum;* *Artaud de Montor, Hist. des souverains Pontifices Romains*, ii, 62; Du Chène, *Hist. des Popes*; Baxmann, *Politik d. Papste*, ii, 76 sq.; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*; Riddle, *Hist. of the Popes*, i, 325 sq.; Gersdorff, *Chron. Herzog, Real-Encyklop. viii, 315; *English Cyclopædia*; Hoefer, *Nova. Biogr. Générale*, xxx, 711.

**Leo VI.** Pope, a native of Rome, succeeded John X July 6, 928, and died seven months afterwards; some say that he was put to death by Marozia, like his predecessor. He was succeeded by Stephan VII. See *English Cyclopædia*; Hoefer, *Nova. Biogr. Générale*, xxx, 712; Bower, *History of the Popes*, v, 95.

**Leo VII.** Pope, a Roman, sometimes called Leo VI, succeeded John XII, the son of Marozia, January 8, 956. He mediated peace between Alberic, duke of Rome, and Hugo, king of Italy, who had offered to marry Marozia, with the object of obtaining the possession of Rome, but was driven away by Alberic, also Marozia's son, Leo is said to have been a man of irreproachable conduct, but little is known of him. He died in 959, and was succeeded by Stephen VIII. We have of him an epitaphe to Hugo, abbot of St. Martin of Tours, published in D'achery's *Epictogenium*; two others to Gerard, archbishop of Lorch, and to the bishops of France and Germany. See *Mabillon, Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti*, vol. ii and iv; Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, vol. iii; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclesiat., Baronius, Annal. cent. x; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, v, 91 sq.; Reichel, *Romans See in the Middle Ages*, p. 121; Baxmann, *Politik d. Papste, ii, 98; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. viii, 316; *English Cyclopædia*; Hoefer, *Nova. Biogr. Générale*, xxx, 712.

**Leo VIII.** Pope, a Roman, succeeded John XII, who was deposed for his misconduct by a council assembled at Rome, in presence of the emperor Otto I, in 964. But soon after Otto had left Rome, John XII came in again at the head of his partisans, obliged Leo to run away, and resumed the papal office. John, however, shortly after died or was murdered while committing adultery, and the Romans elected Benedict V. Otto, returning with an army, burned the city of Rome, deposed Benedict, and reinstated Leo, who died about 965, and was succeeded by John XIII. See Baronius, *Annal. 11*, 129; Platina, *Hist. of the Popes*, v, 112 sqq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Popes*, ii, 42; Reichel, *Romans See in the Middle Ages*, p. 120 sqq., 215; Baxmann, *Politik d. Papste*, iii, 61; Hoefer, *Nova. Biogr. Générale*, xxx, 713.

**Leo IX.** (Bruno), Pope, bishop of Toul, was born in Alsace in 1002, and was cousin-german of the emperor Conrad the Salic. He was noted for great scholarly attainments, and was elected in 1049 to succeed Damaso II, at the joint recommendation of the emperor Henry V and of the famous Hildebrand (afterwards Gregory VII), who became one of Leo IX's most trusted advisers and guides. Indeed, it has often been a matter of comment that the reign of Leo IX was rather Gregorian in tendency. Leo was continually in motion between Germany and Italy, holding councils and endeavoring to reform the monasteries and morals of the clergy. Hildebrand also tried to check the progress of the Normans in Southern Italy, against whom he led an army, but was defeated in Apulia and taken prisoner by the Normans, who treated him with great respect, but kept him for more than a year in Benevento. Having made peace with them by granting to them as a fief of the Roman see their conquests in Apulia and Calabria, he was allowed to return to Rome, where he died in 1054, and was succeeded by Victor II. Among the councils held by Leo IX, one was convened at Rome (1008) against Berengar (q. v.), who was in favor of the liberal theses of Hildebrand. The council held during his pontificate was that of Rheims in 1049, where many laws were enacted against simony, clerical matrimonial, and the conditions and relations of
armed, made a last attempt to assert the Medici
authority, and put down the insurrection by bold exer-
cise of force. It soon, however, became but too appar-
rent to the young cardinal that his hope was all vanity.

"The people multiplied themselves against Pietro," as
Guicciardini (Storia Fiorentina [Opere inedite], iii, 110)
phrases it, and Giovanni, in the disguise of a friar, was
glad enough to facilitate his escape. He was recon-
vened on the open Bologna road, taking the same road
as Pietro, followed by their younger brother Giuliano, still
a mere lad. They went first to John Bentivoglio in
Bologna, but, as they were not received here, went to
Castello, and then, in the city of Vicenza. In any of
other places, the Medici, the cardinal included, lived
for some time, having frequent endeavors made for their
restoration. But when Giovanni was finally persuaded
that all such efforts were fruitless, he decided to quit his
native country, now ravaged by foreign armies, and be-
trayed by the wretched policy of pope Alexander VI,
and he set out on a journey to France, Germany, and
the Netherlands. For the assertion that the cardinal
undertook this journey for political ends there is not
the slightest foundation. While abroad he sought lit-
erary associations only. He continued his expenditure
of men of learning, and not unfrequently displayed his
own taste for literature and the liberal arts. In
1508, upon the death of Alexander VI, against whom he
cherished a bitter hatred, and on whose account only
he had avoided Rome after the expulsion of his family from
Florence, he returned to the latter city.

In 1508, final-
ly, the youthful ecclesiastic, of but thirteen years of
age, was by pope Innocent VIII (father-in-law of Gio-
avanni's sister Maddalena) presented with the cardinal's
cap, limited by the condition only that the insignia of
this dignity might not be assumed until his studies had
been completed at Pisa. Hitherto his education had
been intrusted to tutors mainly, and among them were
the famous Greek historian Chalcondylas, and the
learned Angelo Poliziano, he now set out for Rome
for Pisa, and having there completed his theological
studies in 1492, was on March the 9th of that same year in-
stalled at Florence into the cardinal's position, and three
days after set out for and took up his residence in the
Eternal City. Scarse had a month passed his induction
into the cardinal's dignity when intelligence reached Rome
that Lorenzo the Magnificent was no more, and hastily
Giovanni retraced his steps to Florence, and took
support to his weak but elder brother Pietro, upon
who now depended the continuance of the power of
the Medici over Florence. In July of this year (1492)
Innocent VIII died, and as Giovanni had opposed the
election of Clement VII to the papal throne, he now
no longer hoped for support from the papacy. Blind-
ly and madly, amid all these disadvantages, Pietro, un-
satisfied with absolute power unless he could display
the pomp and exercise the cruelties of despotism, con-
tinued in the short space of two years, to secure, in-
stead of the love and good will, the hatred of the Flor-
entes. Their enthusiastic devotion to the house of the
Medici hitherto alone prevented any attempt to
subvert his authority. They remained quiet even in
1494, when Charles VIII of France came into Italy to
enforce his claim to the throne of Naples, and when Pie-
etro joined the house of Aragon, instead of becoming
a confederate of the French, as his ancestors had always
been. But when Pietro, equally presumptuous in secur-
ity and timid in danger, terrified by the unexpected
success of the French, fled to the camp of Charles, and,
knowing at first to be gone for ever, and in 1495, to
his mercy, the indignation of the Florentines could
no longer be stayed, and, entering into a treaty with the
French, they stipulated especially the exile of the Medi-
ci (Nov. 1494). After his capitulation to king Charles,
Pietro had returned to Florence, but the faction at
Paris had made his stay impossible, and he quickly fled
the city. Giovanni, bolder and more courageous than his
er elder brother, assisted by a few faithful friends, well-
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uliano soon after entered Florence, and, though they had asked only their restoration as private citizens, without any share in the government, they had hardly been re-admitted when they forced the signoria, or executive, to immediately call a "parlamento," or general assembly of the people, in the great square (September). This general assembly of the sovereign people had repeatedly been used by ambitious men as a ready instrument of their views, and it proved such on this occasion. All the laws enacted since the expulsion of the Medici in 1494 were abrogated. A "balla," or commission, was appointed, consisting of creatures of that party, with dictatorial powers to reform the state. No bloodshed, however, accompanied the reaction; but Soderini, having been deposed by the establishment of this new form of government, he and other citizens opposed to the Medici were banished, and "thus once again, after an exile of eighteen years, the fatal Medici were restored to Florence; once again fixed their fangs in the prey they had been scared away from, and 'the most democratical democracy in Europe' was once again muzzled and chained. A conspiracy of priest and soldier—that detestable and ominous combination, more baseful to human nature—and the poison of the pestilence was compounded out of its evil passions and blind stupidity—had as usual trampled out the hopes and possibilities of social civilization and progress" (Trollope, iv, 351), "to see whether mayhap Providence, in the utter inscrutableness of its wisdom, may consider him, Giovanni de' Medici, as the best and fittest person to be intrusted with heaven's vicegerency," accompanied in this excursion to the conclaves by Filippo Strozzi—son of the great banker, the founder of the still well-known Strozzi palace, possessor of one of the then largest fortunes in Florence, and "on whose young shoulders was one of the longest heads that day in Florence"—as his friend, companion, and, most likely, banker. "Especially in this last capacity was Filippo necessary to the aspiring cardinal, so soon to become pope by the grace of God and the capital of Strozzi." The younger members of the conclaves had previously decided to elect one of their own age as successor to Julius II, and upon cardinal de' Medici, only thirty-seven years of age, in whom Pius the Third had much importance, as we have seen by the quotation from Trollope, in a speech of the exercises of the banker Strozzi. One of the first acts of the new pontiff, who assumed the name of Leo X, was to appoint two men of learning, Bembo and Sadoleto, for his secretaries. He next sent a general amnesty to be published at Florence, where a conspiracy had been discovered against the Medici, for which two individuals had been executed, and others, with the celebrated Machiavelli among the rest, had been arrested and put to torture. Leo ordered Giuliano even to receive and recall those that were banished, Soderini among the rest. This act, however, did not remove Leo's hostility, and he was invited to Rome, where he was made gonfaloniere of the Holy Church. "All the rich and lucrative offices of the apostolic court were conferred on Florentines, not a little to the disgust of the Roman world" (Trollope, iv, 359). Of course, that Leo should do anything and everything to enhance the dignity and greatness of the Medici family no one could object to, and consequently, no one had aught to say when he appointed his nephew Lorenzo, the eldest son of Filippo, a profligate young scapegrace, but the only heir remaining to succeed in the grandeur of the Medici, and the reigning court of the republic and general in chief, with absolute and supreme authority over all the Tuscan forces contributed by the commonwealth to the armies of a new league formed in 1515 by the emperor, the king of Aragon, the duke of Milan, and the Florentines against France and Venice. To have made Lorenzo, as Leo would have liked to do, sovereign prince, under the title of duke or some other like distinction, would have been premature, but with the appointment as made no one found fault, and it passed generally approved. Any objection raised to Leo's further action in behalf of Florence, constituting it a dependency of Rome, which it continued during the remainder of his life. His cousin Giulio de' Medici, archbishop of Florence, on the decease of Julius II, Leo at once elevated to the cardinal's dignity, and, in addition, intrusted him with the legateship of Bologna. By these new positions the influence of the Medici had been greatly improved, but the ever-piloting Leo, far-seeing as he was, comprehended clearly that still more was needed to secure to his house the throne of Florence. Upon his accession to the pontificate he found the war renewed in Northern Italy. Louis XII had sent a fresh army, under La Trimmouille, to invade the duchy of Milan. The Swiss auxiliaries of duke Maximilian Sforza defeated La Trimmouille at Novara, and the French were driven back with great loss. This momentous event raised the Venetians themselves with Louis XII, and Leo sent Bembo to Venice to endeavor to break the alliance. Differences occurred between Leo and Alfonso d'Este, duke of Ferrara, who demanded the restoration of Reggio, taken from him by Julius II, which Leo promised, but never performed. The pope was now in his prime, and his emperor Maximilian, disregarding the rights of the house of Este to that town. The pope held likewise Parma and Piacenza, and it appears that he intended to form out of these a territory for his brother Giuliano, and he made attempts to surprise Ferrara also, with the same object. His successor, Marsilius of Pisa, acknowledged that of the Lateran. But in the following year Louis XII died, and his successor, Francis I, among other titles assumed that of duke of Milan. Under him a new Italian war opened. The Venetians joined Francis I, while the emperor Maximilian joined with the Swiss and the Swiss made a league to oppose the French. The pope did not openly join the league, but he negotiated with the Swiss by means of the cardinal of Sion, and paid them considerable sums to induce them to defend the north of Italy. The Swiss were posted near Susa, but Francis, led by old Ervino, passed the Alps by the Col de l'Argentier, entered the plains of Saluzzo, and marched upon Pavia, while the Swiss hastened back to defend Milan. The battle of Marignano was fought on the 14th of September, 1515. The Swiss made desperate efforts, and incurred probable destruction, but they were saved by Giulia Aliviano, with part of the Venetian troops, appeared suddenly with cries of "Viva San Marco," which dispirited the Swiss, who believed that the whole Venetian army was coming to the assistance of the French. The result was the retreat of the Swiss, and the emperor Maximilian, who took possession of the duchy. Leo now saw clearly that the salvation of his house lay in a union with France, and at once made proposals to Francis, who, in turn, eagerly embraced the proffered aid of the Church. It was on the 21st of October, 1515, that news reached Florence of this new alliance of the French monarch with the other and the French king Francis I for the mutual defense of their Italian states, the king obliging himself specially to protect the pontiff, Giuliano and Lorenzo de'
Medici, and the Florentines, and that both Lorenzo and Giuliano should receive commissions in the French service. If the Medici were known as the protector and patron of art, and had well-nigh revived the High Gothic age of the Greeks, could he not break the thought that, while he was pontiff within the walls of the Eternal City, this great enterprise, likely to immortalize the name of its patron in the annals of art, should be passed over, and, finding the coffers of the papacy drained by his predecessor, saw only one way in which to secure the necessary funds for so stupendous an undertaking—the sale of indulgences (q.v.), securing to the contributor for this object forgiveness of sin in any form (comp. Mosheim, Eccles. Hist., ii, 66, note 6; Bower, Hist. of Stipecy, vii, 404 sq.; Robertson, Hist. of Reign of Charles I, ii, pp. 128, 129, especially the footnotes on p. 128). Such utter disregard of the essence of religion resulted in one of the boldest assaults on the Roman Church that it had ever sustained. The very thought that forgiveness of sin was to be offered on sale for money “must have been mortally offensive to men whose convictions on that head had been formed in contemplating the eternal relation between God and man, and who, moreover, had learned what the doctrine of Scripture itself was on the subject” (Banke, Hist. Pop., i, 66). In Saxony, especially, men of piety and thought generally condemned the practice, the great majority of the clergy gave to this subject. They all regretted the delusion of the people, who, being taught to rely for the pardon of their sins on the indulgences which they could secure by purchase, did not think it incumbent on themselves either to study the doctrine of the Church, or to practice the duties which it enjoins. Even the most unthink- ing were shocked at the scandalous behavior of the Dominicans—John Tetzel (q.v.) and his associates, who had the sale of indulgences intrusted to them—and at the manner in which they spent the funds accumulated from this traffic. These sums, which had been piously bestowed in hopes of obtaining eternal salvation and happiness, they saw squandered by the Dominican friars in drunkenness, gaming, and loud debauchery, and “all began to wish that some check were given to this commerce, no less detrimental to society than destructive to religion” (Robertson, p. 128). Indeed, even the princes and nobles objected to this traffic; they were irritated at seeing their vassals drained of so much wealth in order to replenish the treasury of a profuse pontiff, and when Luther’s warm and impetuous temper did not suffer him to remain longer among the forlorn of the Church, the Medicis was the house of Petrucci, headed by the cardin- ally of that name, who was led into a conspiracy to mur- der the pope by the latter’s expropriation of his brother from Sienna. Not satisfied with the acquisition of the duchy of Urbino, he purchased the free state of Sienna, lying between the territories of the Church and those of the republic of Florence, and to this end sent Borghesi, its governor, into exile. At first Borghesi’s brother, cardinal Petrucci, formed the mad design of stabling Leo on their first meeting, but he finally abandoned this enterprise as too daring, and a conspiracy was formed instead to cause the death of Leo X by poison. Fortunately for Leo, the plot to take his life was timely discovered, and the cardinal expiated the intended crime with his life by secret strangling, while many others of his social standing suffered abjection and other punishments. To secure himself against a second attempt of the kind, Leo now (1517) created a whole host of able and experienced Florentines cardinals—no less than thirty-one of them altogether. It was about this time also that the Lateran Council ap- proached its close, and that the decision was reached which resulted so unfavorably to the cause of the papacy and the Church of Rome, and have made the year 1517 forever memorable in the ecclesiastical annals for the foundation and commencement it gave to the revolution in the Church, commonly known by the name of the Reforma- tion (q.v.). One of the greatest desires of Leo X, as pope of Rome, was the continuation of the incom-
cularly sensitive on account of some recent humiliations, particularly by the case of Saxony (q.v.), the Events at Bern, and by the still surviving controversy with Beuchlin (q.v.), aside from the fact that the different mendiant orders cherished constant jealousy against each other. (The conjecture of some that the jealousy of the Augustinian monk was apparent in Luther's attack on the Dominicans is incorrect: he had intrusted the indulgence traffic is too ridiculous to need repetition here. Comp. however, Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. iv, 25, note 17; Mosheim, Eccl. Hist. bk. iv, cent. xvi, sec. i, ch. ii, note 18.) In opposition to Luther's theses, Tetzel himself came forward with a charter, which he published at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. Prominent among others also were Eck (q.v.), the celebrated Augsburg divine, and Prierias (q.v.), the inquisitor general, who both replied to the Augustinian monk with all the virulence of scholastic disputants. But the manner in which they conducted the controversy did little service to their cause. Luther attempted to combat indulgences by arguments founded in reason or derived from the Scriptures; they produced nothing in support of them but the sentiments of the schoolmen, and the conclusions of the canon law, and the gentle words of the Pope. The edict of the judges, so partial and interested did not satisfy the people, who began to call into question even the authority of these venerable guides when they found them standing in direct opposition to the dictates of reason and the determination of the divine law" (Robertson, p. 128). At this juncture Reformation and Reformata were renewed with greater animosity than before. See CARLISLADT; ECK; LEPISIUS DISPUTATION. Luther was forced to reply; the primacy of the pope and other questions became involved, which may be studied in the additional references on the part of the reformers, and "in this way Luther gained so thorough an insight into the errors and corruption of the Roman Church that he gradually began to see the necessity of separating himself from it. He felt himself called as a soldier of God to fight against the Pope and the devil, by which the Church was corrupted" (Gieseler, iv, 49). In this he did hereafter, fearless of consequences, by both his pen and tongue. Luther's was a nature that recolled from no extremity. The result was "the bull of condemnation," issued June 15, 1520, which brought about the formal abjuration of the pope, on the part of Luther by the public burning of the bull, together with the papal law-books, Dec. 10 of this very year. January 8, 1521, came the bull of excommunication, and a demand for its execution by the Diet of Worms, the body to which Luther appeared. See REFORMATION.

With this direct condemnation on the part of the German reformers, Luther was received with great warmth in Germany, and threatened the very existence of Romanism, pope Leo was much more concerned with what occurred around him in Italy. A politician of the best sort in the affairs of his native country; very, extremely efficient in his business, calling for prompt action on the political horizon than any that had yet appeared, in his estimation, on that of ecclesiasticism. Leo, indeed, trembled for Florence at the prospect of beholding the imperial crown placed on the head of the king of Spain and of Naples, and the master of the New World; nor was he less afraid of seeing the king of France, who was the duke of Milan and lord of Genoa, exalted to that dignity. He even foretold that the election of either of them would be fatal to the independence of the holy see, to the peace of Italy, and perhaps to the liberties of Europe. But June 29, 1519, the king of Spain was elected successor to Maximilian. This was, indeed, an event calculated to cause a series of infinite perplexities to God's vicegerent on earth. So the important decision was taken, a secret league, offensive and defensive, signed by the new Caesar on July 8, 1521, by which it was stipulated that the duchy of Milan was to be taken from the French and given to Francesco Maria Sforza, and Parma and Piacenza to be restored to the pope. Leo subsidized a body of Swiss, and Prospero Colonna, with a body of others, and the Swibert de Nobili, the pope's own chamberlain, Charles of Miltitz (q.v.), was dispatched in December (1518) to give assurances to the electoral prince Frederick, by the valuable present of the consecrated golden rose (q.v.), of the good Intentions of the pope. Leo towards Saxony, and at the same time, if possible, to conciliate Luther, in whom was now seen the representative of Wittenberg University, and at whose back stood one to whom even his enemies confess but few men of any age can be compared, either for learning and knowledge of both human and divine things; and to rich endowment in both primary and facility of genius, or for industry as a scholar—Philip Melanchthon (q.v.). Unfortunately for the cause of the Dominicans, this very elector of Saxony, who had identified himself with and become the champion of the cause of the Wittenberg reform movement, was now, upon the death of Maximilian I, made regent of the empire in northern Germany (Jan. 12, 1519), and Miltitz saw the only way in which to settle the controversy—by appeasing the wrath of Luther. He accordingly flattered "the friar of Wittenberg," as he was contemptuously called, by the promise of kindness, assured him that his case had been misrepresented to Leo, and actually succeeded in inducing Luther to promise, not, indeed, recantation, as he desired, but a promise to be silent if his opponents were silent, and an open declaration of obedience to the see of Rome; thus the controversy was settled at Augsburg. The opponents, however, were not silent; the controversy was renewed with greater animosity than before.
more clear of the French, and restored to the dominion of Sforza. Parma and Piacenza were again occupied by the papal troops, and John Leo I sent Alfonso d'Este a rebel to the holy sea for having sided with the French, while the duke, on his part, complained of the bad faith of the pope in keeping possession of Modena and Reggio. The news of the taking of Milan was celebrated at Rome with public rejoicings, but little comfort did this afford the minds of all this Leo fell ill on Nov. 26, and died Dec. 1, 1521, not without reasonable suspicion of poison, though some have maintained that he died a natural death. (See Trollope, Hist. of Florence, iv. 385 sq., who quotes strong proof in favor of the assertion that Leo died by poison.)

Personally Leo was generous, rather prodigal; he was fond of splendor, luxury, and magnificence, and therefore often in want of money, which he was obliged to raise by means not often creditable. He had a discerning taste, was a ready patron of real merit, was fond of wit and humor, not always refined, and at times degenerating into buffoonery: this was, indeed, one of his principal faults. His state policy was like that of his contemporaries in general, and not so bad as that of some of them. He contrived, however, to keep the territories of the papal states in Florence in profound peace during his reign—no trifling boon—while all the rest of Italy was ravaged by French, and Germans, and Spaniards, who committed all kinds of atrocities. He was by no means neglectful of his temporal duties, although he was fond of conviviality and ease, and many charges have been brought against his morals. He did not, and perhaps could not, enforce a strict discipline among the clergy or the people of Rome, where profanity and licentiousness had reigned almost uncontrolled ever since the pontificate of Alexander VI. It is to be regretted, however, that any one should have been able to say of so pious a distinguished man as a patron of learning as Leo X that in his splendid and luxurious papal Christianity had given place, both in its religious and moral influence, to the revived philosophy and the unregulated manners of Greece; that the Vatican was visited less for the purpose of worshiping the footprints of the apostles than to admire the great works of ancient art stored in the papal palace (comp. London Quart. Rev. 1886, p. 294 sq.; Taine, Italy [Rome and Naples], p. 185.). As a pontificate, that of Leo X, though it lasted only nine years, "forms one of the most eventful epochs in the modern Europe, whether we consider it in a political light as a period of transition for Italy, when the power of Charles V of Spain began to establish itself in that country, or whether we look upon it as that period in the history of the Western Church which was marked by the momentous event of Luther's Reformation. But there is a third and a more favorable aspect under which the reign of Leo ought to be viewed, as a flourishing epoch for learning and the arts, which were encouraged by that pontiff, as they had been by his father, and, indeed, as they had been by his family in general, and for which the glorious appellation of the age of Leo X has been given to the first part of the 16th century" (Engl. Cyclop.). The services which Leo rendered to literature are many. He encouraged the study of Greek, founded a Greek college at Rome, established a Greek press, and gave the direction of it to John Lascaris; he restored the Roman University, and filled its numerous chairs with professors; he directed the collecting of MSS. of the classics, and also of Oriental writers, as well as the searching after antiquities; and by his example encouraged the study of the merchant Chigi, to the same. He patronized men of talent, of whom a galaxy gathered round him. He corresponded with Erasmus, Machiavelli, Ariosto, and other great men of his time. He restored the celebrated library of his family, which, on the expulsion of the Medici, had been placed in the possession of the merchant Chigi, and which is known by the name of the Biblioteca Laurenziana at Florence. In short, Leo X, if not the most exemplary among popes, was certainly one of the most illustrious. Pulci, in his History of Italy, describes him as "Vita Leo X (1522);" Audio, Leo X (1644); Giovis, Vita Leo X (1651); Artaud de Montor, Histoire des Souverains Pontifes, vol. iv. The bibliography of his pontificate is: Biblioteca Laurenziana Medicea e Infrarna Estata; Siamondi, Hist. des Repubbliche Italiani; Banke, Hist. of the Popes, vol. i, ch. ii; SchrÖCK, Kirchengesch. xxvii, 491 sq.; xxxiv, 88, 91; and his Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref. i. 76 sq., 314 sq.; s. iii, 207 sq., 211 sq.; Rzymer, Gesch. der Fidalgogen, s. d. Ref. i. 69; Trollope, History of Florence (London, 1865, 4 vols. 8vo), especially vol. iv, book x; Leo, Gesch. Italiens, vol. v, ch. iii. (J. H. W.)

Leo XI, Pope (Alexandro da Medici), a descendant of the house of the Medici, was born at Florence in 1535. After representing Tuscany for some years at the court of pope Pius V, he was made bishop of Pistoia in 1573, and archbishop of Florence in 1574. Made cardinal in 1588, he was sent by his predecessor, Clement VIII, to await a latera to France to receive Henry IV into the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church. He was very old when elected, on the 1st of April in the 2d year of most exertions of the French, against the wishes of the Spanish. He died on the 27th of the same month, it is said, from the fatigue attending the ceremony of taking possession of the patriarchal church of St. John the Lateran. See Artaud de Montor, Histoire des Souverains Pontifes; Bower, History of the Popes, vii, 476; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxx, 755; Engl. Cyclop. s. v.

Leo XII, Pope (cardinal Annibale della Graga), was born in the district of Spoleto in 1670, of a noble family of the Romagna; was made archbishop of Tyre in 1735, and was later employed as nuncio to Germany and France by Pius VII, who made him a cardinal in 1816. On the death of this pontiff he was elected pope, in September, 1823. He was well acquainted with diplomacy and foreign politics, and in the exercise of his authority, and in asserting the claims of his see, he assumed a more imperious tone than his meek and benevolent predecessor. He re-established the right of asylum for criminals in the churches, and enforced the strict observance of fast days. He was a declared enemy of the Carbonari and other secret societies. He proclaimed a jubilee for the year 1825; and in his circular letter accompanying the bull, addressed to the patriarchs, princes, archbishops, and bishops, he made a violent attack upon the Bible Societies, as acting in opposition to the decree of the Council of Trent (session iv) concerning the publication and use of the sacred books. Leo also entered into negotiations with the new states of South America for the sake of filling up the vacant seats. He gave a new organization to the university of the Sapienza at Rome, which consists of five colleges or faculties, viz., theology, law, medicine, philosophy, and pharmacy; and he increased the number of the professors, and raised their emoluments. He published in October, 1824, a Moto Proprio, forming the new system of the papal state, and also the administration of justice, or Procedura Civil, and he fixed the fees to be paid by the litigant parties. He corrected several abuses, and studied to maintain order and a good police in his territories. He died February 10, 1829, and was succeeded by Pius VIII. (Engl. Cyclop. s. v. Roduni, Leone XII Pio VIII; 1828; Schmidt, Trauver de ouf Leo XII (1829); Artaud de Montor, Histoire du pape Lion XII (1843), 2 vols. 8vo); Wiseman, Recollections of the last four Popes (see Index).

Leodegar, a saint (in French St. Liger), was born about 616, and was educated by his uncle (some say his grandfather), the bishop of Poitiers, who made him archdeacon. Leodegar was afterwards called to the
court as adviser of Bathilde, and tutor of her young son Chotaire. In 659 he was appointed bishop of Autun. That diocese was then in a rather dilapidated condition, and Leodegar applied himself at once to its restoration. He supported the poor, instructed the clergy and the people, decorated and enriched the churches, and reformed the monasteries. He introduced by imperial authority the rule of St. Benedict, for which purpose he held a synod at the end of 670. He was also instrumental in securing to Chilperic II, of Austrasia, the western part of France in 670; but the fickle monarch did not long consent to be ruled by a priest, and Leodegar was finally expelled by public execrations after Chilperic's death, being accused of complicity in his murder, in 678. He is now commemorated in the Roman Catholic Church Oct. 2.

Leon da Modena (Ben-Isaac Ben-Mohrdecai), also called Jehudah Arje Modena, one of the most celebrated Italian rabbis, the Jewish John Knox of the 16th century in Italy, was born in Venice April 23, 1571, of an ancient and literary family, originally from France. Leon displayed his talents and extraordinary intellectual endowments at a most tender age. The Sabbatic lesson (hahereth), it is said, he read before the whole congregation in the synagogue when he was only two and a half years old, and he began to preach (ハハレッハ) when he had scarcely reached the age of ten. At thirteen years of age and thereby before the public with his first work, a polemic work against gambling with dice and cards (entitled yehudah ruim, first published in 1596, and reprinted in French, Latin, and German), and thus active, and retaining all the vigor and elasticity of youth, he remained through life, though subject to great suffering by the great misfortune of passing his days by the side of an insane wife, and also by the disgrace and ruin of his promising sons to an early grave. With a genius so fertile, and a mind so well endowed, coupled with a thirst for learning and devotion to Biblical literature and exegesis, master of the Latin, Italian, and Hebrew, he surveyed the whole theological and philosophical field with ease, and became the author of numerous poetical, liturgical, ethical, doctrinal, polemical, and exegetical works. Unfortunately, however, for Leon Modena, he was fickle in mind, and left to adhere long to one opinion, in consequence of which we find him to-day the decided exponent of Mosaicism, to-morrow the staunch defender of Rabbinism, the next day in favor of a total abrogation of the whole ceremonial law, and perhaps on the day following an apologist for Christianity, because, as he expressed it, Judaism formed its base. Both the orthodox and liberal Jewish clergy, claim Leon as the exponent of their doctrines; but we think that justly he can be claimed as the master of the Reformed Jewish Church, for his masterpiece is, after all, the Kol Sanok (אמונת התורה), the existence of which was long known, but it was only in the present century that the MS. was discovered in the library of the duke of Parma. It was then drawn from its hiding-place, and was published under the supervision of the late rabbi Reggio in Kol sanok in lebenenu (Givat, 1869; an English translation appeared in The Jewish Times (New York) in the last numbers of 1871. This work contains a concise and terse exposition of the religious philosophy of Judaism, and of the ideas embodied in the various ceremonial practices, and is written from a most liberal standpoint. He also wrote הָרָעָם תְּנָה (The Captivity of Judah), or הָרָעָם וָאָמֵנָה ("Explanation of Words"), in which he explains in Italian all the difficult expressions in the Hebrew Bible, and which is preceded by grammatical rules (Venice, 1612; Padua, 1614); also printed in the margin of the Hebrew Bibles published for the use of the Italian Jews, following the order of the canonical books):—Rabbemahical and Italian Vocabular, called הָרָעָם וָאָמֵנָה ("The Lion's Mouth"), of which the Italian title is Raccolta delle loro Robbin, non Hebr. ne Chal. etc. (Padua, 1640), appended to the preceding work; afterwards printed separately in Venice, 1648. A polemical treatise against the Cabalists, whom he despised and derided, on the genuineness of their interpretation of the Pentateuch (Sohar), entitled הָרָעָם וָאָמֵנָה (edited by Dr. Furst, Leipzig, 1840):—Historia dei Riti Hebraici ed osservanza degli Hebrei di questi tempi, or the history of the rites, customs, and manner of life of the Jews, consisting of thirteen chapters, and written in Italian (Paris, 1637; in a revised form, Venice, 1638). This celebrated and most useful manual was translated into English by Edmund Chimed (London, 1650), and also edited by Simon Ockley, under the title History of the present Jews throughout the world (London, 1677), in Picard's Ceremonies and Religious Customs of the Various Nations of the known World, vol. I (London, 1733); into French by father Simon, who prefixed it with an elaborate account of the Karaites and Samaritans (Paris, 1674); into Dutch (Amsterd., 1685), and into Latin by Grossbauer, Historia rituum Judaeorum (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1693).—Commentary on the Books of Samuel:—Commentary on the five Megilloth, i.e. the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther: Commentary on the Psalms:—Commentary on Proverbs:—Commentary on the Book of the Apocalypse:—Jewish polemical works on Christianity, entitled הָרָעָם וָאָמֵנָה, but several of these works have not as yet been published. Leo died in Venice, where he was chief rabbi, in 1648. See his autobiography, entitled הָרָעָם וָאָמֵנָה, extant only in MS., from which extracts were made by Carmoly. Rev. Orientale (1842), p. 49 sqq., and Reggio, הָרָעָם וָאָמֵנָה (1852); Furst, Bibl. Judaica, ii, 388 sqq.; Steinmeister, Catalogue Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodleiana, col. 1345-56; Der Israelitische Volksherer (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1845), p. 89 sqq., 247 sqq.; 1856, 396 sqq.; Geiger, in Lieblich's Verzeichn. der Judentum-Jeude, 1865, 451 sqq.; Graetz, Gesch. d. Judent., x, 14 sqq.; Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit., vol. ii, part 1; v. Le\n
Leon or Leon, Jacob Jehudah, a Jewish writer of note, who was born, or Moorish descent, in 1614, in Holland, and flourished first at Middleburg and later at Amsterdam, is noted as a writer on the Temple model (compare Motte, Temple, Medb., 1648, or Hebrew יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל (Amst., 1650), and as an illustrator of the Talmudical writings. He also figured prominently as a polemical writer, contending for the inspiration of the O.T. writings, while he ruthlessly attacked the Gospel doctrines. He is now generally supposed to have been the author of Colloquium Middelburgense (attributed by Fabricius to Manasseh ben-Israel), and of Colloquium theologorum de Christiamid. Leon died after 1671. See Graetz, Gesch. d. Judent., x, 24 sqq., 200 sqq.; Furst, Biblioth. Jud., ii, 232 sqq.\n
Leon. Luis Ponce de, a Spanish ecclesiastic, was born at Belmonte, in the south of Spain, in 1527 (according to the Tesoro de los Procesos Españoles por Ochot [Paris, 1841], at Granada; and according to St. Antonio de Eckter). He was born at Belmonte in 1507, or shortly after, and was educated at Salamanca, entered in 1543 the order of the Augustines, and was thereafter known under the name of Luis de Leon. Having been received D.D., he was in 1561 appointed to a professorship at St. Thomas. His knowledge and success created him many enemies, at the head of whom were the Dominicans. He was accused of heresy and of having translated parts of the Bible into the vernacular, contrary to the orders of the Sanctor Officium, he was in 1572 imprisoned in the dungeon of the Inquisition at Valladolid, and appeared over fifty times before the Inquisition. His case, which is extant, contains 200 closely-written pages in the purest Castilian. Although unable to prove anything against him, his judges condemned him to the
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rack; but this sentence was reversed by the Inquisitionary high court of Madrid, and he was liberated with the advice of being more careful in future. In 1578 he returned to his convent and resumed his office. He thereafter devoted himself exclusively to theology and to the duties of his order; but his health never recovered from the severe attacks he had undergone. He lived in the prisons of the Inquisition. He became general and provincial vicar of his order in Salamanca, and died in 1591. His principal writings are poems in Latin and in Spanish; the latter are distinguished for beauty of language and purity of style. His original pieces have been published, with those of his collaborators, by L. B. Sonnleitner and W. Storck (Munster, 1653). His whole works, consisting of the above, together with translations from the classics, the Psalms, and parts of the book of Job, were collected and published (Madrid, 1804-16, 6 vols.). See Quevedo, Flos de L. de L. (Madrid, 1831); Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, s. v.

Leonard, Sr., a French nobleman who flourished in the first half of the 6th century, was a convert and pupil of Remigius. He retired at first into a convent near Orleans, and afterwards into a hermitage in the neighborhood of Limoges. Here he applied himself to the cultivation of the plow, and soon gathered around him, and he founded the convent of No bla. He took special interest in prisoners, and the legend relates that centuries after his death prisoners were released and captives brought back from distant countries through his intercession. His prayers are said to have saved the life of the queen of France in dangerous confinement, and he became also the protector of travellers. He died in 559, and is commemorated on the 6th of November. He is especially recognized in France and in England. Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, viii, 327; Migne, Nouv. Encycl. Théol., ii, 1066. (J. N. F.)

Leonard, Stephen, an American Congregational minister, was born at Plymouth, Mass., Nov. 5, 1740; graduated at Harvard College in 1759; and was ordained pastor of the original Church in Woodstock, Conn., in 1763. In 1775 he was appointed chaplain in the Revolutionary army, and was in the service of his country until 1778, when he went home on a furlough to see his sick child. Having remained longer than the appointed time, he found, upon his return, that he was superseded, which news so affected him that he put an end to his life in the western part of Connecticut, Aug. 14, 1787. See the LIFE of a minister, and an eloquent speech by Dr. Leonard. He published two sermons. See Cong. Quar. 1861, p. 350.

Leonard, George (1), a Congregational, and subsequently an Episcopal, minister, was born in Middleborough, Mass., April 6, 1838; graduated at Dartmouth College in 1860; studied with Dr. Perkins, of West Hartford; and was ordained over the Church in Canterbury, Conn., in 1868. After two years he was dismissed, and preached in various places in Massachusetts. In 1871 he was ordained a deacon in the Episcopal Church by bishop Griswold; admitted to priest's orders the following year at Marblehead; and was rector of Trinity Church, Cornish, N. H., and of Sts. Paul and St. Winoar, Va., until his death, which took place at the house of his sister in Salisbury, N. H., June 28, 1884. "Disinterested and judicious counselor, open-hearted and honest man, and a sincere Christian," Several of his sermons were published. See Cong. Quar. 1889, p. 394.

Leonard, George (2), a Baptist minister, was born in Barnham, Bristol Co., Mass., Aug. 17, 1802; entered Brown University in September, 1820; graduated in 1824; and after being for some time a subordinate instructor in the Columbia College at Washington, went to the Newton Theological Institution to study theology. In August, 1827, he was elected pastor of the Second Baptist Church of Salem, Mass., and subsequently filled also the office of secretary of the Salem Bible Translation and Foreign Mission Society; but his health compelled him to resign that position in 1829. Having somewhat recovered, he became pastor of the Church in Portland, Me., in October, 1830. Here he labored faithfully and successfully until his death, Aug. 11, 1831. He wrote a Dissertation on the Duty of Churches in reference to Temperance (published in the Christian Watchman, 1829). The year after his death (1832), a small volume containing twelve sermons he had delivered together with the sermon delivered on the occasion of his death, was issued. The Rev. Dr. Babcock, was published under the direction of his widow.—Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, vi, 729.

Leonard, Joseph, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Kingsbury, N. Y., Apr. 15, 1816. He graduated from Union College in 1837, and finished his theological course at Princeton Seminary. He was ordained to the ministry in 1840, and was pastor of the following churches successively: Mexicoville, N. Y., 1840-42; Oswego, 1842-46; Delli, 1845-48; Fulton, Ill., 1856-71. In 1862 he became state school supply at Clinton, 1a., where he died, Feb. 22, 1880. (W. P. S.)

Leonard, Levi Waishburn, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at S. Bridgewater, Mass., June 1, 1790, and was educated at Harvard University, where he graduated in 1805. He then studied theology at Cambridge, and Sept. 6, 1808, became pastor at Dublin, N. H., where he continued until 1815. He died Dec. 12, 1864. He published several school-books and other works of general interest only.—Drake, Dict. of American Biography, s. v.; Appleton, Amer. Annual Cyclopaedia, 1864, p. 628.

Leonard, Zenas Lockwood, a Baptist preacher, was born at Bridgewater, Mass., January 16, 1773. In June, 1779, he was converted, and shortly after joined the church in Middleborough. In May, 1779, he entered the sophomore class of Brown University, and graduated with honor in 1784. On leaving college he commenced a course of theological study with Rev. W. Williams, of Wrentham, Mass. In 1796 he was ordained pastor of the Baptist church in Sturbridge, Mass. The next year he opened a grammar-school, which he continued for several years. Mr. Leonard was active in procuring a division of the Warren, R. I., Baptist Association, Nov. 3, 1801, and the formation of the Sturbridge Association, Sept. 80, 1802. He was particularly active in promoting prominent benevolent objects, especially the Sabbath-school, the temperance cause, African colonization, and missions. On Oct. 18, 1827, he was, by his own request, dismissed from the charge of his congregation. For six terms he represented the town of Sturbridge, on the school committee, and was chairman for five of these terms. Mr. Leonard manifested supreme deference to the authority, truth, and spirit of the Gospel; stability of purpose; uncompromising advocacy of the cause of freedom, righteousness, and public virtue; and unwearying activity in performing the various duties of his profession. He was very steady in progress, ripening continually until his death. He died June 24, 1841. The only printed productions of his pen, with the exception of contributions to various periodicals, are the Circular Letters to the Association for the years 1800, 1810, 1822, and 1825.—Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, vi, 547 sq.

Leonardo da Porto Maurizio, a noted missionary priest and the founder of the Brotherhood of the Heart of Jesus, was born in Liguria in 1676. While yet a youth he became a pupil of the Jesuits, and a member of the Order of the Reformed Franciscans. He was especially active in promoting the doctrine of the immaculate conception. He died about Christmas-tide of the 18th century, and was sainted by Pius VI in 1796.

Leonardo da Vinci. See VINCI.

Leonardoni, Francesco, an Italian painter, was born at Venice in 1654; visited Spain and settled at Madrid; gained great eminence as a portrait-painter; in 1810 was appointed court painter. His historical works are characterized by a grand style of design; and died at Madrid in 1711. Among his principal works are a large altar-piece of the Incarnation, in the Church of San Gerónimo, el Real, at Madrid; and two subjects from the Life of
LEON BRUNO 


Leonbruno, Lorenzzo, an Italian painter, was born at Mantua in 1489; studied under count Castiglione, the friend of Raphael; appointed painter to the duke of Mantua; gave offence to Giulio Romano, in consequence of which he was obliged to quit Mantua; settled at Milan, and then removed to Bologna, about 1537. The pictures at Mantua are highly praised, viz., St. Jerome — The Meatmors of Midas: — and The Body of Christ in the Arms of the Virgin. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of Fine Arts, a. v.

Leonidas, father of the celebrated Origen, was a Christian martyr of the 8th century. Previous to his execution, his son, in order to encourage him as follows: "Beware that your care for us does not make you change your resolution!" The father accepted the heroic exertion of the son, and yielded his neck joyfully to the stroke of the executioner. — Fox, Book of Martyrs, p. 23.

Leoniste is the name by which the Waldenses are sometimes referred to, and derived from Leonis (Lyonna). Leo'tis, an important river of northern Palestine, doubtless the present Litani, which bursts in a deep cleft through the Lebanon range (Robinson, Res. iii., 406 sq.); Ritter, Erdk. xvii, 48 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. a. v.). For a description, see LEBANON.

Leontius, a Christian martyr and saint, probably of Arabian origin, was born at Vicentia, in Venetia, in the 3d century. After his death, in 269, he was moved to Aquileia, in Venetia, where, in company with St. Carpophorus, who was either his brother or intimate friend, he distinguished himself by zeal in favor of Christianity. For this offence they were both brought before the governor Lyriae, and after being tortured in various modes, and, according to the legend, miraculously delivered, they were at last beheaded, probably A.D. 300. Their memory is celebrated by the Romish Church on Aug. 28. See the Acta Sanctorum (in Aug. 20), where several difficulties are critically discussed at length. — Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. vol. ii, a. v.

Leontius of Antioch, a learned Syrian theologian of the early Church, was born in Phrygia about the close of the 8d or the opening of the 4th century. He was a disciple of the martyr Lucianus, and, having entered the Church, was ordained a presbyter. In order to enjoy without scandal the society of a young female, Eustocius he willed to, whom he was closely attached, he mutilated himself, but, notwithstanding, did not escape suspicion, and was finally deposed from his office. On the deposition, however, of Stephanus, or Stephen, bishop of Antioch, he was, by the favor of the emperor Constantine, restored to his preeminent position; and was appointed to that see about 318 or 349. Leontius died about A.D. 358. Of his writings, which were numerous, nothing remains except a fragment of what Caece describes, we know not on what authority, as Oratio in Passionem S. Babylas (cited in the Paschal Chronicle in the notice of the Decian persecution). In this fragment it is distinctly asserted that both the emperor Philip and his wife were avowed Christians (Socrates, Hist. Eccles. ii., 26; Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. iii., 20; Theodoret, Hist. Eccles. ii., 10, 24; Philostorgius, Hist. Eccles. iii., 15, 17, 18; Athanasius, Apollinaris, de Fuga sua c. 26; Hist. Arm. c. 35; Monachos, c. 38; Chron. Paschal, i. 270, 289, ed. Paris: p. 216, 231, ed. Venice: p. 503, 535, ed. Bonn; Caece, Hist. Literario, i. 211, ed. Oxon. 1740-48; Fabricius, Biblioth. Graec. viii., 324). — Smith, Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biog. vol. ii, a. v.

Leontius of Aracina, in Capadocia, of which town he was bishop, flourished as an ecclesiastical writer. The period in which he lived, however, is quite uncertain. Photius has noticed two of his works: i. Εἰς τοὺς ἱεροὺς οἶκους (Sermo de Creatione), and 2. Εἰς τῷ ἀληθείᾳ ἀναφοράν (De Lanaro), and gives extracts from both these works (Photius, Cod. 279). See also Caece, Hist. Liter.

i, 551; Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. viii., 324, x, 268, 771; — Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. vol. ii, a. v.

Leontius of Arletta, or Arles, was bishop of that city about the middle of the 5th century. Several letters were written to him by pope Hilarius, A.D. 461-467, which are given in the Concilia, and a letter of Leontius to the pope, dated A.D. 462, is also given in the Concilia and in D'Anastaticus. See Faber, Concilia, vol. ii, 302 (in the edition of De la Barre, Paris, 1723, folio). Leontius presided in a council at Arles, held A.D. 475, to condemn an error into which some had fallen respecting the doctrine of predestination. He appears to have died in A.D. 486. He is mentioned in the works of Eusebius Apolinaris. See Concilia, iv. col. 1039, 1041, 1044 (1828, ed. Labbe): Caece, Hist. litt. i, 449; Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. viii., 324; xii, 653; Bibl. Med. et infim. Latinitatis, v, 258 (ed. Mansi); Tilmont, Memoires, xvi, 38. — Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. vol. ii, a. v.

Leontius of Byzantium (1), an ecclesiastical writer of the latter part of the 4th century, and of the 7th century, is sometimes designated, from his original profession, Scholausticus, i.e. pleader. As there are several works of that period which bear the name of Leontius, distinguished by various surnames, it is sometimes doubtful to whom they should be assigned. According to Oudin, the work represented as an exposition of the Psalter, which had been founded by St. Saba near Jerusalem, and was for a time its abbot (De Scriptoribus. Eccles. i, col. 1462, etc.), Caece, confounding two different persons bearing this name, places Leontius in the reign of Justinian, but from the ordinary of the work with which he is credited it is evident that he flourished a half century later. The works which appear to bear by their Leontius are as follows: 1. Σχολία (Scholia), taken down from the lips of Theodorus (first published with Latin version by Leucianius, and commonly cited by the title De Societis in a volume containing several other pieces [Baele, 1578, 8vo], and reprinted in the Auctarium Bibliothecae Patrum of Du cus, vol. i [Paris, 1624, folio], in the Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. xi [Paris, 1644, fol.], and in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland, xii, 625, etc. [Venice, 1726, folio]. The Latin version alone is given in several other editions of the Bibliotheca Patrum, 2. Contra Eugychiacoce et Nestoriano Libri tre, s. comnutfatio utrique Fictionis inter se contraria. Some inaccurately speak of the three books into which this work is divided as distinct works. 3. Liber adversus eua eum qui pro dilecto uterque Apollinaris opra ostendit, s. exnomine Sanctorum Patrum, s. adversus Fraudes Apollinarisartarum. 4. Solutiones Argumentationum Sereri. 5. Dubitationes hypothetiche et definienfat contra eos qui negant in Christo post Unamem duos sive naturas. Those pieces have not been printed in the original, but in a Latin version from the papers of Philippus Turrianus (published by Canisius in his Lectiones Antiquae, vol. iv, or ii, 925, etc. ed. Basnage, and reprinted in the Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. ix [Lyons, 1677, folio], and in the above-mentioned volume of Galland). 6. Apologia Concilii Chalcedonenses (printed with a Latin version and notes, by Antonio Bongiovanni, in the Concilia, vii, 799, ed. Mansi [Florence, 1762, folio], and reprinted by Galland, L. c.). In the title of this work Leontius is called Monachus Hieronymiani, but the word Hieronymitanus is possibly an error of the transcriber. At any rate, Galland identifies the writer with our Leontius, and the subject of the work makes it probable that he is right. 7. Adversus Eugychiacoce et nestorianoe in octo libros distinctum (described by Canisius as being extant in MS. at Munich, and by Fabricius as occurring in the catalogue of the Palaeographus of Galland). 8. Liber de Duplci Naturae in Christo contra Harress Monophysitarum (Labbe and Caece speak of this as extant in MS. at Vienna, and they add to it Disputatio contra Philosophum Arianum: this, however, seems to be an extract from Gelasianus of Cyzicus), which probably is.
one of the discussions between the "holy bishops" of the orthodox party and the "philosophers" who embraced the semi-monastic life. Bollandus was also a student of Leontius, who was a bishop of the Cappadocian Caesarea, and contemporary of Athanasius.

3. According to Nicophorus Callistus (H. E. xviii, 48), our Leontius wrote also "an admissible work," in thirty books, unfortunately lost, in which he overflowed the tritheistic heresy of John the Baptist, the only bishop of the orthodox church. Cave also refers to our Leontius Oratio in media Pentecostae et in Cena eum Nativitatis secundum illud: Noli judicare secundum fuscum (published by Combefis, with a Latin version, in his Asteraei Novum, vol. i (Paris, 1648, 1661). The first edition of this last treatise appeared in the Collectanea Patrum, vol. ix (Lyons, 1671, fol.), but Fabricius (Bibl. Græca, viii, 321) ascribes the homily to Leontius of Neapolis, while Galland omits it altogether. A homily on the parable of the good Samaritan, printed among the homilies of Chrysostomos (Opera, viii, 568, ed. Sellier), seems also to be a production of our Leontius.


Leontius of Byzantium (2), the author of a part of the Χρωσύγια, lived in the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. A second portion, bringing the work down to the second year of Romanus, son and successor of Porphyrogenitus, and the Leontius who took part in it, is also to be produced by our Leontius.


Leontius of Neapolis (or of Haepopolis, according to his own authority, in Cyprus, who was bishop of that city, which Le Quen (Ortis Christianorum, ii, 1061) identifies with the Nova Lemnisca, or Nemissia, or Nemissa, that rose out of the ruins of Anathasia, flourished in the latter part of the 6th and the latter half of the 7th century. Baronius, Posevino, and others call Leontius bishop of Salamis or Constantinople, but in the records of the second Nicene or seventh General Council, held A.D. 787, Actio iv (Concilii, vii, col. 386, ed. St. Pius X, ed. c. xiii, vol. 44, ed. Manili), he is expressly described as bishop of Neapolis, in Cyprus. His death is said to have occurred between 630 and 635. His principal works are Αδριανος νυμφης της Χριστιανοτητος ευχαριστηριακος και για την εμμονην της εκκλησίας της σαντίας. A long extract from the fifth of these sermons was read at the second Nicene Council (Concilii, l.c.) to support the use of images in worship, and several passages, most of them identical with those cited in the council, are given by John of Damascus in his third oration, and in De Imaginibus (Opera, i, 378, etc., ed. Le Quen). A Latin version of another portion of one of these discourses of Leontius is given in the Lectiones Antiquae of Canisius, i, 785, ed. Basnage:—Leontii ducis haec est de Imaginibus sermo cuiusdam discipuli aepigraphi της Εὐαγγελισμος Βίας Σαντιϊος Ιωαννίς Αρχιερεύου Αξιολογείει Ανδρειαν Κογνωστον Ελεομοσυνη, e. Ελεομοσυνη. See JOHN THE ALMSGIVER. This life by Leontius was mentioned in the second Nicene Council (Concilii, vol. cit., col. 246, ed. Hardouin, 866 Coleti, 868 Mansi), and is extant in Nos. 7 and 8 in the Imperiale Libri. An ancient Latin version by Anastasius Bibliothecarius is given by Rosweil (De Vita Patrum, par i), Surius (De Probabilis Santoriorum Vitae), and Bollandus (Acta Sanctorum, January, i, 498, etc.). The account of St. John the Baptist is given by Bollandus (Acta Sanctorum, January, i, 702, xvi, 498), and by the Latin version in the Novum Auctarium of Combefis, vol. i (Paris, 1648, fol.). As Leontius is recorded to have written many homilies in honor of saints (γερουσια) and for the festivals of the Church (παναγρογμή λαος), especially on the transfiguration of our Saviour, it is not unlikely that some of those extant under the name of Leontius of Constantinople may be by him. He wrote also Παραλληλικοις λαοις βις, Parallicere, s. Locorum sacramentorum Libri ii, the first book consists of τω εισεγειως, and the other η΄ εισεγειως. Turrianus possessed the second book; but whether that or the first is extant, we know not; neither has been published. It has been thought that John of Damascus, in his Parallale, made use of those of Leontius. Fabricius also inserts among the works of our Leontius the homily Ρε ηραβη, in Patrum (s. Rom. Patrum), generally ascribed to Chrysostom, and printed among his doubtful or spurious works (vii, 384, ed. Saull; vii, 767, ed. Montfaucon, or x, 916, and iii, 384, in the recent Parisian reprint of Montfaucon's edition). Malalas (ad Jom. vii) mentions some MS. Commentarii in Joannem by Leontius, and an Oration to leontius S. Epiphanius is mentioned by Theodore Studita in his Antihereticorum Secundus, spad Siamoni, Opp. v, 180. See Fabricius, Bibli. Graeca, viii, 820, etc.; Cave, Hist. Lat., i, 550; Oudin, De Scriptor. Ecclesiastici, i, col. 1757, etc.; von Fries, De Histor. Græc. lib. ii, c. 28; Le Quen, Oriens Christianus, ii, col. 1602; Acta Sanctorum, July, v, 816—Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography, ii, 768.

Leopard (Lüb. "吸," némér, so called being spotted, Cant. iv, 8; Lev. vi, 5; Jer. v, 8, xiii, 9; Hos. ii, 7; Hab. i, 8; Chald. "吸," nemur, Dan. vii, 6; Gr. ψόφας, Dan. vii, 6; Rev. xii, 2; Ecclus. xxviii, 28). Though zoologists differ in opinion respecting the identity of the leopard and the panther, and dispute, supposing them to be distinct, how these names should be respectively applied, and by what marks the animals should be distinguished from each other, it is not without doubt that the name of the Bible is that great spotted feline which anciently infested the Syrian mountains,
and even now occurs in the wooded ranges of Lebanon, for the Arabs still use minar, the same word slightly modified, to denote that animal. The Abyssinian name differs scarcely from either; and in all these tongues it means spotted. Picturis, according to Kischers, is the Coptic name; and in English "leopard" has been adopted as the most appropriate to represent both the Hebrew word and the Greek λιοντάριον (which is imitated in the Talmudic לִיּוֹנְתָּרִי, Mishna, Bab. Mez. viii, 2), although the Latin leopardus is not found in any author anterior to the fourth century, and is derived from a gross mistake in natural history. Genusis (Thes. Heb. p. 443) contends that the scriptural animal was rather striped than spotted (רְסִילָה רְסִילָה, Jer. xiii, 23), and thinks that not improbably the tiger was also comprised under this name, as the Hebrews had no specific name for that animal (Meseur. p. 888). The panther (Felis pardus of

Syrian Panther (Felis Pardus). Linn.) lives in Africa (Strabo, xvii, 828; Pliny, x, 94), Arabia (Strabo, xvi, 774, 777), as well as on Lebanon (Seetzen, xvii, 343; Burckhardt, Trav. i, 99), and the hills of middle Palestine (Schubert, iii, 119), not to mention more distant countries, as India, America, etc. The most graphic description of the (African and Arabian) panther is by Ehrenberg (Symbol. phys. Mammal., dec. 2, p. 17). The variety of leopard, or rather panther, of Syria is considerably below the stature of a lioness, but very heavy in proportion to its bulk. Its general form is so well known as to require no description beyond stating that the spots are rather more irregular, and the color more mixed with whitish than in the other pantherine felina, excepting the Felis uncia or Felis Irbis of High Asia, which is shaggy and almost white (Somntr, i, 895). It is a nocturnal, cat-like animal in habits, dangerous to all domestic cattle, and sometimes even to man (comp. Plin. x, 94; Hom. Hymns in Vett. 71; Oppian, Cyneget. iii, 76 sq.; Cyril. Alex. in Hos. l. c.; Taetz. Chil. i, 45; Poirier, Voy. i, 224). In the Scriptures it is constantly placed in juxtaposition with the lion (Isa. vi, 7; Jer. v, 6); Hos. xiii, 7; Exclus. xvi, 2; [27]; comp. Odian. V. H. xiii, 4; or the wolf (Gen. iii, 21). The swiftness of this animal, to which Habakkuk (i, 8) compares the Chaldaean horses, and to which Daniel (vii, 6) alludes in the winged leopard, is well known. So great is the flexibility of its body that it is able to take surprising leaps, to climb trees, or to crawl snake-like upon the ground. Jeremiah and Hosea (as above) allude to the insidious habit of this animal, which is abundantly confirmed by the observations of travellers: the leopard will take up its position in some spot near a village, and watch for some favorable opportunity for plunder. From the Cauticles (as above) we learn that the hilly ranges of Lebanon were in ancient times frequented by these animals, and it is now not uncommonly seen in and about Lebanon, and the southern maritime moun-
tains of Syria (Kitto, Pict. Bible, note on Cant. iv, 8).

There is in Asia Minor a species or variety of panther, much larger than the Syrian, not unfrequent on the borders of the snowy tracts even of Mount Ida, above ancient Troy; and the group of these spotted animals is spread over the whole of Southern Asia to Africa. From several names of places (e. g. Beth-pardes) it is not improbable that in the earlier ages of Israelitish dominion, it was sufficiently numerous in Palestine, and recent travellers have encountered it there (see Bibliotheca Sacra, 1845, p. 669; Lynch's Expedition, p. 212). Leopards were known as a part of ceremonial costume by the superiors of the Egyptian priesthood, and by other personages in Nubia; and the animal itself is represented in the processions of tributary nations (Wilkinson, i, 285, 291, 319). In Dan. vii, 7, the third stage of the prophetical vision is symbolized under the form of a leopard with wings, representing the rapidly spreading Macedonian empire; its four heads corresponding to the division of Alexander's dominions among his four generals. In Rev. xiii, 2, the same animal is made a type of the spiritual power of the Roman hierarchy, supported by the secular power in maintaining Papism in opposition to Christianity. See generally Boehm, Hier. ii, 100 sq.; Schoeder, Specim. hieros, i, 46 sq.; Wemyss, Curiae Symbolicae, v.; Wood, Bible Animals, p. 29 sq.; Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 156 sq.

Leopold II of Germany (1750-1792) and I of Tuscany (1752-1790), the second son of Maria Theresa of Austria and her husband Francis of Lorraine, is noted in Church History for the part he took in the ecclesiastical affairs of Tuscany, which, after Maria Theresa had succeeded to the Austrian dominions, according to treaties, establishing the independence of Tuscany as a state separate from the hereditary states of Austria, was devolved upon Leopold, his elder brother Joseph being the presumptive heir of the Austrian dominions. His principal reforms in Tuscany concerned the administration of justice and the discipline of the clergy in his dominions. By his "Motu proprio" in 1786, he promulgated a new criminal code, abolished torture and the pain of death, and established penitentiaries to reclaim offenders. In the ecclesiastical department, after having instituted various reforms, he actually, in July, 1782, abolished the Inquisition in Tuscany, and placed the monks and nuns of his dominions under the jurisdiction of the respective bishops. The discovery of licentious practices carried on in certain nunneries in the towns of Pistoja and Prato with the connivance of their monkish directors induced Leopold to investigate and reform the whole system of monastic discipline, and he intrusted Ricci, bishop of Pistoja, with the office for that purpose. Ricci had caused a long and angry controversy with the court of Rome, which pretended to have the sole cognizance of matters affecting individuals of the clergy and monastic orders. Leopold, however, carried his point, and the pope consented that the bishops of Tuscany should have the jurisdiction over the convents of their respective dioceses. Ricci, who had high notions of religious purity, and was by his enemies accused of Jansenism, attempted other reforms; he endeavored to enlighten the people as to the proper limits of image-worship and the invocation of saints; he suppressed certain relics and, by occasional occasion to superstitious practices; he encouraged the spreading of religious works, and especially of the Gospel, among his flock; and, lastly, he assembled a diocesan council at Pistoja in September, 1786, in which he maintained the spiritual independence of the Tuscany bishops. He also endeavored to make one of the liturgy in the oral language of the country, he exposed the abuse of indulgences, approved of the four articles of the Gallican Council of 1682, and, lastly, appealed to a national council as a legitimate and canonical means for terminating controverted questions. Several of Ricci's new dispensations were condemned by the pope in a bull as scandalous, rash, and injurious to the Holy See. Leopold supported Ricci, but he could not prevent his being annoyed in many ways, and at last
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He saw him forced to resign his charge. (For further details of this curious controversy, see Fosset, Vie de St. Augustin.) Leopold himself had resigned a council at Florence of the bishops of Tus- cany in 1577, and proposed to them fifty-seven articles concerning the reform of ecclesiastical discipline. He enforced residence of incumbents, and forbade plurali- ties, incompatible with the clergy's rights, and their revenues among the poor benefices—thus favoring a parochial clergy, and extending their jurisdiction, as he had supported and extended the jurisdiction of the bishops. He forbade the publication of the bull and cures of Rome without the approbation of the govern- ment, and the publication of his mandates could not interfere with laymen in temporal matters, and restrained their jurisdiction to spiritual affairs only; and he subjected clergymen to the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts in all criminal cases. All these were considered in that age as very bold innovations for a Roman Cath- olic prince to undertake. See Ricci.

Leopold IV, margrave of Austria, son of Leopold III, was born Sept. 29, 1578. He was educated by the priest Udaltfich, under the direction of Altmann, bishop of Passau, and succeeded his father in 1596. His chief object during his whole reign was to promote the hap- piness and increase and elevation of his people. He avoided all foreign wars which endangered the resources of his country with great care. He was about to accompany the emperor, Henry IV, in a crusade to Jerusalem, when the insurrection of the emper- or's son, Henry V, obliged him to change his plans. At first he went to assist the emperor (in 1590), but somewhat later he was influenced by his brother-in-law, Borsywy II, duke of Bohemia, and the promises of Henry V, to join the latter, to whose sister Agnes, widow of Frederick of Suabia, he was married in 1516. The remainder of his reign passed in peace and prosperity, although occasionally (especially in 1616) he was subjected to annoyance by the invades of the Hungarians. In 1612, after the death of Henry V, he was spoken for emperor, but declined in favor of Lothair, duke of Saxony. Leopold died Nov. 15, 1186, and was canonized by pope Innocent VIII in 1485. He founded a large number of convents, among which are those of Neuburg, of Marienzell, and of the Holy Cross, and built a number of churches. See A. Klein, Gesch. des Christentums in Oesterreich (Vienna, 1840), vol. i and ii; Leopold d. Hei- lige (Vie. 1856); L. Lang, D. hl. Leopold (Reutlingen, 1866); Pez, Vita sancti Leopoldi; same, Scriptores Rerum Austriaca (2d ed., Vienna, 1749). For further information see S. Leopoldi; Jaffé, Gesch. des deutschen Reicthes un- ter Lothar dem Sacken (Berlin, 1843); and his Geschichte d. deutsch. Reiches u. Konrad III. (Han. 1845); Herzog, Real-Encyclop. viii, 582; Hoefer, Noua. Biog. Générale, iii, 179.

Lepor (some form of lepor, to smile with a providential intiction; aeprocy). See Leprosoy.

Leporasis, a monastic who flourished in the second half of the 4th and the early part of the 5th century, a native of Gaul, embraced asceticism under the auspices of Cassianus about the opening of the 5th century, at Marseilles, where he enjoyed a high reputation for purity and holiness. Advancing the view that man did not stand in need of direct grace, he was excommunicated in consequence of these heretical doctrines. He be- came himself to Africa, and there became familiar with Aurelius and St. Augustine, by whose instructions he profited so much that he not only became convinced of his former errors, but drew up a solemn profession addressed to Proculus, bishop of Marseilles, and Cyriellius, the bishop of Aix (see below as to the title and value of this treatise), while four African prelates bore witness to the sincerity of his conversion, and made intercession on his behalf. Although now reinstated in his ecclesiastical privileges, Leporasis does not seem to have returned to his native country, but, laying aside the profession of a monk, was ordained a presbyter by St. Augustine, A.D. 425, and appears to be the same Leporasis so warmly praised in the discourse De Magistro, ascriptiones. We know nothing further regarding his career except that he was still alive in 430 (Cassianus, De Incar. i, 4). The treatise above alluded to is still extant, under the title Libellus emendationes quae satisfactions ad Episcopos Cassianus (ed. Migne). E. A. Janssen, Confessio- neum Fidei Catholicae continens de Mysticae Initiationis Christi, cum Erroris pristini Deletatione. It was held in very high estimation among ancient divines, and its author was regarded as one of the finest bul- worms of orthodoxy against the attacks of the Nesto- riants. Some fragments are preserved in modern times, especially Quen- nel, who has written an elaborate dissertation on the subject, have imagined that we ought to regard this as a tract composed and dictated by St. Augustine, founding their opinion partly on the style, and partly on the terms in which it is quoted in the acts of the second Council of Chalcedon and early documents, and partly on certain expressions in an epistle of Leo the Great (clxx, edit. Quenel); but their arguments are far from being conclusive, and the hypothesis is generally rejected.

Leprosy was first collected by St. Dunstan from various sources, and inserted in the Acta Sanctorum of Gaulish councils (xlii, 62). The entire work was soon discovered and published by the same editor in his Opuscula Dogmatica Veterum quingue Scriptorum (Par. 1680, 8vo), together with the letter of the African bish- ops in favor of Leporius. It will be found also in the collection of the demonsiac by Leblanc, translated by Garnier's edition of Marius Mercator (Paris, 1673, fol.), i, 244; in the Bibliotheca Patrum Max. (Lugd. 1677), vii, 14; and in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland (Ven. 1713), ix, 698. Consult the dissertation of Quenel in his edition of the works of Leo, ii, 908 (ed. Paris); Histoire Littéraire de la France, li, 167; the second disser- tation of Garnier, his edition of M. Mercator, i, 230; the Prolegomena of Galland; Schöenemann, Bibliotheca Patr. Latt. ii, § 20.—Smith, Dict. Greek and Roman Biography, vol. ii, 8, v.

Leprosy (lep'rosiy; lep'ros_are, lep'rosy, a smiling, because sup- posed to be a direct visitation of heaven; Gr. λέπρα, so called from its scalliness, hence English "leper," etc.), a name that was given by the Greek physicians to a scaly disease of the skin. During the Dark Ages it was indiscriminately applied to all chronic diseases of the skin, and more particularly to elephantiasis, to which latter it, however, it is now more restricted. Hence prevailed the greatest discrepancy and confusion in the descriptions that authors gave of the disease, un- til Dr. Willan restored to the term lepros its original signification. In the Scriptures it is applied to a foul cutaneous disease, the description of which, as well as the regulations connected therewith, are given in Lev. xliii, xlv (comp. also Exod. iv, 6; Num. xiii, 10-15; 2 Sam. iii, 29; 2 Kings v, 27; vii, vii, viii, 5; Matt. viii, 2; x, 8, etc.). In the discussion of this subject we base our article upon the most recent scientific and ar- chaeological distinctions, compared with the present Oriental usages.

I. Scriptural and Talmudical Statements.—(1) Leprosy in Human Beings.—1. Cases and Symptoms of Biblical Leprosy.—Lev. xiii, 2-44, which describes this distem- per as laying hold of man, gives six different circum- stances under which it may develop itself. They are as follows: (1.) The first circumstance mentioned in Lev. xiii, 2-6 is that it may develop itself without any apparent cause. Hence it is enjoined that if any one should ob- serve a rising or swelling (םָלָה, an emaciated, or scar- tened, or a boil; or עֵבֹשָׁה, or a glossy pimple (רֶפֶשׁ), or a scaly pimple (שָׁלֹשׁ); in the skin of his flesh, which shall terminate in leprosy (רָפֶשׁ), he is at once to be taken to the priest, who is to examine it and pronounce it leprosy, and the man unclean, if it exhibits these two symptoms, viz. a, the hair of the affected spot
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changed from its natural black color to white; and, as the spot decreases than the general level of the skin of the body (ver. 2, 3). But if these two symptoms do not appear in the bright pimple, the priest is to shut him up for seven days, examine him again on the seventh day, and if the disease appears to have made no progress during this time, he is to remand the patient for another seven days, if on the eighth, he finds that the bright spot has grown darker (הָעָרֶב), and that it has not spread on the skin, he is to pronounce it a simple scab (עַרְבָּה יָרָבָּה), and the person clean after washing his garments (ver. 6). If, however, the pustule spreads over the skin after it has been pronounced a simple scab and the individual clean, the priest is to declare it leprous, and the patient unclean (ver. 7, 8). It is thus evident that the symptoms which indicated scriptural leprosy, as the Mannaight remarks (Nega'im, iii, 3), are bright pimpls, a little depressed, turning the hair white, and spreading over the skin.

As the description of these symptoms is very concise, and requires to be specified more minutely for practical purposes, the spiritual guides of Israel defined them as follows: Both the bright pimple (עָרָבָּה) and the swelling spot (עַרְבָּה יָרָבָּה), when indicative of leprosy, assume respectively one of two colors, a principal or a subordinate one. The principal color of the bright pimple is as white as snow (בַּעֲרֹת הַמַּר), and the subordinate resembles plaster on the wall (בַּעֲרֹת רְעָת), and the secondary one resembles white wool (כַּעֲרֹת נַפְשָׁו, Nega'im, i, 1); so that if the affected spot in the skin is inferior to whiteness to the film of an egg, it is not leprous, but simply a gathering (עַרְבָּה יָרָבָּה, Nega'im, i, 1). An inquiry is made as to the state of the patient, except the patient himself or his relatives, but the priest alone can decide whether it is leprosy or not, and accordingly pronounce the patient unclean, because Deut. xxii, 5 declares that the priest must decide cases of litigation and disease. But though the priest only can pronounce the decision, even if he be a child or a fool, yet he must act upon the advice of a learned layman in those matters (Nega'im, iii, 1; Mai
monides, l. c., ix, 1, 2). If the priest is blind of one eye, or is weak-sighted, he is disqualified for examining the disease (Nega'im, i, 3, ii, 8). The inspection must not take place on the Sabbath, nor early in the morning, nor in the middle of the day, nor in the evening, nor on cloudy days, because the color of the skin cannot properly be ascertained in these hours of the day; but in the third hour, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, twentieth, and sixtieth hour (קֵעָר), and the same priest who inspected it at first must examine it again at the end of the second seven days, as another one could not tell whether it has spread. If he should die in the interim, or be taken ill, another one may examine him, but not pronounce him unclean (Maimonides, On Leprospy, ix, 4). There must be at least two hairs white at the root and in the body of the bright spot before the patient can be declared unclean (Maimonides, l. c., ii, 1). If a bridegroom is seized with this distemper he must be left alone during the nuptial week (Nega'im, iii, 2). (2.) The second case is of leprosy reappearing after it has been cured (Lev. xiii, 9-17), where a somewhat different treatment is enjoined. If a person who has once been healed of this disease is brought again to the priest, and if the latter finds a white rising in the skin (עַרְבָּה יָרָבָּה), which has changed the hair into white and contains live flesh (עַרְבָּה יָרָבָּה), he is forthwith to recognize therein the reappearance of the old malady, and declare the patient unclean without any quarantine whatever, since the case (קֵעָר), requires no quarantine or seven days, when the priest is again to examine it, and if he finds that it has neither spread nor exhibits the required criteria, he is to order the patient to cut off all the hair of his head or chin, except that which grows on the affected part (קֵעָר). The inspection must be repeated for a second trial on the same day, and if it continues in the same state at the expiration of this period (ver. 81-84); and if it spreads after he has been pronounced clean, the priest is forthwith to declare him unclean without looking for any yellow hair (ver. 85, 86). The Jewish canonizes דִּרְפָּה by "an affection on the head or chin which causes the hair to grow white," and so that the place of the hair is quite bare" (Maimonides, On Leprospy, viii, 1). The condition of the hair, consti-
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...one of the leprous symptoms, is described as follows: "If it is small or short, but if it be long, though it is yellow as gold, it is no sign of uncleanness. Two yellow and short hairs, whether close to one another or far from each other, whether in the centre of the nethek or on the edge thereof, no matter whether the nethek proceeds the yellow hair or the yellow hair the nethek, are symptoms of uncleanness" (Mishnah, Niddah 1:5). The manner of shaving is thus described: "The hair round the scall is all shaved off except two hairs which are close to it, so that it might be known thereby whether it is spread" (Nigdim, x, 9).

(5.) The fifth case is leprosy which shows itself in white spots where it is not regarded as uncleane (Lev. xiii, 38, 39). It is called kokh (כֹּכְחָה, from כְּכַח, to be white), or, as the Sept. has it, ἀσπίγα, viilegus albus, white scurf.

(6.) The sixth case is leprosy at either the back or in the front of the head (Lev. xiii, 40-44). When a man loses his hair either at the back or in the front of his head, it is a simple case of baldness, and he is clean (ver. 40-41). But if a whitish red spot forms itself on the bald place at the back or in the front of the head, then it is leprosy, which is to be recognised by the fact that the swelling or scab on the spot has the appearance of leprosy in the skin of the body; and the priest is to declare the man's head leprous and unclean (ver. 42-44). Though there is only one symptom of its presence, nevertheless the head leprosy is to be recognised, and nothing is said about remitting the patient if the distemper should appear doubtful, as in the other cases of leprosy, yet the ancient rabbins inferred from the remark, "It is like leprosy in the skin of the flesh," that all the criteria specified in the latter are implied in the former. Hence the Hebrew canons submit that "there are two symptoms which render baldness in the front or at the back of the head unclean, viz. live or sound flesh, and spreading; the patient is also shut up for them two weeks, because it is said of them that they are [and therefore must be treated] like leprosy in the skin of the flesh." (Lev. xiii, 43). Of course, the fact that the distemper in this instance develops itself on baldness, precludes white hair being among the criteria indicating uncleanness. The manner in which the patient in question is declared unclean by two synagogues and in two weeks is as follows: "If live or sound flesh is found in the bright spot on the baldness at the back or in the front of the head, he is pronounced unclean; if there is no live flesh he is shut up and examined at the end of the week, and if live flesh has developed itself, he is declared unclean, and if not he is shut up for another week. If it has spread during this time, or engendered live flesh, he is declared unclean, and if not he is pronounced clean. He is also pronounced unclean if it spreads or engenders sound flesh after he has been declared clean." (Nigdim, x, 10; Maimonides, On Leprosy, v, 9, 10).

2. Regulations about the Conduct and Purification of Leprous Men.—Lepers were to rend their garments, let the hair of their head hang down dishevelled, cover themselves up to the upper lip, like mourners, and warn off every one whom they met by meeting and saying "Unclean! unclean!" since they defiled every one and everything they touched. For this reason they were also obliged to live in exclusion outside the camp or city (Lev. xiv, 45, 46; Numb. v, 1-4; xii, 10-15; 2 Kings xiv, 22, etc.). They were also enjoined never to enter a house, "according to the Jewish canons, renders everything in it unclean" (Nigdim, xii, 11; Kelim, i, 4).

If he stands under a tree and a clean man passes by, he renders him unclean. In the synagogue which he wishes to attend they are obliged to make him a separate compartment, ten handbreadths high and four cubits long and broad; he has to be the first to go in, and the last to leave the synagogue" (Nigdim, xii, 12; Maimonides, On Leprosy, x, 12); and if he transgressed the prescribed boundaries he was to receive forty stripes (Psachkin, 67, a). All this only applies to those who had been pronounced lepers by the priest, but not to those who were on quarantine (Nigdim, i, 7). The rabbinic law also exempts women from the obligation to rend their garments and let the hair of their head fall down (Sota, iii, 8). It is therefore no wonder that the Jews regarded leprosy as a living death (comp. Josephus, Anti, iii, 11, 8, and the well-known rabbinic saying יָשִּׁבַּת בָּרָא יָשִּׁבַּת, and as an awful punishment from the Lord (2 Kings v, 7; 2 Chron. xxvi, 20), which they wished all their mortal enemies (2 Sam. iii, 29; 2 Kings v, 27).

The healed leper had to pass through two stages of purification before he could be received back into the community. As soon as the distemper disappeared he sent for the priest, who had to go outside the camp or town to convince himself of the fact. Thereupon the priest ordered two clean and live birds, a piece of cedar wood, cream wood, and hyssop; killed one bird over a vessel containing spring water, so that the blood might run into it, tied together the hyssop and the cedar wood with the crimson wool, put about them the tops of the wings and the middle part of the belly of the living fowl, and dipped all the four in the blood and water which were in the vessel, then sprinkled the hand of the healed leper seven times, let the bird loose, and pronounced the restored man clean (Lev. xiv, 1; 7; Nigdim, xiii, 1). The healed leper was then to wash his garments, cut off all his hair, be immersed in water, return to the camp, and remain outside his house seven days, which the Mishna (Nigdim, xiv, 2), the Chaldean Paraphrase, Maimonides (On Leprosy, x, 1), etc., rightly regard as a euphemism for exclusion from conubial intercourse during that time (ver. 6), in order that he might not contract impurity (comp. Lev. xv, 16). With this ended the first stage of purification. According to the Jewish canons, the birds are to be "free, and not caged," or sparrows; the piece of cedar wood is to be "a cubit long, and a quarter of the foot of the bed thick;" the crimson wool is to be a shekel's weight; i. e. 820 grains of barley; the hyssop must at least be a handbreadth in size, and is neither to be the so-called Greek, nor ornamental, nor Roman, nor wild hyssop, nor have any name whatever; the vessel must be an earthen one, and new: and the dead bird must be buried in a hole dug before their eyes (Nigdim, xiv, 1-6; Maimonides, On Leprosy, x, 1).

The second stage of purification began on the seventh day, when the leper had again to cut off the hair of his head, his beard, eyebrows, etc., wash his garments, and be immersed (Lev. xiv, 9). On the eighth day he had to bring two live he-lambs without blemish, and one lamb a year old, three tenths of an ephah of fine flour mixed with oil, and one log of oil; the one he-lamb is to be a trespass-offering, and the other, with the ewe-lamb, a burnt and a sin-offering; but if the man was poor he was to bring two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, for a sin-offering and a burnt-offering, instead of a he-lamb and a ewe-lamb (ver. 10, 11, 21). With these offerings the priest conducted the healed leper before the presence of the Lord. What the offerer had to do, and how the priest acted when going through these ceremonies, cannot be better described than in the following graphic language of the Jewish tradition. "The priest approaches the trespass-offering, lays both his hands on it, and kills it, when two priests catch its blood, one into a vessel, and the other in his hand; the one who caught it into the vessel sprinkles its blood upon the tip of his right ear; he next puts in his right hand, and the priest puts some blood upon the thumb thereof; and, lastly, puts in his right leg,
and the priest puts some blood on the toe thereof. The priest then takes some of the log of oil and puts it into the left hand of his fellow-priest, or into his own left hand, dips the finger of his right hand in it, and sprinkles it seven times towards the holy of holies, dipping his finger every time he sprinkles it; when he goes to the laver, puts oil on those parts of his body on which he had previously put blood (i.e., the tip of the ear, the thumb, and the toe), as it is written, 'on the place of the blood of the trespass-offering' (Lev. xiv, 28), and what remains of the oil in the hand of the priest he puts on the head of the man who is to be cleansed, for an atonement' (Neguim, xiv, 8–10; Maimonides, Hilkhot Mechosar Keperos, iv). It is in accordance with this prerogative of the priest, who alone could pronounce the leper clean and readmit him into the congregation, that Christ commanded the leper whom he had healed to show himself to this functionary (Matt. viii, 2, etc.).

(II.) Leprosy Garments and Vessels.—Leprosy in garments and vessels is indicated by two symptoms, green or reddish spots, and spreading. If a green or reddish spot shows itself in a woolen or linen garment, or in a leather vessel, it is indicative of leprosy, and must be shown to the priest, who is to shut it up for a week. If, on inspecting it at the end of this time, he finds that the spot has spread, he is to pronounce it inveterate leprosy (ירחנן והجمهورية), and unclean, and burn it (Lev. xviii, 47–52); if it has not spread he is to have it washed, and shut it up for another week, and if its appearance has not changed, he is to pronounce it unclean and burn it, though it has not spread, since the distemper ranks in the front or at the back of the material (ver. 53–55). But if, after washing it, the priest sees that the spot has become weaker, he is to cut it out of the material; if it reappears in any part thereof then it is a developed distemper, and the whole of it must be burned; and if it vanishes after washing, it must be washed a second time, and is clean (ver. 56–59). The Jewish canons define the color green to be like that of herbs, and red like that of fair crimson, and take this enactment literally as referring strictly to wool of sheep and flax, but not to hemp and other materials. A material made of camel's hair and sheep's wool is not rendered unclean by leprosy if the camel's hair preponderates, but is unclean when the sheep's wool preponderates, or when it is mixed with unclean fibres, or when a mixture of flax and hemp. Dyed skins and garments are not rendered unclean by leprosy; nor are vessels so made if made of skins of aquatic animals exposed to leprosy uncleanliness (Neguim, xi, 2, 3; Maimonides, ed. supra, 1; xii, 10, 11, 1–3).

(III.) Leprosy Houses.—Leprosy in houses is indicated by two symptoms: it should be like that of a deep green or reddish hue, depressed beyond the general level, and spreading (Lev. xiv, 46–48). On its appearance the priest was at once to be sent for, and the house cleared of everything before his arrival. If, on inspecting it, he found the first two symptoms in the walls, viz. a green or red spot in the wall, and depressed, he shut the house up for seven days (ver. 48–58), inspected it again on the seventh day, and if the distemper spread in the wall he had affected stones taken out, the inside of the house scraped all round, the stones, dust, etc., cast into an unclean place without the city, and the stones and plaster put on the wall (ver. 39–42). If, after all this, the spot appeared and spread, he pronounced it inveterate leprosy, and unclean, had the house pulled down, and the stones, timber, plaster, etc., cast into an unclean place without the city, declared every one unclean, till every leper who had entered it, and ordered every one who had either slept or eaten in it to wash his garments (ver. 43–47).

As to the purification of the houses which have been cured of leprosy, the process is the same as that of healed men, and the priest enters the house with the customary sprinkles seven times upon his hand, while in that of the house he sprinkles seven times on the upper door-post without. Of course the sacrifices which the leper man had to bring in his second stage of purification are precluded in the case of the house (Maimonides, On Leprosy, xv, 8).

8. Prevalence, Contagion, and Curableness of Leprosy.—Though the malicious story of Manetho that the Egyptians expelled the Jews because they were afflicted with leprosy (Smith's, 'Athenaeus, Ap. iv, 26), which has been rejected by modern historians and critics as a fabrication, yet Michaelis (Laws of Moses, art. 209), Thomson ('The Land and the Book,' p. 652), and others still maintain that this disease was 'extremely prevalent among the Israelites.' Against this assertion and against the statement that such strict examination was enjoined, and that every one who had a pimple, spot, or boil was shut up, shows that leprosy could not have been so widespread, inasmuch as it would require the imprisonment of the great mass of the people. In cautioning the people against the evil of leprosy, and urging on them strictness to the directions of the priest, Moses adds, 'Remember what the Lord thy God did to Miriam on the way when you came out of Egypt' (Deut. xxv, 9). Now allusion to a single instance which occurred on the way from Egypt, and which, therefore, was an old case, naturally implies that leprosy was of rare occurrence among the Jews; else there would have been no necessity to adduce a by-gone case; and, 3. Wherever leprosy is spoken of in later books of the Bible, which does not often take place, it is only of isolated cases (2 Kings vii, 5; xv, 5), the only instances are strictly limited to the case where the men are shut up so that even the king himself formed no exception (2 Kings xv, 5).

That the disease was not contagious is evident from the regulations themselves. The priests had to be in constant and close contact with lepers, had to examine and handle them, and the priest himself was pronounced unclean and burnt (Lev. xiii, 12, 13); and the priest himself commanded that all things in a leprous house should be taken out before he entered it, in order that they might not be pronounced unclean, and that they might be used again (Lev. xiv, 86), which most unconventionally implies that there was no fear of contagion. This is, moreover, corroborated by the ancient Jewish canons, which were made by those very men who had personally dealt with this distemper, and according to which a leprous minor, a heathen, and a foreigner, as well as leprous garments, and houses of non-Jews, do not render the unclean; nor does even the leper, who is seized with this malady during the nuptial week, defile any one during the first seven days of his marriage (comp. Neguim, iii, 1, 2; vii, 1; xi, 1; xii, 1; Mai- monides, On Leprosy, vi, 1; vii, 1, etc.). These canons are to be understood as implying that a chapter of a house, or a garment with the distemper in question was contagious. The enactments, therefore, about the exclusion of the leper from society, and about defilement, were not dictated by sanitary caution, but had their root in the moral and ceremonial law, like the enactments about the separation and uncleanness of menstruous women, of those who had an issue or touched the dead, which are joined with leprosy. Being regarded as a punishment for sin, which God himself inflicted upon the disobedient (Exod. xv, 26; Lev. xiv, 55), this leprosy disease, with the peculiar regulations connected with it, was especially selected as the typical representation of the pollution of sin, in which light the Jews always viewed it. Thus we are told that 'leprosy comes upon man for seven, ten, or eleven things: for idolatry, profaning the name of God, unchastity, theft, slander, false witness, false judgment, for the profaning of the holy, for harboring of a neighbor devising malicious plans, or creating discord among brethren' (Ezech. 16, 17; Bab. Bathra, 164; Aboth de R. Nathan, ix; Midrash Rabba on Lev. xiv). 'Cedar wood and hyssop, the highest and the lowest, give the leper part and purify.' But the priest, who is the dispenser of the distemper, which cannot be cured till man becomes humble, and keeps himself as low as hyssop' (Midrash Rabba, Kokeleth, p. 104).
As to the curability of the disease, this is unquestionably implied in the minute regulations about the sacrifices and conduct of those who were restored to health. Besides, in the case of Miriam, we find that shaving her up for seven days cured her of leprosy (Num. xii, 1-10).

II. Identity of the Biblical Leprosy with the modern Disease bearing this Name.—It would be useless to discuss the different disorders which have been palmed upon the Mosaic description of leprosy. A careful classification and discrimination is necessary.

1. The Greeks distinguish three species of lepra: the skin-diseases of which are δαίχνης, awhē, and μίτακας, which may be rendered the vitiligo, the white and the black. Now, on turning to the Mosaic account, we also find three species mentioned, which were all included under the generic term of הָרִיקָה, bēkheth, or “bright spot” (Lev. xiii, 2-4, 18-29). The first is called הָרִיקָה, bokehit, which signifies “brightness,” but in a subordinate degree (Lev. xiii, 39). This species did not render a person unclean.

The second was called הָרִיקָה, bēkheth lebâdah, or a bright white bēkheth. The characteristic marks of the bēkheth lebâdah mentioned by Moses are a glistening white and spreading scale upon an elevated base, the depression in the middle, the hair on the patches participating in the whiteness, and the patches themselves perpetually increasing. This was evidently the true leprosy, probably corresponding to the dyschirea of the Greeks and the scrofula of the modern science. The third was הָרִיקָה, bēkheth kikāh, or dusky bēkheth, spreading in the skin. It has been thought to correspond with the black leprosy of the Greeks and the nigrocoma of Dr. Willan. These last two were also called הָרִיקָה, tattath (i.e. proper leprosy), and rendered a person unclean. There are some other slight affectations mentioned by name in Leviticus (chap. xiii), which the priest was required to distinguish from leprosy, such as יָצָה, sedah; בֵּית, shaphâdî; יָנָה, nēdâh; יָצָה, askentî, i.e. “elevation” “depressed,” etc.; and to each of these Dr. Good (Study of Med. v, 590) has assigned a modern systematic name. But, as it is useless to attempt to recognise a disease otherwise than by a description of its symptoms, we can have no object in discussing his interpretation of these terms.

We therefore distinguish two species of real leprosy.

(I) Proper Leprosy.—This is the kind specifically denominated הָרִיקָה, bēkheth, whether white or black, but usually called white leprosy, by the Arabs barraz; a disease not frequent among the Hebrews (2 Kings, v, 27; Exod. iv, 6; Numb. xii, 10), and often called lepra Mo- saicam. It was regarded by them as a divine infliction (hence its Hebrew name הָרִיקָה, tarzath, a stroke i.e. of God), and in several instances we find it such, as in the case of Miriam (Numb. xii, 10), Gehazi (2 Kings, v, 27), and Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi, 16-23), from which and other indications it appears to have been considered hereditary, and incurable by human means (comp. 2 Sam. iii, 25; 2 Kings, v, 7). From Deut. xxiv, 8, it appears to have been unknown among the Egyptians, as a disease (comp. Description of Egypte, iii, 159 sq). The distinctive marks given by Moses to indicate this disease (Lev. xiii) are, a depression of the surface and whiteness or palloriness of the hair in the spot (ver. 3, 20, 25, 26), or a spreading of the swelling (ver. 8, 22, 27, 36), or raw flesh in it (ver. 10, 14), or a shaley-redash sore (ver. 43). The disease, as it is known at the present day, commences by an eruption of small reddish spots slightly raised above the level of the skin, and grouped in a circle. These spots are soon covered by a very thin, semi-transparent scale or epidermis, of a whitish color, and very smooth, which in a little time falls off, and leaves the skin beneath red and uneven. As the circles increase in diameter, the skin recovers its healthy appearance towards the centre; fresh scales are formed, which are now thicker, and superimposed one above the other, especially at the edges, so that the centre of the scale appears to be depressed. The scales are of a grayish-white color, and have something of a micaeous or pearly lustre. The circles are generally of the size of a shilling or half crown, but they have been known to attain half a foot in diameter. The disease more commonly affects the knees and elbows, but sometimes it extends over the whole body, in which case the circles become confluent. It does not at all affect the general health, and the only inconvenience it causes the patient is a slight itching when the skin is rubbed; or, in persons inveterate cases, when the skin about the joints is much thickened, it may in some degree impede the free motion of the limbs. It is common to both sexes, at almost all ages, and all ranks of society. It is not in the least infectious, but it is always difficult to cure, and in old persons, when it is of long standing, may be pronounced incurable (Hlub. beurbbr. p. 136); so that we are probably to regard the statements of travellers respecting the utter exclusion of modern lepers in the East as relating to those affected with entirely a different disease, the elephantiasis.

In Lev. xiv are described particular ceremonies and offerings (comp. Ex. viii, 6) to be officially observed by the priest on behalf of a leper restored to health and purity. See D. C. Lutz, De duob. mech. purific. leprosorum destinatia urourdendae mysterio, Hal. 1787; Buth, Symbol. Symbol. 1782; Ahinger, Comment. i, 11, 170 sq.; Talmud, tract Neiphin, vi, 9; Otto, Lehrbuch der Medizin, p. 865 sq.; Rhenferd, in Meuschen, N. T. Talmud, p. 1057.

(II) Elephantiasis.—This more severe form of cutaneous, or, rather, scrofulous disease has been confounded with leprosy, from which it is essentially different. It is usually called tubercular leprosy (Lepra nodosa, Celus, Med. iii, 29), and has generally been thought to be the disease with which Job was afflicted (2 Sam. x, 4), Job ii, 7; comp. Deut. xxxviii, 35). See John's Disease. It has been thought to be alluded to by the term "botch of Egypt" (בְּרִיקָה, Deut. xxviii, 37), where it is said to have been endemic (Pliny, xxvi, 6; Lucret. vi, 1112 sq.; comp. Areteas, Cappad. morb. diut. ii, 13; see Alimia, in the Transactions of the Asiatic Society, i, 262 sq). The Greeks gave the name of elephantiasis to this disease because the skin of the persons affected with it was thought to resemble that of an elephant, in dark color, ruggedness, and insensibility, or, as some have thought, because the foot, after the loss of the toes, when the hollow of the sole is filled up and the ankle enlarged, resembles the foot of an elephant. The Arabic called it Judhâm, which means "mutilation," "amputation," in reference to the loss of the smaller members. They have, however, also described another disease, and a very different one from elephantiasis, to which they
gave the name of Dal’fil], which means literally mor-
bus elephas. The disease to which they applied this name is called by modern writers the tunas Barbardae
leg, and consists in a thickening of the skin and subcuta-
naneous tissues of the leg, but presents nothing resem-
bling the tubercles of elephantiasis. Now the Latin
translators from the Arabic, finding that the same name
existed both in the Greek and Arabic, translated Dal’
fil by elephantiasis, and thus confused the Barbardae
leg with the Arabian zul典, while this latter, which
was in reality elephantiasis, they rendered by the Greek
term lepra. See Kleyer, in Miscell. nat. curios. 1858, p.
8; Bartholin. Morb. Bibl. c. 7; Michaelis. Enuclei. ins A.
T. 1, 58 sq.; Reinhard. Bibelkranck. iii, 52.
Elephantiasis first of all makes its appearance by slow
swelling of the leg, the breast, or limb, irregularly
dissemintated over the skin and slightly raised above its
surface. These spots are glossy, and appear oily, or as
if they were covered with varnish. After they have
remained in this way for a longer or shorter time, they
are succeeded by an eruption of tubercles. These are
soft, roundish tumors, varying in size from that of a pea
to that of an olive, and are of a reddish or livid color.
They are principally developed on the face and ears,
but in the course of years extend over the whole body.
The face becomes frightfully deformed; the forehead is
thickened and covered with numerous tubercles; the
eyebrows become bald, swelled, furrowed by oblique
lines, and covered with nipple-like elevations;
the eyelashes fall out, and the eyes assume a fixed
and staring look; the lips are enormously thickened
and swelling; the beard falls out; the chin and ears are
enlarged and beaded with tubercles; the lobe and nose
are frightfully enlarged and deformed; the nostrils
irregularly dilated,internally constricted, and excoriat-
ted; the voice is hoarse and nasal, and the breath in-
tolerably fetid. After some time, generally after some
years, many of the tubercles ulcerate, and the matter
which exudes from them dries to crusts of a brownish
or blackish color; but this process seldom terminates
in cicatrisation. The extremities are affected in the
same way as the face. The hollow of the foot is swelled out,
so that the sole becomes flat; the sensibility of the skin
is greatly impaired, and, in the hands and feet, often
totally lost; the joints of the toes ulcerate and fall off
one after the other; insupportable fester exudes from
the whole body. The patient’s general health is not
affected for a considerable time, and his sufferings are
useless since the intensity of the disease remains un-
altered. Often, however, his nights are sleepless or
disturbed by frightful dreams; he becomes morose and
melancholy; he shuns the sight of the healthy because
he feels what an object of disgust he is to them, and life
becomes a losomhere to him; he falls into a state of apathy, and, after many years of such an exist-
ence, he sinks either from exhaustion or from the super-
vision of internal disease.

About the period of the Crusades elephantiasis spread
itself like an epidemic over all Europe, even as far north
as the Faro and Venetian bight, owing to the above-
mentioned mistakes, every one became familiar with
leprosy under the form of the terrible disease that has
just been described. Leper or leper-houses abounded
everywhere: as many as 2000 are said to have existed
in France alone. In the leper hospital in Edinburgh
the inmates begged for the general community—sitting
for the purpose at the door of the hospital. They were
obliged to warn those approaching of them the presence
of an infected fellow-mortal by using a wood rattle or
clapper. The infected in European countries were
often put to the leper hospitals, and were considered lo-
gally and politically deale. The Church, taking the
same view of it, performed over them the solemn cere-
monies for the burial of the dead—the priest closing
the ceremony by throwing upon them a shovelful of
earth. The disease was considered to be contagious
possibly only on account of the belief that was enter-
tained respecting its identity with Jewish leprosy, and
the strictest regulations were enacted for excluding the
disease from society. Towards the commencement of
the 17th century the disease gradually disappeared from
Europe, and is now mostly confined to intertropical
countries. It existed in Faro as late as 1676, and in the
Shetland Islands in 1786, long after it had ceased in the
southern parts of Great Britain. This fearful dis-
case made its appearance in the island of Guadaloupe
in 1760, in the 1790, introduced to America from Africa,
producing great consternation among the inhabitants.
In Europe it is now principally confined to Norway,
where the last census gave 2000 cases. It visits occa-
Sionally some of the sea-port localities of Spain. It
has made its appearance in the most different climates,
from the arctic regions of Lapland, or Labrador, to the
interior regions of Asia—in moist and dry localities. It
still exists in Palestine and Egypt—the latter its most fam-
iliar home, although Dr. Kitto thinks not in such numerous
instances as in former ages. The physical causes of the
disease are uncertain. The best authors of the present
day who have had an opportunity of observing the dis-
case do not consider it to be contagious. There seems,
however, to be little doubt as to its being hereditary.
See Good’s Study of Medicine, iii, 421; Rayer, Mol. de
la Peau, ii, 296; Simpson, On the Levers and Leper-
Surgical Journal, Jan. 1, 1842; J. Gieselen, De elephan-
tiasis Noregica (Havn. 1778); Michael. U. orienti Bibl.
iv, 168 sq.; B. Hambold, Vagilitas leprosa rarioita his-
toria c. epicirtis (Lipa. 1821); C. J. Hille, Rarioris morbi
elephantiasis partialis similes histor. (Lipa. 1825); Rosen-
baum, in der Beschreibung xxxii, 234 sq.
Elephantiasis, or the leprosy of the Middle Ages, is
the disease from which most of the prevalent notions
concerning lepra have been derived, and to which the
notices of lepers contained in modern books of travels
exclusively refer. It is doubtful whether any of the
lepers cured by Christ (Matt. viii. 3; Mark i. 42; Luke
v, 12, 18) were of this class. In nearly all Oriental
towns persons of this description are met with, exclu-
sively from intercourse with the rest of the community,
and usually confined to a separate quarter of the town.
Dr. Robinson says, with reference to Jerusalem: "Within
the Zion Gate, a little towards the right, are some
miserable hovels, inhabited by persons called lepers.
Whether their disease is or is not the leprosy of Scripture
I am unable to affirm; the symptoms described to us were
exactly those of the internal deformity and suffering.
There are said to be leprous persons at Nabulins (She-
chem) as well as at Jerusalem, but we did not here meet
with them." (ib. iii, 118 note.) On the reputed site
of the house of Naaman, at Damascus, stands at the pre-
sent day a hospital filled with unfortunate patients,
the victims affected like him with leprosy. See PLAGUE.
2. That the Mosaic cases of true leprosy were confined
to the former of these two dreadful forms of disease is
evident. The reason why this kind of cutaneous dis-
temper alone was taken cognizance of by the law doubt-
less was because the other was too well marked and ob-
vious to require any diagnostic particularization. With
the scriptural symptoms before he deliver the solemn
pronunciation of modern leprosy of the malignant
type given by an eye-witness who examined this subject:
"The scar comes on by degrees, in different parts of the
body; the hair falls from the head and eye-
brows; the nails loosen, decay, and drop off; joints after
joint of the fingers and toes shrivels up, and slowly fall
The page contains a passage from a text, discussing leprosy and its connection to the ancient Jewish practice of using garments and vessels to protect against evil. The text references historical and religious contexts, such as the leprosy of garments and vessels, the practice of covering holes in garments to prevent leprosy, and the use of these garments as a metaphor for spiritual protection. The passage also touches on the symbolic and literal uses of garments and vessels in religious practices and their significance in maintaining purity and health.

For example, the text states: "...the gowns are absorbed, and the teeth disappear; the nose, the eyes, the tongue, and the palate are slowly consumed; and, finally, the wretched victim shrinks into the earth and disappears, while medicine has no power to stay the ravages of this fell disease, or even to mitigate its tortures" (Thomson, "Land and Book," p. 655). This passage highlights the ancient belief in the contagious nature of leprosy and the serious consequences of the disease, both physical and social.

The text further explains that there is no known cure for leprosy, and as a result, it is often feared and isolated from society. The use of garments and vessels as a metaphor for protection against evil is also discussed, emphasizing the importance of purity and cleanliness in religious and daily life.

The passage concludes by noting the historical and religious significance of leprosy, relating it to broader themes of purity and contamination, and the ways in which these concepts were used to maintain social order and religious discipline.
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sent thirty-six of the younger monks and forty children to Italy, while he and those who remained were murdered, with the exception of four, who were retained prisoner.
They escaped after a while, and, having returned to Saracen, formed the nucleus of a new convent. In 997, under the patronage of Odo, bishop of Grasse, they rose to eminence, and attained its greatest fame under Adalbert (1080-1066). Raymond, count of Barcelona, gave the monks a whole convent in Catalonia, and they had possessions in France, Italy, Corsica, and the islands belonging to Italy. A number at Tarsus, established by the seneschal of Provence, was also subject to their rule, together with a large number of canonicis regularis, to whom the abbots Giraud gave two churches in 1226, under the condition that they should always remain subject to the rule of Lerins. Their prosperity decreasing, the abbots, Augustin Grimoldi, afterwards bishop of Grasse, connected them with the Benedictines in 1565, and this fusion received in 1516 the sanction of pope Leo X and of Francis I. In 1605 the island was taken by the Spaniards, who retained it until 1677; and, although the convent continued to exist, it lost henceforth all its importance. See Vincentius Barralis, Chronologiae Benedictane, vol. ii, 146 sq.; also the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index, p. 42; and by Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 137. The ancient authorities are Hippocrates, Proorokheia, lib. xii, ap. fin.; Galen, Exop- lirou Logiourou Hippokratou, and De Art. Curar. lib. ii; Celeus, De Medic. v, 26, § 19; also the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index, p. 42.; and by Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 137.

Le Quien, MICHAEL, a Dominican, who was born at Bursa, Asia Minor, in 1505, and died at Avignon in 1561, was remarkable for his learning in Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic, and in Oriental Church History. His Joannis Damasceni opera (Paris, 1712, in two folio volumes) is a superior edition of that father. His most important work is Oriens Christianus, inuper et Africen, an account of the churches, patriarchs, etc., of the East and Africa, and of the first persons of which appeared before, the second part after the author's death, which took place at the convent in St. Honoré March 13, 1733,

Lerins, CONVENT OF, one of the oldest, and once one of the most important monastic establishments in France, is situated in the island of St. Honoré, on the coast of Provence, opposite Antibes. The legend concerning its origin is as follows: Honoratus, a man of noble birth and who had even been once consul, embraced the Christian faith, together with his brother, in spite of the remonstrances of his family. They first retired to an island near Marseilles, but Honoratius afterwards went back to Provence, where he settled at Lerins, under the protection of the bishop of Fyrus. His reputation for sanctity induced many to join him, and they lived, some in communities (carmelites), others as hermits in separate cells. It was the time when monachism was lately introduced into Europe from the East, and convents were arising along the shores of the Mediterranean. Thus the convents of Ierusalem (Jerusalem), Gerasa, Cyrene, Capernaum, of Dalmatia, and of France. Martinus had just established a convent at Tauronum, whose rules were adopted in those that were established by Cassian. The statement that the Cassian rules were first introduced at St. Honoré by Honoratus is incorrect. The convent was established by Honoratus, who was afterwards appointed bishop of Arles, the last-named convent made rapid progress. Lerins became one of the most important schools for the clergy of Southern Gaul, and furnished a large number of bishops, among whom we will mention Hilarius of Arles and Eucherius of Lyons: at that time monks were often made bishops. In the 5th century the convent became imbued with semi-Pelagian ideas, which thence spread into Southern France. In the 7th century the monks of Lerins seem to have relaxed in their obedience to their rules, for Gregory wrote to the abbott Conon inviting him to reform the monastics. This work was successfully accomplished by a Benedictine abbott, Aigufl, but only after a struggle which for a while threatened to destroy the convent, the opposition party going so far as to call in the assistance of neighboring lords, and murdering the abbott and some of his followers. Still, as the reform had been inaugurated, the convent resumed its former prosperity, and in the beginning of the 8th century its abbated 3780 monks under his command. Soon after, however, it was overrun by the Saracens from Spain; the abbott Forciarius, in preference of this event,

LebounameX (AbouNME), a SABOTEUR OF Potamon of MYSTERY, a philosopher and seer, lived in the time of Augustus. He was a pupil of Timocrates, who was known as the teacher and friend of Tiberius. Suidas says that LebounameX wrote several philosophical works, but does not mention that he was an orator or rhetorician, although there can be no doubt that he is the same person as the LebounameX who wrote μητραν ρητορει και ιστορια ιστοριαί (see Photius, Bibl. cod. 74, p. 92).—Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography, ii, 772.

Le'ahm (Heb. ליכ, a mammal, as in Exod. xxviii, 19, etc.; Sept. ες, v. t. Aq. ας, a city in the northern part of Palestine (Josh. xix, 47); elsewhere called La'ish (Judg. xvii, 7).—See DAK.

LebounameX. See LIGUR.

Leslie, JOHN, a very celebrated Scottish prelate, was born in 1527, and was educated in the University of Aberdeen. In 1547 he was made canon of the cathedral church at Aberdeen. Under Honoratus, who was afterwards appointed bishop of Arles, the last-named convent made rapid progress. Lerins became one of the most important schools for the clergy of Southern Gaul, and furnished a large number of bishops, among whom we will mention Hilarius of Arles and Eucherius of Lyons: at that time monks were often made bishops. In the 5th century the convent became imbued with semi-Pelagian ideas, which thence spread into Southern France. In the 7th century the monks of Lerins seem to have relaxed in their obedience to their rules, for Gregory wrote to the abbott Conon inviting him to reform the monastics. This work was successfully accomplished by a Benedictine abbott, Aigufl, but only after a struggle which for a while threatened to destroy the convent, the opposition party going so far as to call in the assistance of neighboring lords, and murdering the abbott and some of his followers. Still, as the reform had been inaugurated, the convent resumed its former prosperity, and in the beginning of the 8th century its abbated 3780 monks under his command. Soon after, however, it was overrun by the Saracens from Spain; the abbott Forciarius, in preference of this event,
of Ross. While in this position he took a prominent part in the civil as well as ecclesiastical affairs of his country, and secured to the Scots what are commonly called "the black acts of Parliament" (1566). During the flight of queen Mary to England he defended her cause against the Covenanters. In 1579 he was made suffragan bishop and vicar general of Ross, in Normandy, and in 1582 he was consecrated to the episcopal see of Ross. His writings are not of particular interest to theological students. See Allibone, Dict. of British and American Authors, vol. ii. s. v.; Collier, Ecc. Hist. of England (see Index, vol. viii).

Leslie, Charles, a prominent writer in the political and theological controversies of the 17th century, was the son of bishop John Leslie, of the Irish see of Raphoe and Clogher, and was born in Ireland about 1630, and educated at Trinity College, Dublin. His course in life was very eccentric. In 1671 he went to England to study law, but in a few years turned himself to divinity, was admitted into orders, and, settling in Ireland, became chancellor of Connor. He was living in Ireland at the time of the Revolution, and distinguished himself in some disputations with the Roman Catholics. On the side of the Protestants, through a zealous Protestant, he scrupled to renounce his allegiance to king James, and to acknowledge king William as his rightful sovereign. There was thus an end to his prospects in the Church, and, leaving Ireland, he went to England, and there employed himself in writing many of his controversial works, especially in the political state of the country. When James II. was dead, Leslie transferred his allegiance to his son, the Pretender; and, as he made frequent visits to the courts of the exiled princes, he so far fell under suspicion at home that he thought proper to leave Britain, and join himself openly to the court of the Pretender, then at Bar-le-Duc. He was still a zealous Protestant, and had in that court a private chapel, in which he was accustomed to officiate as a minister of the Protestant Church of England. When the Pretender removed to Italy, Leslie accompanied him; but, becoming at length sensible of the strangeness of his position, a Protestant clergyman in the court of a zealous Roman Catholic, and age coming on, and with it the natural desire of dying in the land which had given him birth, he sought and obtained from the government of king George I. in 1721, permission to return. He died at Goguar, in the county of Monaghan, in 1722. Leslie's writings in the political controversies of the time were all in support of high monarchical principles. His theological writings were controversial; they have been distributed into the following classes:—those against Arminians, the Quakers; 2, the Presbyterian; 5, the Deists; 4, the Jews; 5, the Socinians; and, 6, the Papists. Some of them, especially the book entitled A short and easy Method with the Deists, are still read and held in esteem. Towards the close of his life he devoted himself to his theological writings, and published them in two folio volumes (1721). They were reprinted at Oxford (1832, 7 vols. 8vo). His other numerous works have not been published uniformly. Among them we notice A View of the Times, their Principles and Practices, etc. (3d ed. Lond. 1700, 6 vols. 12mo);—The Massacre of Glencoe (Anon., Lond. 1706, 4to);—The Aze laid to the Root of Christianity, etc. (Lond. 1640, 4to)—Querula temporum, or the Danger of the Church of England (Lond. 1685, 4to)—A Letter, etc., against the sacramental Test (Lond. 1708, 4to)—Ansuer to the Remarks on his First Dialogue against the Socinians. Bayle styles that work of great learning and adding, and says that he was the first who wrote in Great Britain against the fanaticism of Madame Bourignon; his books, he further says, are much esteemed, and especially his treatise The Snake in the Grass. Salmon observes that he was permitted to admit his name as a man thoroughly learned and truly pious. Dr. Hicks says that he made more converts to a sound faith and holy life than any man of the age in which he lived; that his consummate learning, attended by the lowest humility, the strictest piety without the least tincture of narrowness, a conversation to the last degree lively and spirited, yet to the last degree innocent, made him the delight of mankind. See Biog. Brit.; Encyc. Brit.; Jones, Hist. Biog.; Engl. Cyclop. s. v.; Darlington, Cyclop. Bibliog. ii., 1825; Allibone, Dictionary of British and American Authors, p. 924. Leslie, John, D.D., a noted prelate of the Irish Church, father of the celebrated Charles Leslie, was descended from an ancient family, and born in the north of Scotland about the beginning of the 17th century, and was educated at Aberdeen and at Oxford. Afterwards he travelled in Spain, Italy, Germany, and France. He came over to the French, Spanish, and Italian churches with the same propriety and fluency as the natives; and was so great a master of the Latin that it was said of him when in Spain, "Solus Lesleus Latinus loquitur." He continued twenty-two years abroad, and during that time was at the siege of Rochelle, and in the expedition to the isle of Lfe with the duke of Buckingham. He was all along conversant in courts, and at home was happy in that of Charles I., who admitted him into his privy council both in Scotland and Ireland, in which stations he was continued by Charles II after the Restoration. His chief refection in the Church of Scotland was the bishopric of the Orkneys, whence he was translated to Raphoe, in Ireland, in 1658, and the same year sworn a privy councillor in that kingdom. During the Rebellion he opened and valiantly espoused the cause of his royal master, and after the Restoration was translated to the see of Clogher. He died in 1671. See Chambers, Biog. of eminent Scotsmen, s. v.

Less, Gottfried, a noted German theologian of the Pietistic school, was born in 1736 at Coniza, in West Prussia. He was a pupil of Baumgarten, professor of theology at Göttingen. He studied at the universities of Halle and Leipsic, and in 1759 became court preacher at Hanover. He was rather a practical than scholastic theologian, and was inclined both to Mysticism and Pietism. Less was author of a work on the authenticity, uncorrupted preservation, and credibility of the New Testament, which has been translated from German into English, and highly recommended by Michaelis and Marsh. It is not so prolix as Lardner. The German title is Bezieh the Wahreit der christlichen Religion (1768). He also wrote Über die Religion (1786):—Versuch einer praktischen Dogmatik (1779):—Christliche Moral (1777).

Less, Isaac, Lord Hard, a Jesuit moralist, was born at Breot, in Brabant, Oct. 1, 1554, and was educated at the University of Leyden, to which, after a two years' stay at Rome, he was called as professor of philosophy and theology in 1585. The pope had just condemned seventy-six propositions of Bajus, whom the Jesuits, disciples of Scotus, had attacked; but soon Less and Hamel falling into the opposite extremes of Pelagianism, the faculty, after due remonstrance, solemnly condemned also fifty-four propositions contained in their lectures. Still, as several universities of note were inclined to judge moderately of Less's heretical tendency, he retained his position, and remained in high standing, especially with his order. He died Jan. 5, 1628. His numerous and well-written essays on morals partake of the sophistry so often employed in his order. Among the most important, we notice his Liber de justitia et jure, ceterisque virtutibus cordinalibus, which was first printed in 1606 (last edit. Lugd. 1658, folio), with an appendix by Theophil Raynau pro Leon Less, de licito usu aquacocorationum et mentalium reservationum. Also the first volume of his Opm. theol. (Paris, 1651, fol.; Against 1720); and his essays De libero arbitrio, De providentia, De auctoritate, De quotidiana sacra, De Pater nostro benedictione, De actibus scholasticorum systeme of the scholastic moralists, of whom Schrick (Kircn., sept. d. Reform, iv, 104) says: "They, in fact, continued the old method of their predecessors since the
18th century, in so far as that branch of theology was then advanced, i.e., treating it as a dependence of the dogmatic system; yet they differed from them inasmuch as they set forth their views in large works of the same nature, which are pointed out by them in their style, and are of a certain regard for the times in which they lived. Less acquired the Protestant Church in his *Consultatio qua fides et religio sit capessenda* (Amstelod. 1609; last edit. 1701). His chief argument was that the Church did not exist before the Reformation; he was triumphantly answered on this point by Belthasar Meiner, of Wittenberg (+1626), in his *Consultatio catholica de fide Lutherana capessenda et Romano-papistice deservenda* (1623). Still Less always retained the highest consideration in his Church, was even reputed to work miracles, and was finally canonized. See Herzen, *Real-Encyclopddie*, viii. 840; Geseler, *Kirchen Gesch. vol. iii.; Linnemann, *Michael Biau* (Tub. 1867).

**Lesser, Friedrich Christian**, a German theologian, was born May 29, 1692, at Nordhausen. In early life he manifested a desire for the knowledge of natural history, and in this department he afterwards distinguished himself greatly. In 1712 he entered the University of Heidelberg, but soon abandoned his medical plan, and entered on the study of theology, by the advice of the learned theological professor Franke. He finished his theological studies at the University of Leipzig, and became pastor of a Church in his native city in 1716; in addition to it, he assumed in 1724 the superintendency of the Orphan House. In 1739 he became pastor at the college church of St. Martin, and in 1743 of St. Jacob's Church. He died Sept. 17, 1754. Besides his works on natural history, in some of which he endeavored to combine natural history with theology, a *Geologie of Stones* (Leipzig, 1738, 8vo); *Theology of Insects* (De sapientie, omnispotentia et providentia ex partibus insectorum cognoscenda, etc., Nordh. 1738, 8vo), etc., he left productions of a theological character, of which a complete list is given by Doring in his *Gebiete. Theol. Deutschlands*, ii. 297 sq.

**Lessay, Thomas**, a distinguished English Wesleyan minister, was born in Cornwall Apr. 7, 1787; entered the regular ministry about 1808; and after laboring with great ability and success in most parts of the United Kingdom, was in 1839 made president of the Conference, and died June 10, 1841. Mr. Lessay was one of those of preachers, frequent platform speakers of his time, and was the familiar friend of James Montgomery, the poet, Richard Watson, and Robert Hall. Many instances of his remarkable eloquence are recorded, and many souls were saved by his preaching.—*Wakeley, Heroes of Methodism*, p. 396; *Steevieson, Methodists* (London, 1853; see Index, p. 172 T.).

**Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim**, the printer of modern German literature of the 18th century, both secular and ecclesiastic, declared by Macaulay to have been "beyond dispute the first critic in Europe," who "in the same breath conveyed powerfully both the dramatic and theological world, and by his critical acuteness has laid hands on both, and has produced polemics and called forth controversy in art as well as in religion, without having left behind him a finished system in either department, indeed without having been a professional poet in the strict sense of the word, or a professional theologian too." 

Life.—Lessing was born at Kitzins (Camerin), in Upper Lusatia, Jan. 22, 1729. His father was the Protestant (Lutheran) "pastor primarius" of the place, and was widely noted for his learning, especially in the historical department. Designed for the ministry, young Lessing was trained by his pious parents "in the way he should go;" and he was not simply taught what he should believe, but how and why he should believe. Long before he was old enough to be sent to school the youth displayed an uncommon desire for books. After thorough preparation at an elementary school, he entered at the age of twelve the high-school at Meißen, and of his extraordinary diligence in study a sufficient idea may be formed when it is stated that while there he perused a number of classic authors besides those of which his pursuits had led him to the study of the law, and, in particular, designed that her Gotthold Ephraim "should be a real man of God." 

Like an earnest and ardent student, which he always proved himself, Lessing now devoted his time to all she studies and pursuits. See Herzog, *Real-Encyclopddie*, viii. 840; Geseler, *Kirchen Gesch. vol. iii.; Linnemann, *Michael Biau* (Tub. 1867).
turn in his personal history for his well-nigh despairing patience.

Lessing was now twenty years of age. He had no money, no recommendations, no friends, scarcely any acquisitions—nothing but his cheerful courage, his confidence in his own powers, and the discipline acquired through past privations. He was so poor that he was unable to buy the books with which he was eager to make a respectable appearance. He applied for aid to his parents, but they neither felt able nor willing to grant his request, and he had no other course open to him but to throw himself upon the influence and resources of his old schoolmate, Mylius, who was now editing a paper in Berlin, and who, through the help of the friends which Lessing assumed in after life than he had with other persons. Both were yet young men. The former had come to Berlin from Dessau in indigent circumstances, ignorant of the German language, but determined to master not only the German, Latin, and English, but also the intricate subject of philosophy; and in this attempt he had so well succeeded that at the first meeting of Lessing and Mendelssohn, in 1754, the latter was already acknowledged a man of superior ability and a scholar. They recognised in each other qualities that could be used unitedly for the good of humanity, and they soon were content only when in each other's society. For two hours every day regularly they met and discussed together literary and philosophical subjects. Lessing came to comprehend the truth that virtue, honor, and nobility of character could be found in the Jew also, which the people of his day, led by a narrow-minded clergy, were prone to disbelieve: and this gave rise first to his important play entitled Die Jüden, and later to his chief-œuvre, Narren der Weise (transl. by B. Foster, 1838, and by Marchand, 1847) with which storey the essays by Kuno Fischer [Mannheim, 1865] and David Strauss [Berlin, 1866, 8vo, 2d ed.], and Grititz, Gesch. der Juden, xi, 35 sq.; also the works on German literature at the end of this article). Near the close of 1751 Lessing despaired of ever reaching the university, and this time chose Wittenberg, to penetrate into "the innermost sanctuary of book-worm erudition." For nearly a year he was here given up to the study of philology and history, especially that of the Reformation and the Reformer's mediaeval reputation as a critic grew daily, and in five years after his first entry at Berlin he was counted among the most eminent literati of the Prussian capital.

Even at this early age Lessing had ventured into the whole circle of aesthetic and literary interests of the day, never failing to bring their essential points into notice, and subjecting them to an exhaustive treatment, not without the fragmentary form of the composition, while in point of style he had already attained an aptness and elegance of language, a facile grace and sportive humor of treatment, such as few writers of that day had ever dreamed of. "His manner lent enchantment to the dreariest subjects, and even the duldest books gained interest from his criticism." It was during his sojourn at Berlin that, with his and Mendelssohn's assistance, Nicolai (q.v.) started the Library of Polite Literature (1757) and the Universal German Library (1758). (See Hurst's Hazlitt, Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent., i, 276, 297.)

In 1760 the Academy of Sciences of Berlin honored itself by conferring membership on Lessing, and shortly after a somewhat lucrative position fell to his lot in Breslau, whither he at once removed, and where he remained five years. It is in this, the chief city of Silesia, that most of Lessing's valuable contributions to the department of general literature were prepared. After a short visit to his parents, Lessing returned in 1765 to Berlin, then removed to Hamburg, and in 1770 finally started for Wolfenbüttel, to assume the duties of librarian to the Elector Frederick Wilhelm of Brunswick. As Lessing was not of the sterner sort, he left to Frederick Wilhelms of Brunswick the care of the Elector, who, on the death of his father, made him a position congenial to his taste, and here he remained until his death, Feb. 15, 1781.

Theological Position.—We here consider Lessing as a writer and thinker of the 18th century, but in so far only as the works which he published, both his own productions and the publications which were sent forth under his auspices, affected the theological world in his day and since, more especially in Germany. Originally intended for the pulpit, Lessing suddenly came to entertain the belief that morality, which to him was only a synonym of religion, should be taught not only from the pulpit, but also on the stage. Germany, in his day, was altogether Frenchified. "We are ever," said he himself, "the sworn imitators of everything foreign, and especially are we humble admirers of the never sufficiently admired French. Everything that comes to us on the Rhine is considered young, new, and divin." We rather doubt our senses than doubt this. Rather would we persuade ourselves that roughness was freedom; licence, elegance; grimace, expression; a jingle of rhymes, poetry; and shrieking, music, than entertain the slightest notion as to what an amiable people, that first people in the world (as they modestly term themselves), have the good fortune to possess in everything which is becoming, and beautiful, and noble." Such had been the doctrines taught by the great ruler Frederick II himself, and no wonder the people soon fell into the servility of the French; and as the literature is said to be the index of a people, we need feel no surprise at Lessing's great onslaught on Gottsched and his followers while yet a student of the university in which this leader of the school of French taste held a professorship. Nor must it be forgotten that the history of literature stands in unmistakable connection with the history of the thinking and struggling intellect generally, and consequently, also, with the history of religion and philosophy. One is reflected in the other. The influence of the vast, inspiring spirit of Fragonard, which seems to have been transferred to Germany ground, and soon the fruits became apparent in the general spread of French Illuminism (q.v.) and a sort of humanism. See ROUSSEAU. The great German philosopher Wolf, following closely in the footsteps of Leibnitz, had sought to check this rapid flow of ideas towards infidelity by importing into the system of philosophy that should lay securely the foundations for religion and morality, "fully persuaded that the so-called natural religion, which he . . . expected to be attained by the efforts of reason, and which related more to the belief in God and in immortality than to anything else, would become the very best stepping-stone to the temple of revealed religion" (Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent., i, 78). Indeed, the theologians themselves sought to prove, by the mathematical, demonstrative method, the truth of the doctrines of revelation, and the importance of divinity, forgetting altogether the great fact that "that sharp form of thought which bends itself to mathematical formulas is not for every man, least of all for the great mass," and had it not been for the influence which Pietism was exerting in the 18th century upon orthodox Christianity, the latter must have suffered beyond even the most ardent expectations of the most devoted German Voltaireans. As it was, even, there gradually arose a shallow theology, destitute of ideas, and limited to a few moral commonplaces, known under the name of neology (q.v.), which, as a result of Lessing's attacks upon it, was forced into the German mind. See SEMMLER. An active thinker like Lessing, who, when yet a youth, could write to his father that "the Christian
LESSING

religion is not a thing which one can accept upon the
word and honor of a parent," but that the way to the
possession of the truth is for him only "who has once
warily doubted, and by the path of inquiry attained
conviction, or at least striven to attain it," such a one
was not likely to remain passive in this critical period of
the history of the mind. For the honest effort he has made
to arrive at the truth, for it is not the possession of
truth, but the search for it, that enlarges those powers
in which an ever-growing capacity consists. Possession
satisfies, enervates, corrupts. "If God," he says, "held
all truth in his right hand; and his left hand nothing
but the ever-restless instinct for truth, though with the
condition of forever and ever eriring, and should say to
me, Choose, I would bow reverently to his left hand
and say, Father, give; pure truth is for thee alone!"

Thus, forgetting altogether that Christianity is not a
state, but a religion, that the possession of it is, Lessing
became unconsciously one of the greatest promoters of
Rationalism in its worst form (comp. Hurs, History of
Rationalism, p. 147, 149). We say Lessing unconsciously
became the promoter of Rationalism; for, with Dorner
(Gesch. d. Protest. Theol. p. 781), we believe that his ob-
jective was to glorify human thought, and goodness;
true, against Christianity, but only against the poor
proofs that were advanced in its behalf. Indeed, his
own words on Diderot's labors commend the charge so
often brought against Lessing, that he was an outright
opponent of Christianity, pure and simple. In reviewing
one of Diderot's works, he says: "A short-sighted
dogmatist, who avoids nothing so carefully as a
doubt of the memorial maxims that make his system, will
gather a host of errors from this work. Our author is
one of those philosophers who give themselves more
trouble in proving the fallacy of others' eyes fall, the pillars of the firm-
est truth totter, and that which we have seemed to see
quite clearly loses itself in the dim, uncertain distance;
instead of leading us by twilight colonnades to the lumin-
ous throne of truth, they lead us by the ways of fancied
spirits, through the dark of the throne of ignorance, and
then, such philosophers dare to attack opinions that are
sacred. The danger is small. The injury which their
dreams, or realities—the thing is one with them—inflict
upon society is as small as is that great which they in-
filtrate themselves into, and bring among the consciences of all under the
yoke of their own." While librarian of Wolfenbüttel, Lessing discovered
there a MS copy of the long-forgotten work of Berengar
(q.v.) of Tours against Lanfranc (q.v.), which proved that some of the views of the Lutheran Church concern-
ing the doctrine of the Eucharist had already been ad-
vanced by one of the most eminent teachers of the 11th
century. Here was an evident service to theology, and
for it he was commended by the theological world. Not
so, however, when, with the same intent to serve, he sent
forth a work which for years he had been waiting for a
printer and an editor. It is true the work was of de-

decided infidel tendency, but Lessing never could hesitate
on account of that to give the world what had been in-
tended for its perusal and judgment, and he therefore
sent forth "the Wolfenbüttel Fragments," as they are
termed, in his Beiträge zur Gesch. der Literatur (1774-
1778), which treat, 1, of the tolerance of the Deists; 2,
of the accusations brought against human reason in the
pulpit; 8, of the impossibility of a revelation which all
men could believe in in the same manner; 4, of the pas-

cistency of the Christian faith; 5, of the O. T.; 6, of the
Test, not having been written with the intention of re-
vealing a religion; 6, of the history of the resurrection.
The last essay, especially, called forth a storm of oppo-
sition, but this did not prevent Lessing's publishing in
1778 a final essay on the object of Jesus and of the apost-
ties. With the views of these fragments, however, Lessing by no means himself coincided. See WOLFEN-
büttel Fragments. They were intended simply to
induce deeper researches on the part of theologians,
and to establish the character of Lessing the naturalist.
He desired to raise from a deep lethargy, and to purify from
all uncritical elements, the orthodox whom he had so
valiantly defended against neology, and proved that this
was his intention by the manner in which he opposed
the attempts of the Rationalists to substitute the intui-
tions of reason for those of the heart and for the
promptings of faith. "What else," he asks, "is this
modern theology when compared with orthodoxy than
filthy water with clear water? With orthodoxy we
had, thanks to God, pretty much settled; between it and
philosophy [he is writing to his brother] that it is a patch-
work got up by jugglers and semiphilosophers. I do not
know of anything in the world in which human inge-
nuity has more shown and exercised itself than in it. A
patchwork by jugglers and semiphilosophers is that re-
markable a business as [it] could put in the hands of the
old one, and, in doing so, would pretend to more rational
philosophy than the old one claims." When assailed
by Götze (q.v.) as attacking the faith of the Church by
his publication of the Fragments, he replied that, even if
the Fragments were right, the Church is not endanger-
ed. Lessing rejected the letter, but reserved the
spirit of the Scriptures. With him the letter is not the
spirit, and the Bible is not religion. "Consequent-
ly, objections against the letter, as well as against the
Bible, are not precisely objections against the spirit and
religion. For the Bible evidently contains more than
belongs to religion, and it is a mere supposition that, in
this additional matter which it contains, it must be
equally inoffensive. Moreover, religion existed before
there was a Bible. Christianity existed before evan-
gelists and apostles had written. However much, there-
fore, may be found upon the surface of the Gospel, it is pos-
sible that the whole truth of the Christian religion should
depend upon them. Since there existed a period in
which it was so far spread, in which it had already

taken hold of so many souls, and in which, none-the-
less, none of that which was written of that period has
down to us, it must be possible also that everything
which evangelists and prophets have written might be
lost again, and yet the religion taught by them stand.
The Christian religion is not true because the evange-
lists and apostles taught it, but they taught it because
it is true. It is from their internal truth that all writ-
ten documents cannot give it internal truth when it has
none" (Lessing's Werke, ed. by Lachmann, x, 10, as cited
by Kahnis, Hist. of German Protestantism, p. 152, 153).
Lessing also distinguished between the Christian relig-
ion and the religion of Christ; "the latter, being a life
immediately implanted and maintained in our heart,
manifests itself in love, and can neither stand nor fall
with the [facts of the] Gospel. The truths of religion
have nothing to do with the facts of history" (Hurs,
Rationalism, p. 154). "Although I may not have the
least objection to the facts of the Gospel, this is not of
the slightest consequence for my religious convictions.
Although, historically, I may have nothing to object to
Christ's having even risen from the dead, must I for
that reason accept it as true that this very risen Christ
was the Son of God?" Was this the question of God's
more relation to the Church as the plan of a large building to
the building itself. It would be ridiculous if, at a con-
flagration, people were first of all to save the plans; but
just as ridiculous is it to fear any danger to Christianity from an attack upon Scripture. In his *Doppels Messingmann* he says all the more to the effect that the resurrection of Christ is a "discretion of the same kind as the resurrection of the earthly Jesus in the New Testament." He had been told also that it does not follow from this circumstance that the resurrection is unhistorical. "Who has ever ventured to draw the same inference in profane history? If Livy, Polybius, Dionysius, and Tacitus relate the very same event, it may be the very same battle, the very same siege, each one differing so much in the details that those of the one completely give the lie to those of the other, has any one, for that reason, ever denied the event itself in which they agree?"

On the other hand, Lessing advanced in his theological polemical writings, particularly in the controversy with pastor Götze after the publication of the so-called "Wolfsbittel Fragments," but to present from them a connected theological system strictly defining Lessing's stand-point has not yet been made possible. Indeed, we would say with Hagenbach (Church Hist of 18th and 19th Cnt. i, 298) that "he had none." But just as much difficulty we would find in assigning Lessing a place anywhere in any theological system of thought already in vogue. Really, we think all that can be done for Lessing is to consider in how far his writings indicate the dispositions of mind which made of him as a theological writer. There are at present three different classes of theologians who claim him as their ally and support. By some he has been judged to have held the position of a rather positive, though not exactly orthodox, system of thought, to be one, might judge himself from his views on the doctrine of the Trinity in his *Erzierung des Menschengeistes*. (He there says: "What if this doctrine [of the Trinity] should lead human reason to acknowledge that God cannot possibly be understood to be one, but in that sense in which all finite things are one? that his unity must be a transcendental unity, which does not exclude a kind of plurality," evidently explaining the Trinity as referring to the essence of the Deity.) By others, either in praise or condemnation, he has been adjudged a "freethinker," while still others have pronounced him guilty not only of a change of opinion—of a change from the camp of orthodoxy to heterodoxy—but have also given him up in despair, as incapable of having cherished any positive opinion, because he was so many-sided in his polemics; indeed, he had himself explicitly declared that he preferred the search for the possible and the probable to a mere dogmatic one and of all these classifications had been Dr. J. A. Dornert (Gesch. der protest. Theol. [Munich, 1857, 8vo], p. 722 sq.), who assigns Lessing a position similar to that generally credited to Jacobi, the so-called "philosophical," and of the Jacobi, whose name he has certainly much in favor of Lessing's own declarations; for, like Jacobi, he held that reason and faith have nothing in conflict with each other, but are one. He held fast, likewise, to a self-conscious personal God of providence, to a living relation of the divine spirit to the world, to whom a place belongs in the inner revelation, notwithstanding that he ascribes the outer revelation in its historical credibility, and assigns it simply a place in the faith of authority (Auctoritätgläuben). "It is true," says Dornert (p. 757), "Lessing has particularly aimed to secure for the purely human and moral a place right by the side of that rational to the history of the resurrection. But he is far from asserting that the understanding (Vernunft) of humanity was from the beginning perfect, or even in a normal development, but rather holds it to be developing in character, and in need of education; in the last analysis, to become part of the common sense of all men," he says, "as a passive holder of the active universe." (We have here a number of premises, which later writers, particularly Schleiermacher, have taken to secure for historical religion a more worthy position.) Indeed, right here lies the attempt to make humanity progressive, and this progress dependent upon revelation, central to the whole of Lessing's theological views. "To the reason," he said, "it must be much rather a proof of the truth of revelation than an objection to it when it meets with the resistance of the affairs of this own conception of his *Nathan* as a "revelation which reveals nothing.""

(Comp. Hegel on this point as viewed by Hagenbach, Ch. Hist of 18th and 19th Cnt. ii, 864 sq.) Thus he acknowledged the truth of revelation, though he would not regard the idea of a revelation as settled for all time, but rather as God's subsequent act of training; and to elucidate this thought, he wrote, in 1786, *Die Erziehung des Menschengeistes* (the authorship of which has sometimes been denied him: comp. Zeitschr. f. d. hist. theol. 1888, No. 8; Gruhler, *Erziehung des Menschengeistes* kritisch und philosophisch erortert [Berlin, 1841] p. 274 sq.), concentrated in a hundred short paragraphs, is a system of religion and philosophy—the germ of Herder's and all later works on the education of the human race.

"Something there is of it," says a writer in the *Westminster Rev.* (Oct. 1871, p. 222, 223), "that reminds the reader of Plato. It has his tender melancholy and his undertone of inspired conviction, and a grandeur which recalls that moving of great figures and shifting of vast scenes which we behold in the myth of Er. There speaks in it a voice of one crying words not his own to times that it cannot come."

The English Deists, as Bolingbroke and Hobbes, had regarded religion only from the standpoint of politics. "Man," they held, "can know nothing except what his senses teach him and, to this the intelligent confine themselves; a revelation, or, rather, what pretends to be a good thing from without, is DUX. Lessing came forward, and, while seeking to make morality synonymous with religion, eye, with Christianity, taught that in revelation only lies man's strength for development. "Revelation," says Lessing, "is to the whole human race what education is to the individual man. Education is revelation which is imparted to the individual man, and revelation is education which has been and still is imparted to the human race. . . . Education no more presents everything to man at once than revelation does, but makes its communications in gradual development." First Judaism, then Christianity, first unity, then diversity; first happiness for this life, then immortality and never-ending bliss. (See the detailed review on these points in Hurst's Hagenbach, Ch. Hist of 18th and 19th Cnt. i, 291 sq.) The elementary work of education was the O.T. The material event of education is the Resurrection by the timely coming of Christ, "the reliable and practical teacher of immortality; . . . reliable through the prophecies which appeared to be fulfilled in him, through the miracles which he performed, and through his own return to life after the death by which he had sealed his doctrine." The second and better elementary book for the human race, expecting (according to Ritter [Lessing's philosophische u. religiöse Grundätze, p. 56 sq.]): the complete treatise itself in the fulfillment of the promises of Christianity. Lessing, because Christianity is spoken of as the second elementary work, in anticipating another religion, to be universally enjoyed, to supersede Christianity, but for this we can see no reason, and side with Ritter.

The position of Lessing has sometimes become equivocal by the popular interpretation of his *Nathan* and *The Wise*. In his *Education of Humanity*, Christianity unquestionably is the highest religion in the scale; in his "Nathan" it is not so. Hence it has been asserted by many, Christian writers especially, that in his later work he has become Spurious of his early opinions. Lessing and Jacobi even asserted that he had died a Spinozist. (Compare the article Jacobi, and the literature at the end of this article.) The former interpretation is due, however, to wrong premises. Lessing wrote Nathan the Wise simply for one object: not to aggrandize and ennoble his assertions, but to point to the danger of depriving Christianity of the best of its beauty, but only
to teach humanity—ay, to the followers of the Chris-
tian faith, in the 19th century, the great lesson of
tolerance. The great French inquisitor—philosopher
Voltaire had sought to do this, but he had failed—had
failed utterly—and only because his idea of tolerance
was really without meaning. He meant only too much by
tolerance, for he demanded of the party tolerating not
only to esteem all religions alike, to be content with any
and every belief, to have no rights in conflict with an-
other in religious matters, but to be obliged to conform
to the notions and inclinations of others out of mere
politeness, and we wonder whether Froude (p. 29)
says that “this is the toleration of shallowness, of
cowardice, of religious indifference, of religious indiffer-
ence—a toleration that finally and easily degenerates into
intolerance, which is the hatred of everyone who wish-
es no harm to the enemy he cannot destroy.” Such persons
must come at last to regard the tolerating
party as unyielding and stiff-necked. Such was
the toleration of the Romans, which was so much praised
by Voltaire. It soon came to an end with the Chris-
tians, because they neither could nor would submit to a
religion which was so opposed to their own. But in that
the things themselves were not, but that the world itself
was in the Roman empire, and that the effort is
forced to the desire to separate truth from error,
or, at all events, from non-essentials. Not even the
modest charge that Lessing in his latest years, by reason
of his affiliation with Nicolai and Mendelssohn, inclined
towards organicism, cannot, on examination, be sub-
stantiated. His own words from Vienna, whither he had
go on a call from Joseph II, who in 1789 invited
all the great and learned men of the times to his capital
for a general assemblage, addressed to Nicolai, who had
taken this occasion to ridicule Vienna, and praise his
own town, even for its unimportant affairs; he might
with some ex-
sertion: “Say nothing, I pray you, about your Berlin
freedom of thinking and writing. It is reduced simply
and solely to the freedom of bringing to market as many
gives and jeers against religion as you choose, and a
decent man must speedily be ashamed to avail himself
of it.” If this was not the case in the Liberal age, then
the Rationalists, we should first distinguish between the
higher Rationalism of humanity and its double-sighted
compeer, trivial and vulgar Rationalism, and then assign
Lessing a place in that of the former, for it alone can
be claimed to have rendered intentional aid.

Of his service to German literature generally, it may
be truly said “he found Germany without a national litera-
ture; when he died it had one. He pointed out the ways
in poetry, philosophy, and religion by which the nation-
al mind should go, and it has gone in them” (Westm. Rev.
trans. by C. C. Felton, Bost. 1840, 8 vols. 12mo, ii. 405),
“was the principle of Lessing’s whole life. He composed
in the same spirit that he lived. He had to contend
with obstacles his whole life long, but he never bowed
down his head. He struggled not for posts of honor,
but for his own ideas, and did not gain any by such
extraordinary ability, have rioted in the favor of the great,
like Goethe, but he scorned and hated this favor as unwor-
thy a free man. His long continuance in private life,
his services as secretary of the brave general Tau-
enzien, his service in Seven Years’ War, his service as
Curator in the University, as librarian at Wolfenbuttel,
proved that he did not sacrifice his
principles to high places. . . .” He ridiculed Gellert, Klopstock,
and all who bowed their laurel-crowned heads to heads
encircled with golden crowns; and he himself shunned
call association with the great, animated by that stainless
spirit of pride which acts instinctively upon the motto
Noles taniare.

Literature. — The complete works of Lessing were
first published at Berlin (1771, 32 vols. 12mo), then with
annotations by Laechmann (1809, 12 vols.), and by
von Malezkin (1855, 15 vols.). See Karl G.: O. Lessing, Leis-
tung, seinen Tod, Leben u. Werke (Leipzig, 1789, 2 vols.)
D. D. Lessing, sei Leben u. seine Werke (1840), continued
by Guhrauser (1858-54); Stahl, G. E. Lessing, sein Leib u.
seine Werke (1850), trans. by E. P. Evans, late professor at
Mich. Univ., Boston, 1867, 2 vols. 12mo; H. Ritter, in
Ritter, Gesch. d. christl. Philos., ii. 480 sq.; Bohtz, Lessing’s
Protestantismus und Natur der Weise; Lang, Religion
Charakter, i, 215 sq.; Röper, Lessing und Götte; Bühr,
Kleine theologische Schriften (Schlesingen, 1841, vol. 1);
Schwarz, Lessing als Theologe (1864); Gernez, Nationen
et-Literatur und Geschichte (Crelle’s Jahrbuch, 1821,
Berlin). What the thinker does not, in the frankness and confidence of
intercourse, give utterance at times to momentary impres-
sions, as if they were his abiding ones? This much is
LESSONS

LESSONS. See LECTIO NARIUM.

LETINAE. See LITURGIA.

LETNAH. See LIZARD.

Leithe (ληθή, oblivion), in the Grecian mythology, the stream of forgetfulness in the lower world, to which the departed spirits go, before passing into the Elysian fields, to be cleansed from all recollection of earthly sorrows. See Hades.

Leithe (λήθη, Septuag., vii, 56), a Hebrew word which occurs in the margin of Hosea iii, 2; it signifies a measure for grain, so called from emptying or pouring out. It is rendered a 'half homer' in the A.V. (after the Vulg.), which is probably correct. See HOMER.

Leitl, Gregory, a historian, born at Milan in 1650, who travelled in various countries, became Protestant at Lausanne, for a time well received at the court of Charles II. in England, and died at Amsterdam in 1704. He wrote, among other things, Life of St. Titus V.;—Life of Philip II. :—Monarchy of Louis XIV. :—Life of Cromwell:—Life of Queen Elizabeth:—Life of Charles V. Letters. See LITERA ENCYCLOP.".

Letters, Encyclop. See LITERA ENCYCLOP.

Letters of Orders, a document usually of parchement, and signed by the bishop, with his seal appended, in which he certifies that at the specified time and place he ordained to the office of deacon or priest the clergyman whose name is therein mentioned.

Lettice, John, D.D., an English clergyman and poet, was born in Northamptonshire in 1750, and was educated at Cambridge, where he took his first degree in 1761. He soon obtained eminence as a pulpit orator. In 1768 he was presented to the living of Peasemarsh, and later with a prebend in the cathedral of Chichester. He died in 1823. Among his works are The Conversion of St. Paul, a Lyric essay, which secured the friendship of Richard Farmer, from his alma mater in 1764:—The Antiquities of Herculaneum, a translation from the Italian (1773):—The Immortality of the Soul, translated from the French (1795). See Biog. Dict. of Living Authors (London, 1816); Allibone, Dict. of Authors, vol. ii. a. v.; Thomas, Biogr. Dict. a. v.

Let'tus (Λατοκ, v. r. Αρτοκ; Vulg. Accusus), a "son of Sechienas," one of the Levites who returned from Babylon (1 Esd. viii, 29), evidently the Hatturim (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Exra viii, 22).

Let'ushim (Heb. Lewushim, דועשימ, hampered, plur.; Sept. Arowwasm), the second named of the three sons of Dedan (grandson of Abraham by Keturah), and head of an Arabian tribe descended from him (Gen. xxx, 3; and Vulg. at 1 Chron. i, 92). B.C. considerably later 2044. See ARABIA. "Fremel (Journ. Arch. iii, serie, vi, 217) identifies it with Tamm, one of the ancient and extinct tribes of Arabia, just as he compares Leumium with Uemiyim. The names may perhaps be regarded as conceptions of the article—Leumium, the tribe without limits, the identification in each case seems to be quite untenable. It is noteworthy that the three sons of the Keturahite Dedan are named in the plural form, evidently as tribes descended from him" (Smith). "Forer supports (Unigot. of Arabia, i, 384) that the Letusim were absorbed in the generic appellation of Dedanim (Jer. xxv, 3; Ezek. xxv, 18; Isa. xxi, 13), and that they dwelt in the desert eastward of Edom." See LEEMM.

Leucippus, the founder of the atomistic school of Greek philosophy, and forerunner of Democritus (q. v.). Nothing is known concerning him, neither the time nor the place of his birth, nor the circumstances of his life.

Leucopetrians, the name of a fanatical sect which sprang up in the Greek and Eastern churches towards the close of the 12th century; they professed to believe in a double trinity, a rejeted and wedlock, abstained from flesh, treated with the utmost contempt the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and all the various branches of external worship; placed the essence of religion in internal prayer alone; and maintained, as it is said, that an evil being or goblin dwelt in the breast of every mortal, and could be expelled from thence by no other method than by perpetual supplication to the Supreme Being. The founder of this sect is said
to have been a person called Leospetrus, and his chief disciple Tychicus, who corrupted by fanatical interpretations several books of Scripture, and particularly the Gospel of Matthew. This account is not undoubted.

*Lettimin* (Heb. *Leittinion*, לֶטִיתִי, peoples, as often; Sept. *Anasai*i, the last named of the three sons of Abraham by Keturah, and head of an Arabian tribe descended from him (Gen. xxvii. 5; and Vulgate at 1 Chron. i. 82). R.C. considerably post 2024. See Arabia. They are supposed to be the same with the *Aleumosae* (*Aλευμοσαίοι*), named by Ptol.-

emny (v.7, 24) as near the Gerasim, which appears to be a correct rendering of the Hebrew word with the *m* prefixed.

He also enumerates *Luna* among the towns of Arabia Deserta (v, 19), and Forster (Geogr. of Arabia, i, 385) suggests that this may have been an ancient settlement of the same tribe (Kitto). They are identified by Forsell (in the *Journ. Asiat. iii ser.* vii, 217) with an Arab tribe called *Umeqim*, one of the very ancient tribes of Arabia of which no genealogy is given by the Arabs, and who appear to have been *Anat-Arabian*, and possibly aboriginal inhabitants of the country.

See *Lettitinum*.

Leusden, Johann, a very celebrated Dutch Orientalist and theologian, was born at Utrecht in 1624, and was educated at the then recently founded university of his native place and at Amsterdam, paying particular regard to the Oriental languages, especially the Hebrew. In 1649 he was appointed professor of Hebrew at Utrecht, and for nearly fifty years he most creditably discharged the duties of this office, for which he had fitted himself, not simply at the universities already mentioned, but also by private study with several learned Jewish rabbis. He died in 1699, regarded by all as one of the most learned scholars of his day, the Dutch Buxtorf, only taking precedence in rank. Of his works we may say that the writings of but few biblical scholars of that day have descended to us which can be said to be of more solid utility than Leusden's. "If they are defective in originality of genius (the amount of which quality, however, it is impossible rightly to determine in works like our author's), they undoubtedly afford evidence of their author's varied resources of learning, adorn'd by clearness of method and an easy style, characteristics which made Leusden one of the most renowned and successful teachers of his age." His numerous works, which were all Biblical, may be classed as follows: (1) Critical, (2) Introductory, and (3) Exegetical. Under the first head we have his valuable *Biblia Hebraea accuratissima notis Hebraicis et lemmatisibus illustrata*: typos Josephi Athias (Amstel. 1617 [2d ed. 1667], the first critical edition by a Christian editor ("Estimatisima primum numeratis versibus, primaque Christiano adhibitis MSS. facta."); Steinschneider, *Cat. Bodl.*). In 1684 he joined Eismenenger in publishing a Hebrew Bible without points. The Greek Scrip-

tures are not barren of profitable instruction, which is proved by his additions to his editions of the Greek Text. In 1675, 1688, 1693, 1698, 1701, and by his edition of the Septuagint (Amsterdam, 1688). After his death, Schaaf completed a valuable edition of the Syriac New Test. (with Tremelius's version) which Leusden had begun. Under this first head we may also place his Hebrew Lexicon (1698); Elementary Heb. Gram., which was translated into English, French, and German (1668); his *Compendia* of the O.T. and the N. Test. (comprising selections of the originals, with translations and grammatical notes in Latin), frequently reprinted by his (and his son-in-law, H. *Hübner*) and his still useful *Clavis Hebr. Vet. Test.* (containing the Masoretic notes, etc., besides much grammatical and philological information), first published in 1688, and his *Clavis Graec. N. T.* (1672). His contributions to the second head of his work (E inclusive) and sacred archeology were not less valuable than the works we have already commended. Of these we mention three (sometimes to be met with in one volume) as very useful to the Biblical student: *Philologiae Hebr. continens Questions Hebr. qua circa V. Test. Hebr. fere moveri sunt* (Utrecht, 1626, 1672, 1655, Amst. 1686, are the best editions, and contain his edition and translation of Mai- monides's *Precepta de Moses*, p. 66); *Philologiae Hebre- wicae, sua cum *Spicileg. Philol. (Utr. 1686, etc., con- tains treatises on several interesting points of Hebrew antiquities and Talmudical science); *Philologiae Hebræo- Graecæ generalis* (Utr. 1670, etc.) treat questions relating to the sacred Greek of the Christian Scriptures, its Hebraisms, the Syriac and other translations, its inspired authors, etc., well and succinctly handled (with this work occurs Leusden's translation into Hebrew of all the Chapters of the Gospels, with the O.T. text and Exegetical head, we have less to record. In 1656 (re- printed in 1692) Leusden published in a Latin translation David Kimchi's Commentary on the prophet Jonah (*Jonas illustratus*), and in the following year a similar work (again after David Kimchi) on Joel and Obadiah (*Joel explicatus, adjunctus Obadias illustratus*). Well worthy of mention are also his editions (prepared with the help of Villenamb and Morinus) of Bochart's works, and the works of Lightfoot (which he published in Latin, in 8 vols. folio, in the last year of his life) and Poule (whose *Syntagma sacrum* occurs in its very best form in Leusden's edition, 1684, 5 vols. folio). See Burmann, *Trajectum eruditorum*; De Vries, *Oratio in Obiitum J. Leusdini* (1699); Fabricius, *Hist. Biblioth. Graec. i, 244; Walch, *Bibl. Theol. Selecta*, vols. iii, iv; *Bibliographia universelle asc. et mod.* (1818) xxxvi, 357; *Elzevirii Philologorum quorumdam Hebraicum* (Lub. 1708, 8vo); Meyers, *Graec. d. Schriftenkunde*, p. 111, 114 sq.; Hoefer, *Newe. Bibl. Générale*, xxxi, 11 sq.; Kalisch, *Heb. Gram. pt. ii* (Historical Intro.), p. 87; and in Herzog, *Real-Encyclop. viii, 945, 946; Kitto, *Cyclop. Biblical Literature*, vol. ii, 457; *Z. ut.&, 1900.*

Leutard or Leutard, a French fanatic, flourished among the peasants of Chalons-sur-Marne, in 1698 and 1000. He claimed the enjoyment of spiritual visions, and authority from on high for separation from his family and his iconoclastic idiosyncrasies. He also, by like inspirations, became the opponent of many practices of the Church which had their authority in the sacred Scriptures of both the O. and N. T., and supported his position likewise by the inspired word of God. The bishop of the diocese in which Leutard flourished— Gebuin by name—treated him with perfect contempt, believing him insane, and, for want of opposition, few followed him. He was finally put down by Leutard, who in despair destroyed himself by drowning.

Levellers or Radicals, a political and religious sect of fanatics, which arose in the army of Cromwell at the time of the difficulty between the Independent and the Long Parliament (1647), advocating entire civil and religious liberty. They were not only treated as traitors by the king, but persecuted also by Cromwell as similar heretics. This dangerous party is proved by the notes and editorials of the *Leveller* or the *Principles and Maxims concerning Government and Religion of those commonly called Levellers* (Lond. 1658). We see there that their fundamental principles included, in politics, 1, the impartial, sovereign authority of the law; 2, the legislative power of Parlia-
ment; 8, absolute equality before the law; and, 4, the raising of the people in order to enable all to secure the enforcement of the laws, and also to protect their liberties. In religion they claimed, 1, absolute liberty of conscience, and for guilt makes them, contented in inward concurrence with revealed religion; 2, freedom for everyone to act according to the best of his knowledge, even if this knowledge should be false—the government acting on the knowledge and conscience of the people through the ministers is appoints; 8, religion to be considered under two aspects: one as the correct understanding of revelation, and this is quite a private affair, in regard to which every one must stand or fall by himself; the other is its effects as manifested in actions, and these are subject to the judgment of others, and especially of the authorities; 4, they condemned all strife on matters of faith and forms of worship, considering these as only outward signs of different degrees of spiritual enlightenment. This sect, like many others, disappeared at the time of the Restoration. See Weigarten, "Revolutionary Kirchen England (Lp. 1608); Neale, Hist. of the Shakers (see Index, vol. ii. Harper's edition).

LEVY, THOMAS, an eminent English divine, was born in Lancashire in the early part of the 16th century. He was ordained a Protestant minister in 1550. On the accession of Mary (1553) he retired to the Continent. He afterwards dissented from the Anglican Church from a partiality to Calvinism. He died in 1577. Thomas Levy was more vehement in his denunciations against the waste of Church revenues, and other prevailing corruptions of the court, which occasioned Bishop Ridley to rank him with Latimer and Knox. Besides a number of sermons, he published a "Mediation on the Lord's Prayer" (1551)—"Certayne Godly Exercises"—"The Danger of False Spirits" (1551-1575). See Allibone, "Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors," vol. ii. s. v.; Thomas, "Bibl. Dictionary," s. v.

Le'vi (Heb. Levi), "wreathed [see below], being the same Heb. word also signifying "Levite," Sept. and R. V. and A. V., the name of several men.

1. The third son of Jacob by his wife Leah. This like most other names in the patriarchal history, was connected with the thoughts and feelings that gathered round the child's birth. As derived from הָלָה, to twine, and hence to adher, it gave utterance to the hope of the mother that the affections of her husband, who had hitherto rested on the favored Rachel, would at last be drawn to her. "This time will my husband be joined (מְנַעְדֶה) unto me, because I have borne him three sons" (Gen. xxix, 34). B.C. 1317. The new-born child was to be a "foundling" (Josephus, Ant. xii, 19; 8), a new link binding the parents to each other more closely than before. The same etymology is recognized, though with a higher significance, in Numb. xviii, 2 (רִמְעֵה). One fact only is recorded in which he appears prominent. The sons of Jacob had come from Padan-Aram to Canaan with their father, and were with him "at Shechem." Their sister Dinah went out "to see the daughters of the land" (Gen. xxxiv, 1), i.e., as the words probably indicate, and as Josephus distinctly states (Ant. xii, 21), to be present at one of their great annual gatherings for some festival of nature-worship, analogous to that which we meet with afterwards among the Midianites (Numb. xxv, 2). The license of the time or the absence of her natural guardians exposed her, though yet in earliest youth, to lust and outrage. A stain was left, not only on her, but on the honor of her kindred, which, according to the rough justice of the times, must come out. The story of extorting that revenge fell, in the case of Ammon and Tamar (2 Sam. xiii, 22), and in most other states of society in which polygamy has prevailed (compare, for the customs of modern Arabs, J. D. Michaelis, quoted by Kurtz, "Hist. of Old Covenant," i, § 82, p. 340.), on the brothers rather than the father, just as, in the case of Rebekah, it belonged to the brother to conduct the negotiations for the marriage. We are left to conjecture why Reuben, as the first-born, was not foremost in the work, but the sin of which he was afterwards guilty makes it possible that Reuel for his want of purity was not so sensitive as theirs. The same explanation may perhaps apply to the non-appearance of Judah in the history. Simeon and Levi, as the next in succession to the first-born, take the task upon themselves. Though not named in the Hebrew text of the O.T. till xiii 15, it is possible that Ishmael for his want of purity was so sensitive towards them. The sons of Jacob who heard from their father the wrong over which he had brooded in silence, and who planned their revenge accordingly. The Sept. does introduce their names in ver. 14. The history that follows is that of a quarrel and regulative crime. The two brothers exhibit, in its broadest contrasts, that union of the noble and the base, of characteristics above and below the level of the heathen tribes around them, which marks much of the history of Israel. They have learned to loathe and scorn the impurity in the midst of which they lived, to regard themselves as a peculiar people, to glory in the sign of the covenant. They have learned only too well from Jacob and from Laban the lessons of treachery and falsehood. They lie to the men of Shechem as the Druses and the Moronites lie to each other in the prosecution of their blood-Feuds. They have the blood of one man they destroy and plunder a whole city. They cover their murderous schemes with fair words and professions of friendship. They make the very token of their religion the instrument of their purity and revenge. (Josephus [Ant. i. c.] characteristiclly glories over all that connects the attack with the circumcision of the Shechemites, and represents it as made in a time of feasting and rejoicing.) Their father, timid and anxious as ever, utters a feeble lamentation (Blunt, "Script. Coincidence, pt. i, § 8), "Ye have made me an astonishment among the inhabitants of the land: few in number, they shall gather themselves against me." With a zeal that, though mixed with baser elements, foreshadows the zeal of Phinehas, they glory in their deed, and meet all remonstrance with the question, "Should he deal with our sister as with a harlot?" Of other facts in the life of Levi, there are none in which he takes, as in this, a prominent and distinct part. He shares in the hatred which his brothers bear to Joseph, and joins in the plots against him (Gen. xxxvii, 4). Reuben and Judah interfere seriously to prevent the consummation of the crime (Gen. xxxviii, 21, 26). Simeon appears, as being made afterward the representative of a sharper discipline than the others, to have been foremost—as his position among the sons of Leah made it likely that he would be—in this attack on the favored son of Rachel; and it is at least probable that in this, as in their former guilt, Simeon and Levi were brethren. The rivalry of the mothers was perpetuated in the jealousies of their children; and the two who had shown themselves so keenly sensitive when their sister had been wronged, make themselves the instruments and accomplices of the hatred which originated in treachery, with the lasciviousness of the sons of Canaan (Gen. xxxviii, 2). Then comes for him, as for the others, the discipline of suffering and danger, the special education by which the brother whom they had wronged leads them back to faithfulness and natural affection. The detention of Simeon in Egypt may have been intended once to be the punishment for the large share which he had taken in the common crime, and to separate the two brothers who had hitherto been such close companions in evil. The discipline did its work. Those who have been so relentless toward Joseph became self-sacrificing for Benjamin.

After this we trace Levi as joining in the migration of the tribe that owned Jacob as its patriarch. He, with his three sons, Gershon, Kohath, Merari, went down into Egypt (Gen. xlvii, 11). As one of the four eldest sons we may think of him as among the five (Gen. xlvii, 2)
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that were splendidly presented before Pharaoh. (The Jewish tradition [Tola'ot ha-Pardesim] states that first to have been presented to Pharaoh was, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher.) Then comes the last scene in which his name appears. When his father’s death draws near, and the sons are gathered round him, he hears the old crime brought up again to receive its sentence from the lips that are no longer capable of bestowing it. Thus, even as the inconstant first-born, had forfeited the privileges of their birthright.

“In their anger they slew men, and in their wantonness they maimed oxen” (margin, reading of the A. V.; Sept. וּפֶתַּנְוַאֶכ הָעָיִן וּפֶתַּנְוַאֶכ הָעָיִן הָעָיִן, Therefore the sentence on those who had been united for evil was, that they were going to be hated and despised; Jacob and Joseph were found in Israel.” How that condemnation was at once fulfilled and turned into a benediction, how the zeal of the patriarch reappeared purified and strengthened in his descendants, how the very name came to have a new significance, will be found elsewhere. See Leviathan.

The history of Leviathan has been dealt with here in what seems the only true and natural way of treating it, as a history of an individual person. Of the theory that sees in the sons of Jacob the mythical Eponymi of the tribes that claimed descent from them—which finds in the fuller representation of their lives in the poems of national or tribal chronicle—which refuses to recognise that Jacob had twelve sons, and insists that the history of Dinah records an attempt on the part of the Canaanites to enslave and degrade a Hebrew tribe (Ezra 2:46; Neh. 7:46), it is of course only necessary to say, as the author says of other hypotheses hardly more extravagant, “Die Wissenschaft versuchet alle solche Geseplente” (ibid., i, 406). The book of Genesis tells us of the lives of men and women, not of ethnological phantoms. A yet wilder conjecture has been hazarded by another German critic, P. Redelshof (Die alttestamentl. Namen, Hamburg, 1846, p. 24, 25), recognising the meaning of the name of Levi as given above, finds in it evidence of the existence of a confederacy or symph of the priests that had been connected with the several local worships of Canaan, and who, in the time of Samuel and David, were gathered together, joined the “central Pantheon in Jerusalem.” Here, also, we may borrow the terms of our judgment from the language of the writer himself. If there are “abgeschreckten etymologischen Mehrheiten” (Redelshof, p. 82) connected with the name of Levi, they are hardly those we meet with in the narrative of the text of Genesis, see Jacob.

2. The father of Matath and son of Simeon (Massaiah), of the ancestors of Christ, in the private maternal line between David and Zebediah (Luke iii, 29). B.C. post 876. Lord Hervey thinks that the name of Levi represented a shopkeeper (Lobel, Les origines du Christ, p. 100), see Genealogy of Jesus Christ.


4. (Arv.) One of the apostles, the son of Alpheus (Mark xi, 14; Luke vi, 15; 16, 29); elsewhere called Matthew (Matt. ix, 9). Levi’athan (Heb. יְרֵאשָׁת, usually derived from יְרֵא, a screech, with adj. ending; but perhaps compounded of יְרָא, scream, and יָת, a sea-monster; occurs Job iii, 8; xii, 1 [Hebrew xi, 25]; Ps. lxxiv, 14; civ, 26; Isa. xxvii, 1; Sept. spireus, but τὸ μῦκα εἰκον ἐν Ἰοβ 3, 8; Vulg. Leviathan, but dextra in Ps.; Auth. Vers. “Leviathan,” but “their mourning” in Job iii, 8) probably has different significations, c. g.: (1) A serpent, especially a large one (Job iii, 8), hence as the symbol of the hostile kingdom of Babylon (Isa. xxxviii, 1). (2) Specificaly, the crocodile (Job xii, 1). (8) A sea-monster (Ps. civ, 26); tropically, for a cruel enemy (Ps. lxxiv, 14; compare Isa. ii, 9; Ezek. xxviii, 3). This Hebrew word suggests any twisted animal, is especially applicable to every great tenant of the waters, such as the great marine serpents and crocodiles, and, it may be added, the colossal serpents and great monitors of the desert and desolate regions. In general, it points to the crocodile, and Job xii is a more specifically descriptive of that saurian. But in Isaiah and the Psalms foreign kings are evidently apostrophised under the name of Leviathan, though other texts more naturally apply to the whale, notwithstanding the objections that have been raised to this view (cf. Job iii, 8). “It is quite an error to assert, as Dr. Harris [Dict. Nat. Hist. Bibl.], Mason Good (Book of Job translated), Michaelis (Supp. 1297), and Rosenmüller (quoting Michaelis in note ad Bochart Hieroz. iii, 780) have done, that the whale is not found in the Mediterranean. The Orca gladiator (Gray) and the Leviathan (Leuckart, Physalus antiquorum (Gray), or the Bœque de la Méditerranée (Cuvier), are not uncommon in the Mediterranean (Fischer, Synops. Mamm. p. 625, and Lacépède, H. N. des Cétac. p. 115), and in ancient times the species may have been more numerous.” See Whale.

The word crocodile does not occur in the Auth. Vera, although its Greek form ὄρκωδος is found in the Sept. (Lev. vi, 29, where for the “tortoise,” γῆς, it has ὄρκωδος ἀρχαῖος τούτου Vocabulary of that saurian. But in Isaiah and the Psalms foreign kings are evidently apostrophised under the name of Leviathan, though other texts more naturally apply to the whale, notwithstanding the objections that have been raised to this view (cf. Job iii, 8). “It is quite an error to assert, as Dr. Harris [Dict. Nat. Hist. Bibl.], Mason Good (Book of Job translated), Michaelis (Supp. 1297), and Rosenmüller (quoting Michaelis in note ad Bochart Hieroz. iii, 780) have done, that the whale is not found in the Mediterranean. The Orca gladiator (Gray) and the Leviathan (Leuckart, Physalus antiquorum (Gray), or the Bœque de la Méditerranée (Cuvier), are not uncommon in the Mediterranean (Fischer, Synops. Mamm. p. 625, and Lacépède, H. N. des Cétac. p. 115), and in ancient times the species may have been more numerous.” See Whale.

The word crocodile does not occur in the Auth. Vera, although its Greek form ὄρκωδος is found in the Sept. (Lev. xi, 9, where for the "tortoise," γῆς, it has ὄρκωδος ἀρχαῖος τούτου Vocabulary of that saurian. But in Isaiah and the Psalms foreign kings are evidently apostrophised under the name of Leviathan, though other texts more naturally apply to the whale, notwithstanding the objections that have been raised to this view (cf. Job iii, 8). “It is quite an error to assert, as Dr. Harris [Dict. Nat. Hist. Bibl.], Mason Good (Book of Job translated), Michaelis (Supp. 1297), and Rosenmüller (quoting Michaelis in note ad Bochart Hieroz. iii, 780) have done, that the whale is not found in the Mediterranean. The Orca gladiator (Gray) and the Leviathan (Leuckart, Physalus antiquorum (Gray), or the Bœque de la Méditerranée (Cuvier), are not uncommon in the Mediterranean (Fischer, Synops. Mamm. p. 625, and Lacépède, H. N. des Cétac. p. 115), and in ancient times the species may have been more numerous.” See Whale.
Levi Ben-Gerson. See Rabbi.

Levi ben-Gerson. A noted English Jewish writer, was born in London in 1740. He was a hatter by profession, but ardently devoted himself to the study of Jewish literature, and gained great reputation by several learned publications, of which the principal is his Lingua Sacra, a dictionary and grammar of the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Talmudic dialects (London, 1785-89, 3 vols. 8vo). He wrote also Dissertations on the Prophecies of the Old Testament (1780, 2 vols. 8vo)-a Defence of the Old Testament, in reply to Thomas M. on the Prophecies of Jesus (1787, 8vo). Levi died in 1789. See Lyon's Environs, sup. vol. European Magazine (1789); London Gent. Mag. (1801); Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii. a. v.

Levings, Noah, D.D., an eminent Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Cheshire County, N. H., Sept. 29, 1796, and early removed to Troy, N. Y.; was converted about 1812; entered the New York Conference in 1818; was stationed at New York in 1827-8; at Brooklyn in 1829-30; at New Haven in 1831-2; at Albany in 1833; on Troy District in 1838, in 1843 at Vestry Street, New York; in 1844 was finally elected financial secretary of the American Bible Society. He died at Cincinnati Jan. 9, 1849. In early life he advantage was secured in his education, but limited by the tenor of his mind and unmeasured effort bore him above all obstacles, and he became one of the most popular and useful ministers of his time. He was a learned, honest, and accomplished man, and many souls were converted under his labors; and as a platform speaker he had few equals amongst the ministry of his age.—Conf. Min. iv. 327; Meth. Qu. Rev. 1849, p. 515.

Levirate (from the law-Latin term levir, a husband's brother), the name applied to an ancient usage of the Hebrews (Gen. xxxviii, 8 sq.), retranslated by Moses (Deut. xxxii, 5-10; comp. Joseph, ii. 23; Matt. xxii, 24 sq.), that when an Israelite died without leaving male issue, his brother (נַעֲבָם, yebam), which was the specific term applied to this relation, resident with him, was compelled to marry the widow, and continue his deceased brother's family through the first-born son issuing from such union as the heir of the former husband (comp. Joseph, ii. 23; Lev. xxi, 17). If he was unwilling to do so, he could only be released from the obligation by undergoing a species of insult (Deut. xxv, 9). This is illustrated in the story of the Moabite prince Rachmon (ch. iii, iv), where, however, as an estate was involved, Boaz is styled by a different term (יַעֲבָן, an eremot). The Talmud contains a very subtle exposition of this statute (see Mishna, Yebamoth, iii, 1; comp. Eduy. iv, 8, on Deut. xxv, 9; see also Jebam. xii, 6; comp. Selden, Uxor Hebr. i, 12; Gans, Ehekeret, i, 167 sq.). The high-priest appears to have been exempt from this law (Lev. xxii, 18), and there must doubtless have been other exceptions, especially in the case of aged persons and prostrates (Mishna, Jebam. xi, 2). A similar law prevails among the natives of Central Asia (Bernay, p. 84 sq.; Niebuhr, Besch. p. 70; Berger, Vorgesch. i, 28) and Abyssinia (Drake, Geogr. ii, 225, and 280 sq.; comp. also, among the ancient Italians (Diod. Sic. xii, 18). This law now originated in the love of offspring, proverbially strong in the Eastern bosom, which sought this method at one of perpetuating a deceased person's name and of procuring progeny for the widow (John's Archael. § 157). See Kinsman. The law, however, was unquestionably attended with great inconveniences, for a man cannot but think it the most unpleasant of all necessities if he must marry a woman whom he has not himself chosen. Thus we find that the brother in some instances has not been satisfied with any such marriage (Gen. xxxviii; Ruth iv), and stumbled at this, that the first son produced from it could not belong to him. Whether a second son might follow and continue in life was very uncertain; and among a people who so highly prized genealogical immortality of the name, it was an important relationship for a man to be obliged to procure it for a person already dead, and to run the risk meanwhile of losing it himself. Nor was this law very much in favor of the morals of the other sex; for, not to speak of Tamar, who, in reference to it, conceived herself justified in having recourse to such a proceeding, it may be observed that what Ruth did (iii, 6-9), in order to obtain for a husband the person whom she accounted as the nearest kinsman of her deceased husband, is, to say the least, by no means conformable to those modesty and delicacy which we look for in the other sex. A wise and good legislator could scarcely have been inclined to patronize any such law; but then it is not advisable directly to attack an inveterate point of honor, because, in such a case, for the most part nothing is gained; and in the present instance, as the point of honor placed immortality of the name entirely in a man's hands, and the descendants behind him, it was so favorable to the increase of population that it merited some degree of forbearance and tenderness. Moses therefore left the Israelites still in possession of their established right. But, at the same time, he studied as much as possible to guard against its rigor and abuses, by limiting and qualifying it, and providing for its operation in various respects. In the first place, he expressly prohibited the marriage of a brother's widow if there were children of his own alive. Before this time, brothers were probably in the practice of considering a brother's widow as part of the inheritance, and of appropriating her to themselves, if unable to buy a wife, as the Mongols do, so that this was a very necessary prohibition. For a successor, presumpatius in thor, whom a wife can regard as her future husband, is rather a dangerous neighbor for her present one's honor, and if she happens to conceive any predilection for the younger brother, he, her husband, particularly in a southern climate, will hardly be secure from the risk of poison. In the second place, Moses allowed, and, indeed, enjoined the brother to marry the widow of his childless brother; but if he was not disposed to do so, he did not thereby compel him, but left him an easy means of rescission, for he had only to declare in court that he had no inclination to marry her, and then he was at liberty. This, it is true, subjected him to a punishment, which at first appears sufficiently severe—the slighted widow had a right to divide his clothes as much as she pleased, and to have his pulling off his shoe and delivering it to the widow.
he received the appellation of Barsose, which anybody might apply to him without being liable to a prosecution. But this infraction was, after all, merely nominal, and we find that it did not prevent the rejection of the widow when there was a decided aversion to it on the part of the surviving relative (Ruth iv, 8). The law, however, was not so rigidly intended to be the same for the whole city or country, not to one residing at a greater distance. Nor did it affect a brother having already a wife of his own. At least, if it had its origin in this, that by reason of the price required for a wife, often only one brother could marry, and the others also wished to do the same, it could only affect such as were unmarried; and in the two instances that occur in Genesis (ch. xxxviii) and Ruth (ch. iv) we find the brother-in-law, whose duty it was to marry, apprehensive of its proving hurtful to himself and his inheritance, which could hardly have been the case if he had previously had another wife, or (but that was at least expensive) could have taken one of his own choice. When there was no brother alive, or when he declined the duty, the levirate law, as we see from the case of Ruth, extended to the nearest relative of the deceased husband as, for instance, to his paternal uncle or cousin; so that at last even quite remote kinsmen, in default of nearer ones, might be obliged to undertake it. Boaz does not appear to have been very nearly related to Ruth, as he did not so much know who she was when he met her giving her names (ib. v, 11). Nor did she think it likely that he was in any relation to her until aspired of it by her mother-in-law. Among the Jews of the present day levirate marriages have entirely ceased, so much so that in the marriage contracts of the very poorest people among them it is generally stipulated that the bridegroom's brother shall abandon all those rights to the bride to which he could lay claim by the law in question (Michaelis, Moa. Reich, ii, 197 sq.). See Perizon. De constitutions dir. super defuncti fratris uxoris decedunt (Halon. 1742); F. Bernay, De Hebræor. levi retro (Berlin, 1835); J. M. Redelb, Die Leviratstach bei den Hebräern (Leipzic, 1836); C. W. F. Wulch, Die levir. ad fratres germ., sed tribus referenda (Göttingen, 1763); Hullman, Staatsverf. d. Israel, p. 190 sq.; Rauschenbusch, De leg. levirate (Göttingen, 1765). See MARRIAGE.

Levita (Levi), given (1 Esdr. i, 14) as a proper name, but meaning simply a Levi, as correctly read in the Hebrew passages (xv. 15).

Levites, MORDECAI GUMPFL, a learned Jewish physician and commentator, was born and educated at Berlin, where he was a fellow-student of the celebrated philosopher Moses Mendelssohn. He afterwards removed to London, and was physician in one of the hospitals (1790); was then nominated by Gustavus III., of Sweden, to the professorship in Upsala. In 1781 he returned to his native place, but lived again three years later for Hamburg, where he died February 10, 1797. His works illustrate the Bible are A Commentary on Ecclesiastes, called בֵּית הַכֹּלֶסֹתִיק, dedicated to Gustavus III (Hamburg, 1784). This elaborate work is preceded by five introductions, which respectively treat on the name, the Hebrew pronunciation, the meaning, the etymology, the appropriate sense of its name, the Hebrew synonyms, roots, the verb and its inflexions, the names of the Deity, on the design of the Bible, etc.; whereupon follows the Hebrew text with a double commentary: one explains the words and their connection, and the other gives an exposition of the argument of the book:—A Treatise on Holy Scripture, published at the request of the king of Sweden (London, 1770):—A Treatise on the Pentateuch, the Prophets, and the Talmud, entitled מִנַּה גָּלֶלֶת כֹּל (Hamb. 1797):—A Hebrae Lexicon, called מִנַּה דֶלֶסָר, dedicated to the sons of Israel (1795);—A Work on Hebrew Synonyms, entitled מִנַּה דֶלֶסָר יִרְאוֹת and a Hebrew Grammar, called מִנַּה דֶלֶסָר יְדִיעָה. The last three works have not as yet been published. See Fürst, Bibliotheca Judæica, ii, 238 sq.; Kittto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. vol. ii, n. v.

Levites (לֶבְיָתֵים), son of Levi, or simply הַלֶּבְיָה, Levi, for לֶבְיָה, Deut. xii, 18; Judg. xvii, 5, 11, xviii, 3; usually in the plural, and with the art. בֵּיתֵהֶם; Sept. Are. (LXX), a patronymic of Levi, which, besides including all the descendants of the tribe of Levi (Exod. vi, 25, 30, 31, 32, etc.); Num. xxxv, 2; Josh. xxi, 3, 41), is the distinctive title of that portion of it which was set apart for the subordinate offices of the sanctuary, to assist the other and smaller portion of their own tribe, invested with the superintendence of the house of God (1 Kings viii, 4; Ezra ii, 70, John i, 19, etc.), and this is the meaning which has perpetuated itself. Sometimes, again, it is added as an epithet of the smaller portion of the tribe, and we read of "the priests the Levites" (Josh. iii, 3; Exek. xlii, 15). See Priest. In describing the institution and development of the Levitical order, we shall treat of it in chronological order, availing ourselves of the best systematizations hitherto produced.

I. From the Exode till the Monarchy.—This is the most interesting and important period in the history of the Levitical order, and in describing it we must first of all place amongst the chief tribes eunuchs from the wives of Jacob, and share with them a recognised superiority over those that bore the names of the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah. Within the tribe itself there are some slight tokens that the Kohathites were gaining the first place; the first class of Ephod of Exod. vi, 18-25 gives to that section of the tribe four clans, whereas the first order of Levi had five. To this belonged the house of Amram, and "Aaron the Levite" (Exod. iv, 14) is spoken of as one to whom the people would be sure to listen. He married the daughter of the chief of the tribe of Judah (Exod. vi, 28). The work accomplished by him, and by his yet greater brother, would naturally tend to give prominence to the family and the tribe to which they belonged, but as yet there are no traces of a caste-character, no signs of any intention to form a separate sect. This book, therefore, belongs to that time the Israelites had worshipped the God of their fathers after their fathers' manner. The first-born of the people were the priests of the people. The eldest son of each house inherited the priestly office. His youth made him, in his father's lifetime, the representative of the purity which was connected from the beginning with the thought of worship (Ewald, Alterthum, p. 373, and comp. Priest). It was apparently with this as their ancestral worship that the Israelites came up out of Egypt. The "young men" of the sons of Israel offer sacrifices (Exod. xxiv, 6). They, we may infer, are the priests to whom reference is made when the people while encamped at the heights of Sinai (xx. 22-24). They represented the truth that the whole people were a "kingdom of priests" (xxi, 6). Neither they, nor the "officers and judges"
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appointed to assist Moses in administering justice (xxviii, 25), are connected in any special manner with the tribe of Levi. The first mention of this tribe is in the institution of a hereditary priesthood in the family of Aaron during the first withdrawal of Moses to the solitude of Sinai (xxviii, 1). This, however, was one thing: it was quite another to set apart a whole tribe of Israel as a priestly family. The directions given for the construction of the tabernacle imply no pre-eminent- 
sence of the Levites. The chief workers in it are from the tribes of Judah and Dan (Exod. xxxi, 2-6). The next extension of the idea of the priesthood grew out of the terrible crisis of Exod. xxxii. If the Levites had been shakers in the sin of the golden calf, at any rate, the foremost to rally round their leader when he called on them to help him in stemming the progress of the evil. Then came that terrible consecration of themselves, when every man was against his son and against his brother, and the offering with which they filled their hands (Exod. xxxi, 1-4, Exod. xxxii, 29; comp. Exod. xxviii, 41) was the blood of their nearest of kin. The tribe stood forth separate and apart, recognizing even in this stern work the spiritual as higher than the natural, and therefore counted worthy to be the repre- sentative of the ideal life of the people, "an Israel with- in an Israel" (Ewald, Alterthum, p. 279), chosen in its highest representatives to offer incessant holiness-sac- rifices before the Lord (Dent. xxxiii, 9, 10), not without a share in the glory of the Urim and Thummim that were worn by the prince and chief of the tribe. From this time, accordingly, they occupied a distinct position. Experience had shown how easily the people might fall back into idolatry—how necessary it was that there should be a body of men, an order, numerically large, and, when the people were in their promised home, equally diffused throughout the country, as attestators and guardians of the truth. Without this the individualism of the worship would have had its chance in an ever-multitudinous idolatry. The tribe of Levi was therefore to take the place of that earlier priesthood of the first-born as representatives of the holiness of the people.

The tabernacle, with its extensive and regular sacrificial service, which required a special priestly order regularly to perform the higher functions of the sanctuary, was the special occasion which also called into being the Levitical staff to aid the priests in their arduous task, just as the primitive and patriarchal mode of worship which prevailed till the erection of the tabernacle, and according to which the first-born of all Israelites performed the priestly offices (comp. Exod. xxiv, 4, and see First-born), could not be perpetuated under the newly-organized congregational service without the constant intervention of the priests. It was for this reason, as well as to secure greater effi- ciency in the sacred offices, that the religious primogeniture was conferred upon the tribe of Levi, which were henceforth to give their undivided attention to the re- quirements of the sanctuary (Num. iii, 11-19). The tribe of Levi were selected because they had manifested a very extraordinary zeal for the glory of God (Exod. xxxii, 26, etc.), had already obtained a part of this religious primogeniture by the institution of the hered- itary priesthood in the family of Aaron (Exod. xxviii, 1), and because, as the tribe to which Moses and Aaron belonged, they would most naturally support and pro- motie the institutions of the lawgiver. To effect this transfer of office, the first-born males of all the other tribes and all the Levites were ordered to be numbered, from the age of one month and upwards; and when it was found that the former were 22,073, and the latter 22,000 (see below), it was arranged that 22,000 of the first-born should be replaced by the 22,000 Levites, that the 273 first-born who were in excess of the Levites should be redeemed at the rate of five shekels each, bei- ing the legal sum for the redemption of the first-born child (Num. xviii, 16), and that the 186 shekels be

given to Aaron and his sons as a compensation for the odd persons who, as first-born, belonged to Jehovah. As to the difference as to the title which the first-born should be redeemed by paying this money, and which should be exchanged for the Levites, since it was natural for every one to wish to escape this expense, the Midrash (On Num. iii, 17) and the Talmud relate that Moses wrote on 22,000 tickets Levi (יְיַעַקז), and on 273 Fire Shekhels (לְפִנָּיָּהֲשָךְ), mixed them all up, put them into a vessel, and then bid every Israelite to draw one. He who took out one with Levi it was redeemed by a Levite, and he who drew one with Fire Shekels it had to be redeemed by payment of this sum (תבשדה, 17, a). There is no reason to doubt this ancient tradition. It was further ordained that the cattle which the Levites then happened to possess should be considered as equivalent to all the first-born cattle which all the Israelites had, without their being num- bered and exchanged one for one, as in the case of the human beings (Num. iii, 41-51), so that the firstlings should not now be given to the priest, or be redeemed, which the Israelites therefore suggests they a had to do (Num. xviii, 15). In this way the Levites obtained a sacrificial as well as a priestly character. They for the first-born of men, and their cattle for the firstlings of beasts, fulfilled the idea that had been asserted at the time of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt (Exod. xiii, 12, 13).

There is a discrepancy between the total number of the Levites, which is given in Num. iii, 39 as 22,000, and the separate number of the three divisions which is given in verses 22, 28, and 44, as follows: Gershoni- tes, 7500—Kohathites, 8000—Merarites, 22,300. Compare also verse 45, where it is said that the 22,273 first-born exceeded the total number of Levites by 273. The Talmud (Bechotch, 5, a) and the Jewish commen- tators, who are followed by most Christian expositors, submit that the 220 surplus Levites were the first-born of this tribe, which, (1) could not be substituted for the first-born of the other tribes, and therefore were omitted from the total. To this, however, it is objected that if such an exemption of first-born had been intend- ed, the text would have contained some intimation of it, whereas there is nothing whatever in the context to indi- cate it. Houbigant therefore suggests that שפ is a del- ped out of the word שפ in verse 28, making it שפ, and that by retaining the former word we obtain 2200 instead of 8000, which removes all the difficulty. Philippson, Keil, and others adopt this explanation. The number of the first-born appears disproportionately small as com- pared with the population. It must be remembered, however, that the conditions to be fulfilled were that they should be at once (1) the first child of the father, (2) the first child of the mother, and (3) males. (Comp. on this question, and on that of the difference of numbers, Kurtz, History of the Old Covenant, iii, 201.)

2. Division of the Tribe of Levi.—As different functions were assigned to the separate branches of the Levitical branch of the tribe, to which frequent references are made, we subjoin the following table from Exod. vi, 16-25, italicizing the Aaronic or priestly branch in order to facilitate these references.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GERASHON</th>
<th>(Lbdn.)</th>
<th>Shimelel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMRAM</td>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Benj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVI</td>
<td>Korath</td>
<td>Ishar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebron.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B.—Those mentioned in the above list are by no means the only descendants of Levi in their respective generations, as is evident from the fact that, though no
sons of Libni, Shimei, Hebron, etc., are here given, yet mention is made in Numb. iii, 26, of "the family of the Libnites"; and in Numb. iii, 27; xxvi, 68, of "the family of the Hebronites"; whilst in 1 Chron. xxvii, 19 and elsewhere, as it is commonly supposed, these sons of Mahli and Mushi are mentioned by name. Again, no sons of Mahli and Mushi are given, and yet they appear in Numb. iii as fathers of families of the Levites. The design of the passage is simply to give the pedigrees of Moses and Aaron, and some other principal heads of the families as is expressly stated. 1 Chron. vi, 25: "These are the heads of the fathers of the Levites according to their families." In this connection, it is customary to mention other members of the family of Moses and Aaron. The observations afford an answer to a considerable extent to the conclusions of bishop Colenso upon the number of the Levites (The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua critically examined, i, 107-113).

It will thus be seen that the Levitical order comprises the whole of the descendants of Gershom and Merari, and those of Kohath through Izhar and Uzzziel, as well as through Amram's second son, Moses, whilst Aaron, Amram's first son, and his issue, constitute the priestly order. It is well known that there has been marked throughout the history of Israel in the second point of age and order, yet his family will be found to occupy the first position, because they are the nearest of kin to the priests.

3. Age and Qualifications for Levitical Service.—The order of the Levites for active service in the Mosaic law is mature age, which in Numb. iv, v, 33, 30, 39, 43, 47 is said to be from thirty to fifty, whilst in Numb. viii, 24, 35 it is said to commence at twenty-five. Various attempts have been made to reconcile these two apparently contradictory injunctions. The Talmud (Chol. 24, a), Rashbi (Comment. ad loc.), and Maimonides (Jed Ha-Chezaka, iii, 7, 3), who are followed by some Christian commentators, affirm that from twenty-five to thirty the Levites attended in order to be instructed in their duties, but did not enter upon actual duties until they were full thirty years of age. But this explanation, as Abrahanel rightly remarks, "is at variance with the plain declaration of the text, that the Levites were called at twenty-five years of age to wait upon the service of the tabernacle, which clearly denotes not instruction for their ministry, but the ministry itself" (Commentator. on Numb. viii, 24). Besides, the text itself does not give the slightest intimation that any period of the Levitical life was devoted to instruction. Hence Rashbam, Aben Ezra, and Abrahanel, who are followed by most modern expositors, submit that the twenty-five years of age refers to the Levites entering upon the lighter part of their duties, as preparing water as the Levites did of the holy things in the tabernacle, whilst the thirty years of age refers to their entering upon the more onerous duties, such as carrying heavy weights, when the tabernacle was moved about from place to place, which required the full strength of a man, maintaining that this distinction is indicated in the text by the words הַנְּכַשָּׁה, נְכַשָּׁה, נְכַשָּׁה, for labor and burdens, when the thirty years' work is spoken of (Numb. iv, 30, 31), and by the omission of the word הָיַבִּים, burden, when the twenty-five years' work is spoken of (Numb. viii, 24, etc.). But it may fairly be questioned whether man is more fitted for arduous work from thirty to thirty-five than from twenty-five to thirty. Besides, the Gereshonites and the Merarites, who had the charge of the heavier burdens, did not carry them at all (comp. Numb. viii, 3-9, and sec. 4 below). According to another ancient Jewish interpretation adopted by Bähr (Symbol. ii, 41) and others, Numb. iv, iv, 35-18, 22 of the necessary age of the Levites for the immediate performance of their duties is thirty, and twenty-five years of age gives their age for the promised land, when they shall be divided among the tribes and a larger number shall be wanted (Siphri on Numb. viii). Somewhat similar is Phillipon's explanation, who affirms that at the first election of the Levitical order the required age for service was from thirty to fifty, but that all future Levites had to commence service at twenty-five. The Sept., solves the difficulty by uniformly reading twenty-five instead of thirty.

4. Duties and Classification of the Levites.—The commencement of the service of the Levites from Sinai gave prominence to their new character. As the tabernacle was the symbol of the presence among the people of their unseen King, so the Levites were, among the other tribes of Israel, as the royal guard that waited exclusively on him. The title of "host" is specially applied to them (comp. gen. 14, 18, in Numb. iv, 8, 90; and of עָרָיִם, in 1 Chron. ii, 6, 16). The number of the Levites (Numb. i, 47; ii, 38; xxvi, 62), but were reckoned separately by themselves. When the people were at rest they encamped as guardians around the sacred tent; no one else might come near it under pain of death (Numb. i, 51; xvii, 22). The differences pitched their tents around it in the following manner: the Gershonites behind it on the west (Numb. iii, 29), the Kohathites on the south (iii, 29), the Merarites on the north (iii, 45), and the priests on the east (iii, 38). See CAMP. They were to occupy a middle position in that ascending scale of consecration which, starting from the idea of the whole nation as a priestly people, reached its culminating point in the high-priest, who alone of all the people might enter "within the veil." The Levites might come nearer than the other tribes, but they might not sacrifice, nor burn incense for the Lord, and were called to "the holy things" of the sanctuary till they were covered (Numb. iv, 15). When on the march, no hands but theirs might strike the tent at the commencement of the day's journey, or carry the parts of its structure during it, or pitch the tent again when they halted (Numb. i, 51). It was obviously essential for the people that there should be a fixed and unchangeable arrangement of duties, and now, accordingly, we meet with the first outlines of the organization which afterwards became permanent. The division of the tribe into the three sections that traced their descent from the sons of Levi formed the groundwork of it. The Levites were given as a gift (קֵרֵם, יִנְחָמִים) to Aaron and his sons, the priests, to wait upon them, and to do the subordinate work for them at the service of the sanctuary (Numb. vii, 19; xvii, 2-6). They also had to guard the tabernacle and take charge of certain vessels, whilst the priests had the watch over the altar and the interior of the sanctuary (Numb. ii, 30; vii, 19; xvii, 1-7). To carry this out effectually, the charge of certain vessels and portions of the tabernacle, as well as the guarding of its several sides, was assigned to each of the three sections into which the tribe was divided by their respective descent from the three sons of Levi, i.e. Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, as follows: (1) The Kohathites, who out of 8600 persons yielded 2750 qualified for active service according to the prescribed age, who were under the leadership of Elizaphan, had to occupy the south side of the tabernacle, and, as the family to which Aaron the high-priest and his sons belonged, had to take charge of the holy things (כֹּל הַנְּכַשָּׁה, viz., the ark, the table of shew-bread, the candlestick, the two altars of incense and burnt-offering, as well as of the sacred vessels used at the service of these holy things, and the curtains of the holy of holies. All these things they had to carry on their own shoulders when the camp was broken up (Numb. iii, 27-32; iv, 5-15; vii, 8; Deut. xxxi, 25), after the priests had covered them with the dark blue cloth which was to hide them from all profane gaze; and thus they became also the guardians of all the sacred treasures which the tribe had to carry about with them. Elazar, the head of the priests, who belonged to the Kohathites, and who was the chief commander of the three Levitical divisions, had the charge of the oil for the candlestick, the incense, the daily meat-offering, and the anointing oil (Numb. iii, 51, 52; iv, 16).
(3.) The Gershonites, who out of 7500 men yielded 2500 for active service, and who were under the leadership of Eliasaph, had to occupy the west side of the tabernacle, and to take charge of the tapestry of the tabernacle, all its curtains, hangings, and coverings, the pillars of the tapestry hangings, the implements used in connection therewith, and to perform all the work connected with the making down, setting up, and putting up of the viti- cles over which they had the charge (Numb. iii. 21-26; iv. 22-28).

(3.) The Merarites, who out of 2000 yielded 2800 active men, and who were under the leadership of Zuriel, had to occupy the north side of the tabernacle, and take charge of the boards, cypress poles, sockets, tent-nails, etc. (Numb. iii. 33-37; iv. 39, 40). The two latter companies, however, were allowed to use the six covered wagons and the twelve oxen which were offered as an offering to Jehovah; the Gershonites, having the less heavy portion, got two of the wagons and ten of the oxen, while the Merarites, who had the heavier portions, got four of the wagons and eight of the oxen (Numb. vii. 3-9).

Thus the total number of active men which the three divisions of the Levites yielded was 3850. When en- camped in the wilderness they were, according to the ancient Hebrew canon, even a priest was not allowed to do the service assigned to the Levites, nor was one Levite permitted to perform the duties which were incumbent upon his fellow Levite under penalty of death (Maimon- ides, Hhekikot Ha-Ha-Midash, i, 10).

The book of Deuteronomy is interesting as indicating more clearly than had been done before the other functions, over and above their ministrations in the tabernacle, which were to be allotted to the tribe of Levi. Through the whole land they were to take the place of the old household priests (subject, of course, to the special rights of the Aaronic priesthood), and at the religious festivals, feasts and rejoicings (Deut. xii. 19; xiv, 26, 27; xxvi. 11). Every third year they were to have an additional share in the produce of the land (Deut. xiv. 28; xxvi. 12). The people were charged never to forsake them. To “offer the Levites” was to entrust to the office of preserving, transcribing, and interpreting the law (Deut. xvii. 9-12; xxvi. 26). They were solemnly to read it every seventh year at the Feast of Tabernacles (Deut. xxxi. 9-13). They were to pronounce the curses from Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvi. 14). Such, if may be said, was the ideal of the religious organization which was present to the mind of the lawgiver. Details were left to be developed as the altered circumstances of the people might require. The great principle was, that the warrior-caste who had guarded the tents of the captain of the hosts of Israel, and that people should be throughout the land as witnesses and light, and that people still owed allegiance to him. It deserves notice that, as yet, with the exception of the few passages that refer to the priests, no traces appear of their character as a learned caste, and of the work which afterwards be- longed to them as hymn-writers and musicians. The hymns of this period were probably occasional, not re- curring (comp. Exod. xv; Numb. xxvi. 17; Deut. xxiii.).

Women bore a large share in singing them (Exod. xv, 21; Psa. lxxvii. 22). It is not unlikely that the wives and daughters of the Levites, who must have been with them in all their encampments, in their battles, took the foremost part among the "damsels play- ing with their timbrels," or among the “wise-hearted," who wave hangings for the decoration of the tabernacle. There are, at any rate, signs of their presence there in the mention of the "women that assembled" at its door (Exod. xxxviii. 8, and comp. Ewald, Abergithum, p. 297).

5. Consecration of the Levites.—The first act in the consecration of the Levites was to sprinkle them with the water of purification (Exod. xxi. 22), putting on them the ephod, vestments, etc., as was the custom at the anointing of kings and priests (Lev. vi. 31). They had, in the next place, as an emblem of further purification, to shave the hair of their head from their body, "to teach thereby," as Balbag says, "that they must renounce, as much as was in their power, all worldly things, and devote themselves to the service of the most high God," and then wash their garments. After this triple form of purification, they were brought before the door of the tabernacle, along with two bullocks and fine flour mingled with oil, when the whole congregation, through the elders who represented them, laid their hands upon the heads of the Levites, and set them apart for the service of the sanctuary, to occupy the first-born of the children of Israel; instead of the first-born of the children of Israel. The part which the whole congregation took in this consecration is a very important feature in the Hebrew constitution, inasmuch as it most distinctly shows that the Levitical order proceeded from the midst of the people (Exod. xxvii. 1), was to be regarded as essentially identical with it, and not as a sacred caste standing in proud eminence above the rest of the nation. This principle of equality, which, according to the Mosaic law, was not to be infringed by the introduction of a priesthood or monarchy (Deut. xviii. 14-20), was recognized throughout the existence of the Hebrew commonwealth, as is evident from the fact that the representatives of the people took part in the coronation of kings and the installment of high-priests (I Kings ii. 35; with I Chron. xxix, 32), and even in the days of the Maccabees we see that it is the people who are installed as the high-priests of the Lord (I Macc. i. 80).

6. Rewards of the Levites.—Thus consecrated to the service of the Lord, it was necessary that the tribe of Levi should be relieved from the temporal pursuits of the rest of the people, to enable them to give themselves wholly to their spiritual functions, and to the cultivation of the arts and sciences, as well as to preserve them from contracting a desire to amass earthly possessions. For this reason they were to have no territorial possessions, but Jehovah was to be their inheritance (Numb. xviii. 20; xxvi. 62; Deut. x. 9; xviii. 1, 2; Josh. xviii. 7). To reward their labor, which they had henceforth to perform instead of the first-born of the whole people, as well as to compensate the loss of their share in the material wealth of the nation, it was ordained that they should receive from the other tribes the tithes of the produce of the land, from which the non-priestly portion of the Levites, in their turn had to offer a tithe to the priests as a recognition of their higher consecration (Numb. xviii. 21-24, 26-32; Neh. x. 37). If they had had, like other tribes, a distinct territory assigned to them, their influence over the people at large would have been diminished. The Levites, however, were not to forget, in labors common to them with others, their own peculiar calling (Neh. x. 37). As if to provide for the contingency of falling crops or the like, and the consequent inadequacy of the tithes thus assigned to them, the Levite, not less than the widow and the orphan, was commanded to enjoy the special kindness of the people (Deut. xii. 19; xiv, 27, 29).
But, though they were to have no territorial possessions, still they required a place of abode. To secure this, and at the same time to enable the Levites to disseminate a knowledge of the law and exercise a refined and intellectual influence among the people at large, upon whose conscientious payment of the tithes they were dependent for subsistence, forty-eight cities were assigned to them, six of which were to be cities of refuge for those who had inadvertently killed any one (Num. xxxv, 1–8). From these forty-eight cities, which they obtained immediately after the conquest of Canaan, and which were made up by taking four cities from the district of each tribe, thirteen were allotted to the priestly portion of the Levitical tribe. Which cities belonged to the priestly portion of the tribe, and which to the non-priestly portion, and how they were distributed among the other tribes, as recorded in Josh. xxi, will be seen from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judah and Simeon</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Manasseh (east)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issachar</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asher</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naphtali</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebulun</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuben</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gad</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these cities was required to have an outlying suburb (עֵרֶב, נְדָרָה) of meadow land for the pasture of the flocks and herds belonging to the Levites, the dimensions of which are thus described in Num. xxxv, 4, 5: "And the suburbs [or pasture-ground] of the cities which ye shall give unto the Levites are from the wall of the city to the outside a thousand cubits round about; and ye shall measure from without the city the east corner two thousand cubits, and the south corner two thousand cubits, and the west corner two thousand cubits, and the north corner two thousand cubits, and the city in the centre." These dimensions have occasioned great difficulty, because of the apparent contradiction in the two verses, as specifying first 1000 cubits and then 2000. The Sept. and Josephus (Ann. iv, 4, 3), and Philo (De auct. hon. 247) get over the difficulty by reading 2000 in both verses, as exhibited in diagram I, a, while ancient and modern commentators,

Levitical City.—Diagram I, a.

who rightly adhere to the text, have endeavored to reconcile the two verses by advancing different theories, of which the following are the most noticeable: i. According to the Talmud (Erezem, 51, a), the space "measured from the wall 1000 cubits round about" was used as a common or suburb, and the space measured "from without the city on the east side," etc., was a further tract of land of 2000 cubits, used for fields and vineyards, the former being "the suburbs" properly so called, and the latter the "fields of the suburbs," as represented in diagram I, b. Against this view, however, which is the most simple and rational, and which is adopted by Maimonides (Hilchot Shehita Ve-Jobel, xii, 2); bishop Patrick, and most English expositors, it is urged that

Levitical City.—Diagram I, b.

it is not said that the 2000 cubits are to be measured in all directions, but only in the east, south, etc., direction, or, as the Hebrew has it, east, south, etc., corner (תִּמְרָא). 2. It means that a circle of 1000 cubits radius was to be measured from the centre of the city, and then a square circumscribed about that circle, each of whose sides was 2000 cubits long, as exhibited in diagram II. But the objection to this is that the 1000 cubits were to be measured "from the wall of the city," and not from the centre. 3. The 1000 cubits were measured perpendicularly to the wall of the city, and then perpendicularly to these distances, i. e. parallel to the walls of the city, the 2000 cubits were measured on the north, south, east, and west sides, as shown in diagram III. This, however, is obviously incorrect, because the sides would not be 2000 cubits long if the city were of finite dimensions, but plainly longer. 4. It is assumed that the city was built in a circular form, with a radius of 1500 cubits, that a circle was then described with a radius of 2500 cubits from the centre of the city, i. e. at a distance of 1000 cubits from the walls of the city, and that the suburbs were inclosed between the circumferences of the two circles, and that the corner of the circumscribed square was 1000 cubits from the circumference of the outer circle. Compare diagram IV. But the objection to this

Levitical City.—Diagram IV.

is that by Euclid, i, 47, the square of the diagonal equals the sum of the square of the sides, whereas in this figure 3500² does not equal 2500² + 2500². The assigned length
of the diagonal varies about 85 cubits from its actual value. The city is supposed to be of a circular form; round it a circle is described at a distance of 1000 cubits from its walls; then from the walls 2000 cubits are measured to the north, south, east, and west corners — the whole forming a starlike figure, as exhibited in diagram V. This view, which is somewhat fanciful, strictly meets the requirements of the Hebrew text. 6. The 1000 cubits are measured from the centre in four directions at right angles to one another, and perpendicular to each of these a side of 2000 cubits long is drawn, the whole forming a square. But in this case the condition of 1000 cubits round about is not fulfilled, the distance of the centre from the corners of the square being plainly more than 1000 cubits. 7. The "1000 cubits round about" is equivalent to 1000 cubits square, or 305 English acres. 8. The city is supposed to be square, each side measuring 1000 or 500 cubits, and then, at a distance of 1000 cubits in all directions from the square, another square is described, as represented in diagrams VI, a, and VI, b. But this incurs the objection urged against it, that the 1000 cubits cannot be said to be measured "round about," the distance from the corner of the city to the corner of the precincts being plainly more than 1000 cubits. Upon a review of all these theories, we incline to the ancient Jewish view, which is stated first, and against which nothing can be said, if we take "on the south, east," etc., simply to mean, as it often does, in all directions, instead of four distinct points. It presupposes that the cities were built in a circular form, which was usual in the cities of antiquity, both because the circle of all figures comprises the largest area within the smallest periphery, and because the inhabitants could reach every part of the walls in the shortest time from all directions, if necessary, for purposes of defence. These revenues have been thought exorbitant beyond all bounds; for, discounting the unjustifiable conclusion of bishop Colenso, that "forty-four people [Levites], with the two priests, and the two Levites, had both the cities assigned to them" (The Pentateuch, etc., i, 112), and adhering to the scriptural numbers, we still have a tribe which, at the second census, numbered 23,000 males, with no more than 12,000 arrived at man's estate, receiving the tithes of 800,000 people; "consequently," it is thought, "that each Levite, without having to tend seed and charges of husbandry, had as much as five Israelites reaped from their fields or gained on their cattle" (Michaelis, Lives of Moses, i, 252). To add to this that, though so small in number, the Levites received for eight cities, while other cities which consisted of more than double the number of men received less cities, and some did not get more than twelve cities. But in all these calculations the following facts are ignored: 1. The tithes were not a regular tax, but a religious duty, which was greatly neglected by the people; 2. Even from these irregular tithes the Levites had to give a tithe to the priests; 3. The tithes never increased, whereas the Levites did increase. 4. Thirteen of the forty-eight cities were assigned to the priests, and six were cities of refuge; and, 5. Of the remaining twenty-nine cities, the Levites worked by no means the whole year, the greater part being devoted to business or to travel. Hence it is evident that the Levites were not compelled to sell their houses, and that a special clause bearing on this subject was inserted in the Jubilee law (see NIV); inasmuch as Lev. xxv, 32-34, would have no meaning unless it is presumed that other Israelites lived together with the Levites. These provisions for abode, of course, did not apply to the Levites in the time of Moses. When wandering in the wilderness, they were supported like the other Israelites, with but slight emoluments or perquisites, and at first with comparatively little honor, amid their considerable burdens in caring for the religious cultus. But how rapidly the feeling of reverence gained strength we may judge from the share assigned to them out of the flocks, and herds, and women of the conquered Midianites (Numb. xxxi, 27, etc.). The same victory led to the dedication of gold and silver vessels of great value, and thus increased the importance of the tribe as guards of the national treasures (Numb. xxxi, 50-54). C. Modifications under Joshua and the Judges. — The submission of the Gibeonites, after they had obtained a promise that their lives should be spared, enabled Joshua to retain the tribe-divisions of Gershon and Merari of the most burdensome of their duties. The conquered Hivites became "house-servants" and ","dwellers outside" for the house of Jehovah and for the congregation (Josh. ix, 27). The Nethinim (Deo dato) of 1 Chron. ix, 2; Ezra ii, 43, were probably sprung from captives taken by David in later wars, who were assigned to the service of the tabernacle, replacing possibly the Gibeonites who had been slain by Saul (2 Sam. xxii, 1). See NETHINIM. The scanty memorials that are left us in the book of Judges are rather unfavorable to the inference that for any length of time the reality answered to the Mosaic idea of the Levitical institution. The ravages of invasion, and the pressure of an alien rule, marred the working of the organization which seemed so perfect. Levitical cities, such as Aijalon (Josh. xxxi, 24; Judg. i, 35), and Gezer (Josh. xxxi, 21; 1 Chron. iv, 67), fell into the hands of their enemies. Sometimes, as in the case of Nob, others apparently took their place. The wandering, unsettled habit of such Levites as are mentioned in the later chapters of Judges are probably to be traced to this loss of a fixed abode, and the consequent necessity of taking refuge in other cities, even though their tribe as such had no portion in them. The tendency of the people to fall into the idolatry of the neighboring nations showed either that the Levites failed to bear their witness to the truth or had no power to enforce it.
Even in the lifetime of Phinehas, when the high-priest was still consulted as an oracle, the very reverence which the people felt for the tribe of Levi becomes the occasion of a rival worship (Judg. xvii). The old household priesthood renews (see Kalisch, *On Genesis xiv, 7*), and there is the risk of the national worship breaking up into individualism. Micaiah first consecrates of his own soul the tribe of Levi to the Lord, while the officers of the temple call him as "a father and a priest" for little more than his food and raiment. The Levite, though probably the grandson of Moses himself, repeats the sin of Korah. See JONATHAN. First in the house of Micaiah, and then for the emigrants of his time, he exercises the office of a priest with "an ephod, and a teraphim, and a graven image." With this exception the whole tribe appears to have fallen into a condition analogous to that of the clergy in the darkest period and in the most outlying districts of the medieval Church, going through a ritual routine, but exercising no influence for good, at once corrupted and corrupting. The shameless license of the sons of Eli may be looked upon as the result of a long period of decay, affecting the whole order. When the priests were such as Hophni and Phinehas, we may fairly suppose that the Levites were not doing much to sustain the moral life of the people.

The work of Samuel was the starting-point of a better time. Himself a Levite, and, though not a priest, belonging to that section of the Levites which was nearest to the priesthood (1 Chron. vi, 38), adopted, as it were, by the Levite type of profession, he exerted himself for the welfare of the Israelites, and trained for its offices (1 Sam. ii, 18), he appears as infusing a fresh life, the author of a new organization. There is no reason to think, indeed, that the companies or schools of the sons of the prophets which appear in this time (1 Sam. x, 1), and are traditionally said to have been founded by him, consisted exclusively of Levites; but there are many signs that the members of that tribe formed a large element in the new order, and received new strength from it. It exhibited, indeed, the ideal of the Levitical life as one of praise, devotion, teaching; standing in the same relation to the priests and Levites generally as the monastic institutions of the 5th century, or the mendicant orders of the 18th did to the secular clergy of Western Europe. The fact that the Levites were thus brought under the influence of a system which addressed itself to the mind and heart in a greater degree than was the case with the priests, who were the main sustaining force of the Levite world, possibly have led them on to apprehend the higher truths as to the nature of worship which begin to be asserted from this period, and which are nowhere proclaimed more clearly than in the great hymn that bears the name of Samuel (I Sam. vii, 19). The calling of the name of prophet to a new significance is itself a Levite (1 Sam. ix, 9). It is among the prophets that we find the first signs of the musical skill which is afterwards so conspicuous in the Levites (1 Sam. x, 5). The order in which the Temple services were arranged is ascribed to two of the prophets, Nathan and Gad (2 Chron. xxix, 25), who must have grown up under Samuel's supervision, and in part to Samuel himself (1 Chron. ix, 22). Asaph and Heman, the psalmists, bear the same title as Samuel the seer (1 Chron. xxv, 5; 2 Chron. xxix, 30).

The very word "prophesying" is applied not only to sudden bursts of song, but to the organized psalmody of the Temple (1 Chron. xxxii, 2, 8). Even of those who bore the name of a prophet in a higher sense a large number are traceably of this tribe.

The capture of the ark by the Philistines did not entirely interrupt the worship of the Israelites, and the ministrations of the Levites went on, first at Shiloh (1 Sam. xiv, 3), then for a time at Nob (1 Sam. xxii, 11), afterwards at Gibeon (1 Kings iii, 2; 1 Chron. xvi, 89). The history of the return of the ark to Beth-shemesh and to Jerusalem is very well characterized by the Philistines' removal to Kirjath-jearim, points apparently to some strange complications rising out of the anomalies of this period, and affecting, in some measure, the position of the tribe of Levi. Beth-shemesh was, by the original assignment of the conquered country, one of the cities of the priests (Josh. xxiii, 16). They, however, do not appear in the narrative, unless we assume, against all probability, that the men of Beth-shemesh who were guilty of the act of profanation were themselves of the priestly order. Levites, indeed, are mentioned as doing their separation from the heathen (1 Sam. iv, 3). But the heathen sacrifices and burnt-offerings are offered by the men of the city, as though the special function of the priesthood had been usurped by others, and on this supposition it is easier to understand how those who had set aside the law of Moses by one offering also, by another, by a third, by every other. The singular reading of the Sept. in 1 Sam. vi, 19 (και ὁ θείων οἱ πατέρες την ιδην εἰνάνθιν Κυνοτροφός της εἴδου εἰσαγότος) indicates, if we assume that it rests upon some corresponding Hebrew text, a struggle between two opposed parties, one guilty of the profanation, the other—possibly the Levites who had been before mentioned—zealous in their remonstrances against it. Then comes, either as the result of this collision, or by direct supernatural influence, the great slaughter of the Beth-shemites, and they shrink back in terror from the ark, and keep it any longer among them. The great Eben (stone) becomes, by a slight personistic change in its form, the great Abel (lamentation), and the name remains as a memorial of the sin and of its punishment. See BETH-SHEMESH. We are left entirely in the dark as to the reasons which led them, after the ark had been brought into their city, to place it in some other priestly city, but to Kirjath-jearim, round which, so far as we know, there gathered legitimately no sacred associations. It has been commonly assumed, indeed, that Abinadab, under whose guardianship it remained until the time of David, was the founder of some priestly family, and the keeper and guardian of the ark, and had been of the tribe of Levi. See ABINADAB. Of this, however, there is not the slightest direct evidence, and against it is the language of David in 1 Chron. xv, 2, "None ought to carry the ark of God but the Levites, for them hath Jehovah chosen," which would lose half its force if it were not meant as a protest against a recent innovation, and the ground of a return to the more ancient order. So far as one can see one way through these perplexities of a dark period, the most probable explanation—already suggested under KIRJATH-JEARIM—seems to be the following: The old names of Baaleh (Josh. xv, 8) and of Beth-shemesh (1 Chron. xix, 13) are survivals of old some special sanctity attached to the place as the centre of a Canaanite local worship. The fact that the ark was taken to the house of Abinadab in the hill (1 Sam. vii, 1), the Gibeah of 2 Sam. vi, 8, connects itself with the same idea, with this difference, that the ark, which, through the whole history of the Israelites, continued to have such strong attractions for them. These may have seemed to the panic-stricken inhabitants of that district, mingling old things and new, the worship of Jehovah with the lingering superstitions of the conquering people, sufficient grounds to determine their choice of a locality. The consecration (the word used is the special sacerdotal term) of Eleazar as the guardian of the ark is, on this hypothesis, analogous in its way to the other irregular assumptions which characterize this period, though here the offence was less flagrant, and did not involve, apparently, the performance of any sacrificial acts. While, however, this aspect of the religious condition of the people brings the Levitical and priestly orders before us as having lost the position they had previously occupied, there were other influential and authoritative things to reestablish them.

II. During the Monarchy.—The deplorably disorganized condition of the Levitical order was not much improved in the reign of the first Hebrew monarch. The rule of Samuel and his sons, and the prophetic character of the Philistines, doubtless the tribe of Levi, was to give them the position of a ruling caste. In the strong desire of the people for a king we may perhaps trace a protest against the assumption by the Levites of a higher
position than that originally assigned them. The reign of Saul, in its later period, was at any rate the assertion of the Levite and the Gibeonites, who were attached to their service, were parts of the same policy, and the narrative of the condemnation of Saul for the latter (2 Sam. xxvii), shows by what strong measures the truth, of which that policy was a subversion, had to be impressed on the minds of the Israelites. The reign of David, however, brought the change from persecution to honor. The Levites were ready to welcome a king who, though not of their tribe, had brought up the temple and temple service, was able and skilled in their arts, prepared to share even in some of their ministrations, and to array himself in their apparel (2 Sam. vi, 14); and 4600 of their number, with 3700 priests, waited upon David at Hebron—himself, it should be remembered, one of the priestly cities—to tender their allegiance (1 Chron. xii, 25). When his kingdom was established, there came a fuller organization of the whole tribe. Its position in relation to the priesthood was once again definitely recognized. When the ark was carried up to its new resting-place in Jerusalem, their claim to be the bearers of it was acknowledged (1 Chron. xvi, 7). When the sin of Uzza stopped the procession, it was placed for a time under the care of Obad-edom of Gath—probably Gath-rimmon—as one of the chiefs of the Kohathites (1 Chron. xiii, 18; Josh. xxiv, 24; 1 Chron. xv, 18). In the processional order which attended the alternate conveyance of the ark to its new resting-place the Levites were conspicuous, wearing their linen ephod, and appearing in their new character as minstrels (1 Chron. xv, 27, 29). The Levites engaged in conveying the ark to Jerusalem were divided into six father's houses, headed by six chief priests belonging to Kohath, one to Gershon, and one to Merari (1 Chron. xv, 5, etc.). The most remarkable feature in the Levitical duties of this period is their being employed for the first time in choral service (1 Chron. xvi, 16-24; xvi, 4-36); others, again, were appointed as door-keepers (xx, 23, 24). Still the thorough reorganization of the whole tribe was effected by the shepherd-king in the last days of his eventful life, that the Levites might be able at the erection of the Temple "to wait on the sons of Aaron for the service of the house of Jehovah, in the courts and the chambers, and the king's house in all the work of the service of the house of God" (1 Chron. xxiii, 28). This reorganization may be described as follows:

1. Number of Levites and Age for Service.—The Levites from thirty years of age and upwards were first of all enrolled. It was found that they were 38,000 (1 Chron. xxiii, 2), this being about 29,500 more than at the first Mosaic census. It will be seen that, according to this statement, the Levites were to commence service at thirty years of age, in harmony with the Mosaic institution (Num. iv, 3, 23, 30); while in ver. 27 of the same chapter (i. e. 1 Chron. xxiii, 27) it is said that they were to take their share of duty at twenty years of age. Kimchi, who is followed by bishop Patrick, Michaelis, and others, tries to reconcile this apparent contradiction by submitting that the former refers to a census which David made at an earlier period, which was according to the Mosaic law (Num. iv, 3), while the latter speaks of a second census which he made at the close of his life, when he found that the duties of the fixed sanctuary were much lighter and more numerous, and could easily be performed at the age of twenty. But the tribe has always had the same time as the priests as the qualification of the staff of men. Against this, however, Bertheau rightly urges that, 1. The 38,000 Levites of thirty years of age given in the census of ver. 3 are the only persons appointed for the different Levitical offices, and that it is nowhere stated that this number was insufficient, or that the arrangements based thereupon, as recorded in vers. 4 and 5, were not carried out; and, 2. The chronicler plainly indicates, in ver. 25, etc., that he is about to impart a different statement from that communicated in ver. 5; and, 3. He mentions herein the reason why David was not abid by the Mosaic institution, which prescribes the age of service to commence at thirty, and in ver. 27 expressly points out the source from which he derived this deviating account. The two accounts are, therefore, entirely different; the one records that the Levites, whose service in David's time, were numbered from their thirtieth year, while the other, which applies to the chronicler more trustworthy, states that David introduced the practice which afterwards obtained (2 Chron. xxxi, 17; Extra iii, 8) of appointing Levites to office at the age of twenty.

2. Division of the Levites according to the three great Families.—Having ascertained their number, David, following the example of the Mosaic institution, divided the Levitical fathers' houses, according to their descent from the three sons of Levi, when it was ascertained that these three sons, Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, were represented by twenty-four heads of fathers' houses (1 Chron. xxiii, 26-28; xxxiv, 20-31), as follows:

3. Classification and Duties of the Levites.—These twenty-four fathers' houses, numbering 88,000 men qualified for active service, were then divided into four classes, to each of which different duties were assigned.

(1.) The first class consisted of 24,000 Levites. These were appointed to assist the priests in the work of the sanctuary (αναδιπλωματεις). They had the custody of the official garments and sacred vessels, had to deliver them when wanted, and collect and lock them up again after they had been used; to replenish the sacrificial storehouse with cattle, four, wheat, wine, oil, incense, and other articles used as sacrifices, and mete out each time the required quantity; to provide the different spiceries from which the priests compounded the incense (1 Chron. ix, 90); to prepare the shewbread and the other baked things used as sacrifices; to assist the priests in slaughtering the victims, and to attend to the cleaning of the Temple, etc. (1 Chron. xxiii, 28-32; ix, 29). They had most probably, also, the charge of the sacred treasury (1 Chron. xxvi, 20-28). Like the priests, they were subdivided into twenty-four courses or companies, according to the above-named twenty-four Levitical fathers' houses, and were headed respectively by one of the twenty-four representatives of these houses. Each of these courses was a week on duty, and was relieved on the Sabbath (2 Kings xi) by the company whose turn it was to serve next, so that there were always a thousand men of each class on duty, and so that they had served two weeks during the year. The menial work was done by the Nethinim, who were appointed to assist the Levites in these matters. See NETHINIM.

(2.) The second class consisted of 4000, who were the musicians (<strong>μουσικοι</strong>, <strong>μουσικοῖ</strong>). They were subdivided into twenty-four companies or corps, each headed by a chief (1 Chron. xxv, 2) and are to be traced back to the three great families of Levi, inasmuch as four of the
chiefs were sons of Asaph, a descendant of Gershom (1 Chron. vi, 24–28); six were sons of Jeduthun, also called Ethan (1 Chron. xxv, 17), a descendant of Merari (1 Chron. vi, 28); and fourteen were sons of Heman, a descendant of Kohath (1 Chron. vi, 18). Each of these chiefs had eleven assistant masters from his own sons and family. Every twenty-four of them, when they had relieved each other in the solemn service, were known by the name of one of the three great families of Levi: seven were sons of Meacheliah, a descendant of Kohath; thirteen were from Obad-edom, a descendant of Gershom; and four were sons of Hoash, a descendant of Merari. These families, including the twenty-four leaders, consisted of ninety-three members, who, together with the three heads of the families, viz. Meacheliah, Obad-edom, and Hoash, made ninety-six, thus yielding four chief leaders for each course. We thus obtain a watch-course every week of 162 or 168 persons, under the command of four superintendents, one of whom was the commander-in-chief. As 24 sentinel posts are assigned to these guards, thus making 168 a week, it appears that each person only served one day in the week (1 Chron. xxvi).

The Levites lived for the greater part of the year in their own cities, and came up at fixed periods to take their turn of work (1 Chron. xxv, xxvi). The predominance of the number twelve as the basis of classification might seem to indicate monthly periods, and the festivals of the new moon would naturally suggest such an arrangement. The analogous order in the civil and military administration (1 Chron. xxvii, 1) would tend to the same conclusion. It appears, indeed, that there was a change of some kind every week (1 Chron. ix, 25; 2 Chron. xxiv, 4, 6); but this is, of course, compatible with a system of rotation, which would give to each a longer period of residence, or with the permanent residence of the leader of each division within the precincts of the sanctuary. Whatever may have been the system, we must bear in mind that the duties now imposed upon the Levites were such as to require almost continuous practice. They would need, when their turn came, to be able to bear their parts in the great choral hymns of the Temple, and to take each his appointed share in the complex structure of a sacrificial liturgy, and for this a special study would be required. 

The education which the Levites received for their peculiar duties, no less than their connection, more or less intimate, with the schools of the prophets (see above), would tend to make them, so far as there was any education at all, the teachers of the others (there is, however, a curious Jewish tradition that the Nazirites of Israel were of the tribe of Simeon [Solomon. Jarchi on Gen. xlix, 7, in Godwyn's Moses and Aaron], the transcribers and interpreters of the law, the chroniclers of the times in which they lived. We have some striking instances of their appearance in this new character. One of them, Ethan who Ezrathai, takes his title from the old Hebrew sages who were worthy to be compared with Solomon, and (Ps. lxxix, title) he name appears as the writer of the 39th Psalm (1 Kings iv, 31; 1 Chron. xv, 17). One of the first to bear the title of "scribe" is a Levite (1 Chron. xxiv, 6), and this is mentioned as one of their special offices under Josiah (2 Chron. xxxv, 13). They are described as "officers and judges" under David (1 Chron. xxvi, 29), and, as such, are employed "in all the business of Jehovah, and in the service of the king." They are the agents of Je-roboam's successors in their work of civilizing their people and are sent forth to proclaim and enforce the law (2 Chron. xvii, 8; xxxi, 22). Under Josiah the function has passed into a title, and they are "the Levites that taught all Israel" (2 Chron. xxxv, 5). The two books of Chronicles contain remarkable marks of distinction written by men whose interests were all gathered round the services of the Temple, and who were familiar with its records. The materials from which they compiled their narratives, and to which they refer as the works of seers and prophets, were written by men who were probably Levites themselves, or, if not, were associated with them.

This reorganization effected by David, we are told, was adopted by his son Solomon when the Temple was completed (2 Chron. viii, 14, etc.). The revolt of the ten tribes, and the policy pursued by Jeroboam, led to a great change in the position of the Levites. They were the witnesses of an appointed order and of a central worship. Jeroboam wished to make the priests the creatures and instruments of the king, and to establish a provincial and divided worship. The natural result was that they left the cities assigned to them in the territory of Israel and gathered round the metropolis of Judah (2 Chron. xi, 13, 14). Their influence over the people at large was thus diminished, and the design of the Mosaic polity so far frustrated; but their power as a religious class continued, and was enjoyed in narrow limits. In the kingdom of Judah they were from this time forward a powerful body, politically as well as ecclesiastically. They brought with them the prophetic element of influence, in the wider as well as in the higher meaning of the word. We accordingly find them prominent in the war of Abijah against Jeroboam (2 Chron. xiii, 10–12). They are, as before noticed, sent out by Je Rohoashap to instruct and judge the people (2 Chron. xix, 8–10). Prophets of their order encourage the king in his war against Moab and Ammon, and go before his army with their loud baleful vociferations (2 Chron. xx, 21). And join in the triumphant exultation of his return. The apostasy that followed on the marriage of Jehoram and Athaliah exposed them for a time to the dominion of a hostile system; but the services of the Temple appear to have gone on, and the Levites were again conspicuous in the restoration efected by Jehoiada (2 Chron. xxiii), and in restoring the Temple to its former stateliness under Jehoash (2 Chron. xxiv, 5). They shared in the disasters of the reign of Amaziah (2 Chron. xxv, 24) and in the prosperity of Uzziah, and were ready, we may believe, to support the priests, who were able to withstand the opposition of the latter king (2 Chron. xxvi, 17). The closing of the Temple under Ahaz involved the cessation at once of their work and...
of their privileges (2 Chron. xxxviii, 24). Under Hesekiah they again became prominent, as consecrating themselves to the special work of cleaning and repairing the Temple (2 Chron. xxix, 12-15); and the hymns of David and of Asaph were again renewed. In this instance it was thought worthy of special record that there were simply Levites who were more "upright in heart" and zealous in the performance of their priestly functions (2 Chron. xxix, 34); and thus, in that great Passover, they took the place of the unwilling or unprepared members of the priesthood. Their old privileges were restored, they were put forward as teachers (2 Chron. xxx, 22), and the payment of tithes probably had been discontinued under Ahaz, was renewed (2 Chron. xxxi, 4). The genealogies of the tribe were revised (ver. 17), and the old classification kept its ground. The reign of Manasseh was for them, during the greater part of it, a period of depression. That Josiah witnessed a fresh revival and reorganization (2 Chron. xxxiv, 8-18). In the great Passover of his eighteenth year they took their place as teachers of the people, as well as leaders of their worship (2 Chron. xxxiv, 3, 15). Then came the Egyptian and Chaldaean invasions, and the rule of foreign oppressors. The sanctity of the sacred order and the character of its functions showed itself unsatisfactory. The repeated protests of the priest Ezeekielle indicated that they had shared in the idolatry of the people. The prominence into which they had been brought in the reigns of the two reforming kings had apparently tempted them to think that they might enjoy the same prosperity on the special occasions of the priesthood, and the sin of Korah was renewed (Ezek. xlix, 10-14; xlvi, 11). They had, as a penalty of their sin, to witness the destruction of the Temple and to taste the bitterness of exile.

III. After the Captivity.—The position taken by the Levites in the first movements of the return from Babylon indicates that they had cherished the traditions and maintained the practices of their tribe. They, we may believe, were those who were specially called on to sing to their conquerors one of the songs of Zion (De Wette on Ps. cxvii). It is noticeable, however, that in the first body of returning exiles they were present in a disproportionately small number (Ezra ii, 36-42). Those who did come took their old parts at the foundation and dedication of the second Temple (Ezra iii, 10; iv, 18). In the next movement under Ezra their reluctance (whatever may have been its origin) was even more strongly marked. None of them presented themselves at the first great gathering (Ezra viii, 15). The special efforts of Ezra did not succeed in bringing together more than 38, and their place had to be filled by 229 of the Nehemians (v. 20). There was a tradition (Surenhusius, Mishna, Sota, ix, 10) to the effect that, as a punishment for this backwardness, Ezra deprived them of their tithes, and transferred the right to the priests. Those who returned with him resumed their functions (Neh. vii, 7), and those who were most active in that work were foremost also in chanting the hymn-like prayer which appears in Neh. ix as the last great effort of Jewish psalmody. They were recognised in the great national covenant, and the offerings and tithes which were their due were once more solemnly secured to them (Neh. x, 37-39). They took their old places in the Temple and in the villages near Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 29), and are present in full array at the great feast of the Dedication of the Wall. The two prophets who were active in the time of the return, Haggai and Zechariah, if they did not belong to the tribe, helped it forward in the work of restoration. The strongest measures were adopted by Nehemiah, as before by Ezra, to guard the purity of their blood from the contamination of mixed marriages (Ezra x, 25), and they were made the special guardians of the holiness of the Sabbath (Neh. xii, 22). The last prophet of the O.T. sees, as part of his vision of the latter days, the time when the Lord "shall purify the sons of Levi" (Mal. iii, 9).

The guidance of the O.T. fails us at this point, and the history of the Levites in relation to the national life becomes consequently a matter of inference and conjecture. The synagogue worship, then originated, or receiving a new development, was organized irrespectively of them [see SYNAGOGUE]; and thus throughout the whole of Palestine the methods of instruction in the law which they were not connected with. This would tend materially to diminish their peculiar claim on the reverence of the people; but where priests or Levites were present in the synagogue they were still entitled to some kind of precedence, and special sections in the lectionary of the day were assigned to them (Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. on Matt. iv, 26). During the period that followed the captivity they contributed to the formation of the so-called Great Synagogue. The Levites, with the priests, theoretically constituted and practically formed the majority of the permanent Sanhedrin (Maimonides in Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. on Matt. xxvi, 3), and as such had a large share in the administration of justice even in capital cases. In the characteristic feature of this period, as an age of scribes succeeding to an age of prophets, they, too, were likely to be shakers. The constant nature of their historical and religious functions disposed them to attach themselves to the new system as they had done to the old. They accordingly may have been among the scribes and elders who accumulated traditions. They may have attached themselves to the sects of Pharisees and Sadducees. But it is not unlikely as they thus acquired fame and reputation individually, their functions as Levites became subordinate, and they were known simply as the inferior ministers of the Temple. They take no prominent part in the Maccabean struggles, though they must have been present at the great purifications of the Temple.

How strictly during this post-exilic period the Levitical duties were enforced, and how severely any neglect in performing them was punished, may be gathered from the following description in the Mishna: "The Levites had to guard twenty-four places: five were stationed at the five gates of the Mountain of the House (יִירָעָה יִירָעָה), four at the four corners inside, five at the five gates of the outer court, four at its four corners inside, one at the sacrificial storehouse, one at the curtain depository, and one behind the holy of holies. The inspector of the Mountain of the House went round through all the guards [every night] with burning torches before him. If the guard did not immediately stand up, the inspector of the Mountain of the House called out to him, 'Peace be with thee'; but if he perceived that he was asleep, he struck him with his stick, and even had the liberty of setting his garments on fire; and when it was asked, 'What is that noise in the court?' they were told, 'It is the noise of a Levite who is beaten, or whose clothes have been burnt, because he slept when on duty' (Middoth, i, 1, 2). It is thought that allusion is made to the fact in the Apocalypse when it is said "Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments" (Rev. xvi, 15). As for the Levites who were the singers, they were summoned by the blast of the trumpet after the incense was kindled upon the altar, when they assembled from all parts of the spacious Temple at the orchestra which was joined to the fifteen steps at the entrance from the women's outer court to the men's outer court. They sung psalms of thanksgiving and songs, accompanied by three musical instruments—the harp, the cithern, and cymbals—while the priests were pouring out on the altar the libation of wine. On Sunday they sang Ps. xxiv, on Monday Ps. xxviii, on Tuesday Ps. lxx, on Wednesday Ps. civ, on Thursday Ps. lxx, on Friday Ps. xcvii, and on Saturday Ps. sabath Ps. xcvii. Each of these psalms was sung in nine sections, with eight pauses (יִרָעָה יִרָעָה), and at each pause the priests blew trombones, when the whole congregation fell down every time worshipping on their faces (Talmud, vii, 3, 4).
The Levites had no prescribed canonical dress like the priests, as may be seen from the fact which Josephus narrates, that the singers requested Agrippa "to assemble the Sanhedrim in order to obtain leave for them to wear linen garments like the priests... contrary to the law" (Ant. xx. 6). Though they wore no official garments at the service, yet the Talmud says that they ordinarily wore a linen outer-garment with sleeves, and a head-dress; and on journeys were provided with a staff, a pocket, and a copy of the Pentateuch (Joma, 122, a). Some modifications were at this period introduced in what was considered the necessary qualification for service. The Mosaic law, it will be remembered, regarded age as the only qualification, and freed the Levite from his duties when he was fifty years old; now that singing constituted so essential a part of the Levitical duties, any Levite who had not a good voice was regarded as disqualified, and if he continued good and melodious, he was retained in service all his lifetime, irrespective of age, but if he failed he was removed from that class which constituted the choristers to the gate-keepers (Maimonides, Hilchot Kele Ha-Mikdash, iii, 8). During the period of mourning a Levite was exempt from his duties in the Temple. The Levites appear but seldom in the history of the N.T. Where we meet with their names it is as the type of a formal, heartless worship, without sympathy and without love (Luke x, 29). The same parable in its moral aspect could only become a reality when it had been transferred to a new setting (see Josh. xxii 1 Chron. vii—one of the great stations at which they and the priests resided (Lightfoot, Cent. Chorographe, c. 47). In John i, 19 they appear as delegates of the Jews—that is, of the Sanhedrim—coming to inquire into the credentials of the Baptist, and giving utterance to their own Messianic expectations. The mention of a Levite of Cyprus in Acts iv, 36, shows that the changes of the previous century had carried that tribe also into "the dispersed among the Gentiles." The conversion of Barnabas and Mark was probably no solitary instance of the reception by them of the new faith, which was the fulfilment of the old. If "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith" (Acts vi, 7), it is not too bold to believe that their influence may have led Levites to follow their example; and thus the old psalms, and possibly also the old chants of the Temple service, might be transmitted through the agency of those who had been specially trained in them to be the inheritance of the Christian Church. Later on, in the history of the first century, when the Temple had received its final completion under the younger Agrippa, we find a great development of the engagement and new movement with that strange unconsciousness of a coming doom which so often marks the last stage of a decaying system, the singers of the Temple thought it a fitting time to apply for the right of wearing the same linen garment as the priests, and persuaded the king that the concession of this privilege would be the glory of his reign (Joseph. Ant. xx. 8, 6). The other Levites at the same time asked for and obtained the privilege of joining in the Temple choruses, from which hitherto they had been excluded. The destruction of the Temple so soon after had deprived the object of their desires came as with a grim irony to sweep away their occupation, and so to deprive them of every vestige of that which had distinguished them from other Israelites. They were merged in the crowd of captives that were scattered over the Roman world, and disappear from the stage of history. The rabbinc schools, that rose out of the ruins of the Jewish polity, fostered a studied and habitual depreciation of the Levitical order as compared with their own teachers (M'Caul, Old Paths, p. 450). Individual families, it may be, cherished the tradition that their fathers, as priests or Levites, had taken part in the services of the Temple. If their claims were recognised, they received the old marks of reverence in the worship of the synagogue (comp., the Regulations of the Great Synagogue of London, in Margoliouth's Hist. of the Jews in Great Britain, iii, 270), took precedence in reading the lessons of the day (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. on Matt. iv, 23), and pronounced the blessing at the close (Barang, Hist. des Juifs, vi, 790). Their existence was acknowledged in some of the laws of the Christian emperors (Constantine, Juv. l.c.). The repeated mise en scène of these recollections is shown in the prevalence of the names (Cohen, and Levita or Levy) which imply that those who bear them are the sons of Aaron or the tribe of Levi, and in the custom which exempted the first-born of priestly or Levitical families from the payments which he was required, in the case of others, as the redemption of the first-born (Leo of Modena, in Piscin. Cerimoniae Religiosae, i, 26; Allen's Modern Judaism, p. 297). In the mean time, the old name had acquired a new significatio. The early writers of the Christian Church applied to the later hierarchy the language of the elder, and gave to the bishops and presbyters the title (ipote) that had belonged to the sons of Aaron, while the deacons were habitually spoken of as Levites (Suicer, Thes. s. v. Alevr). Though the destruction of the Temple and the dispersion of the Jews have necessarily done away with the Levitical duties which were strictly local, yet the Levites, like the priests, still exist, have to this day certain functions to perform, and continue to enjoy certain privileges and immunities. On such festivals whereon the priests pronounce the benediction on the congregation of Israel, which may be done by the man of God in Numb. vi, 22–27, the Levites have "to wait on the priests," and wash their hands prior to the giving of the said blessing. At the reading of the law in the synagogue, the Levite is called to the second section, the first being assigned to the priest. See Haphtarah. Moreover, like the priests, the Leviites are exempt from redeeming their first-born, and this exception even extends to women of the tribe of Levi who marry Israelites, i. e. Jews of any other tribe. IV. Literature.—Mishna, Erubin, ii, 3–6; Tamid, viii, 3, 4; Succa, v, 4; Bikkurim, iii, 4; Maimonides, Jos. Hah. Cherusk, Hilchot Kele Ha-Mikdash, iii, 1–11; Michael of, Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, sec. 52 (English translation, i, 225 sq.); Bahr, Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus, ii, 5, 89, 165, 342, 428; Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel von der Zeit der Blasburg bis zum ersten Tempel, p. 162, 204, 387–842 (Bruna 1847); the same, Geschichte des Volkes Israel von der Vollendung des zweiten Tempel, i, 55–58, 63–66, 141 (Nordhausen, 1855); Salachtz, Das Mosaische Recht, i, 93–106 (Berlin 1865); the same, A Räthschlage der Hebräer, vol. ii, ch. lxviii, p. 842 (Königstein 1865); Kühn, Geschichte des Hebräischen Volkes (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1858); Kalisch, Historical and Critical Commentary on Genesis, p. 735–744 (London 1848); Brown, Antiquities, i, 301–347; Godwyn, Moses and Aaron, i, 5; Vitusian, Dissert. II. de Theocrate. Israelita.; Jennings, Antículos, p. 184–205; Carpove, Aequipar. Crit. (see Index); Sautier, Comm. de Sucerdot. et sacris Hebr. personar. in Opp. p. 283 sq.; Gramberg, Krüt, Geschichte d. Religionismen des Alten Test, vol. i, ii; Re- land, Antiq. Sacri, ii, 6; Ugolino, Sucerdot. Hebr. ch. xii, in his Theodr., vol. xiii; Schacht, Antículo, ii, 377 sq.; Other Lex. Rab. p. 868 sq.; Willisch, Deulia Levitarum (Lips. 1708). Levites, Military, a name given to such ministers in the time of the Commonwealth as filled the office of chaplain in the regiments of the Parliamentary army. Levit'ious, so called in the Vulgate from treating chiefly of the Levitical service; in the Heb. levit'is, and he called, being the word with which it begins; in the Sept. Artavüeáv; the third book of the Pentateuch, called also by the later Jews levat'is, "law of the priests," and ἱεραδική ἀρχή, "law of offerings." In our treatment of it we have especial regard to the various sacrifices enumerated.
1. Contents.—Leviticus contains the further statement and development of the Mosaic legislation, the beginnings of which are described in Exodus. It exhibits the 

historical progress of this legislation; consequently, we must not expect to find the laws detailed in it in a systematic form. There is, nevertheless, a certain order observed, which arose from the nature of the subject, and of which the plan may easily be perceived. The whole is intimately connected with the contents of 

Exodus, at the conclusion of which book that sanctuary is described with which all external worship was connected 

(Exod. xxxv-xl).

Leviticus begins by describing the worship itself (ch. i—vii). It concludes with pastoral legislation and exhortations as to the worshippers (ch. xviii—xxvii). More specifically the book may be divided into seven leading sections.

(I.) The Laws directly relating to Sacrifices (ch. i—vii).

At first God spoke to the people out of the thunder and lightning of Sinai, and gave them his holy com-

mandments by the hand of a mediator; but henceforth his presence is to dwell not on the secret top of Sinai, but in the midst of his people, both in their wanderings 

through the wilderness and afterwards in the Land of Promise. Henceforward, therefore, the sacrificial wor-

ship of the people is conducted under Moses. The offerings which Moses receives after the work is finished have reference to the offerings which were to be brought to the door of the tabernacle, As Jehovah draws near to the people in the tabernacle, so the people draw near to Jehovah in the offering. Without offerings none may approach him. The offering is the act of presentation and of dedication. It is the sacrifices and the priests, the people and the sanctuary, which are for Jehovah's altar; the sacrifices and the priests, the people (ch. iv—vii). Last of all, when a man lies and swears falsely concerning which he was intrusted to him, etc. (verses 20—26). This decalogue, like the preceding one, has its characteristic words and expressions. The prominent word which introduces so many of the enactments is "therefore," "as Jehovah," etc. (verses 1—27; v. 1, 2, 4, 15, 17, 19, 20, and the phrase, "If a soul shall hear," iv. 2), is, in almost all 

verses 20—26). This decalogue, like the preceding one, has its characteristic words and expressions. The promi-

nent word which introduces so many of the enactments is "therefore," "as Jehovah," etc. (verses 1—27; v. 1, 2, 4, 15, 17, 19, 20, and the phrase, "If a soul shall hear," iv. 2), is, in almost all variations having an equivalent meaning, the distinctive phrase of the section. As in the former decalogue the nature of the offerings, so in this the person and the nature of the offering are the chief features in the several statutes.

3. Naturally upon the law of sacrifices follows the law of the priests' duties when they offer the sacrifices (ch. vii, viii). Hence we find Moses directed to address himself immediately to Aaron and his sons (vi. 2, 18 = vi. 9, 28, A.V.). In this group the various kinds of offerings are to be offered in nearly the same order as in the first two preceding decalogues, except that the offering at the consecration of a priest follows, instead of the thank-

offering, immediately after the meat-offering, which it resembles, and the thank-offering now appears after the trespass-offering. There are, therefore, in all, six kinds of offering, and in the case of each of these the priest has his distinct duties. Bertheau has very ingeniously so 

distributed the enactments in which these duties are prescribed as to arrange them all in five decalogues. We will briefly indicate his arrangement.

(1.) The first decalogue. (a.) "This is the law of the burnt-offering" (vi. 9, A.V.), in five enactments, each verse (vers. 9-18) containing a separate enactment. (b.) "And this is the law of the meat-offering" (verse 14), again in five enactments, each of which is, as before, contained in a single verse (verse 14—18).

(2.) The second decalogue is contained in verses 19—20, (a.) Ver. 19 is merely introductory; then follow, in five verses, five distinct directions with regard to the offering at the time of the consecration of the priests, the first in verse 20, the next two in verse 21, the fourth in the for-

mer part of verse 22, and the last part of it in verse 22 and ver. 23. (b.) "This is the law of the sin-offer-

ning" (verse 25). Then the five enactments, each in one verse, except that two verses (27, 28) are given to the third.

(3.) The third decalogue is contained in ch. vii, 1—10, the laws of the trespass-offering. But it is impossible
to avoid a miscasting as to the soundness of Bertheau's system when we find him making the words "It is most holy," in verse 1, the first of the ten enactments. This he is obliged to do, as verses 2 and 4 evidently form but one.

(4.) The fourth decalogue, after an introductory verse (verse 11), is contained in ten verses (verses 12-21).

(5.) The last decalogue consists of certain general laws about the fat, the blood, the wave-bread, etc., and is comprised again in ten verses (verses 23-30), the verses, as before, marking the divisions.

The chapter closes with a brief historical notice of the fact that these several commands were given to Moses on Mount Sinai (verse 38-39).

(II.) An entirely historical section (chap. viii-x), in three parts. 1. In chap. viii we have the account of the consecration of Aaron and his sons by Moses before the world. The order of the high-priestly vestments and anointed with the holy oil; his sons also are arrayed in their garments, and the various offerings appointed are offered. 2. In chap. ix Aaron offers, eight days after his consecration, his first offering for himself and the people: this comprises for himself a sin- and burnt-offering, and a peace-offering. He blesses the people, and fire comes down from heaven and consumes the burnt-offering. 3. Ch. x tells how Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, eager to enjoy the privileges of their new office, and perhaps too anxious for its dignity, forgot or despised the restrictions by which it was surrounded (Exod. xxix, 7, etc.), and, daring to "offer strange fire before Jehovah," perished because of their presumption.

With the house of Aaron began this wickedness in the sanctuary; with them, therefore, began also the divine punishment. Very touching is the story which follows. Aaron, though forbidden to mourn his loss (ver. 6, 7), will not eat the sin-offering in the holy place; and when rebuked by Moses, pleads in his defence, "Such things have befallen me: and if I had eaten the sin-offering to-day, should it have been accepted in the sight of Jehovah?" Moses, the lawgiver; he arranges the plea, and honors the natural feelings of the father's heart, even when it leads to a violation of the letter of the divine commandment.

(III.) The laws concerning purity and impurity, and the appropriate sacrifices and ordinances for putting away impurity (chap. xii-xvi). The first seven decalogues were but an outline to the present section. By the appointed sacrifices the separation between man and God was healed. The next seven concern themselves with the putting away of impurity. That chap. xii-xv hang together so as to form one series of laws there can be no doubt. Besides that they treat of kindred subjects, they have their characteristic words, נמוד, "unclean," "uncleanness," נזוד, נזוד, "clean," which occur in almost every verse. The only question is about ch. xvi, which by its opening is connected immediately with the occurrence related in ch. x. Historically it would seem, therefore, that ch. xvi ought to have followed ch. x. As this order is neglected, it would lead to all the other historical arrangement than that of historical sequence has been adopted. This we find in the solemn significance of the great day of atonement. The high-priest on that day made atonement "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins" (xvi, 16), and he "reconciled the holy place and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar" (ver. 20). Delivered from their guilt and cleansed from their pollutions, from that day forward the children of Israel entered upon a new and holy life. This was typified both by the ordinance that the bullock and the goat for the sin-offerings should be burnt without the camp (ver. 27), and also by the sending away of the goat laden with the iniquities of the people into the wilderness. Hence ch. xvi seems to stand most fitting at the end of this second group of seven decalogues. It has reference, we believe, not only (as Bertheau supposes) to the putting away, as by one solemn act, of all those uncleannesses mentioned in ch. xi-xv, and for which the various expiations and cleansings there appointed were temporary and insufficient, but also to the making of atonement, in the sense of hiding sin or putting away its guilt. For not only do we find the idea of cleansing as from defilement, but far more prominently the idea of reconciliation. The often-repeated word "be, to cover, to stone," is the great word of the section.

1. The first decalogue in this group refers to clean and unclean (chap. xi). Five classes of animals are pronounced unclean. The first four enactments determine what animals may or may not be eaten, whether (1) beasts of the earth (ver. 2-8), or (2) fishes (ver. 9-12), or (3) birds (verse 18-20), or (4) creeping things with wings. The next four are intended to guard against pollution by contact with the carcass of any of these animals: (5) ver. 24-26; (6) ver. 27, 28; (7) ver. 29-38; (8) verse 39-40. The ninth and tenth specify the last class of animals which are unclean for food, (9) ver. 41, 42, and forbid any other kind of pollution by means of them, (10) ver. 43-44. Verse 45 and 46 are merely a concluding sentence.

2. (a.) Women's purification in childbed (chap. xii). The whole of this chapter, according to Bertheau, constitutes (1) the first law of this decalogue. (b.) The remaining nine are to be found in the next chapter (xiii), which treats of the various leprosements: (1) ver. 1-8; (2) ver. 9-17; (4) ver. 18-23; (5) ver. 24-28; (6) ver. 29-37; (7) ver. 38, 39; (8) ver. 40, 41; (9) ver. 42-46; (10) ver. 47-55. This arrangement of the several sections is not altogether free from objection, but it is certainly supported by the characteristic mode in which each section opens. Thus, for instance, ch. xii, 2 begins with לָּנִּים "to wash"; ch. xiii, 2 with לָּנִּים לָּנִּים לָּנִּים, ver. 9 with לָּנִּים לָּנִּים לָּנִּים, and so on, the same order being always observed, the substantive being placed first, then יַעֲם, and then the verb, except only in ver. 42, where the substantive is placed after the verb.

3. The law of the leper in the day of his cleansing, i.e. the law which the priest is to observe in purifying the leper (xiv-152). The priest is mentioned in ten verses, each of which begins one of the ten sections of this law: ver. 8, 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20. In each instance the word יְבַטְחָה is preceded by 1 consecut. with the perf. It is true that in verse 8, and also in verse 14, the word יְבַטְחָה occurs twice; but in both verses there is MS. authority, as well as that of the Vulg. and Arab. versions, for the absence of the second. Verses 21-215 may be regarded as a supplemental provision in cases where the leper is too poor to bring the required offering.

4. The leprosy in a house (xiv, 16-37). It is not so easy here to trace the arrangement noticed in so many other laws. There are no characteristic words or phrases to guide us. Bertheau's division is as follows: (1) ver. 84, 85; (2) ver. 86, 87; (3) ver. 88; (4) ver. 89; (5) ver. 40; (6) ver. 41; (7) ver. 42-45. Then, as usual, follows a short summary which closes the statute concerning leprosy, ver. 54-57.

5. The law of uncleanness by issue, etc., in two decalogues (xv, 1-15; xv, 16-31). The division is clearly marked, as Bertheau observes, by the form of the law: "the law of cleansing, which is so exactly similar in the principal cases, and which closes each series: (1) ver. 13-15; (2) ver. 28-30. We again give his arrangement, though we do not profess to regard it as in all respects satisfactory.

(a.) (ver. 2, 3, 8; (2) ver. 4; (3) ver. 5; (4) ver. 6; (5) ver. 7; (6) ver. 81; (7) ver. 9; (8) ver. 10; (9) ver. 11, 12 [these Bertheau considers as one enactment, because it is another way of saying that either the unclean or thing which the unclean person touches is unclean;
but, on the same principle, verses 4 and 5 might just as well form one ensmnt: [10] ver. 13-15.

(1) ver. 5; (2) ver. 7; (3) ver. 18; (4) ver. 19; (5) ver. 20; (6) ver. 21; (7) ver. 22; (8) ver. 23; (9) ver. 24; (10) ver. 28-30. In order to complete this arrangement, he considers ver. 25-27 as a kind of supplementary enactment provided for an irregular uncleanness, leaving it as quite uncertain, however, whether it was a later addition or not. Verses 32 and 33 form merely the same general conclusion which we have had in vix. 54-57.

7. The last decalogue of the second group of seven decalogues is to be found in chap. xvi, which treats of the good day of atonement. The law itself is contained in verses 1-30 of the preceding version. The law is an exhortation to its careful observance. In the act of atonement three persons are concerned: the high-priest, in this instance Aaron; the man who leads away the goat for Azazel into the wilderness; and he who burns the skin, flesh, and dung of the bullock and goat of the sin-offering without the camp. The last two have special purification assigned them—the second because he has touched the goat laden with the guilt of Israel, the third because he has come in contact with the sin-offering. The ninth and tenth enactments prescribe what purificatory sacrifices each of them concerning themselves shall make; formula, נבך נבך הירש ירוח נבך נבך, and hence distinguished from each other. The duties of Aaron, consequently, ought, if the division into decades is correct, to be comprised in eight enactments. Now the name of Aaron is repeated eight times, and in six of these it is preceded by the prep. ולconc., as we observed was the case before when "the priest" was the prominent figure. According to this, then, the decalogue will stand thus: (1) Verse 2, Aaron not to enter the holy place at all times; (2) verses 3-5, with what sacrifices and in what dress Aaron is to enter the holy place; (3) verses 6, 7, Aaron to offer the bullock for himself, and to net the two goats before Jehovah; (4) Aaron to cast lots on the two goats; (5) verses 9, 10, Aaron to offer the goat on which the lot falls for Jehovah, and to send away the goat for Azazel into the wilderness; (6) verses 11-19, Aaron to sprinkle the blood both of the bullock and of the goat to make atonement for himself, for his house, and for the whole congregation, as also to purify the altar of incense with the blood; (7) verses 20-22, Aaron to lay his hands on the living goat, and confess over all it the sins of the children of Israel; (8) verses 23-25, Aaron after this to take off his linen garments, bathe himself, and put on his priestly garments, and then offer his burnt-offering and sin-offering in -one (9) by which the goat is sent into the wilderness to purify himself; (10) verses 27-28, what is to be done by him who burns the sin-offering without the camp.

(IV.) Laws chiefly intended to mark the separation between Israel and the Heathen Nations (chap. xvii.-xx).—We here reach the great central point of the book. All going before was but a preparation for this. Two great truths have been established: first, that God can only be approached by means of appointed sacrifices; next, that man in nature and life is full of pollution, which must be cleansed. Now a third is taught, viz., that not by several cleansing, for several sins and pollutions can guilt be put away. The several acts of sin are but so many manifestations of the sinful nature. For this, therefore, also must atonement be made by one solem act, which shall cover all transgressions, and turn away God's righteous displeasure from Israel. Israel is now removed from the idolatry of the Canaanites, and in all that shall be the sin-offering offered, it is to enter upon a new life. It is a separate nation, sanctified and set apart for the service of God. It may not, therefore, do after the abominations of the heathen by whom it is surrounded. Here, consequently, we find those laws and ordinances which especially distinguish the nation of Israel from all other nations of the earth.

Here again we may trace, as before, a group of seven decalogues; but the several decalogues are not so clearly marked, nor are the characteristic phrases and the introductions and conclusions so common. In ch. xviii there are twenty enactments, and in chap. xix thirty. In ch. xvi, on the other hand, there are only six, and in ch. xx there are fourteen. As it is quite manifest that the enactments in ch. xvi are entirely separate, and have no introduction from those in ch. xvii, Bertheau, in order to preserve the usual arrangement of the laws in decalogues, would transpose this chapter, and place it after ch. xix. He observes that the laws in ch. xvii, and those in chap. xvi, i-9, are plain to one another, and may very well constitute a single decalogue, and, what is of more importance, that the words in xvi, i-5 form the natural introduction to this whole group of laws: "And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, I am Jehovah your God. After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do; and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do; neither shall ye walk in their ordinances." etc. There is, however, a point of connection between chapters xvii and xviii which must not be overlooked. It seems to indicate that their position in our present text is the right one. All the six enactments in chap. xvii (vers. 8-5, vers. 6, 7, vers. 8, 9, vers. 10-12, vers. 13, 14, vers. 15) bear upon the nature and meaning of the sacrifice to Jehovah as compared with the sacrifices offered to false gods. It would be wise, therefore, to think that it was necessary to guard against any license to idolatrous practices which might possibly be drawn from the sending of the goat for Azazel into the wilderness [see Atonement, Day of], especially, perhaps, against the Egyptian custom of appeasing the evil spirit of the wilderness and averting his malice (Hengstenberg, Mose u. Jüd. u. Jüd., p. 179; Moors, J. H. Müller, i, 389). To this there may be an allusion in vers. 7. Perhaps, however, it is better and more simple to regard the enactments in these two chapters (with Bunsen, ci. 2.6, ii, i, 245) as directed against two prevalent heathen practices, the eating of blood and fornication. It is remarkable, as showing how intimately moral and ritual observances were blended together in the Jewish mind, that abstinance "from blood and things strangled, and fornication," was laid down by the apostles as the only condition of communion to be required of Gentiles converted to Christianity. But the rendering of the A.V. in vers. 11, "for it is the blood that maketh atonement for the soul," should be, "for it is the blood that maketh atonement by means of the life." This is all-important. It is not blood merely as such, but blood as having in it the principle of life that God accepts in sacrifice; for, by thus giving vicariously the life of the dumb animal, the sinner confesses that his own life is forfeit.

In ch. xvi, after the introduction to which we have already alluded, vers. 1-5, and in which God claims obedience on the double ground that he is Israel's God, and that to keep his commandments is life (ver. 5)—there follow twenty enactments concerning unlawful marriages and unnatural lusts. The first ten are contained in one in each verse (vers. 6-15). The next ten range themselves in like manner with the verses, except that verses 17 and 23 contain each two. Of the twenty the first fourteen are alike in form, as well as in the repeated פָּרָשָׁה נָשַׁ֫עְבֹּר. In chap. xix are three decalogues, introduced by the words, "Ye shall be holy, for I Jehovah your God am holy," and each of them contains, in addition, the statutes, and all my judgments, and do them. I am Jehovah." The laws here are of a very mixed character, and many of them a repetition merely of previous laws. Of the three decalogues, the first is comprised in verses 8-14, and may be thus distributed: (1) verse 8, to be holy; (2) vers. 9-11, to be pure in heart and father and mother; (3) vers. 12-14, to keep the Sabbath; (4) ver. 4, not to turn to idols; (4) ver. 4, not to make mol-
cated Bertheau's groups, and then append some general observations on this whole section.

a. Chapter xxvi, ten laws, as follows: (1) ver. 1-3; (2) ver. 4; (3) ver. 5-6; (4) ver. 7-8; (5) ver. 9; (6) ver. 10, 11; (7) ver. 12, (8) ver. 13-14; (9) ver. 17-21; (10) ver. 22, 23. The five first laws concern all the priests; the sixth to the high-priest; the ninth and tenth, the effects of bodily blemish in particular; the eleventh to the is hired, etc.

b. Chap. xxvi, 1-16. (1) ver. 2; (2) ver. 8; (3) ver. 4; (4) ver. 4-7; (5) ver. 8, 9; (6) ver. 10; (7) ver. 11; (8) ver. 12; (9) ver. 13; (10) ver. 14-16.

c. Chap. xxvi, 17-38. (1) ver. 18-20; (2) ver. 21; (3) ver. 22; (4) ver. 24; (5) ver. 25; (6) ver. 27; (8) ver. 29; (9) ver. 30; (10) ver. 30; and a general conclusion in verse 31-38.

d. Chap. xxvii. (1) verse 3; (2) verse 5-7; (3) verse 8; (4) verse 9-14; (5) verse 15-21; (6) verse 22; (7) verse 24, 25; (8) verse 27-52; (9) verse 54, 55; (10) verse 56; verses 37, 38 contain the conclusion, or general summarizing, of the Decalogue. On the remainder of the chapter, as well as chapter xxiv, see below.

e. Chap. xxvii, 1-22. (1) verse 2; (2) verse 3-4; (3) verse 5; (4) verse 6; (5) verse 8-10; (6) verse 11, 12; (7) verse 18; (8) verse 19-22; (9) verse 23; (10) verse 16; with a concluding formula in verse 18-22.

f. Chap. xxvii, 23-38. (1) verse 23, 24; (2) verse 25; (3) verse 26, 27; (4) verse 28; (5) verse 29; (6) verse 30; (7) verse 31; (8) verse 32, 33; (9) verse 34; (10) verse 35-57; the conclusion to the whole in verse 38.

g. Chap. xxviii, 1. (1) verse 39; (2) verse 40-42; (3) verse 43; (4) verse 44, 45; (5) verse 46; (6) verse 47-49; (7) verse 50; (8) verse 51, 52; (9) verse 53; (10) verse 54.

It will be observed that the above arrangement is only completed by omitting the latter part of chapter xxiii and the whole of chapter xxiv. But it is clear that chapter xxiii, 39-44 is an addition, containing further instructions respecting the Feast of Tabernacles. Verse 39, as compared with verse 34, shows that the same feast is referred to; while verse 37, 38 are no less manifestly the original conclusion of the laws respecting the feasts which are enumerated in the previous part of the chapter. Chapter xxiv, again, has a peculiar character of its own. First, we have a command concerning the oil to be used in the lamps belonging to the tabernacle, but this is only a repetition of an enactment already given in Exod. xxvi, 20, 21, which seems to be its natural place. Then follow directions respecting the feasts which have occurred previously. In Exod. the shebaverde is spoken of always as a matter of course, concerning which no regulations are necessary (comp. Exod. xxv, 30; xxxv, 15; xxxix, 30). Lastly come certain enactments arising out of a historical occurrence. The son of an Egyptian father by an Israelitish mother, who, according to chapter xxiii, 39, 40, took the name of Jehovah, and Moses is commanded to stone him in consequence; and this circumstance is the occasion of the following laws being given: (1) That a blasphemer, whether Israelite or stranger, is to be stoned (comp. Exod. xxv, 39); (2) That he that kills any man shall surely be put to death (comp. Exod. xxi, 12-27); (3) That he that kills a beast shall make it good (not found where we might have expected it, in the series of laws Exod. xxi, 28-xxii, 16); (4) That if a man cause a blemish in his neighbor he shall be required in like manner (comp. Exod. xxii, 22-26). (5) We have then a repetition in an inverse order of verses 17, 18; and (6) the injunction that there shall be one law for the stranger and the Israelite; (7) lastly, a brief notice of the infliction of the punishment in the case of the son of Shelomith, who blasphemed. Not another instance is to be found in the whole collection in which any historical circumstance is made the occasion of enacting a law. Then, again, the laws (2), (3), (4), (5), are mostly repetitions of existing laws, and seem here to have no connection with the event to which they are referred. Either, therefore, in other circumstances there is no place at the same time with which we are not acquainted, or these isolated laws, detached from their proper connec-
tion, were grouped together here, in obedience perhaps to some traditional association.

(VII) These decalogues are now fitly closed by words of promise and threat—promise of largest, richest blessing to those that hearken unto and do these commandments; threats of utter destruction to those that break the covenant of their God. Thus the second great division of the Pentateuch closes like the first part, or Book of the Covenant, ends (Exod. xxiii, 20-33) with promises of blessing only. There is nothing said of the judgments which are to follow transgression, because as yet the covenant had not been made. But when once the nation had freely entered into that covenant, they bound themselves to accept its sanctions, its penalties, as well as its rewards. Nor can we wonder if in these sanctions the punishment of transgression holds a larger place than the rewards of obedience; for already it was but too plain that "Israel would not obey." From the first they were a stiff-necked and rebellious race, and from the first the doom of disobedience hung like a fiery sword over their heads.

(VII) On Vows.—The legislation is evidently completed in the last words of the preceding chapter: "These are the statutes, and judgments, and laws which Jehovah made between him and the children of Israel in Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses." Chap. xxvii is an appendix, again closed, however, by a similar formula, which at least shows that the transcriber considered it as an integral part of the original Mosaic legislation. This ought to be kept in view when we come to apply the law to a case in which he undertakes to grant them a fellowship in Christ, and to the end of the book. Bertheau classes it with the other less regularly grouped laws at the beginning of the book of Numbers. He treats the section Lev. xxvii—Num. x, 10 as a series of supplements to the Sinaitic legislation.

II. Integrity.—This is very generally admitted. These critics even who are in favor of different documents in the Pentateuch assign nearly the whole of this book to one writer, the Elohist, or author of the original document. According to Knobel, the only portions which are not to be referred to the Elohist are—Moses's rebuke of Aaron because the goat of the sin-offering had been burned (xv, 16-20); the group of laws in chap. xvii—xx; certain additional enactments respecting the Sabbath and the feasts of Weeks and of Tabernacles (xxiii, part of ver. 2, from לול י וליאנ וליאנ, and ver. 3, ver. 18, 19, 22, 29, 44); the punishments ordained for blasphemy, murder, etc. (xxiv, 10-23), the directions respecting the sabbatical year (xxv, 18-22), and the promises of prosperity in ch. xxvi. With regard to the section ch. xvii—xx, Knobel does not consider the whole of it to have been borrowed from the same sources. Ch. xvii he believes was introduced here by the Jehovahist from some ancient document, while he admits, nevertheless, that it contains certain Elohistic forms of expression, as מזא 32, "all flesh," ver. 14, מזא, "soul" (in the sense of "person), ver. 10-12, מזא, "beast," ver. 18, מזא, "offering," ver. 4, מזא, "a sweet savor," verse 6, "a statute forever, same after your generations," ver. 7. But it cannot be said from this that he argues, but he would have placed it after ch. vii, or at least after ch. xv; (b) he would not have repeated the prohibition of blood, etc., which he had already given; (c) he would have taken a more favorable view of his nation than that implied in ver. 7: and, lastly, (d) the phraseology has something of the coloring of ch. xviii—xx and xxvi, which are certainly not Elohistic. Such reasons are too transparently unsatisfactory to need serious discussion. He observes further that the chapter is not altogether Mosaic. The first enactment (ver. 1-7) does indeed apply only to Israelites, but it is not comparable to the chapter of Moses which the author has before him. (a) He would have placed it after ch. vii, or at least after ch. xv; (b) he would not have repeated the prohibition of blood, etc., which he had already given; (c) he would have taken a more favorable view of his nation than that implied in ver. 7: and, lastly, (d) the phraseology has something of the coloring of ch. xviii—xx and xxvi, which are certainly not Elohistic. Such reasons are too transparently unsatisfactory to need serious discussion. He observes further that the chapter is not altogether Mosaic. The first enactment (ver. 1-7) does indeed apply only to Israelites, but it is not comparable to the chapter of Moses which the author has before him. But the remaining three contemplate the case of strangers living among the people, and have a reference to all time. Ch. xvii—xx, though they have a Jehovahistic coloring, cannot have been originally from the Jehovahist. The following peculiarities of language, which are worthy of notice, according to Knobel (Exod. und Leviticus erläutert, in the "Kurzg. Eexg. HLbuch." 1857), forbid such a supposition, the more so as they occur nowhere else in the O.T.: לול, "lie down to" and "gender," xviii, 28; xix, 19, xx, 16, מזא, "confusion," xviii, 23, xx, 12, מזא; מזא, "gather," xix, 9, xxiii, 22, מזא, "grapes," xix, 10, מזא, "near kinswomen," xviii, 17, מזא; מזא, "scourged," xix, 20, מזא, "free," מזא, "print marks," xix, 28, מזא, "who intend to be circumcised," and מזא, "uncircumcised," as applied to fruit-trees, xix, 29; and מזא, "born," xviii, 9, 11; as well as the Egyptian word (for such it probably is מזא) "garment of divers sorts," which, however, does occur once beside in Deut. xxii, 11.

According to Bunsen, chap. xix is a genuine part of the Mosaic legislation, given, however, in its original form, not on Sinai, but on the east side of the Jordan; while the general arrangement of the Mosaic laws may perhaps be as late as the time of the judges. He regards it as a very ancient document, based on the Two Tables, of which, and especially of the first, it is, in fact, an extension, consisting of two decalogues and one peninsula of laws. The composition in it is he concludes from the supposing that the people were already settled in the land (ver. 9, 10, 13, 15), while, on the other hand, ver. 23 supposes a future occupation of the land. Hence he concludes that the revision of this document by the transcribers was incomplete, whereas all the passages may fairly be interpreted as looking forward to a future settlement in Canaan. The great simplicity and lofty moral character of this section compel us, says Bunsen, to refer it at least to the earlier time of the judges, if not to that of Joshua himself.

III. Authorship etc.—Some critics, however, such as De Wette, Gramberg, Vatke, and others, have strenuously endeavored to prove that the laws contained in Leviticus originated in a period much later than is usually supposed; but the following observations sufficiently support their Mosaic origin, and show that the whole of Leviticus is historically genuine, and that it contains not only a real L or Levitical part, but an even earlier L or Levitical part. The L or Levitical part contains manifest vestiges of the Mosaic period. Here, as well as in Exodus, when the priests are mentioned, Aaron and his sons are named; as, for instance, in chap. i, 4, 7, 8, 11, etc. The tabernacle is the sanctuary, and the other promises of worship are made to come anywhere (i, 3; iii, 8, 13, etc.). The Israelites are always described as a congregation (iv, 13 sq.), under the command of the elders of the congregation (iv, 16), or of a ruler (iv, 22). Everything has reference to life in a camp, and that camp commanded by Moses (iv, 15, 21; vi, 11; xiv, 8; xv, 26, 28). A later writer could scarcely have placed himself so entirely in the times, and so completely adopted the modes of thinking of the time of Moses; especially if, as has been asserted, these laws gradually sprung from the usages of the people, and were written down at a later period with the object of sanctioning them by the authority of Moses. They so entirely befit the Mosaic age that, in order to adapt them to the requirements of any later period, they must have undergone some modification, accommodation, and a peculiar mode of interpretation. This inconvenience could have been avoided by a person who intended to forge laws in favor of the later modes of Levitical worship. A forger would have endeavored to identify the past as much as possible with the present.

The section in chap. vii—x is said to have a mythical coloring. This assertion is grounded on the miracle narrated in ch. ix, 24. But what could have been the inducement to forge this section? It is said that the priests invented it in order to support the authority of the sacerdotal caste by the solemn ceremony of Aaron's consecration. But to such an intention the narration
levy (D2, must, tribute, as usually rendered), a tax or requirement of service imposed by Eastern kings for public works, hence a gang or company of men impressed into such service (1 Kings 9, 18, 14; ix, 10). In two
passages other terms (תְּנֵנָה, 1 Kings ix. 21; רָעָה, Num. xxxi. 28) are employed in connection with this, to denote the parts of tribute. See Tributes.

Lew Chew. See Loo Choo.

Lowd (נָוָּוָ, 1 Sam. xix. 7; 2 Sam. xiv. 13), Lewdness (נָוָּוָה, נִשְׁכָּה, Acts xvii. 14), are used elsewhere in their proper sense of licentiousness (תֵּנֵנָה, etc.; Judg. xx. 6), Ezek. often; Jer. xi. 15; xiii. 27; Hos. vi. 9; once for תִּשְׁכָּה, the parts of shame, Hose. ii. 10).

Lewin, Hirsch, a Jewish rabbi who was born in 1721 in Poland, and died at Berlin in 1800, is noted for his attitude towards Moses Mendelssohn. Lewin was chief rabbi of Prussia in the days of the great Jewish philosopher. He was severely censured and Mendelssohn for rationalistic views expressed in his correspondence with La- vater [see Mendelssohn], and in his translation of the Pentateuch into German. To the credit of Lewin, however, it must be stated that he by no means condemned, or permitted the condemnation of Mendelssohn as a heretic, as Landau and other Polish rabbis were inclined to do. See Gritz. Gesch. der Juden, xi, 45 sq.

Lewis, Isaac, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Jan. 21, 1746 (O.S.), in Stratford (now Huntington), Conn.; graduated at Yale College in 1765; entered the ministry in March, 1768; and was ordained pastor at P Coventry. He resigned his charge in June, 1786, and was installed October 18, 1786, pastor in Greenwich, and there he labored until Dec. 1, 1818, when he gave up the work on account of the infirmities of age. He died Aug. 27, 1818. In 1816 he was made a member of Yale College Corporation, but resigned in 1818. He published a few occasional sermons. Sprague, A mouth of the American Puritans, i, 662.

Lewis, John Mitchie, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Westchester Co., N. Y., in 1806. He graduated at Yale College in 1828, and studied theology both at Andover and Princeton, and was licensed at Goshen, N. Y., in 1832. He preached for a number of years, principally in the State of New York, and was then chosen secretary of the Central American Education Society in New York. He was for some time editor of the Seaman's Magazine, and wrote a Manual for the Presbyterian Church. He died in 1861. — Wilson, Presbyterian Historical Almanac, 1865.

Lewis, Moses, a Methodist minister, was born in Roxbury, Va., May 19, 1797, and early decided upon the ministry as his work of life. He entered the travelling connection in 1831 in the New Hampshire Conference. After five years of faithful and successful labors as an itinerant, failing health compelled him to retire from the effective work, with the hope of remaining in his present place as a pastor at no distant day with recuperated physical strength, which, however, he never realized. During thirty-four years he sustained either a superannuatory or superannuated relation to his Conference. In 1844 the New Hampshire Conference was divided, and the Vermont Conference constituted, and of it Lewis, living within the limits of the new Conference, became a member. He died Sept. 26, 1859. He in the domestic circle brother Lewis was beloved and honored; in the community, active and reliable; and in the Church, a pillar of faith, a safe counselor, and a liberal contributor to all the interests of the Church of his choice.”—Minutes of Conf. 1870 (see Index).

Lewis, Thomas, an Independent minister, was born in 1777. He was pastor of an Independent congregation at Islington, England, from 1804 till 1852, the year of his death. He published works are 1. Christian Duties in the various Relations of Life (1839); 2. Religious State of Islington for the last Forty Years (1842); 3. Christian Privileges (1847).— Allibone, Dictionary of British and American Authors, vol. ii. s. v.

Lewis, Zechariah, a Presbyterian minister, studied theology at Philadelphia, and was licensed by the Fairfield West Association in 1796. In the autumn of that year he became tutor in Yale College, and held that office until 1799. He was elected a trustee of Princeton Seminary in 1812. For six years he acted as corresponding secretary of the Religious Tract Society, afterwards the American Tract Society. Having resigned that position in 1818, he was elected one of the secretaries of the United Foreign Missionary Society. He died in 1822. — Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, s. v.

LEYCISON Nobla is the name of a poem which was extensively circulated among the Waldenses in the 15th century. It exalts to reverence and to Christian life, and treats of the temptations to which the wicked subject the pious and the good, and of the punishments for sin. Some, among them Dickhoff, contend that the poem originated with the Bohemian Brethren, but Edward and Herzog incline to the general opinion that the "LEYCISON" belongs to the Waldensian literature. The name it bears is derived from the first words of the poem, which are "LEYCISON nobla" (letheo, sermon). See Zeit- schrift f. hist. theol. 1864, 1865; Herzog, Die romanischen Waldenser, etc. (Ital., 1850).

LEYDDEcker, MELCHIOR, a Calvinistic theologian, was born at Middelburg in 1642. He became pastor in the province of Zealand in 1662, was appointed professor at Utrecht in 1678, and died in 1721. He was an ardent exponent of the doctrines of the Reformed Church, and wrote a number of systematic works, including the works of Drusius, Spener's book De Legibus Hæbraorum, and the Lutheran tendencies of Witsius. Very learned in theological, rabbinical, and ecclesiastical literature, he distinguished himself by wielding a strong pen in favor of the Reformed theological system. Among his apologetical works are De eresia fidei Reformatae ejusdemque sanctitate, s. Commentarius ad Catech. Psalm. (Ultragracis, 1679, 4to):— De aeternum trium personarum in negotio salutis hum. libri iv, quibus universa Reformatae fidei principiis concursus nec expositione (Trag., ad hon. 1683, 12mo.)— Veritas evangelica tria phansae de errores quorvmus seculorum opus, quae principiis fidei Reformatae demonstratur (Trag., 1688, 4to);— also, Historia ecclesiae Africanae illustrata pro ecclesiae Reformatae veritate et libertate (Ultrajac., 1690, 4to). His controversial works against Cocceians met with great success, because they discussed the question with great clearness. Among them we notice his Synopsis controversiarum de fide et testamento Dei, quae hodie in Belg. momentum (Trag., 1690, 8vo):— Vix veritaetatis disquisitionum ad nonnullas controversias, quae hodie in Belg. momentum normalis ecclesiasticarum, De legibus Hebræorum prope 1679, 4to)— Fax veritate (Leide, 1677, 4to). When yet a youthful student at the university Leyden he had paid special attention to Biblical studies, and, guided by a learned rabbi, made rapid strides in the explication of Biblical lore. In after life, when tired of polemical and clerical pursuits, he looked about for a field on which he might profitably venture, this department of theological study allured him anew. Attempting to fit the works of Godwin (Moses and Aaron) and Cunesus (De Republica Hebraeor) to his academical purposes, he soon discovered their insufficiency, and set about to prepare himself for the controversial treatise, which is everywhere marked by a vigorous and independent judgment. While he conceals not his aversion to the "fulfillments" of the Talmud, he quotes the great rabbins with respect. He, moreover, keeps a sharp eye on the extravagances of Christian writers, and his work contains a well-handled justice the well-known rabbinism of the Buxtorfs and the Egyptians of Spencer (De Legibus Hebr.). It is only characteristic of this unsparring criticism of the orthodox author that he adds an appendix of severe an- inadversion against the cosmogony of Thomas Burnet, to whose Thesaurum he prefixes the pedantic preface. The six dissertations of this appendix, whatever may be thought of the author's views, are valuable for their learning, and interesting as closely bearing on the questions now raised on the Mosaic cosmogony.
Especially mention among his Biblical works is due to his archeological treatise entitled De Repubblica Hebraeorum (Amst. 1704, thick fol. vol.), which is one of the largest repertoires ever written on the wide subject of Hebrew antiquities, and exhibits in an eminent degree vast stores of historical, ethnographical, and historical learning. Added to the interest of the subject are dissertations on the Hebrew laws and customs, both political and religious, interwoven in a historical narrative, in which the sacred history is developed, by epochs, from the earliest period to the last. The author, in his progress, learnfully investigates the history, parti politici, of the leading Gentile nations, very much after the manner of Shuckford and Russell in their Connections. This valuable work, on which Leyden's fame deserves mainly to depend, is singularly enough ignored in Schweizer's sketch of the author in Herzog (see below). A complete list of his works is to be found in the Univeritalsche Kirchen-Hist. A. u. N. Test., etc., ii, 625.—Herzog, Real-Encykl., viii, 380; Gase, Daggengeschichte, vol. iii; Kittro, Cyclop. Bibl. Eit. vol. ii, s. v.

Leyden, John of. See Bookhold.

Leyden, Lucas van. One of the most celebrated painters of the early Dutch school, noted for his success in history pictures. He was born in Leyden in 1594. His talents were early developed in the school of Cornelius Engelbrecht, an artist of repute in his day. He commenced engraving when scarcely nine years of age. His picture of St. Hubert, painted when he was only twelve, brought him very high commendation; and the celebrated publisher, van der Werff, well known to connoisseurs by the name of "Mohammed and the Monk Sergius," was published in 1598, when he was only fourteen. He practiced successfully almost every branch of painting, was one of the ablest of those early painters who engraved their own works, and he succeeded, like Albert Dürer, in imparting certain qualities of delicacy and finish to his engravings that no mere engraver ever attained. His pictures are noted for clearness and delicacy in color, variety of character, and expression; but his drawing is hard and Gothic in form. His range of subjects was very wide, and embraced events in sacred history, incidents illustrative of the manners of his own period, and portraits. He died in 1633.

Leyden, School of, Theologians of the, is the name given to that class of Dutch theologians who follow in the wake of the rationalistic professors of the University of Leyden (founded in 1575), and of whom J. P. More (professor in Leyden, since 1648 in Leyden) and his pupils are at present the main interpreters. The Leyden school is in reality nothing more nor less than a Dutch Tübingen school. In his younger days Scholten belonged to the orthodox school, and at one time (1643) well known to connoisseurs by the name of "Mohammed and the Monk Sergius," was published in 1598, when he was only fourteen. He practiced successfully almost every branch of painting, was one of the ablest of those early painters who engraved their own works, and he succeeded, like Albert Dürer, in imparting certain qualities of delicacy and finish to his engravings that no mere engraver ever attained. His pictures are noted for clearness and delicacy in color, variety of character, and expression; but his drawing is hard and Gothic in form. His range of subjects was very wide, and embraced events in sacred history, incidents illustrative of the manners of his own period, and portraits. He died in 1633.

Leyden, School of, Theologians of the, is the name given to that class of Dutch theologians who follow in the wake of the rationalistic professors of the University of Leyden (founded in 1575), and of whom J. P. More (professor in Leyden, since 1648 in Leyden) and his pupils are at present the main interpreters. The Leyden school is in reality nothing more nor less than a Dutch Tübingen school. In his younger days Scholten belonged to the orthodox school, and at one time (1643) well known to connoisseurs by the name of "Mohammed and the Monk Sergius," was published in 1598, when he was only fourteen. He practiced successfully almost every branch of painting, was one of the ablest of those early painters who engraved their own works, and he succeeded, like Albert Dürer, in imparting certain qualities of delicacy and finish to his engravings that no mere engraver ever attained. His pictures are noted for clearness and delicacy in color, variety of character, and expression; but his drawing is hard and Gothic in form. His range of subjects was very wide, and embraced events in sacred history, incidents illustrative of the manners of his own period, and portraits. He died in 1633.

Leyden, School of, Theologians of the, is the name given to that class of Dutch theologians who follow in the wake of the rationalistic professors of the University of Leyden (founded in 1575), and of whom J. P. More (professor in Leyden, since 1648 in Leyden) and his pupils are at present the main interpreters. The Leyden school is in reality nothing more nor less than a Dutch Tübingen school. In his younger days Scholten belonged to the orthodox school, and at one time (1643) well known to connoisseurs by the name of "Mohammed and the Monk Sergius," was published in 1598, when he was only fourteen. He practiced successfully almost every branch of painting, was one of the ablest of those early painters who engraved their own works, and he succeeded, like Albert Dürer, in imparting certain qualities of delicacy and finish to his engravings that no mere engraver ever attained. His pictures are noted for clearness and delicacy in color, variety of character, and expression; but his drawing is hard and Gothic in form. His range of subjects was very wide, and embraced events in sacred history, incidents illustrative of the manners of his own period, and portraits. He died in 1633.
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his Hist. of Rationalism, p. 388 sq.; Scholten, De Leer der Hereworde Kerck in hare grondigeinwil de broe-
ness voorgesteld en beoordeeld. (1848; 2d ed. 1850; 4th ed. 1861); and his article on "Modern Materialism and its
Causes" in Progress of Religious Thought in the Protot.
Ch. of France (Lond. 1861), p. 10 sq. See Reformed
(Dutch) Church. (J. H. W.)

LEYDT, Henri. As a prominent minister of the Re-
formed Dutch Church, was born in Holland in 1718, and
came early to America. He studied theology under the
Rev. John Freylinghuyzen and J. H. Goettchius, was li-
censed in 1748, and became pastor of the united church-
es of New Brunswick and Six-mile Run, New Jersey. In
his great Cato and Conferentie conflict he was ac-
tively identified with the former, which insisted upon
the education of ministers in this country, and upon an
independent Church organization separate from the Re-
formed Church of the mother country. In this "liberal
and progressive" movement Mr. Leydt was a powerful
leader. He published several pamphlets in its favor, and
was one of the most prominent men in the estab-
lishment of Queen's College (now Rutgers) in 1770. He
was one of its first trustees. He was president of the
General Synod in 1778. An ardent patriot of the Rev-
olutionary War, he preached boldly on the great ques-
tions of the time, arousing much enthusiasm among the
people, "and counselling the young men to join the
army of freedom." His active and useful ministry closed
only with his life in 1783. He is represented to have
been an instructive, laborious, and faithful minister, an
impressive preacher, a favorite in installations of pastors,
an organization of churches, and other public services. He
was a healer of the breach of Zion, as well as an in-
trepid leader in an important crisis of the Church and of
the country. — Historical Sermon by R. H. Steele, D.D.;
Conwin, Manual of the Reformed Church, a. v. (W. J.
R.T.)

LEYSER. See LYSLEK.

L'Hôpital. See HOSPITAL.

Liar. See LIE.

Libanius, a celebrated sophist of the 4th century,
named as a friend of the emperor Julian, was born about
A.D. 314 at Antioch, where he studied in early youth,
devoting his attention to the purest classic models. Af-
fer a stay of four years at Athens, where he attracted
much attention, he pursued his studies at Constantin-
ople, and here entered upon a brilliant career as teacher,
which excited the envy of others, especially of the sophi-
ast Demarchius, his former instructor. The latter falsely
charged him with the practice of sorcery, and many
victims so that the prefect was persuaded to expel him
from the city, A.D. 346. He went to Nice, and shortly
after to Nicomedia, and there pleasantly passed five
years with great success as an instructor, and returned,
by invitation of emperor Julian, who had frequently at-
tended his lectures, to Constantinople, only to leave it,
however, shortly after, on account of the opposition still
existing. He retired, by permission of Caesar Gallus,
to his native city. Here he continued to reside till his death,
which is supposed to have occurred after the accession
of Arcadius, A.D. 408, under the death of Julian, Libanius lost
much of his hope for the restoration of paganism. He
complains to the gods that they had granted so long a
life to Constantinus, and only so brief a career to Julian.
He interchanged many letters with Julian. Under Va-
less he defended himself successfully against a charge
of treason, and seems to have obtained the emperor's
favor. He besought from him a law, in which Libanius
himself, on account of his own natural offspring by a
mistress, was personally interested, granting to natural
children a share in their father's property at his death. Libanius
was the precursor of Basil and Chrysostom; and
although himself a pagan to the very end, he main-
tained friendly relations with these Christian fathers.
He was a warm advocate for tolerance, and sought to
defend the Manicheans of the East from the violent
measures directed against them. He addressed Theo-
doulos in one of his Discourses in defence of the heathen
temples, which the monks were eager to despoil. He
lived long enough to see Christianity everywhere tri-
umphant, and his personal efforts no longer applauded.
Separate works of Libanius have from time to time been
discovered and edited, but many yet lie in MS. only in
different libraries. His style was rhetorically correct, but,
in accordance with the spirit of his times, highly arti-
ificial. Gibbon's criticism may be considered too severe
(Decline and Fall, ch. xxiv). Among the writings of
Libanius are his Prologomena, or Examples of Rheto-
critical Exercises, divided into thirteen sections; and
Discourses, many of which were never pronounced, nor
designed for that purpose. Some of the latter are moral
dissertations, after the fashion of the times, on such sub-
jects as Friendship, Riches, Poverty. One is entitled
Monopolia, a lament on the death of Julian. Another,
the most interesting of all his writings, is his autobiog-
raphy, which he first wrote at the age of sixty years,
titled Μη διδάσκων παρα της η εικονος τυχης. A frag-
ment of his Discourses, addressed to Theodosius in de-
fense of the heathen temples, was discovered by Mai in
1822 in the Biblioteca Estense. The Declamationes, com-
prising forty in number, are exercises on imaginary subjects.
There are not less than 2000 Letters addressed to over
500 persons, among whom are Athanasius, Basil, Greg-
ory of Nyssa, and Chrysostom. He wrote also a Life
of Demosthenes, and Arguments to the Opinion of De-
monthes. He is no complete edition of Libanius.
His Discourses and Declamations were edited by Reiske
(Lips. 1791-97, 4 vols. 8vo). The most copious edition
of his Letters (1655 in the Greek, and 1522 translated into
Latin) is that by J. C. Wolf (Amsterd. 1738, fol.). See
Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vol. viii, a. v.; Wetsle u. Weile,
Kirchen-Lexikon, vol. vi, a. v.; Smith, Dict. of Gr.
and Rom. Biog. vol. ii, a. v.; Gibbon, Decline and Fall of
the Roman Empire, ch. xxiii, xxiv; Sievers, Leben des Li-
baniius (Berl. 1868).

Lib' annus (Libanu), the Graecized form of the
name of Mount Lebanon (q. v.), used in the Apocrypha
(1 Esdr. iv, 48; v, 55; 2 Esdr. xvi, 20; Judith, 7, 1; Ec-
cclus. xxiv, 13, 12) and by classical writers. See also
Antilibanus.

Libation (Lat. libation, "to pour out," liter-
ally any thing poured out) is used, in the sacrificial lan-
guage of the ancients, to express an effusion of liquors
poured upon victims to be sacrificed to a deity. The
quantity of wine for a libation among the Hebrews was
the fourth part of a hin, rather more than two pints.
Libations were poured on the victim after it was killed,
with the several parts of it; or it might be consumed by
the flames (Lev. vi, 20; viii, 25, 26; ix, 4; xvi, 12, 20).
These libations usually consisted of unmixed wine
(συμφυλιον, μεριν), but sometimes also of
milk, honey, and other fluids, either pure or diluted with
water. The libations offered to the Furies were always
without wine. The Greeks and Latins offered libations
with the sacrifices, but they were poured on the victim's
head while it was living. So Simon, relating the man-
ner in which he was to be sacrificed, says, he was in
the priest's hands ready to be slain, was folded and
garlands: that they were preparing to pour upon him
the libations of grain and salted meal (A. E. ii, 180,
131). Likewise Dido, beginning to sacrifice, pours wine
between the horns of the victim (A. E. iv). The wine
was usually poured out in three separate streams.
Libations always accompanied the sacrifice; those of
were offered in concluding a treaty with a foreign nation,
and that here they formed a prominent part of the solemn-
ity is clear from the fact that the treaty itself was called
συμφυλιον. But libations were also made independent
of any other sacrifice, as in solemn prayers, and on many
other occasions of public and private life, as in drinking
meals, and the like. St. Paul describes himself,
as it were, a victim about to be sacrificed, and that the
accustomed libations of meal and wine were already, in
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a measure, poured upon him: “For I am ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand” (2 Tim. iv, 6). The same expressive sacrificial term occurs in Phil. ii, 17, where the apostle represents the faith of the Philippians as a sacrifice, and his own blood as a libation poured forth to hollow and consecrate it: “Ye, and if I be offered, even as a sacrifice upon a holy altar, accept the shadow of his death, and the life of his grace upon your faith, in [the] name of Jesus Christ, and rejoice with you all.” The word libation was frequent-ly extended in its signification, however, to the whole offering of unbloody sacrifices of which this formed a part, and which consisted not only in the pouring of a little wine upon the altar, but were accompanied by the presentation of fruit and cakes. Cakes in particular were peculiar to the worship of certain deities, as to that of Apollo. They were either simple cakes of flour, sometimes also of wax, or they were made in the shape of some animal, and were then offered as symbolical sacri-fices in the place of real animals, either because they could not easily be procured, or were too expensive for the sacrificer. This custom prevailed even in the houses of the Romans, who at their meals made an offering to the Lares in the fire which burned upon the hearth. The libation was thus a sort of heathen “grace before meat.” See Watson, Bibl. and Theol. Dict. s. v.; Chambers, Cyclopa. s. v.

Libel is the technical name of the document which contains the accusation framed against a minister before ecclesiastical courts. See Faxon, Clerical. In England, libel, in the ecclesiastical courts, is the name given to the formal written statement of the complainant’s ground of complaint against the defendant. It is the first stage in the pleadings after the defendant has been cited to appear. The defendant is entitled to a copy of it, and must answer the allegations contained in it upon oath. In Scotland, the libel is a document drawn up, as usual, in the form of a sylllogism, the major proposition stating the name and nature of the crime, as condemned by the Word of God and the laws of the Church; the minor proposition averring that the party accused is guilty, specifying facts, dates, and places; and then follows the conclusion deducing the justice of the sentence, if the accusation should be proven. By the term relevancy is meant whether the charge is one really deserving censure, or whether the facts alleged, if proved, would afford sufficient evidence of the charge. A list of witnesses is appended to the copy of the libel served in due time and form on the person accused. One of the forms is as follows: “Unto the Rev. the Moderator and Remonant Members of the —— Presbytery of ——; and to the Clergy resident in the same; ——, a member of said Church; Swesheth, That the Rev. C. D., minister of the —— Congregation of ——, has been guilty of the sin of (here state the denomination of the offence, such as drunkenness, formalization, or such like). In so far as, upon the —— day of ——, 1800, or about that time, and within the house of ——, situated in —— street, ——, he, the said C. D. (here the circumstances attending the offence charged are described), drank (or some other spirituous liquor to excess, whereby he became intoxicated), to the great scandal of religion and disgrace of his sacred profession; may it therefore please your reverent court to appoint service of this libel to be made on the said Rev. C. D., and him to appear before you to answer to the same; and on his admitting the charge, or on the same being proved against him, to visit him with such censure as the Word of God and the rules and discipline of the Church in such cases prescribe, in order that he and all others may be deterred from committing the like offences in the time to come, or to do otherwise in the premises as to you may appear expedient and proper. According to justice, etc. List of witnesses.” — Ediac, Eccles. Dict. s. v.

Libellatici is the name of that class of the lai ped who received from the heathen magistrate a writ ten certificate (libellum) as a warrant for their security; either testifying that they were not Christians, or containing a dispensation from the necessity of sacrificing to the gods in confirmation of their adherence to heathenism. Another class of the lai ped were the sacrifici-arii —— that is, who had offered the libation and libated the gods in testimony of their renunciation of the faith; another the traditores, because they had delivered up into the hands of the heathen either copies of the sacred writings, baptismal registers, or any other property of the Church. See Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s. v.; Schaff, Ch. Hist. i (see Index); Moench, Commentary (see Index). See Lapidary.

Libellii Pacis, or LETTERS OF PEACE. In Egypt and Africa many of those who had fallen away in time of persecution, in order the more readily to obtain pardon for their offences, resorted to the intercession of persons destined to suffer martyrdom by securing from them libellii pacis, letters of peace; papers in which these returning apostates were commended as worthy of communion and Church membership. In this way they were again taken into communion sooner than the rules of the Church otherwise allowed. From this practice the pope derived a pretext for the exercise of his plenipotent power to grant spiritual indulgences, which seems to have been used first about the middle of the second century. See Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s. v.; Moench, Commentary (see Index). See INDECIU tIONS; LAPI DARY.

Liberalism. See RATIONALISM.

Liberality is a term denoting a generous disposition of mind, exerting itself in giving largely. It is thus distinguished from its opposite, liberality denotes freedom of spirit; generosity, greatness of soul; bounty, openness of heart.

LIBERALITY OF SENTIMENT. A generous disposition a man feels towards another who is of a different opinion from himself; or, as one defines it, “that generous expansion of mind which enables it to look beyond all petty distinctions of party and system, and, in the estimate of men and things, to rise superior to narrow prejudices.” Unfortunately, liberalism of sentiment is often a cover for error and scepticism on the one hand, and is most generally too little attended to, or by the Ignatii, to be called liberaliments, says an eminent English writer, “must be distinguished from him who has no religious sentiments at all. He is one who has seriously and effectually investigated, both in his Bible and on his knees, in public assemblies and in private conversations, the important articles of religion. He has laid down principles, he has inferred consequences; in a word, he has adopted sentiments of his own. He must be distinguished also from that tame, undiscerning domestic among good people, who, though he has sentiments of his own, yet has not judgment to estimate their worth and value of one sentiment beyond another. Now a generous believer of the Christian religion is one who will not allow himself to try to propagate his sentiments by the commission of sin. No collusion, no bitterness, no wrath, no undue influence of any kind, will he apply to make his sentiments receivable; and the best course which he will be less happy for his being a Christian. He will exercise his liberality by allowing to those who differ from him as much virtue and integrity as he possibly can.”

There are, among a multitude of arguments to convince, a force such as is given the attention of the public: “1. We should exercise liberality in union with sentiment because of the different capacities, advantages, and tasks of mankind. Religion employs the capacities of mankind just as the air employs their lungs.
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and their organs of speech. The fancy of one is lively, at another dull. The imagination of one, poetic; of another, feeble; a discuss spring. The memory of one is retentive, that of another treacherous as the wind. The passions of this man are lofty, vigorous, rapid; those of that man, mild, hum, and buzz, and, when on wing, sail only round the circumference of a tulip. Is it by the quality of reasoning; is it then both together? If he argues something else, should be all alike in religion? The advantages of mankind differ. How should he who has no parents, no books, no tutor, no companions, equal him whom Providence has graced with them all; who, when he looks over the treasure of his knowledge, can say I had a good mark, that I learned of a Roman; this information I acquired of my tutor, that was a present of my father? A friend gave me this branch of knowledge, an acquaintance bequeathed me that? The tasks of mankind differ; so I call the employments and exercises of life. In my opinion, circumstances make great men; and if we have not Caesars in the State, and Pauls in the Church, it is because neither Church nor State are in the circumstances in which they were in the days of those great men. Push a dull man into a river, and endanger his life, and suddenly he will improve. As in life, in speech. So, in a formal lecture. The world is a fine school of instruction. Poverty, sickness, pain, loss of children, treachery of friends, malice of enemies, and a thousand other things, drive the man of sentiment to his Bible, and, to speak, brings him to his sentiment. Do not despise the sentiment of the whole church, for it is conceivable that he whose young and tender heart is yet unpracticed in trials of this kind has an ascen- tion, and tasted so many religious truths as the sufferer has. 2. We should believe the Christian religion with liberalism, because every part of the Christian religion inculcates the love of God, and establishes a character of God; but what a character does it give! God loves. Christianity teaches the doctrine of Providence; but what a Providence! Upon whom does not its light arise? Is there an animal so little, or a wretch so forlorn, as to be forsaken and forgotten of his God? Christianity teaches the doctrine of redemption; but the redemption of whom?—of all tongues, kindred, nations, and people; of the infant of a span, and the sinner of a hundred years old; a redemption generous in its principle, generous in its price, generous in the effect, fixed in the Bible; it is not want sar- ronc, and revealed with a liberality for which we have no name. In a word, the illiberal Christian always acts contrary to the spirit of his religion; the liberal man alone thoroughly understands it. 3. We should be lib- eral in our dealings, have a liberal spirit. Let us be liberal guides whom we profess to follow. I set one Paul against a whole army of uninspired men: 'Some preach Christ of good-will, and some of envy and strife. What then? 'Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice. One eateth all things, another eateth herbs; but why dost thou judge thy brother? We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.' We often inquire, What was the doctrine of Christ, and what was the practice of Christ? Suppose we were to insti- tute a third question, Of what temper was Christ? 4. We should be liberal as well as orthodox; because truths, especially the truths of Christianity, want support from our illiberalism. Let the little bee guard its little honey with its little sting; perhaps its little life may depend a little while on that little nourishment. Let the fierce bull shake his head, and nod his horn, and threaten his enemy, who seeks to eat his flesh, and wear his coat, and live by his death: poor fellow! his life is in danger; I forgive his bellowing and his rage. But the Christian religion—is that in danger? And what human efforts can render that false which is true, that odious which is lovely? Christianity is in danger, because it is a religion of life and breath, and all things except a power of injuring others.

& Liberality in the profession of religion is a wise and innocent policy. The bigot lives at home; a reptile he crawled into existence, and there breathes. A general Christian goes out of his own party, associates with others, and gains improvement by all. It is a Persian proverb, 'A liberal hand is better than a strong arm.' The dignity of Christianity is better supported by acts of liberality than by accuracy of reasoning; by its diffusion both join together. The sentiment of Christianity can clearly state and ably defend his religious principles, and when his heart is as generous as his principles are inflexible, he possesses strength and beauty in an eminent degree.
abolished in that year; but, on the other hand, it must be posterior to 685, for in caput ii, tit. ix, the emperor Constantine (Pogonatus) is spoken of as being already dead. It must also have been written under some successor of Agatho († 682), as this Roman bishop is also mentioned in death. It is likely that the Liber Diurnus was composed in the time of Gregory II, somewhat after 714, on the ground that in the second professio fidei pontificis, given in the Liber Diurnus, there are expressions and views which correspond exactly to those we find in the letters of that pope to the emperor Leo. It is likely, though, that the Liber Diurnus existed originally in a more elementary form before it assumed that under which it is known at present, for the different MS. copies of it differ somewhat from each other. The Liber Diurnus was frequently consulted by all writers on canon law, such as Lino of Chartres, Asselin of Lucua, Deusdedit, Gratian (c. 8, dist. xvi). As the ritual and various points of law underwent modifications in the course of time, it was less used, and its existence even came to be concealed by the popes for fear lest it might recall their former sentence to the emperors and arapchi. Still there were copies of it in existence, and a codex contained in the library of the Vatican was published in 1660 by the care of Lucas Holsteinus; it was, however, once suppressed by the Roman see. Hoffmann (Novo collectio scriptorium ac monumentorum, Lipsiae, 1788, p. 76) has published the whole text, and adds the remarks on Petrus de Marca, De concordia aecorditac (ac imperii, lib. i, cap. ix, No. viii) the statement that at the time of Holsteinus the Vatican library possessed no codex of the Liber Diurnus, and that his publication was based upon a MS. that is divided into the 15th century monk Hilarianus Rancatus. But as both editions of the works of P. de Marca, published at Paris by Baluze, state only (lib. ii, cap. vi, No. viii) that Holsteinus's publication of the Liber Diurnus was suppressed, and Baluze again, in his notes appended to Anton. Augustinus, Litterae epistolae, Lipsiae, 1828, p. 50, and in the ed. (Par. 1760, p. 483), says that there were various copies of the Liber Diurnus in existence, from one of which, that in the Vatican library, Holsteinus published his edition, it seems reasonable to suppose that Hoffmann's statement lacks support. As for Rancatus, Mabillon names Leo Alsatius, and not Holsteinus, the partaker whom he imparted the MS. (see also Cave, Scriptorium ecc., hist. literaria, Basle, 1741, i, 621). The MS. of the Vatican has actually been described by Pertz (Italienische Reise, in Archiv, f. altere deutsche Geschichtskunde, v. 23, p. 21) and is an 8vo single sheet. And, that, according to the statement found on its first pages, it dates from the 8th century. The Jesuit Joannes Garncius, with the aid of a similar codex and a MS, found in Paris, published in 1680 another edition of the Liber Diurnus cum privilegio regis Christiani simul. Mabillon, in the Museum Italicum (folio ii, li, 32 sq.), published additions to it by means of the MS. which had been used by Leo Alsatius. With the aid of all these works, Hoffmann published a new edition of it in the Nova collectio cit. (vol. ii), which was subsequently done also by Rieger (Vienna, 1762, 8vo). All this gave rise afterwards to collections of formulas to replace the obsolete Liber Diurnus. There are several such collections still extant in MS. Among them the Formularium et stylius scriptorium curae Romane, from John XXII to Gregory XII and John XXIII, in Summa constitutionum Summa X V. W. We may also consider as belonging to this class of works the Ritual ecclesiasticorum sacrum pontificum et clericorum, printed by Hoffmann (i, 269 sq.), and containing a description of the rites accomplished in the Canons and Decretals in the 13th century. Collections of formulas similar to the Liber Diurnus were also made for the use of bishops, abbots, etc. See Rockinger, Nachweisungen liber Formelbuche v. xi11---xii Jahrhund. (Munich, 1855, p. 94, 126, 173, 183, etc.); Paclacky, Liber Formelbucher (Prague, 1841); Herzog, Real-
vented, some 20 years ago, an alphabet for writing their own language, and, next to the Mandingoos, they are regarded as the most promising of the tribes. As they hold constant intercourse with the Mandingoos and other Mohammedan tribes in the far interior, Mohammedanism is making rapid progress among them. The Anglican missionary, bishop Payne, has recently suggested a plan of occupying the country of the Veys with an extensive and vigorous mission, and the mission-school opened by the Episcopalians at Totoncorch, which is nearer to Cape Mount than to Monrovia, is regarded as the first outpost towards the vast interior. 2. The Pesches, who are located about seventy miles from the coast, had 24,000 population, of whom about half the population of their capital, Palaka, consisted of Mohammedans who had come from the Mani country, but the latest explorer, W. Spencer Anderson, states that there are at present no Mohammedans in the Barline country. 3. The Bassas occupy a coast-line of over sixty miles, and extend about the same distance inland. They are the great producers of palm-oil and canewood, which are sold to foreigners by thousands of tons annually. In 1835 a mission was begun among these people by the American Baptist Missionary Union, whose missionaries studied the language, organized three schools, embracing in all nearly a hundred pupils, maintained preaching statedly at three places, and occasionally at a great many more, and translated large portions of the New Testament into the Bassa language. Notwithstanding this promising commencement, the mission has been now (1872) for seven years suspended. But the Southern Baptist Convention has lately resumed missionary operations among the Bassas. Great results for the spreading of Christianity are expected from the missionary labors of Mr. Jacob V. Vonbrum, a son of a well-known king of the Grebo people. 4. The Kroo, who occupy the region south of the Bassa, extend about seventy miles along the coast, and only a few miles inland. They are the sailors of West Africa, and never enslave or sell each other. About thirty years ago a mission was established among them by the Presbytery of Liberia, but it has long since ceased operations. 5. The Greboes, who border upon the southern boundary of the Kroo, extend from Grand Sistors to the Cavalla River, a distance of about seventy miles. In 1864 a mission was established among them by the American Missionary Commissioners for Foreign Missions, which continued in operation for seven years. A Church was organized, the language reduced to writing, and parts of the New Testament and other religious books translated into it; but in 1864 the mission was transferred to Gaboon. A mission established by the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States among the same tribe a few years previously still continues in operation, and has recently established at Bohlen a missionary station, about seventy miles from the coast. 6. The Mandingoos, who are found on the west coast frontier of the republic, and extend back to the height of Sordan, are a pagan tribes under the influence of the slave traders. One of the greatest obstacles to the progress of Christian missions among the aboriginal tribes is the climate, and the difficulty of acculturization. Thus the Basile Missionary Society, which in 1827 established a mission at Zudur, was in 1831 compelled to abandon it when four of the eight missionaries had succumbed to the climate. At the close of the year 1871 the churches among the Americo-Liberians and the missions among the natives were all merged or less connected with the Protestant churches of the United States. The Methodist Episcopal Church, which sent her first missionary to Liberia in 1832, has subsequently organized the Liberia Mission into an Annual Conference, with a missionary bishop (since 1864 William Taylor) at its head. In 1868 the mission churches, which had 24 Sunday-school scholars, 96 local preachers, 292 Sunday-school scholars, 38 churches of an aggregate value of $11,014. There were 127 baptisms and 60 deaths. In 1869 the number of members was 2755, preachers 244, local preachers 54. The intense interest which has been aroused among civilized nations by the explorations of Livingstone, and the later of Stanley, in the heart of Africa, has been heroically followed up by Bishop Taylor and the missionary band led by him, especially along the Congo River; and the native chiefs have granted lands and subsidies for the purpose of establishing settlements and building churches at the prominent points. The impetus thus given to commerce and improvements in Africa, has, to some degree, extended to Liberia likewise, and the country is gradually advancing to an independent position, both politically and ecclesiastically, especially as the evangelistic labors of Bishop Taylor and his coadjutors are conducted on the plan of "self support," by means of agricultural pursuits on the part of the missionaries, whose first expenses in outfit and travel only are met by direct contributions. A new era may therefore be now said to have dawned upon the "dark continent," a period of religious as well as secular point of view, and Liberia, with the oldest of the modern mission fields there, will doubtless still continue to be the centre of missionary action, at least for the immense and densely populated middle region of that quarter of the globe. The Protestant Episcopal Church likewise has a bishop there, and its mission in 1889 had 60 stations, 17 clergymen, 17 candidates for orders (8 Liberians), 6 postulants (3 Liberian and 3 native), confirmations 106, communicants 612, marriages 12, burials 52, Sunday-school scholars 908, boarding and day-schools 877, total contributions $1,416.56. There are 22 day-schools, 11 boarding schools, and 29 Sunday-schools in all connected with the mission. The Baptist churches in Liberia have mostly been organized by the Southern Board of American Baptists. Their work was suspended during the war, and the American Baptist Missionaries continued it, but the Mission Board of Liberia with the understanding that the Southern Board would not resume the work; but in 1870 the Southern Baptists sent an agent to Africa with a view of renewing their labors there. The Missionary Union continued, however, to give a partial support to the work of Stanleys. In March, 1868, the Baptist churches of Liberia organized the "Liberian Baptist Missionary Union" for "the evangelization of the heathen" within the borders of the Republic of Liberia, "and contiguous thereto." At this first meeting of the union ten Baptist churches were represented, and twelve fields of missionary labor were designated and committed to the care of the nearest churches. The Baptist churches have a training-school for preachers and teachers at Virginia. The Presbytery of the United States has congregations at Monrovia, Kentucky, Harrisonville, or Sinon, and Fitts. In Maryland and a few other places, with an aggregate membership of about 280. The Liberian churches in union with those of Gaboon and Corisco form the presbytery of Western Africa. The Alexander High-school is intended to be an academy and preparatory school under the government of the Presbytery, and designed especially to aid young men preparing for the ministry. It is situated on a farm of
LIBERIUS, Sr., pope of Rome, was a native of the Eternal City. He succeeded Julius I May 22, 538. The Semi-Arians, countenanced by the emperor Constantius, had then the ascendency; and both the Council of Arles (358) and that of Milan (355) condemned Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria. As Liberius, together with some other Western bishops, refused to subscribe to this condemnation, he was arrested by order of the emperor, and taken to Milan, where he held a conference with Constantius, which terminated in a sentence from the emperor on the bishops from his side. He succeeded in obtaining the carrying of his son Felix to the pope's court at Beroea, in Thrace. Felix, a deacon at Rome, was consecrated bishop. A petition was presented to the emperor by the principal ladies of Rome in favor of Liberius, but it was not till 538 that Liberius was restored to his see. He was the last of the Christian emperors, during whose reign theodosius of Beroea, approved in several letters of the deposition of Athanasius, and subscribed to the confession of faith drawn up by the court party at the Council of Sirmium, is a matter of great improbability, and depends chiefly upon the genuineness of his correspondence with Athanasius. The dependence of Liberius on the emperor had a disadvantageous influence upon many of the Italian bishops, and we need not wonder that at the Council of Rimini Arianism was openly countenanced. It is not true, as asserted by some, that Liberius subscribed the Rimini confession of faith. He ended his career in orthodoxy, and died in 566. He was succeeded by Damasus I. Liberius is said to have built the basilica on the Esquiline Mount, which has been called Liberiana, from his name, and is now known by the name of Santa Maria Maggiore. He is commemorated in the Romish Church Aug. 17, and in the Greek Church Sept. 29. See Grév. Kirchengesch. ii, 1, 254-283; Hefele, P. Liber. in the Thub. theol. Quartalschr. (1888), ii, 261 sq.; and Concilegesch. i, 626-714; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. viii, 872.

Liber Pontificalis de vita Romanorum Pontificum, Gesta Romanorum Pontificum, Liber Gesta Romanorum Pontificum, Liber Pontificalium, are the names of a history of the bishops of Rome from the apostle Peter down to Nicolas I († 867), to which those of Adrian II and of Stephen VIII († 892) were subsequently added. On the authority of Onuphrius Pavius, the first editor of this Liber Pontificalis considered as its author Anastasius, abbot of a convent at Rome, and librarian of the church under Nicolas I; but more thorough researches have proved this Liber to vary greatly in style, and even in views manifestly the martynological biographies of the 8th century, since the so-called Liber Pontificalis extant which can with certainty be ascribed to the close of the 7th or the beginning of the 8th century, and which contain extracts from the Liber Pontificalis. In the early part of the 17th century, several writers put forth arguments in favor of the last-mentioned views. Among them are Emanuel of Schel- statte, librarian of the Vatican (Dissertatio de antiqua Romanorum Pontificum catalogo, ex quibus Liber Pontificalis concinnatus est, et de Libri Pontificii auctore ac præstantia [Rome, 1692, fol.; reprinted in Muratori, Rerum italicarum scriptores, iii, 1 sq.]), Joannes Ciam- pinii (magistri brevium gratiae: Examen Libri Pontificalis sive viarum Romanorum Pontificum, qua sub nomine Anastasi bibliothecarii circumstantur [Rom. 1688, 4to; reprinted in Muratori, p. 83 sq.]), and others. The supposition that the codex was compiled by pope Damasus, the successor of Liberius, as maintained by the authors before cited, is not maintained by those who have reference between Damasus and Jerome which is adduced in support of this view is evidently spurious (see Schelstatte, Dissertatio, etc.). The author or authors are unknown, but the information it contains is valuable. It is now generally thought to have been written about the 4th century.

The oldest source known at present of the Liber is generally considered to have been a list of the popes down to Liberius, and probably written during his life (552-586), as it makes no mention of his death (see Schelstatte, Dissertatio, etc., ch. ii, iii; Hefele, Tübinger theolog. Quartalschr., 1844, p. 812 sq.). The original MS. of this so-called Codex Liberis is now lost. In 1684 a copy was made of it from an Antwerp MS. by Bucher, the Bollandists give one in the Acta Sanctorum, April, vol. i, 1675, and Schelstatte another from a Vienna copy of the Codex Lideris, which was sold by order of the Inquisitio of the Empire, Rome, 1826, vol. i.

Another list of the popes extends down to Felix IV († 483). It was first published in a codex of the Vatican Library, called Liber Pontificalis, or Liber Pontificalis (continuatus), in the Annals of Henricus and Papebroch, and is also found in the introduction of the first volume of the Acta Sanctorum for April, in Schelstatte, and in the above-mentioned Origines, p. 212. There are transcripts of French origin, and the original MS. of this so-called Catalogus Felicis IV is lost, but the two at present in existence are evidently copies of the same original, as results from a careful comparison of them by Schelstatte. That the author of it must have consulted the Catalogus Liberi is evident from the fact that its errors are repeated in it. They both omit the names of the consuls and emperors between Liberius and John I († 528), and commence again at the reign of the latter, and of his successor, Felix IV (al. III). Schelstatte already correctly surmised from this fact that the author lived in the time of these two popes, which view is also supported by the completeness and thoroughness with which their history, in particular, is treated. Still, as to the author, there is no definite information. The numerous references to the archives of the Roman Church, in which, moreover, the first MS. was discovered, would make it probable that the author himself was a librarian, and consulted the archives, if the confusion and even incorrectness of some parts did not militate against this view. Aside from the similarity of this collection with the Catalogus Liberis, which extends so far that whole passages are copied literally, or nearly so, from the one into the other, the Catalogus Felicis IV differs from the Liberi principally by its particular care on the order in which the names are arranged, by the names of the bishop of the popes, and their funerals, which the author may have derived from tradition and other similar sources, pseudo-decreets and canons, or MSS. extant. The author of the Catalogus Felicis IV before been considered worthy of full confidence are those which coincide with the Catalogus Liberi, and those which refer to the times of John and Felix, when the author would be better acquainted with the facts than with those of preceding periods.

Both lists were subsequently continued, and this is what produced the Liber Pontificalis. This filiation, however, can only be traced by the aid of MSS. The oldest copy known belongs to the close of the 7th or the beginning of the 8th century. It ends at the death of Conon (696-697). A rather incomplete Codex rescriptus, discovered by Peretz (Arcbe, p. 50 sq.) at Naples, gives the list of the popes down to Conon; it must have been written, at the latest, in the early part of the 8th century. Another is found in a codex of the cathedral
chapter of Verona, ending also with Conon, but to it was added afterwards all the names of the popes down to Paul I († 767). This MS. was published in the fourth volume of Bianchini's collection, but, unfortunately, we have no description of this codex; it was to have been given in the fifth volume, which never appeared (see Rostel, Beschreibung der Stadt Rom, 1, 208, 210), so that it is impossible to establish the correct order of the Neapolitan MS. A continuation of this first work goes down to Gregory II (from 714), and is to be found in the Codex of the Vatican, No. 5299, which must be a copy of an older MS. (Scheelestar, c. v, § 8). Then there is another continuation from the end of the first part of the book (Gregory II) to the end of the 8th century. The other MS. was published by Francis Bianchini (Rom. 1718, folio), and this served as a basis for Muratori's, contained in the 3d volume of his Scriptores rerum italicarum (1728); Bianchini's work was continued by his nephew, Joseph Bianchini (vols. ii-iv, Rom. 1785; there was to have been a 5th volume, but it never appeared). There also appeared at Rome an edition by John and Peter Joseph Vignoli (1724, 1752, 1758, 5 vols. 4to). Rottel recently undertook another for the Monumenta Germaniae, while Giesbrecht announced for the same work a continuation of the Liber Pontificalis to the years 799-803. The Quellen der früheren Papstgesch., art. in der Kieler Al- lgem. Monatschrift f. Wissenschaft u. Literatur, April 1862, p. 357-374.

The investigations made on this subject permit us to distinguish several continuations of the Liber Pontificalis.

1. From an unknown source have been composed three histories of the popes: (a) one is contained in the Vatican Codex, 3764, extending from Laudo (912) to Gregory VII, and belonging to the end of the 11th century. It is reproduced in the first volume of Vignoli's edition of the Liber Pontificalis, and the second, in the codex of the library of Eate, 5, and extending as far down, was written during Gregory's lifetime. (b) The third, dating from the time of Paschal II, in the early part of the 12th century (in the library of Santa Sofia in Rome). This, the most important continuation of the Liber Pontificalis, composed in the 12th century, extends from Gregory VII to Innocent III (1124-1129). Onuphrius Panvini and Baronius name it as its author either the subdeacon Pendulph of Pisa or a Roman li- brarian named Peter Constant. Gaetani published in 1638 a biography of Gelasio II, and from this edition was ori- ginated in the inscription in the Vatican Codex (5762, fol. 90 b-96), which, however, states only that a certain Peter Guillermus of Genoa, librarian of the convent of S. Zegidius, wrote this Vatican Codex in the year 1142 (see, in the Libri Pontificales, ed. by De счита, etc., April, 1862, p. 266, 267; Monumenta Germaniae, xi, 318).

2. The sources of the Liber Pontificalis, besides those above mentioned, consist partly in traditions, partly in MSS. documents, and remaining monuments, such as buildings, inscriptions, etc. The collection of canon law of the 7th or 8th century, published by Zachary from a codex of Modena, stands in close connection with the Liber Pontificalis (see Zaccaria, Dizionario caric. italiano a storia ecclesiastica appartente, Rom. 1790, vol. ii, diss. i; reproduced by Galland, De cetatis com- monium collectionibus dissertationum sylloge, Mogunt. 1770, 4to, ii, 679 sq.); yet it is not to be considered as one of its sources, but rather appears to have been based on it.

The Liber Pontificalis has become particularly valuable for the correctness of the information since the latter part of the 7th century, when the Roman archives were regularly organized, and the continuation of the Liber Pontificalis could only be in- trusted to the librarians or other members of the clergy having free access to the archives. The Liber Pontificalis is especially useful for the history of those secular churches, ecclesiastical institutions, the discipline, etc. Scheelestar names as its first edition Peter Crabb's Concilium (Cologne, 1588); but this is neither complete nor well connected. It only contains extracts on each pope, like Ammianus' Anima and subsequent collections of canons, and as the "editio princeps" the edition of J. Buissius (Mayence, 1602, 4to) is generally ac- cepted, which is based on a MS. of Marcus Weber, of Augsburg. It was followed by the edition of Hannibal Fahrotti (Par. 1640), for which several codices were con- sulted. Luscinia pins the text to the edition of Buissius with a number of MSS., and, although never published, it was greatly used by Scheelestar and others (see Scheelestar, cap. v, No. 3 sq.). From the hands of the Scheelestar the MS. of Holsteinius passed into the library of the Vatican in the 17th century (see Dulich, Iter Romanum, pt. i [Vienna, 1825, p. 41]). The work was finally published by Francia Bianchini (Rom. 1718, folio), and this served as a basis for Muratori's, contained in the 3d volume of his Scriptores rerum italicarum (1728); Bianchini's work was continued by his nephew, Joseph Bianchini (vols. ii-iv, Rom. 1785; there was to have been a 5th volume, but it never appeared).
the Acta Vaticana, but Muratori published it under the name of the cardinal of Aragon. Nicolás Roselli (a Dominican, made cardinal in 1851, in 1859) caused a collection of old historical documents to be prepared, which contained the lives of the popes from Leo IX to Alexander II, and also the biography of Gregory IX. Porta (Archivo, p. 97) says that these biographies are borrowed from the Liber censuum camera apostolicæ of Cencius Camerarius, who in 1216 became pope under the name of Honorius III. But these also are not the work of Cencius himself, but of another nameless writer. The life of Alexander IV was written by his relative, cardinal Bosco, from materials furnished by himself, during the reign of Alexander III. The life of Alexander III was written at the same time, and most likely also by Bosco, who probably wrote most of the whole collection. The introduction is taken from Bonizo's collection of canons, the biographies of John XII, and from Leo IX down to Gregory VII are adapted from the ad Amicitiam of the same writer; subsequent ones down to Eugenius III are based on the records, but after that they become more complete, resting on Isao's own experience, as he then lived at Rome. For subsequent biographies the sources are much more numerous. We might also mention, as a compendium of the whole, the Actus Pontificum Romanorum of the Augustinian monk Amalricus Angleri, written in 1232. It embraces the lives of the popes from John XII (1212), which is to be found in Eead, Corpus hist. medii ævi, ii, 164 sq., and in Muratori, vol. iii, pt. ii. Herzog, Real-Enzyklop., viii, 867 sq. See Baxmann, Politik der Päpste (Elberfeld, 1865), vol. i (see Index); Wachter, Vita Romanorum Pontificum (Lips., 1862); Pi- pet, Einleit., in die monumentale Theologie (Ueberh., 1867); De Rossi, Rom. Sotetam. (1857).

Liber Sextus and Septimus. See Canons and Decretals, Collections of. Libertine (Aíasiprov). The Latin libertina, a frequent occurrence in the N.T., "Certain of the synagogue, which is called (the synagogue) of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians," etc. (Acts vi, 9). There has been much diversity in the interpretation of this word. The structure of the passage leaves it doubtful how many synagogues are implied in it. Some (Calvin, Beza, Bengel) have taken it as if there were but one synagogue, including men from all the different cities that are named. Winer (N. T. Gramm., p. 179), on grammatical grounds, takes the repetition of the article as indicating a fresh group, and finds accordingly two synagogues, one including the ordinary Synag-

1. The other names being local, this also has been referred to a town called Libertinum, in the prosconsular province of Africa. This, it is said, would explain the close juxtaposition with Cyrene. Siduas recognises Aíasiprov as Sómrus Sómar, and in the Council of Carthage in 411 (Mansi, iv, 256-274, quoted in Wiltich, Handbuch der Kirchik. Geogr., § 96) we find an Episcopos Libertinensis (Simon, Onomasticon N. Text. p. 99). Against this hypothesis it has been urged (1) that the existence of a Libertinum in the south of Italy is not established; and (2) that if it existed, it can hardly have been important enough either to have a synagogue at Jerusalem for the Jews belonging to it, or to take precedence of Cyrene and Alexandria in a synagogue common to the three.
Libertines, True, or, as they called themselves, Spiritualists, were a Pantheistic and Antinomian sect of the Reformation days. They appeared first in the Netherlands, under the name of "Deists ad infinitum et Secundum Animam Spiritum." They spread into France, and, by the interest they manifested in political affairs, gained considerable influence also in Switzerland, especially in Geneva. The impulse given to thought by the Reformation gave rise also to many errors, which flourished by the side of evangelical truth, and, though they were not without a little Realism, but to Protestants as well, the influence of the Libertines must be baneful, and he took an early opportunity to warn the Christians of those countries against them (Gieseler, Kirchengesch. iii [1], 557). Calvin also had to fight against this gain of influence of the libertine sect, and, in speaking of the mention of a certain Coppin, of Lille, as the first who attempted to introduce, as early as 1529, the doctrines of the Free Spirit in his native city. This Coppin was soon eclipsed by his disciple Quintin, of Hennequin, who, with his companion Bertrand, became the leader of the sect in France in 1534, and with whom a priest called Poquet (Pocque) connected himself. These two, for Bertrand soon died, are represented as uneducated but shrewd men, who made religion a means of securing earthly goods, and who were very successful in the attempt. They openly professed to have found the principle of "moral falsehood" (or moral reservation) inculcated in the Scriptures, and, in consequence, thought it but right to profess Roman Catholicism when among Roman Catholics, and Protestantism when with Protestants. They are said to have made 400,000 converts in 2 years (1534-1536). They, however, confine their attempts at deceit to the lower classes; but, on the contrary, endeavored to gain proceleys among the learned and in the higher walks of society; they succeeded even in gaining the ear of the queen Margaret of Navarre, sister of Francis I, who received them in a friendly manner not to Rome, but to her court, and daily consulted with them. They made great use of allegory, figures of speech, etc., taking their authority from the precept, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." We have said above that the system of the Libertines was pantheistic; it was, in fact, pure pantheism. They held that there is one universal spirit, which is found in every creature, and is the Spirit of God. This one spirit and God is distinguished from itself according as it is considered in heaven or on earth. "Deum a se ipso diversum esse et alius esse in hoc mundo et alius esse in caelo" (Calvin, Instr. adv. l bert. c. 11). All creatures, angels, etc., are nothing in themselves, and have no real existence aside from God. Man is preserved only by the Spirit of God, which is in him, and exists only until that spirit again departs from him; instead of a soul, it is God himself who dwells in man, and all his actions, all that takes place in the world, is direct from him, is the immediate work of God ("Quidquid in mundo fit, opus ipius [Dei] directo censendum esse," c. 18). Everything else, the world, the flesh, the devil, souls, etc., are by this system mere projections, mere superfluities (opinatio). Even sin is not a mere negation of right, but, since God is the active agent of all actions, it can be but an illusion also, and will disappear as soon as this principle is recognized ("Peccatum—non solum alienum bontatis peccationem esse, sed illa opinatio, quae evanescit et absurdam, cum nulla habetur ejus ratio," c. 12. Poquet says, in regard to that, "Et quia omnia quae sunt extra Deum, nihil sunt quam vanitas," c. 23). There is, therefore, but one evil, and that evil is this illusion of a distinction between the spirit of God and the spirit of man. To secure the idea of a certain relation between it and the right. Thus the original fall or sin was nothing else than a separation of man from God, or rather the result of man's desire to be something by himself, separating himself from union and identity with God. Thus unintentionally man subjected himself to the world and its ideas. And we, in our position, are like a smoke which passes away and leaves nothing behind. So Poquet says, "Ideo scriptum est (7), "Qui videt peccatum, peccatum ei manet et veritas in ipso non est" (in Calvin, c. 29). From the Libertine point of view the nature of Christ did not materially differ from ours; he consisted, like other human beings, in divine spirit, such as dwells in us all, and in the sacrifice only the illusionary, or worldly part, was lost. However considered, the whole history of Christ, and especially his crucifixion, death, and resurrection, had for them but a symbolic significance, as the incarnation of this idea of evil. Calvin's strong expression, only "une facce ou moralité fouée pour nous figurer le mystère de notre salut"—only a type of the idea that sin was effaced and atoned for, while in reality, and in God's view, it was no account in itself ("Christ surnomme, et tant est puissant et glorifique par le..." quae ad salutem nostri requiri scriptura; e. g. cum siunt, Christum abolevisse peccatum, sensum eorum est, Christum abolutionem illam in persona suam representasse, c. 17). But in so far as we are one in spirit with Christ, all that he underwent is as if we had undergone it; his example and His passion, "Est ille finitionis," is true as well for us as for himself; sin has lost all significance so far as we are concerned, and the fight against sin, repentance, mortification of the flesh, etc., are no longer necessary. Neither can nor should the spiritualist be any longer subject to suffering, since Christ has suffered all. Here the idea and the reality, however, are in conflict ("Nam scriptum est: Factus sum totus homo. Cum factus sit totus homo [tous hommes, in a twofold sense], accipiens naturam hominum, ac mortuos sit, potestin..." aduin in his inferiorius locuri mori? Magni esset error hoc creaturarum, etc., destruitur etc., c. 29). Of course men should be born anew, but this new birth is secured when he regains the state of innocence of Adam before the fall; when in absolute filial unity with God, he neither sees nor knows sin, or, in other words, when he is no longer able to distinguish it from righteousness (moeo...quae amplius opus est); and when he can find no tacts of God's Spirit by virtue of natural impulse ("Sed si adue committamus delictum et ingendiaram hortum voluptatis, qui adue nobis prohibet..." quae adue vel..." sed siimus nos duci a voluntate Dei. Aliquâ non esse anima potius etc., qui est pars prima nostrae Adam, etc. videmus peccatum, sicut ipse et utior ejus, etc. Nunc vivificati sumus cum secundo Adamo; qui est Christus, non cernendo amplius peccatum, quia est mortuum," etc.: ibidem ; compare c. 18). Such a twice-born one is Christ, is God himself, to whom the Libertine returns after death, to be absorbed in him ("Hoc enim imaginatur, animam hominam, quae est Deus, ad seipsum redire, cum ad mortem ventum est, non ut tanguam anima humana, sed tanguam Deus ipse vitav, sicut ab initio," c. 19 and 22). The consequences of such principles are obvious: they lead naturally to sensuality, to the emancipation of the flesh and the laying aside of all restrictions; make men look upon propriety or ownership as a wrong, as opposed to the principles of love, and, in fact, a theft, though this principle was not carried into practice. Calvin called its principal actor the "Ordo...doctoris" (c. 19). Ordinary or legal marriage comes to be looked upon as a mere carnal bond, and therefore dissoluble; true mar-
riage, such as satisfies both body and mind, being a union of each to each; communion of saints extended not merely to the worldly possessions, but also to the very bodies of the saints. In short, spiritualism soon degenerated into open and avowed sensualism and materialism. But this is the very feature which gave it its influence with some classes in Geneva. The example of their bishops and of the cathedral canons had excited their imagination by inclining them to self-indulgence and licentiousness, and political circumstances operated in favor of the result. Soon, however, the real principles of the Libertines appeared in their full light, and created a reaction, some women having gone so far as to quote Scripture to authorize their excesses, insisting especially on the fact of God's first command to our first parents having been "to increase and multiply" ("Crescere et multiplicare super terram. En prima lex, quan ordinavit Deus, quae vocabatur lex natura," c. 23). See Communism; "Free Love" in the article Marriage.

As Calvin had favored political libertinism, those who considered themselves aggrieved by the practice of the church acted against him, and this political-religious reaction went as far as irreligion and atheism, as in the case of Jacob Gruet, whose ultra-radical principles in politics and rationalism in religion led to his trial before the courts of Geneva July 27, 1547. Yet no one really did more to counteract the principles of the Libertines than Calvin himself. First, in 1544, he brought all their secret principles to light in one of his works (see Institut. iii, § 14). Afterwards, in 1547, he warned the faithful of Rouen against an ex-Franciscan monk who was incalculating libertinizing doctrines, and who had both some success, especially among women of the higher classes. Under Calvin, influence of Parel also took the pen against the Libertines (Le glaise de la parole véritable, tiré contre le bouclier de défense, dans quel un cordelier s'est voulu servir pour approuver ses fausses et daumantes opinions [Geneva, 1550]; see Kirchhofer, Theological History of Switzerland, 1861). The Church of Navarre was highly offended at Calvin for denouncing the leaders of the Libertines who were then at her court; he therefore wrote to her a letter which is a remarkable specimen of reasonable remonstrance (Aug. 28, 1546; in French, see J. Bonnet, Lettres de J. Calvin, i, 111 sq.; Latin, Epist. et Rem. ed. Amsterdam, p. 80). It is in fact due to his efforts that this sect, this baneful curse, left France to take refuge in its native country, Belgium, and that it finally disappeared altogether. Against the Libertines of Geneva the attacks were for a long time unanswerable, could not be contained, and were successfully ended until after the insurrection of May 15, 1555, when the principal leaders were either exiled or imprisoned. See Calvin, Aux ministres de l'église de Neufchatel contre la secte fanatique et furieuse des Libertins qui se nomment Spiritualés (Gen. 1544, 8vo; 1545, and other editions); Contre un Franciscain, sectateur des erreurs des Libertins, adressé à l'église de Rouen (20 Août, 1547 [both these have been published together in 1547, in Opuscules, p. 817 sq.], and by P. Jacob, p. 293 sq.); Lat. by Des Gallars, in Opusc. obs. Gen. 1522; Opp. ed. Amsterdam, vii, 374 sq.); Plecit, Histoire de Genève; Giseler, Kirchengesch. iii, l. p. 885; Hundeshagen, in the Thol. Stud. und Krit. (1845); Herzog, Encyclop. viii, 374-380. (J. H. W.)

Liberty. The idea of liberty," says Locke, "is the idea of a power in any agent to do or forbear any particular action, according to the determination or thought of the mind, whereby either of them is preferred to the other. When either of them is not in the power of the agent, to be produced by him according to his volition, then he is not at liberty, but under necessity." From this abstract definition, it cannot be inferred that Locke's ideas of liberty and of power are very nearly the same. "Every one," he observes, "finds in himself a power to begin or forbear, continue or put an end to, several actions in himself. From the consideration of the extent of this power of the mind over the actions of the man, which every one finds in himself, arise the ideas of liberty and necessity." These definitions, however, merely extend to the ability of the individual to execute his own purposes without obstruction; whereas as Locke, in order to do justice to his own decided opinion on the subject, gave it also included also in his idea of liberty a power over the determinations of the will. "By the liberty of a moral agent," says Dr. Reid, "I understand a power over the determinations of his own will. If, in any action, he had power to will what he did not want to do, he would not have the liberty. But if, in every voluntary action, the determination of his will be the necessary consequence of something involuntary in the state of his mind, or of something in his external circumstances, he is not free; he has not what I call the liberty of a moral agent, but is subject to necessity." On the other hand, some affirm that necessity is perfectly consistent with human liberty; that is, that the most strict and inviolable connection of cause and effect does not prevent the full, free, and unrestricted development of certain powers in the agent, or take away the distinction between the nature of virtue and vice, praise and blame, reward and punishment, but is the foundation of all moral reasoning. "I conceive," says Hobbes, "that nothing taketh beginning from itself, but from the action of some other immediate agent without itself; and that therefore, when first a man had no will, he would not be free; but he would have been immediately before he had no appetite nor will, the cause of his will is not the will itself, but something else not in his own disposing; so that whereas it is out of controversy that of voluntary action the will is the necessary cause, and by this which is said the will is also caused by other things wherein it disposes not, it followeth that voluntary actions have all of them necessary causes, and therefore are necessitated. I hold that to be a sufficient cause to which nothing is wanting that is needful to the producing of the effect. The same is true of the action of nature, and also of innate instinct. If a sufficient cause shall not bring forth the effect, then there wanteth somewhat which was needful to the producing of it, and so the cause was not sufficient; but if it be impossible that a sufficient cause should not produce the effect, then is a sufficient cause a necessary cause (for that is said to produce the effect in an effect necessarily that cannot but produce it). Hence it is manifest that whatsoever is produced hath a sufficient cause to produce it, or else it had not been, and therefore also voluntary actions are necessitated." "I conceive liberty," he observes, "to be, 'to have power to do or forbear, a power not necessarily that cannot but produce it.' In the absence of all impediments to action that are not contained in the nature and intrinsic quality of the agent: as, for example, the water is said to descend freely, or to have liberty to descend by the channel of the river, because there is no impediment that way, but not across, because the banks are impediments; and, though the water cannot ascend, yet men never say it wants the liberty to ascend, but the faculty or power, because the impediment is in the nature of the water, and intrinsic. So also we say, he that is tied wants the liberty to go, but not to move, and it is not necessary that he cannot move. We say, he wants not the liberty to move in his bands; whereas we say not so of him that is sick or lame, because the impediment is in himself. I hold that the ordinary definition of a free agent—namely, that a free agent is that which, when all things are present that are needful to produce the effect, can nevertheless not produce it—implies a contradiction, and is nonsensical; being as much as to say the cause may be sufficient, that is to say, necessary, and yet the effect shall not follow." He afterwards defines a moral agent to be one that acts from deliberation, or will, or not at all. As no great amount of the difficulty will be seen in the insensibility between choice and necessity, he adds: "Commonly, when we see and know the strength that moves us, we acknowledge necessity; but when we do not, or mark not the force that moves us, we then think there is none, and thus conclude that it is not cause, but lib-
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eity, that produces the action. Hence it is that we are apt to think that one does not choose this or that when necessity chooses for us; but we might as well say fire does not burn because it burns of necessity." The general question is thus stated by Hobbes in the beginning of his treatise: the point is not, he says, "whether a man can be a free agent; that is to say, whether he can do a thing contrary to his will, but whether the will to write or the will to forbear come upon him according to his will, or according to anything else in his power. I acknowledge this liberty, that I can do if I will; but say I can will if I will, I take to be an absurd speech. In fine, that freedom from external constraint, is a subject of consideration purely to liberty of action. This latter is simply a physical question, and applies to all agents, whether human, animal, or even material; that liberty which concerns, and indeed constitutes, a being as a moral agent, is quite a different thing: Hobbes as a materialist, and therefore a necessitarian, of course finds no room for this kind of moral or self-determining power.

It is unquestionable that the source of most of the confusion on the subject is in the ambiguity lurking under the term necessity, which includes both kinds of necessity, moral and physical. If double meaning of the word has been the chief reason why persons who were guided more by their own feelings and the customary associations of language than by formal definitions have altogether rejected the doctrine, while persons of a more logical turn, who could not deny the truth of the abstract principle, have yet, in their explanation of it and inference from it, fallen into the same error as their opponents. The partisans of necessity have given up their common sense, as they supposed, to their reason, while the advocates of liberty rejected a demonstrable truth from fear of a real consequence, which may have been the dupe of a word. The obscurity of the term has doubtless been the cause of nearly all the difficulty and repugnance which many who really hold the doctrine find in admitting it. It was to remove this prejudice that Dr. Jonathan Edwards was induced to write his dissertation, calling it "The History of Sin written expressly to vindicate himself from the charge of having, in his great work, confounded moral with physical necessity, he says: "On the contrary, I have largely declared that the connection between antecedent things and consequent ones, which take place with regard to the acts of men's wills, which is called moral necessity, is called by the name of necessity improperly, and that all such terms as must, cannot, impossible, unable, irresistible, unavoidable, inexcusable, etc., when applied here, are not employed in their proper signification, and are either used nonsensically and with perfect insignificance, or in a sense quite diverse from their original and proper meaning and their use in common speech, and that such a necessity as attends the acts of men's wills is more properly called certainty than necessity." The well-known definition of Edwards on this subject is in the following words: "The plain and obvious meaning of the words freedom and liberty, in common speech, is power, opportunity, or advantage that any one has to do as he pleases, or, in other words, his being free from hindrance or impediment in the way of doing or conducting in any respect whatsoever. A determination by motives cannot, to our understanding, escape from necessity—nay, were we even to admit as true what we cannot think as possible, still the doctrine of a motiveless volition would be only casualistic, and the free acts of an indifferent are morally and rationally as worthless as the fore-ordained passions of the necessitarian. If, therefore, we admit that liberty is possible in man or God we are utterly unable speculatively to understand. But practically the fact..."
that we are free is given to us in the consciousness of our moral accountability; and this fact of liberty cannot be reargued on the ground that it is incomprehensible, for the philosophy of the conditions proves, against the necessitarian, that things there which may, may must be true, of which the understanding is wholly unacquainted. But this philosophy is not only competent to defend the fact of our moral liberty, possible, though inconceivable, against the assault of the fatalist; it retorts against himself the very objection of inconceivability by which the fatalist had thought to triumph over the libertarian. It shows that the scheme of freedom is not more inconceivable than the scheme of necessity; for, whilst fatality is a recoil from the more obscure inconceivability of an absolute commencement, on the fact of which commencement the doctrine of liberty proceeds, the fatalist is shown to overlook the equal or less obscure inconceivability of an infinite non-commencement, on the assertion of which non-commencement his own doctrine of necessity must ultimately rest. As equally unthinkable, the two counter, the two one-sided schemes, are thus theoretically balanced. 10

Sir William, however, asks, as we, in this extract, do not closely adhere to the conditions of the problem. According to his own admission, it is not the fact of a self-determining power in the will that is 'inconceivable', but only the mode (the how) of its exercise. This, like many other open problems, is a mystery. Again, it is not claimed that the will acts without motive, but only that it is not controlled by external motive; that it has the power of itself choosing what motive shall be strongest with it, irrespective of the intrinsic force of that motive. It is a distinction that preserves-as no other can-the truly moral character of the agent. Those theologians, on the other hand, who deny that the divine predestination extends to the individual acts of men in general, think that they thus more effectually obviate the whole difficulty. In the divine foreknowledge of all human actions they admit the certainty of their occurrence, but find no conclusive power, such as seems to enter essentially into the predestinations of an Almighty will. As to the argument that such foreknowledge rests upon, and therefore implies fore-ordination, they contend that this is a reversal of the true order (comp. Rom. viii., 29), and that God's presence is a simple knowing beforehand by his peculiar power of intention, not any conclusion or inference from what he may or may not determine. See PRESENCE.

Collins's Philosophical Inquiry concerning Human Liberty; Clarke's Remarks upon a Book entitled "A Philosophical Inquiry concerning Human Liberty"; Edwards's Inquiry into the Freedom of the Will; Essay on the Genius and Writings of Edwards, prefixed to the London edition of his works, 1834, by H. Rogers; J. Taylor's introduction to his Principles of Natural and Moral Powers of Man; Tappan's Review of Edwards's Inquiry into the Freedom of the Will; Mill's System of Logic; Jowsey's Introduction to Ethics; Blakey's History of the Philosophy of Mind; Hazard, On the Will; Bogus, On the Will; Whedon, On the Will. See also SHISHOR-LIBNATH.

Libnah (Heb. Libnah, לִבְנַה, transparency, as in Exod. xxiv., 10), the name of two places. See also SHISHOR-LIBNATH.

1. (Sept. Ἄσωμα ου καὶ Ἄσωμα.) The twenty-first station of the Israelites in the desert, between Rimon-pares and Rissah (Num. xxxiii., 20, 21); probably identical with Laban (Deut. i., i), and perhaps situated near wady el-Ain, west of Kedesh-Barnea. See EXOD.

2. (Sept. Ἄσωμα, sometimes Ασωμα, occasionally Ασιωμα or Ασιωματος.) A town of the Canaanites (Josh. xii., 15), taken and destroyed by Joshua immediately after Makkedah and before Lachish (Josh. x., 29-32, 89). It lay in the plain within the territory assigned to Judah (Josh. xv., 42), and became one of the Levitical towns in that tribe, as well as an asylum (Josh. xxi., 18; 1 Chron. vi., 57). In the reign of king Jehoram, Libnah is said to have revolted from him (2 Kings viii., 22; 2 Chron. xxi., 10). From the circumstance of this revolt having happened at the same time with that of the Edomites, it has been supposed by some to have reference to another town of the same name situated in that country. But such a conjecture is unnecessary and improbable, for it appears that the Philistines and Arabsians revolted at the same time (2 Chron. xxi., 10). Libnah of Judah rebelled because it refused to admit the idolatries of Jehoram; and it is not said in either of the passages in which this act is recorded, as of Edom, that it continued in revolt "unto this day." It may be inferred either that it was speedily reduced to obedience, or, that, on the re-establishment of the true worship, it spontaneously returned to its allegiance. Libnah is said to have been the father of two of the last kings of Judah (2 Kings xxiii., 81; xxiv, 18; Jer. lii., 1). It appears to have been a strongly fortified place, for the Assyrian king Sennacherib was detained some time before it when he invaded Judaea in the time of Hezekiah. See Hezekiah. On completing or relinquishing the siege of Lachish—which of the two is not quite certain—Sennacherib laid siege to Libnah (2 Kings xix., 8; Isa. xxxvii., 8). While there he was joined by Rabshakeh and the part of the army which had visited Jerusalem (2 Kings xix., 6; Isa. xxxvii., 8), and received the intelligence of Tarchah's approach; and it would appear that at Libnah the destruction of the Assyrian army took place, though the statements of Herodotus (i., 141) and of Josephus (Ant. x., 1, 4) place it at Pelusium (see Rawlinson, Herod., 4, 400). Libnah was the native place of Haman, chief of the eunuchs, to his king, Darius the Mede (2 Kings xxiii., 81) and Zedekiah (xxiv., 18; Jer. lli., 1). It is in this connection that its name appears for the last time in the Bible. It existed as a village in the time of Eusebius and Jerome, and is placed by them in the district of Eleutheropolis. See ELEUTHEROPOLIS (compare Josephus, Ant. x., 5, 3). Dr. Robinson was unable to discover the least trace of its site (Bib. Res., ii, 388). Stanley inclines to find the site at Tell er-Safajeh (Sinai)
and Pat., p. 207, 238); but this is probably Gath. Van de Velde suggests Arak el-Mehriyeh, a hill about four miles west of Beitol-Jobriah (Armen., p. 380), which seems to answer to the requirements of location. It stood near Lachish, west of Makkedah, and probably also west of Eleutheropolis (Kelly, Comment. on Jos., x., 29), and was situated in the district immediately west of the hill region, in the vicinity of Eber, Ashan, etc. (Jos. xvi., 46).

Libnath. See Shishoh-Libnath.

Libnah. See Poplar.

Libni (Heb. Libni, לִבְנִי, white; Sept. Αὐστρείον Αὐστρείον), the first-born of the two sons of Gershon, the son of Levi (Exod. vi., 17; Num. iii., 18, 21; 1 Chron. vi., 17; comp. Num. xxxvi., 58); elsewhere called Laadan (1 Chron. xxiii., 7; xxxvi., 21), B.C. post 1856. His son is called Jailath (1 Chron. vi., 20, 46), and his descendants were named Limmrites (Num. iii., 21; xxxvi., 58). In 1 Chron. vi., 26, by some error he is called the son of Mahli and the father of Shimei.

Libnite (Heb. Libni, לִבְנִי, being a patronymic of the same form from Libni; Sept. Αὐστρείον), a descendant of Libni the Levite (Num. iii., 21; xxxvi., 58).

Liboris, Sr., fourth bishop of Manna, a disciple of St. Pauvncius, flourished from the middle to the close of the 4th century. The existing documents on his life are quite untrustworthy, and relate only that he was a pious man, and a great friend of St. Martin of Tours. See the Bollandists for July 23; Tilmont, Mémoires, x., 307; Mabillon, De Pontif. Consecratis, 1. His body was transferred in the 9th century from Manna to Paderborn, by order of Biso, bishop of the latter place. See Pertz, Script. iv. (vi.), 149 sqq.; Herzig, Real-Encyklopädie, viii., 388.

Libra (pound), the name sometimes given to the seventy suffragans of the bishop of Rome, from the circumstance that there were seventy solidi or parts in the Roman libra.

Libraries. In the early Church, as soon as churches began to be erected, it was customary to attach libraries to them. In these were included not only the liturgical and other Church books, and MS. copies of the holy Scriptures in the original languages, but also homilies and other theological works. That they were of some importance is evident from the manner in which they are referred to by Eusebius and Jerome, who mention having made use of the libraries at Jerusalem and Constantinople, and the prominence held by them as principal part of the materials for his Ecclesiastical History in the library at Jerusalem. One of the most famous was that attached to the church of St. Sophia, which is supposed to have been commenced by Constantine, but was afterwards greatly augmented by Theodosius the Younger, in whose time there were not fewer than one hundred thousand books in it, and a hundred and twenty thousand in the time of Basilius and Zeno. No doubt a particular reason for thus collecting books was their great expense and rarity before the art of printing enabled men to possess themselves the works they needed for thorough research. In churches where the itinerant system prevailed libraries possessed by churches would even in our very day prove a source of pleasure, and time-saving indeed. As a consequence of this arrange- ment there are already advocating this plan.

Libri Carolinii. See Caroline Books.

Libya (Λιβύη or Αιβύη), a name which, in its largest acceptance, was used by the Greeks to denote the whole of Africa (Strabo, ii., 131); but Libya Proper, which is the Libya of the New Testament (Acts ii., 10), and the country of the Libyans in the Old, was a large tract along the Mediterranean coast of Egypt (Strabo, xvii., 824). It is called Pentopolitana Regio by Pliny (Hist. Nat. v., 6), from its five cities, Berenice, Arsinoe, Ptolemais, Apollonia, and Cyrene; and Libya Cyrenaica by Ptolomy (Geog. iv., 5), from Cyrene, its capital. The name of Libya occurs in Acts ii., 10, where "the dwellers in the parts of Libya about Cyrene" are mentioned among the other Jews who came up to Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost. This obviously means the Cyrenaics. Similar expressions are used by Dion Cassius (A.D. 156-237), ii., 12, and Josephus (ς εἰς Κυρηνακας Αιτίαν, Anti xvi., 6, 1). See Cyrene.

In the Old Testament, it is the rendering sometimes adopted of שֲנֵה (Jer. xvi., 9; Ezek. xxx., 5; xxxviii., 8, 9) elsewhere rendered פַּרְעֹע (Gen. x., 6; Ezek. xxvii., 10).

Libya is supposed to have been first peopled by, and to have derived its name from, the Lebebos or Libsins (Gen. x., 18; Nah. iii., 9; see Geniius, Monum. Pharn. p. 211; comp. Michaelis, Spicil. i., 362 sqq.; Vater, Comment. i., 182). These, its earliest inhabitants, appear, in the time of the Old Testament, to have consisted of wandering tribes, who were sometimes in alliance with Egypt (compare Herod. iv., 159), and at others with the Ethiopians, as they are said to have assisted both Shishak, king of Egypt, and Zerah the Ethiopian in their expeditions against Judah (2 Chron. xii., 4; xiv., 8; xvi., 9). In the time of Cambyses they appear to have formed part of the Persian empire (Herod. iii., 10), and the Libyans formed part of the immense army of Xerxes (Herod. vii., 71, 86). They are mentioned by Daniel (xii., 43) in connection with the Ethiopians and Cushites. They were eventually subdued by the Carthaginians; and it was the policy of that people to bring the nomadic tribes of Northern Africa which they mastered under the condition of cultivators, that by the produce of their industry they might be able to raise and maintain the numerous armies with which they made their foreign conquests. But Herodotus assures us that none of the Libyans beyond the Carthaginian territory were tillers of the ground (Herod. iv., 196, 187, compare Polybius, i., 161, 167, 168, 177, ed. Schwingeauser). Since the time of the Carthaginian supremacy, the country, with the rest of the East, has successively passed into the hands of the Greeks, Romans, Saracens, and Turks. See Africa.

Libyan (only in the pl.), the rendering adopted in the A.V. of two Heb. names, לִבְיוֹן (Libbim, Sept. Λιββίων), Dan. xi., 48 (where otherwise written Λιββίων); 2 Chron. vii., 8; viii., 9; Nah. iii., 9; prob. i. q. לִבְיוֹן, "Libbim." Gen. x., 18; 1 Chron. i., 11) and פָּרְעֹע (Put, Jer. xvi., 9; Sept. Αὐστρείον; elsewhere rendered "Libya," Ezek. xxx., 5, xxxviii., 8; Phut, or "Put"). See Libya.

Lice (ζόο, perh. from δζο, to sip; only once in the sing., used collectively, Isa. li., 6, and there doubtful, where the Sept., Vulg., and Engl. Ver. confound with ζο, and render ὀνοσκο, "in like manner;" elsewhere plural, פַּרְעֹע, Exod. viii., 16, 17, 18; Psa. cv., 81; Sept. κυπρίκες, ver. 17 κυπρίκες; r. κυπρίκες; Vulg. antipodes, in Psa. canibus; also the cognate sing. collective Πυπο, κυριον, Exod. viii., 17, 18, Sept. and Vulg. κυπρίκες, cypriques), the name of the creature employed in the third plague upon Egypt, miraculously produced from the dust of the land. Its exact nature has been much disputed. Dr. A. Clarke has inferred, from the words "in man and in beast," that it was the acarus suspensus, or "tick" (Comment. on Exod. viii., 15). Michaelis remarks (Suppl. ad Lex. 1174) that if it be a Hebrew for "lice," it is strange that it should have disappeared from the cognate tongues, the Aramaic, Samaritan, and Ethiopic. The rendering of the Sept. seems highly valuable when it is considered that it was given by learned Jews resident in Egypt, that it occurs in the most ancient and best executed version of that version, and that it can be elucidated by the writings of ancient Greek naturalists, etc. Thus Aristotle, who was nearly contemporary with
the Sept. translators of Exodus, mentions the οἰκότεις (the οἰκότεις of the Sept.) among insects able to distinguish between a herb (οἰκότεις) and a fruit (οἰκότεις), and refers to species of birds which he calls οἰκοτείονα, that live by hunting οἰκότεις (vi., 6). His pupil Theophrastus says, "The οἰκότεις are born in certain trees, as the oak, the fig-tree, and they seem to subsist upon the sweet moisture which is collected under the bark. They are also produced on some vegetables" (Hist. Plant. i, 17, and ii., ul.). This description applies to ὀξίδες, or rather to the various species of "call-flies" (Cymipsa, Linn.). Hesychius, in the beginning of the third century, explains οἰκότεις as "a green four-winged creature," and quotes Theophrastus as saying that these are "damsels to a wondrous wretch, and adds, "From the little creature among trees, which speedily devour them." Philo (A.D. 40) and Origen, in the second century, who both lived in Egypt, describe it in terms suitable to the gnat or mosquito (Philo, Vita Moses, i, 57, ed. Mangely; Origen, Homilia tertia in Exod., as does also Augustine in the third or fourth century (De Conveniuntis, etc.). But Theodoret, in the same age, distinguishes between οἰκότεις and οἰκότεις (Vita Jacob). Suidas (A.D. 1100) says χιφύς, "resembling gnats," and adds, "a little creature that eats the flesh of the Christian fathers," but gives no authority for their explanations, and Bochart remarks that they seem to be speaking of gnats under the name οἰκότεις, which word, he conjectures, bisected them from its resemblance to the Hebrew. Schleusener adds (Gloss. s.n. in Testament) οἰκότεις, "less than gnats," and (Lec. Cyril., M. Br.汉堡), "very small creatures like gnats." From this concurrence of testimony it would appear that not lice, but some species of gnats, is the proper rendering, though the ancients, no doubt, included other species of insects under the name. Mr. Bryant, however, gives a curious turn to the evidence derived from ancient naturalists. He quotes Theophrastus, and admits that a Greek must be the best judge of the meaning of the Greek word, but urges that the Sept. translators concealed the meaning of the Hebrew word, which he labors to prove is ιέρικες, for fear of offending the Ptolemies, under whose inspection they translated, and the Egyptians in general, whose detestation of lice was as ancient as the time of Herodotus (ii., 37) (but who includes "any other foul creature"), and whose disgust, he thinks, would have been too much excited by reading that their nation once swarmed with those creatures through the instrumentality of the servants of the God of the Jews (Plague of Egypt, Lond. 1794, p. 56, etc.). This suspicion, if admitted, upsets all the previous reasoning. But a plague of lice, upon Bryant's own principles, could not have been more offensive to the Egyptians than the plague of locusts that sapped the Nile, the former of which the Sept. translators have not mitigated. Might it not be suggested with equal probability that the Jews in later ages had been led to interpret the word lice as being peculiarly humiliating to the Egyptians, (see Josephus, ii., 14, 5, who, however, makes the Egyptians to be afflicted with phthisis). The rendering of the Vulg. affords us no assistance, being evidently formed from that of the Sept., and not being illustrated by any Roman naturalist, but found only in Christian Latin writers (see Facchini, a. v.). The other ancient versions, etc., are of no value in this inquiry. They adopt the popular notion of the times, and Bochart's reasonings upon them involve, as Rosenmüller (apud Bochart) justly complains, many unsafe permutations of letters. If, then, the Sept. be discarded, we are deprived of the highest source of information. Bochart's reasonings upon the form of the word (Hieroz. iii., 518) is unsound, as, indeed, that of all others who have relied upon etymology to furnish a clue to the insect intended. It is strange that it did not occur to Bochart that if the plague had been lice it would have been easily imitated by the magicians, which was attempted them, etc., but in vain (i., iii., 18). Nor is the objection valid that if this plague were gnats, etc., the plague of flies would be anticipated, since the latter most likely consisted of one particular species having a different destination (see Fly), whereas this may have consisted not only of mosquitoes or gnats, but of some other species which also attack domestic cattle, as the astrus, or tabanum, or simr (Bruce, Travels, i, 315, 8vo), on which supposition these two plagues would be sufficiently distinct. See PLAGUES OF EGYPT. But, since mosquitoes, gnats, etc., have ever been one of the evils of Egypt, there must have been some peculiarity attending them on this occasion which proved the plague to be "the lunger of God." From the next chapter, ver. 81, it appears that the fly and the barley were smitten by the hail; that the former was beginning to grow, and that the latter was in the ear, which, according to Shaw, takes place in Egypt in March. Hence the κινόμων would be sent about February, i.e. before the increase of the Nile, which takes place at the end of May or beginning of June. Since, then, the innumerable swarms of mosquitoes, gnats, etc., which every year affect the Egyptians, come, according to Hasselquist, at the increase of the Nile, the appearance of them in February would be as much a variation of the course of nature as the appearance of the astrus in January would be in England. They were also probably numerous and fierce beyond example on this occasion, and, as the Egyptians would be utterly unprepared for them, (for it seems that this plague was not announced), the effects would be signal distress. Bochart adduces instances in which both mankind and cattle, and even wild beasts, have been driven by gnats from their localities. It may be added that the proper Greek name for the gnat is ἰμιρίς, and that probably the word χιφύς, which much resembles χιφύς, is appropriate to the mosquito. Har- douin observes that the χιφύς of Aristotle are not the ἰμιρίς, which latter is by Pliny always rendered κυλικος, a word which he employs with great latitude. See GNAT. For a description of the evils inflicted by these insects upon man, see Kirby and Spence, Introduction to Entomology, Lond. 1828, i, 115, etc.; and for the annoyance they cause in Egypt, Maillet, Descrip. de l'Egypte par l'Abbé Mascerier (Paris, 1756), x, 57; Forskal, Descr. Animal. p. 85. Michaelis proposed an inquiry into the meaning of the word οἰκότεις to the Société des Savants, with a full description of the qualities ascribed to them by Philo, Origen, and Augustine (Recueil, etc, Amst. 1744). Niebuhr inquired after it of the Greek patriarch, and also of the metropolitan at Cairo, who thought it to be a species of gnat found in great quantities in the gardens there, and whose bite was extremely painful. A merchant who was present at the inquiry called it ὅδυγ- βρότον, or the dog-fly (Descrip. de l'Arabe, Pref. p. 39, 40). Besides the references already made, see Romanelli, Schol. ad Hesych. Michaelis, ad Lec. Hieroz. 1.230 sq.; Oedocn, Vra, Samml. aus der Naturkunde, i, 6, 74-91; Bakker, Annotat. in Ed. M. i, 1099; Egyptian Gnat magnified.
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The advocates of the other theory, that lice are the animals meant by kinsiam, and not gnats, base their arguments upon these facts: (1) Because the kinsiam sprang from the dust, whereas gnats come from the waters; (2) Because it is said though they may greatly irritate men and beasts, cannot properly be said to be 'in' them; (3) Because their name is derived from a root (סח) which signifies to 'establish,' or to 'fix,' which cannot be said of gnats; (4) Because, if gnats are intended, then the fourth plague of flies would be unduly anticipated; (5) Because the Talmudists use the word kinsiam in the singular number to mean a louse; as it is said (Shabb. xiv, 107, b), "As is the man who slays a camel on the Sabbath, so is he who slays a louse on the Sabbath." (Smith). "The entomologists, Kirby and Spence, place these minute but disgusting insects in the very front rank of those which inflict direct injury upon man. A teratologist, for example, lists them among the ravages of this and closely allied parasitic pests. They remark that, for the quelling of human pride, and to pull down the high conceits of mortal man, this most loathsome of all maladies, or one equally disgusting, has been introduced into the earth from the east, the west, and the mighty; and in the list of those that have fallen victims to it, you will find poets, philosophers, prelates, princes, kings, and emperors. It seems more particularly to have been a judgment of God upon oppression and tyranny, whether civil or religious. Thus the inhuman Pharaoh mentioned by Herodotus, Antiochus Epiphanes, the dictator Sylla, the two Herods, the emperor Maximin, and, not to mention more, the persecutor of the Protestants, Philip the Second, were carried off by it." (Introd. to Entomol. vol. iv). The Egyptian plague might also have been somewhat like that dreadful disease common in Poland, and known as plica Polonica, in which the hair becomes matted together in the most disgusting manner, and is infested with swarms of vermin. Each hair is highly sensitive, bleeds at the root on the least violence, and if but slightly pulled feels exquisite pain. Lafontaine, whom Herrmann calls a very exact describer, affirms that millions of lice appear on the wretched patient on the third day of this disease (Mem. Aperon. p. 78). These insects form the order Anoplaria of Leach, and Parasitina of Latreille. Most mammals are infested by them, and probably all, and probably all, are infested by them; each beast and bird, as is stated, having its own proper species of louse, and sometimes two or more. Three distinct species make the human body their abode." See Lice.

Licean, the name given to the liberty and warrant to preach.

(1.) In the Presbyterian Church it is regularly conferred by the Presbytery on those who have passed satisfactorily through the prescribed curriculum of study. When a student has fully completed his course of study at the theological hall, he is taken on trial for the licence by the Presbytery to which he belongs. These trials consist of an examination on the different subjects taught in the theological hall, his personal religion, and his motives for seeking to enter the ministerial office. He also delivers a lecture on a passage of Scripture, a homily, an exercise and additions, a popular sermon, and an exegesis; and, lastly, he is examined on Church History, Hebrew and Greek, and on divinity generally. It is the duty of the Presbytery to criticise each of these by itself, and sustain or reject it separately, as a part of the series of trials, and then, when the trials are completed, to pass a judgment on the whole by a regular vote. If the trials are sustained, the candidate is required to answer the questions in the formula, and, after prayer, is licensed and authorized to preach the Gospel of Christ, and exercise his gifts as a probationer for the holy ministry, of which license a regular certificate is given if required. He is simply a layman or lay candidate for the clerical office, preaching, but not dispensing the sacraments. See Oath.

(2.) In the Methodist churches it is conferred on laymen who are believed to be competent for this office, and it is from persons thus brought into the ministry [see Lay Preaching] that the Church is supplied with ministers. See Local Preachers; Licentiate.

Lichteneberg, Johann Conrad, a German theologian, was born at Darmstadt Dec. 9, 1669. In 1707 he entered the University of Giessen, and then attended successively those of Jena, Leipsic, and Halle; in the latter he finished his academic course in 1711. Soon after he accepted a call as vicar to Neun-Kirchen, in the grand-duchy of Hesse; in 1716 he became pastor of the same place; in 1719, pastor of Upper Hamstadt; in 1738, metropolitan of the diocese of the balinvelt Lichteneberg; in 1745, tutor at Daniel's College, and examiner of teachers; and in 1749, superintendent. He died July 17, 1751. His knowledge was extensive, embracing not only theology, but also mathematics and physics. Astronomical studies, especially, had a lasting interest for him; the latter he knew skilfully how to weave into his sermons in a simple and popular manner, thus captivating the attention of the audience. He contributed largely to Church music. The various books which he composed are all of an ascetical character; we only mention Texte zur Kirchenuuskii (Darmst. 1719, 1720, 8vo); Ermuternde Stimmen aus Zion (Ibid. 1722, 8vo); Gesehliche Betrachtungen über gewisse in den Evangelien enthaltene Materien (Ibid. 1721, 8vo). — Döring, Geschichte Theol. Deutschlands, ii, 296 sq.

Lidbir. See Lo-debar.

Lie (Yād, Ḥādāq), an intentional violation of truth. In Scripture we find the word used to designate all the ways in which mankind denotes or alters truth in word or deed, as also evil in general. In general the term is used as the evil in deed, evil in action, or lie, and consequently the devil (being the contrary to God) as the father of lies, and liars or impious persons as children of the devil. Hence the Scriptures most expressly condemn lies (John viii, 44; 1 Tim. i, 9; Rom. xiii, 8; Heb. iv, 10; Rev. xx, 6), and Christ's comment on the lie said that all men are liars, it is synonymous with saying that all are bad. The Bible nowhere admits of praising, praiseworthy, or pious lies, yet it recommends not to proclaim the truth when its proclamation might prove injurious. Hence Christ commands (Matt. vii, 6)
The evil and injustice of lying appear, 1. From its being a breach of the natural and universal right of mankind to truth in the intercourse of speech. 2. From its being a violation of God's sacred law (Phil. iv., 8; Lev. xix., 11; Col. iii., 9). 3. The faculty of speech was bestowed as an instrument of knowledge, not of deceit; to communicate our thoughts, not to hide them. 4. It is esteemed a mark of nobility to speak the truth in levity, or to do others good, or to glorify God, Christ ever spoken an uncle. Truth, on the contrary, denied both Christ by word in the moment of danger (Matt. xxvi., 69 sq.; Mark xiv., 66 sq.; Luke xxii., 56 sq.; John xviii., 17 sq.) and his apostles, e.g. by his very Body in Acts xii., 15. But Paul, in Acts xxviii., 5, made use of an implication to clear himself, or, at any rate, concealed part of the truth in order to create dissension between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, and thus save himself. Strict truthfulness requires that we should never alter the truth, either in words or actions, so as to deceive others, whether it be for pleasure, or to benefit others or ourselves, or even for the best cause. Yet, although there can, absolutely considered, be no injurious truth, it is not expedient to tell all truth to those who are not able to receive or comprehend it. Then evil might result from the attempt to communicate the truth to children, to persons full of error and prejudice, to counterfeiters, spies, etc. But this does not imply that we may tell them that which is not true, only that we are to remain silent when we perceive that the truth would be useless, or might result in inflicting injury on ourselves or others. Of course, it is utterly impossible to adjudge, as this is positive lying, and indeed, by its calling on God, becomes diabolical lying, the Father of truth being invoked to confirm a lie, and the highest attribute of man, his consciousness of God, is made use of to deceive others, and to gain an advantage. See Oaths. But there are varieties of untruthfulness which do not belong to the domain of ethics, but to aesthetics. Such are parables, jests in word or deed, tales and fables, the usual formulas of politeness, mimicry (εἰσώροπος), etc., which are not calculated to deceive. But the aesthetic untruthfulness or suppression of the truth can also be abused. In morals, however, all depends on the improvement of conscience, and a correct, firm consciousness of God's presence and knowledge. These cannot be obtained by mere commandments or moral formulas, but by strengthening the moral sense, fortifying the will, by justifying and sanctifying the moral power. Morality is an inner life; those only can be called liars who willfully oppose the truth by word or deed, or by conscious untruthfulness seek to lead others into error or sin; in short, to injure them physically, or, as regards a sacred matter, "necessity". Lies, they also are condemned by the God of all truth; nor even in this world of imperfection, where there are so many ingenious illusions, is there any just occasion for their use. That truthfulness is a limited duty must necessarily be conceded, since the non-expression of the truth is in itself a limitation of it. The Bible mentions instances of lies in good men, but without approving them, as that of Abraham (Gen. xii., 12; xx, 2), Isaac (Gen. xxvi.), Jacob (Gen. xxvi.), the Hebrew midwives (Exod. i., 15–19), Michael (1 Sam. xix., 14 sq.), David (1 Sam. xx., etc.)—Kehrl, Neust. Wörterbuch.

There are various kinds of lies. 1. The pernicious lie, uttered for the hurt or disadvantage of our neighbor. 2. The officious lie, uttered for our own or our neighbor's advantage. 3. The ludicrous and jocose lie, uttered by word of jest, and only for mirth's sake in common conversation. 4. Pious frauds, as they are improperly called, pretended inspirations, forged books, counterfeit miracles, are species of lies. 5. Lies of the conduct, for a lie may be told in gestures as well as in words; as when a tradesman shuts up his windows to induce his creditors to believe that he is abroad. 6. Lies of omission, as when an author willfully omits what ought to be related; and may we not add, 7. That all equivocation and mental reservation come under the guilt of lying?
existence, as opposed to death and non-existence (Gen. ii, 7; xxvii, 7; Luke xvi, 26; Acts xvi, 25; 1 Cor. iii, 19; 2 Cor. v, 17; James i, 21; Rev. iii, 11; xi, 16; xvii, 3). See LONGEVITY. The ancients generally entertained the idea that the vital principle (which they appear to have denoted by the term spirit, in distinction from the soul itself, comp. 1 Thess. v, 26) resided particularly in the blood, which, on that account, the Jews were wont to use as food (Lev. xix, 11). See BLOOD. Other terms occasionally rendered "life" in the Scriptures are: 

(1) *nepheh*, a living creature,

(2) *psinn, a day, i.e. a lifetime, biouc (lifetime), xwirima (breath, i.e. spirit), psqri (soul, or animating principle).

The term life is also used more or less figuratively in the Scriptures for the spiritual life (i.e. existence, life, absolutely and without end, immortality (Heb. vii, 16). So also "tree of life," or of immortality, which preserves from death (Rev. ii, 7; xii, 2, 14; Gen. ii, 9; iii, 22); "bread of life" (John vi, 35, 51); "way of life" (Psa. xxi, 11; Acts ii, 29); "water of life," i.e. living fountains of water, perennial (Rev. vii, 17); crown of life, the reward of eternal life (James i, 12; Rev. ii, 10). See BOOK; BREAD; CROWN; FOUNTAIN; TREES, etc. (2) The manner of life, conduct, in a moral respect; "rightness of living" (Rom. vi, 4); "the life of God," i.e. the life which God enjoins a goodly soul (Eph. iv, 18; 2 Pet. i, 9). (3) The concept of "life" as the opposite of death, or the holiness and happiness of salvation procured by the Saviour's death. In this sense, life or eternal life is the antithesis of death or condemnation. Life is the image of all good, and is therefore employed to express it (Deut. xxv, 15; John iii, 16, 17, 18, 36; v, 24, 38, 40; vi, 47; viii, 51; xi, 26; Rom. v, 12, 18; 1 John v, 11); death is the consummation of evil, and so it is frequently used as a strong expression in order to designate every kind of evil, whether temporal or spiritual (Jer. xxxi, 8; Ezek. xviii, 26; xxxiii, 11; Rom. i, 28; vi, 21; vii, 5, 10, 13, 24; John vi, 50, viii, 31). (4) Life is also used for eternal life, i.e. the life of bliss and glory in the kingdom of God which awaits the true disciples of Christ (Matt. xix, 16, 17; John iii, 15; 1 Tim. iv, 8; Acts v, 29; Rom. vi, 17; 1 Pet. iii, 7; 2 Tim. i, 1). (5) The term life is also used of God and Christ or the Word, as the absolute source and cause of all life (John i, 4, 5; v, 26, 39; xi, 23; xii, 50; xiv, 6; xviii, 8, Col. iii, 4; 1 John i, 1, 2; 20). See DEATH.

LIFE EVERLASTING. See ETERNAL LIFE; FUTURE LIFE.

Lift (prop. N.T., diph) besides having the general sense of raising, is used in several peculiar phrases in Scripture. To *lift up the hands* is, among the Orientals, a part of the ceremony of greeting an oath: "I have lift up mine hand unto the Lord," says Abraham (Gen. xxiv, 22): "I will bring you into the land concerning which I lift up my hand" (Exod. vi, 8), which I promised with an oath. To *lift up one's hand against any one to attack him* to fight him (2 Sam. xviii, 25; 2 Kings xi, 9). To *lift up one's feet in the presence of any one* to appear boldly in his presence (2 Sam. ii, 22; Ezra ix, 6. (See also Job x, 15; xi, 15). To *lift up one's hands, eyes, soul, or heart unto the Lord* are expressions describing the sentiments and emotions of one who prays earnestly or desires a thing with ardor.

Lifters and ANTILIFTERS, a name given to the opening of the 18th century to the congregations at Killermossack, in the west of Scotland, who, according to Sir John Sinclair, differed on the patrimonial question whether the manor for the military and other purposes, the patent of his hand the plate of bread before its distribution in the Lord's Supper, the Lifters holding this to be essential, the others regarding it as of no moment. They were also called New Lights, and the others Old Lights, terms that have been applied in other cases somewhat analogously. [See SINCLAIR, Henry, 161; quoted from Sinclair, Words, ix, 375-6; Williams, Religious Encyclopedia, s. v., v. 14*.

Light (properly 'vin, br, `aw, from its shining) is represented in the Scriptures as the immediate result and offspring of a divine command (Gen. i, 3), where doubtless we have a reference to the celestial luminaries, still partially obscured by the haze that settled as a pall over the grave of nature at some tremendous cataclysm which well-nigh reduced the globe to its pristine chaos, rather than their actual formation, although they are subsequently introduced (Gen. ii, 14 sq.). In consequence of the intense brilliance and beneficial influence of light in an Eastern climate, it easily and naturally became, with Orientals, a representative of the highest human good. From this idea the transition was an easy one, in corrupt and superstitious minds, to the granting of the great light of the external, i.e. natural, world (Job xxxi, 26, 27). See ADORATION. This 'illuminity' the Hebrews not only avoided, but when they considered the heavens they recognised the work of God's fingers, and learnt a lesson of humility as well as of reverence (Psa. viii, 3 sq.). On the contrary, the entire residue of the East, with scarcely any exception, worshipped the sun and the light, primarily, perhaps, as symbols of divine power and divine brightness in the material state, as themselves divine; whence, in conjunction with darkness, the negation of light, arose the doctrine of dualism, two principles, the one of light, the good power, the other of darkness, the evil power, a corruption which rose and spread the more easily because the whole of human life, being a checkered scene, seems divided as between two conflicting agencies, the bright and the dark, the joyous and the sorrowful, what is called prosperous and what is called adverse. But in the Scriptures the purer symbolism is everywhere maintained (see Memphite, Symbol, Decal., s. v.). "All the more joyous emotions of the mind, all the pleasing sensations of the frame, all the happy hours of domestic intercourse, were habitually described among the Hebrews under imagery derived from light (1 Kings xi, 36; Isa. liviii, 8, 9; Ezek. viii, 16; Psa. xcvii, 11). The transition was natural from earth to heavenly, from corporeal to spiritual things, and so light came to typify true religion and the felicity which it imparts. But as light not only came from God, but also makes man's way clear before him, so it was employed to signify moral truth, and pre-eminently to symbolize the system of truth which the light of the Gentiles is brought to the Gentiles, from its earliest gleanings onward to the perfect day of the great sun of righteousness. The application of the term to religious topics had the greater propriety because the light in the world, being accompanied by hostile confederacies, enriching the world's darkness, is the peculiar province of true religion to produce in the human soul (Isa. xlii, 20, Matt. xvi, 16; Psa. cxix, 105; 2 Pet. i, 19; Eph. vi, 8; 2 Tim. i, 10; 1 Pet. ii, 9)."

Besides its physical sense (Matt. xii, 2; Acts ix, 8, xii, 7; 2 Cor. iv, 6), the term light is used by metonymy for a fire giving light (Mark xiv, 54; Luke xxii, 56); for a torch, candle, or lamp (Acts xvi, 29); for the material light of heaven, as the sun, moon, or stars (Psa. cxxvii, 7; James i, 17). In figurative language it signifies a manifest or open state of things (Matt. x, 25; Luke xiii, 3), and in a higher sense the eternal source of truth, purity, and joy (1 John i, 5). God is said to dwell in light inaccessible (1 Tim. vi, 16), which seems to contain a reference to the glory and splendor that shone in the holy of holies, where Jehovah appeared in the luminosity of the shekinah, or cloud of glory, which was none but the high-priest, and he only once a year, was permitted to approach (Lev. xvi, 2; Ezek. i, 22, 26, 28). This light was typical of the glory of the celestial world. See SHEKHINAH. Light itself is employed to signify the celestia laws, rules, or directions that proceeds from the ruling powers for the good of their subjects. Thus of the great
king of all the earth the Psalmist says, "Thy word is a light unto my path" (Ps. cxix. 105), and "Thy judgments are as the light" (Hos. vi. 5). Agreeably to the notion of lights being the symbols of good government, light also signifies protection, deliverance, and joy. Light not only signifies illumination and knowledge, but of spiritual life, health, and joy to the souls of men (Isa. lx. 1). "Among the personifications on this point which Scripture presents we may specify, (1.) God. The apostle James (i. 17) declares that "every good and perfect gift cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variability, neither shadow of turning;" obviously referring to the faithfulness of God and the constancy of his goodness, which shine on undimmed and unshadowed. So Paul (1 Tim. vi. 16), "God who dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto." Here the idea involved in the imagery is the incomprehensibleness of the self-existent and eternal God. (2.) Light is also applied to Christ: "The people that sat in darkness have seen a great light" (Matt. iv. 16; Luke ii. 32; John i, 46 sq.). "He was the true light;" I John i, 5, 6 sq.) He is the "Light of the world," by pointing the way to his followers (John viii. 12). (3.) It is further used of angels, as in 2 Cor. xi. 14; "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." (4.) Light is moreover employed of men: John the Baptist "was a burning and a shining light" (John v. 35); also Acts xiii. 47; Eph. vi. 5." See LIGHT.

LIGHT, DIVINE. See KNOWLEDGE; RELIGION.

LIGHT, INWARD. See QUAKERS.

LIGHT OF NATURE. See NATURE.

LIGHT, FRIENDS OF. See FREE CONGREGATIONS.

Light, George C., a Methodist episcopal minister, was born in Westmoreland County, Va., Feb. 28, 1785. In 1792 his father removed to Kentucky, and in 1799 to Ohio, where in 1806 he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1804 the son was converted at a camp-meeting; in 1806 he entered the itinerant ministry in the Western Conference, and in 1807 he was ordained deacon. Locating after his marriage in 1808, he was employed as a surveyor till 1822, when he entered the Kentucky Conference. From this time until 1859 he labored actively as an itinerant preacher, filling the most important appointments in Kentucky, Illinois, and Mississippi. He died Feb. 27, 1859. Mr. Light was held to be one of the most eloquent and useful ministers in the West during many years. No man of his day, it is thought, had greater control over the popular mind.—Camp, Sketch of the Rev. G. C. Light (Nashville, 1860).

LIGHT, OLD AND NEW. See UNITED PRESBYTERIANS.

Lightfoot, John (1), D.D., a noted English divine and hebrast, was born at Stoke-upon-Trent in 1602. He was educated first at a grammar-school at Morton Green, in Cheshire, and afterwards at Cambridge. He was remarkable, at Cambridge and afterwards, for his eloquence and his proficiency in Latin and Greek. Quitting the university, he became assistant at the well-known school of Repton, in Derbyshire. A year or two after he entered into orders, and settled at Norton-under-Hales, in Shropshire, where he began the study of the Hebrew, which ripened into the most familiar and consummate knowledge of the whole range of Biblical and Rabbinical literature. In 1627 he accepted the cure of Stone, in Staffordshire. Two years later he removed to Horsley, in order to be near the library of Sion College, and later accepted the rectory of Ashford, in Staffordshire. Here he remained during the turbulent years which led to the death of Charles I, the establishment of the Commonwealth, and the temporary subversion of the Church of England. During the civil war he was identified with the Presbyterians, and became a member of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, where he displayed great courage and ability in all the learning in opposition to the doctrines of the divines were endeavoring to establish. While in London he was minister of St. Bartholomew's. In 1658 he was presented by Parliament with the living of Great Munden, in Hertfordshire. In 1653 he entered upon the office of vice-chancellor of Cambridge, to which he was chosen that year, having taken the degree of doctor in divinity in 1652. The living of Great Munden was given to Dr. Lightfoot by Parliament, and upon the restoration of Charles II it was bestowed upon another person. Through the influence of Sheldon, then bishop of London, Lightfoot was, however, reinstated in his living, as well as confirmed in the mastership of Catharine Hall, which he had offered to resign, having previously complied with the terms of the Act of Uniformity. Through the influence of Sir Orlando Bridgeman he was appointed to a prebendal stall in the cathedral of Ely, where he died peaceably, Dec. 6, 1675. Lightfoot was a very learned Hebraist for his time, but he was not free from the unscientific crotchets of the period, holding, for example, the inspiration of the vowel-points, etc. He has done good service to theologians, by pointing out the connection between the Talmudical and Midrashic writings and the New Testament, which, to a certain extent, is only to be understood by illustrations from the anterior and contemporaneous religious literature (Chambers). His object at first was "to produce one great and perfect work—a harmony of the four evangelists, with apparatus critical and chronological," (Kittto). Lightfoot's works are: Erubin, or Miscellanies, Christian and Judicial (1629);—A few and new Observations upon the Book of Genesis (1642).—A Hundred of Gleanings out of the Book of Exodus (1643):—The Harmony of the four Gospels, by comparing and explaining them with each other (1644):—A Commentary upon the Acts of the Apostles (1645):—The Temple Service in the Days of our Saviour (1649).—The Harmony, 3d part (1649):—The Temple (1650):—Horn Hebræorum et Talmudica Expositio. 2 vols. (1656), etc., upon the Gospel of St. Mark (1661; new ed. by Rev. R. Gadwell, Oxf. 1859, 4 vols. 8vo):—Jerush and Talmudical Expositions upon St. Luke:—Jerush, etc., upon St. John:—Horn Hébræorum, etc., Acts of the Apostles:—Horn, etc.; upon the first Epistle to the Corinthians: During the latter years of his life he contributed valuable assistance to the authors of Walton's Polyglott Bible, Calvin's Heptaglot Lexicon, and Pool's Synopsis Criticorum. His works were published entirely, (1) with a preface by Dr. Bright and a life by the editor, John Strype, at London in 1864 (2 vols. fol.); (2) at Amsterdam in 1866 (2 vols. fol.); (3) at Utrecht, by John Le floch, and Amsterdam (vols. fol.); and (4) by Pitman, at London, in 1822-25 (13 vols. 8vo), which is the best edition, and contains a very elaborate biography of Lightfoot. Dr. Adam Clarke says in Biblical criticism I consider Lightfoot the first of all English writers; and in his works he includes his learning, his judgment, and his usefulness." See also the biographies connected with the various collections of his works, Brevia Descriptiva Ven. J. Lightfootii (1699); Kittto, Cyclopedia Bib. Lit. vol. ii. & v.; Herzog, Real-Encyclopaedie, vol. viii. a. v.
Lightfoot, John (2), an English divine and botanist, was born in Gloucestershire in 1785. He was educated for the Church, became chaplain to the Duke of Devonshire, and attained the livings of Sheldon and Gotham. He also devoted himself specially to the study of botany, and, in company with Pennant, explored the Hebrides about 1772, and published in 1777 a valuable "Flora of Scotland" ("Flora Scotica," 2 vols.), with excellent figures. He died in 1789. — Thomas, "Biographical Dictionary," p. 1482.

Lightning (properly γίγαντος, barak), Dan. x, 6; collectively "lightnings," Ps. cxvii, 6; 2 Sam. xxii, 15; Ezra i, 18; plur. Job xxxvii, 35; Ps. xviii, 15; lxix, 19; etc; trop. the "brightness of a glittering sword," Ezek. xxi, 15, 33; Deut. xxvii, 41, etc. — astrarjus, Matt. xxiv, 27; xxvii, 31; Luke x, 18; xvi, 30; xxii, 21; Rev. iv, 5; vi, 5; xi, 19; xvi, 18; oinos γίγαντος, barak, a "flash of lightning," Ezek. i, 14; less properly κλεφτις, dr, light, Job xxxvii, 8, 11, 25; ἱριπός, a burning torch, Exod. xx, 18; fig. θεός ὄμοιος, an arrow, i. e. thunder-flush, Zech. vi, 1; comp. Job xxxvi, 26; xxxviii, 25. Travellers state that in Syria lightnings are frequent in the autumnal months. Seldom a night passes without a great deal of thunder, which is sometimes accompanied by thunder and sometimes not. A squall of wind and clouds of dust are the usual accompaniments of the first, rain of the latter. To these natural phenomena the sacred writers frequently allude. In directing their energies, "the Lord hath his way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet; the mountains quake at him, and the hills melt, and the earth is burned at his presence; his fury is poured out like fire, and the rocks are thrown down by him" (Nah. i, 3-4). The terrors of the divine wrath are often represented by thunder and lightning; and thunders, on account of its awful impression on the minds of mortals, is also spoken of in the "Song of the Lord" (Ps. cxxvii, 7; cxvii, 6; 2 Sam. xxi, 15; Job xxxvi, 26; xxxvi, 4; 5; xxxviii, 25; xl, 9; Zech. ix, 14; Rev. iv, 5; xvi, 18-21). On account of the fire attending their light, they are the symbols of edicts enforced with destruction to those who oppose them, or who hinder others from giving obedience to them (Ps. cxvii, 6; Zech. ix, 14; Ps. xcvii, 14; Rev. iv, 5; xvi, 18). Thunders and lightnings, when they proceed from the throne of God (as in Rev. iv, 5), are fit representations of God's glorious and awful majesty; but when fire comes down from heaven upon the earth, it expresses some past or present action of God in the world (as in Rev. xx, 9). The voices, thunders, lightnings, and great hail, in Rev. xvi, 18-21, are interpreted expressly of an exceeding great plague, so that men blasphemed on account of it (see Wemenes, "Symb. Dict."

Lights. 1. The use of artificial light in baptism was practiced in the Church at an early day, although it was opposed in this instance as its use for communion service, etc. But where it was used it was the practice, in addition to the ceremony of putting on white garments at baptism, to place lighted tapers in the hands of the baptized. Gregory Nazianzen says: "The station where, immediately after baptism, thou shalt be placed before the altar, is an emblem of the glory of the life to come; the pomegranate with which thou shalt be received is a foretaste of the hymns and praises of a better life; and the oil in which thou shalt bathe, a figure of those lamps of faith wherewith bright and virgin souls shall go forth to meet the Bridegroom." Others say that the lamp was designed to be a symbol of their own illumination, and to remind the candidates of the works of Christ, which, however fine that thought may be, may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." In some baptisms the attendants were clothed in white, and carried tapers. At the baptism of the younger Theodosius, the leaders of the people were all clothed in white, and all the senators and men of quality carried lamps. Lighted candles were, according to St. Jerome (Epist. cont. Vigintil. cap. 3; comp. also Cave, Prin. Christ. lib. i, c. 7, p. 208), sometimes used in the Eastern churches before the advent of the Gospel was received to design the show of those who received the glad tidings, and also to be a symbol of the light of truth. The lighting of candles on the communion table is observed only in the Romish Church. See Farrar, "Eccles. Dictionary," s. v.; Bingham, "Antiquities of the Christ. Church," bk. xii, ch. iv, sect. 2; Horsley, "Chaldee, Vulg." (1831), p. 85; Herzog, "Real-Encyklop. vili, 517 sq.; Asbach, "Kirchen-Lexikon," iii, 769 (Kerzen). See Candles.

2. Lights were employed by the Apostolic Church, but for no other purpose than to obviate the inconvenience of work in the church, and to prevent the temple from use as a matter of religion, or, rather, of superstition, is of far less ancient date, although it has been defended as a primitive custom, and might, of course, be traced even to Jewish antiquity, if such a precedent were esteemed of any value. In all probability, artificial light was used during the daytime, and for a symbolical purpose, about the 4th century, if we accept the statement of St. Paulinus, bishop of Sola (A.D. 385-431), who, speaking of the great numbers of wax-lights which burned about the altar, makes the statement more splendid than the day itself was made more glorious by the same means: "Nocte dieque micuet. Sic nos splendore dicit Fulget: et ipsa diece celasti illustri horae. Plus minus luminaria lacerum gentium lumen est." (Paulin., Nat. iii, 3. Pollic."

(Come also Isidore, "Orig., viii, 12.") But this custom was severely condemned by many. Comp. Lamps.

III. The practice of lighting candles on the altar, which prevailed, and still prevails in the Romish Church, was abolished in England at the Reformation. Those candles which (according to one of the Injunctions of Edward VI, set forth in 1547) have been suffered to remain upon the Lord's table are sometimes designated with the coldcock (Greek colda), or coldcock (Elda). But it is to be noticed that no lights are ever used in the English churches, only candles, which are never lighted, the lighting of any such candles at an evening service being merely for a necessary purpose. See Altar.

Lights, Feast of. See Epiphany.

Ligu-alo (only in the plur. pl. alui, kalui, Numh. xxiv, 6. Sept. acapi, Vulg. tabernaculam; Prov. vii, 17. Sept. alou, Vulg. ater, A. V. "aloe"; or fem. alouha, alouha, Ps. xiv, 8. Sept. acapi, Vulg. gutta, A. V. "aloe;"); Cant. iv, 4, dawo, alu, "aloes," a kind of perfume which interpreters have by common consent regarded as derived from some Oriental tree, and compared with the coldcock (Gk. colda, L. Elda), described by Dioscorides (i, 21) in the following terms: "It is a wood brought from India and Arabia, resembling thyme-wood, compact, fragrant, astrigent to the taste, with great bitterness; having a skin-like bark. . . . It is burned for frankincense." Pliny likewise speaks of it as being derived from the same region (Nat, Hist. xxvii, 5). Later writers, as Orobiasus, etius, and P. Regineta, mention it, but give no further description. Arabic authors, however, as Rhases, Narsier, and others, were well acquainted with the substance of which they describe several varieties, and the Latin translator of Avicenna (llii, 132) gives "agalochoom," "xyloch," and "lixgium aloe," as equivalent to the aghlajum, aghulakib, and si of the text. Royle ("Illustr. of Talm. Bot. p. 171") has traced the same substance in the "aggar," a famous aromatic wood obtained in the island of Socotra, or Somber, in India under three names: 1, aod-i-kima; 2, a variety procured from Surat, but not differing essentially from 3, aod-i-kimari, said to come from China, doubtless the olearium of Avicenna. Garcia las Hosto (Clusiis, Zoot. Nat, viii, 1790), writing on this subject near Surat, says that "it is called in Malacca garo, but the choicest sort lobocano." Paul a
Bartholin (in Vossaraca, p. 205) likewise distinguishes three sorts, "one common, very odoruous, and of great price, called agkili; the black, which is termed kar-agkili or kal-agam; the third, producing a flower, named marami, properly menagaliyun or malagandiyugil."

There is considerable confusion among naturalists in their attempts to identify the exact species from which each which yields the far-scented wood. "Dr. Roxburgh states that agur or agur is the Sanscrit name of the incense or aloë-wood, which in Hindostan is called agur, and in Persian ad-khud, and that there is little doubt that the real calumbre, or agullochum, is the same. It is yielded by an immense tree, a native of the mountainous tracts east of and southeast from Silhet, in about 24° N. latitude. This plant, he says, cannot be distinguished from Thriving plants, exactly of the same age, of the Gara de Malacca, received from that place, and growing in the garden of Calcutta. He further states that small quantities of agullochum are sometimes imported into Calcutta by sea from the eastward, but that such is always deemed inferior to that of Silhet (Flora Ind. ii, 423). The Gara de Malacca was first described by Lamarck (Encyclopédie Méthodique, 47 sep), from a specimen presented to him by Somar, as that of the tree which yielded the bois d'âne of commerce. Lamarck named this tree Aquilaria Malaccensis, which Cavanilles afterwards changed unnecessarily to Aquilaria ovata. As Dr. Roxburgh found that his plant belonged to the same genus, he named it Agullochum, but it is a cinnamomum Agullock in his Flora India, probably by an oversight. He is of opinion that the Agullochum secundarium of Rumphius (Herb. Amb. ii, 34, t. 10), which that author received under the name of Agullochum Malaccensis, also belongs to the same genus, as well as the Styrax of Kempfer (Am. Ecol. p. 303), and the Oxypermum sinense of Loureiro. This last-named missionary describes a third plant, which he names Abeyzium agullochum, representing it as a tall tree growing in the lofty mountains of Champa, belonging to Cochini China, about 13° of N. lat., near the great river Lavum, and producing calumbre (Flora Cochii Cinensis, edit. Wildenow, i, 327). This tree, belonging to the class and order Decandria monogynia of Linneus, and the natural family of Leguminosae, has always been admitted as one of the trees yielding agullochum. But as Loureiro himself confesses that he had only once seen a cutiated branch of the tree in flower, which, by long carriage, had the petals, anthers, and stigmas much bruised and torn, it is not impossible that this may also belong to the genus Aquilaria, especially as his tree agrees in so many points with that described by Dr. Roxburgh. Rumphius has described and figured a third plant, which he named Arbor excorces, from 'Blindhout,' in consequence of its acrid juice destroying sight, whence the generic name of Excexaria; the specific one of agullochum he applied because its wood is similar to, and often substituted for, agullochum, and he states that it was sometimes exported as such to Europe, and even to China. This tree, the Excexaria agullochum, of the Linnean class and order Dicotyti triandra, and the natural family of Euphorbiaceae, is also very common in the deep of the forest, where it is called Aglia; 'but the wood-cutter of the Sunderbundes,' Dr. Roxburgh says, 'who are the people best acquainted with the nature of this tree, report the pale, white, milky juice thereof to be highly acrid and very dangerous.' The only use made of the tree, as far as Dr. Roxburgh could learn, was for charcoal and firewood. Agolla is part of any sort is, he believed, never found in this tree, which is often the only one quoted as that yielding agila-wood; but, notwithstanding the negative testimony of Dr. Roxburgh, it may, in particular circumstances, as stated by Rumphius, yield a substitute for that fruit and long-famed wood.

In Arabic authors numerous varieties of agullochum are mentioned (Celsus, Hierobot, p. 143). Persian authors mention only three: 1. Aod-i-kind; that is, the Indian; 2. Aod-i-chini, or Chinese kind (probably that from Cochini China); 3. Suvandari, a term generally applied to things brought from sea, which may have reference to the inferior variety from the Indian islands. In old works, such as those of Balmus and Ray, three kinds are also mentioned: 1. Agullochum praesiantissimum, also called Calumbre; 2. A. Officinalis, or Polo de Agula or Linschoten; 3. A. Nyctare, or Agula braua. But, besides these varieties, obtained from different localities, perhaps from different plants, there are also distinct varieties, obtainable from the same plant. Thus, in a MS. account by Dr. Roxburgh, to which Dr. Hope had access, is stated, in a letter from R. K. Dick, at Silhet, that four different qualities may be obtained from the same tree: 1st, Ghurki, which sinks in water, and sells from 12 to 16 rupees per seer of 2 lbs; 2d, Doin, 6 to 8 rupees per seer; 3d, Simile, which floats in water, 3 to 4 rupees; and, 4th, Cheryn, which is in small pieces, and also floats in water, from 1 to 12 rupees per seer, and that sometimes 80 lbs. of these four kinds may be obtained from one tree. All these turgyn-trees, as they are called, do not produce theogur, nor does every part of even the most productive tree. The natives cut into the wood until they observe dark-colored veins yielding the perfume; these guide them to the place containing the ogur, which generally extends but a short way through the centre of the trunk or branch. An essence, or attar, is obtained by bruising the wood in a mortar, and then infusing it in boiling water, when the perfume floats on the surface. Early decay does not seem incident to all kinds of agullochum, for we possess specimens of the wood gorped with fragrant resin (Illustr. Hym. Bot. p. 173) which show no symptoms of it, but still it is stated that the wood is sometimes buried in the earth. This may be for the purpose of increasing its specific gravity. A large specimen in the museum of the East-India House displays a cancelled structure in which the resonous parts remain, the rest of the wood having been removed, apparently by decay. Notwithstanding the uncertainty respecting the identity of some of the above-described varieties, we have, at all events, two trees ascertained as yielding this fragrant wood—one, Aquilaria agullochum, a native of Silhet, and the other A. ovata or Malaccestis, a native of Malacca, although it is still not clear that they are anything more than local variations of the same species. The former is described as a magnificent tree, growing to the height of 120 feet, being 12 feet in girth. 'The bark of the trunk is smooth and sub-colored, that of the branches gray and lightly striped with brown. The wood is white, and very light and soft. It is totally without smell, and the leaves, bark, and flowers are equally inodorous' (Script. Herb. p. 298). The fra-
grance appears to reside wholly in the resin deposited in the pores, and is developed by heat. Both plants belong to the liana class and to the genus Agallochum, and the natural family of Aquilariae.

"It is extremely interesting to find that the Malay name of the substance in question, which is agala, is so little different from the akhalim of the Hebrew; not more, indeed, than may be observed in many well-known words, where the meaning of one language is turned into the aspirate in another. It is therefore probable that it was by the name agala (aghl in Rosenmüller, Biblical. Bot. p. 224) that this wood was first known in commerce, being conveyed across the bay of Bengal to the island of Ceylon or the peninsula of India, which the Arab traders regarded as the most remote periods, and where they obtained the early-known spices and precious stones of India. It is not a little curious that captain Hamilton (Account of the East Indies, i, 68) mentions it by the name of agala, an odoriferous wood at Muscat. We know that the Portuguese, when they reached the eastern coast from the peninsula, obtained it under this name, whence they called it pau d'agala, or eagle-wood, which is the origin of the generic name Agaliarix.

"It must be confessed, however, that, notwithstanding all that has been written to prove the identity of the akhalim-trees with the aloe-wood of commerce, and notwithstanding the apparent connection of the Hebrew word with the Arabic aghalajin and the Greek agallochon, the opinion is not clear of difficulties. In the first place, in the passage for which the analogy, 'as the akhalim which Jehovah hath planted,' is an argument against the identification with the Aquilaria agallochum. The Sept. seem to have read בַּשָּׂדֵת, kalaim, tent; and they are followed by the Vulg., the Syriac, the Arabic, and some other versions. If this is not the true reading—and the context is against it—then if akhalim be the word here, we must make it a synonym. But Balsam is speaking of trees concerning which, in their growing state, he could have known nothing at all. Rosenmüller (Schol. in T. T. ad Numb. xxiv, 6) allows that this tree is not found in Arabia, but thinks that Balsam might have become acquainted with it from the merchants. Perhaps the prophet might have seen the wood. But the passage in Numbers manifestly implies that he had seen the akhalim growing, and that in all probability they were some kind of trees sufficiently known to the Israelites to enable them to understand the allusion in its full force. But if the akhalim be the agallochum, then much of the illustration would have been lost to the people who were the subject of the prophecy; for the Ag. agallochum is found neither on the banks of the Euphrates, where Balsam lived, nor in Mesopotamia. The word was an equivocal one (Scape p. 34, 85) believes the Sept. reading to be the correct one, though he sees no difficulty, but rather a beauty, in supposing that Balsam was drawing a similitude from a tree of foreign growth. He confesses that the parallelism of the verse is more in favor of the tree than the tent; but he objects that the liana-aloes should be mentioned before the cedars, the parallelism requiring, he thinks, the inverse order. But this is hardly a valid objection, for what tree was held in greater estimation than the cedar? And even if akhalim be the Ag. agallochum, yet the latter clause of the verse does no violence to the law of parallelism, for of the two trees the cedar 'is greater and more august.' Again, the passage in Psa. xlv, 8 would perhaps be more correctly translated thus: 'The myrrh, aloes, and cassia, perfuming all thy garments, brought from the ivory palaces of Lebanon, shall be thy crown.' The Minei, or Minei, were inhabitants of spicy Arabia, and carried on a great trade in the exportation of spices and perfumes (Plny, xii, 14, 16; Bochart, Phaleg, ii, 22, 136). As the myrrh and cassia are mentioned as coming from the Minei, and were doubtless natural productions of the country, the inference is that aloes, being named with them, were also a production of the same region."

See MINNI.

See generally Abuloda, in Buschings's Magazin, i, 277; Bokin, in Notice et Extraits de la Bibliothèque du Roi, ii, 897; Linneaus, Pflanzenymystem nach Houttyg (Nouv. 1777), ii, 422 sq.; Michelia, Supplement. p. 32; Wahl, Ostindien, i, 772; the Fundrubes des Orientalen, v, 725; Bondi, Or-Father, p. 18; Sylv. de Senex, ad Abdollahi Descrip. Abolafiae, p. 25.

Liguori, Alfonso Maria da, a Roman Catholic bishop, and founder of the Order of Redemptorists, was born Sept. 27, 1695, at Naples. He was descended from a noble family, and the son of a royal officer; from his mother, who was a fervid Catholic, he imbued in early childhood a glowing devotedness to the Church of Rome. Educated at an institution of the princely and ecclesiastical registry, he made such rapid progress that he obtained in the sixteenth year of his life the degree of LLD. In accordance with the wish of his parents he became a lawyer, but the loss of an important lawsuit so mortified him that he resolved to enter a priesthood. He overcame the violent opposition of his father, and took orders in 1725. Soon after he entered the Congregation of the Propaganda at Naples, and began to labor with great zeal for the religious awakening of the lower classes in Naples and the neighboring provinces. In order to enlargethis field of operations he concluded with the civil authorities a new religious congregation. The first house of the new congregation was established with the assistance of twelve companions at Scala; the chief task of the members was declared to be to devote themselves to the service of the poorest and most abandoned souls. Three years later another house was established at Cioniano, in the diocese of Salerno. The rule of the new congregation, which Liguori had drawn up with the assistance of several prominent men, was confirmed by a brief of pope Benedict XIV, dated Feb. 22, 1746, and Liguori was consecrated bishop of the new diocese of the same name. He was appointed assistant archbishop of Palermo, and his efforts in behalf of the suffering of his countrymen were rewarded by being made bishop of Cosenza. He was at this time a prelate of the first rank, and possessed an influence amounting to real power; but Liguori declared that all the superiors of the order should be elected in place of Liguori, but that the latter should appoint a vicar general to preside over the congregation in his place. The feeble state of his health repeatedly induced him to ask the pope to accept his resignation, but his wish was not granted until 1775. He retired to the house of his congregation at Noce'a de Pagani, where he spent the remainder of his life in composing theological and, in particular, ascetical works. In consequence of the intrigues of several prominent members of his order, and the government's inclination to official ecclesiastical matters, Michaelis, his biographer, says that Liguori, in order to save the rules of his order to be changed, was compelled to resign its supreme management. He died August 1, 1787.

In 1796 he received from Pius VI the title "Venerable," in 1816 he was beatified, and on May 28, 1839, was canonized by pope Gregory XVI. In 1871 Pius IX conferred upon him the title and rank of "Doctor Ecclesiae." Liguori was a very prolific writer, the best known among his works being the Theologia Morali (Naples, 3 vols.); — Homo Apostolicus (Venice, 1782, 3 vols.); — Instructio Catechetica (Bassano, 1768); — Praxis Confessarii. Complete editions of his works have been published at Paris (1856 sq., in 16 vols.), at Monza (70 vols.), and other places. His works have been translated into French and German, and, in great part, into English, Spanish, Polish, and other European languages. The principles of casuistry explained by Liguori have been rejected by the Church of Rome in favor of the school of the Roman Catholic theologians, and his moral theology, which is a modification of the so-called "probabilistic system" of the age immediately before his own, is largely used in the direction of consciences. Few writers in modern times have gone so far in the defence of the extreme ultra-papal theories and practices as
Liguori, and, while his honesty and zeal are undoubted, he stands forth in the recent history of the Roman Church as a representative of the very worst tendencies of casuists. In the ordinary concerns of life, where there is no particular quarrel between bodies in the Church, he never elaborately teaches how falsehood and trickery between man and man may be most advantageously practiced, and how far cheating and stealing on the part of tradesmen and servants may be venially carried on, and without incurring mortal sin. See Connelly, Reasons for abjuring Allelopiance to the See of Rome (Lond. 1852). Tour. Qu. Rec. 1856, p. 396; Christian Remembr. 1854 (Jan.), p. 88; 1855 (Oct.), p. 407. Biographies of Liguori have been written by Giatanni (Vita del Beato A. J. Liguori, Rome, 1815), Jeanardi (Vie du C. A. Liguori, Louvain, 1829), Kieper (1845), Stahl (Stettin, 1853), and others. In English we have a very good biographical Life of St. A. M. de Liguori (London, 1848, 2 vols. 8vo). For an account of the religious order founded by Liguori, see Redemptorists. (A. J. S.)

Liguorians. See Redemptorists.

Lig'gure (לגיירה), le'shem, supposed to be from an old root preserved in the Arab., and signifying to taste) occurs but twice (Exod. xxviii, 19; xxxii, 12) as the name of the first stone in the third row on the high-priest's breastplate, where the Sacred Ark is (in general alluding to the above derivation), and is followed by the Vulg. liguria, as well as the A.V. So also Josephus (War, v, 57). "The word ligurie is unknown in modern mineralogy. Phillips (Mineralogy, p. 87) mentions ligurite, a mineral of which a number of species have been described. But the name is not now used, and is left to commemorate a tribe of Corsicans who are noted for their commerce with the ancients, and for their fertility. It occurs in a sort of talcose rock in the banks of a river in the Apennines." (Smith.)

The classical ligur (or λεγωρός) was thought to be a species of amber (see Moore, Anc. Min., p. 106), although ancient authors speak uncertainly respecting it. Pliny (Nat. Hist. xxi, 11, 18; xxii, 11, 19; De lapid. c. 50), and assign a false derivation to the name (see Gesius, Theaur. Heb, p. 763). The Hebrew word has been thought to designate the same stone as the Jacinth (Braunius, De rebus sacris, ii, 14), although others adhere to the opal as corresponding better with the ancient ligure (Rosenmüller, Sekt, in Exod. xxviii, 19). "Dr. Woodward and some old commentators have supposed that it was some kind of balsam ite, because, as these fossils contain bituminous particles, they have thought that they have been able to detect, upon heating or rubbing, a smell resembling that of the amber. From the absurd origin of the name, the word Theophrastus (Frag. ii, 28, 81; xv, 2, edit. Schneider) and Pliny (H. N. xxviii, iii) ascribe to the ignemur. As to the belief that amber is denoted by this word, Theophrastus, in the passage cited above, has given a detailed description of the stone, and clearly distinguished it from the electric, or amber. Amber, moreover, is too soft for engraving upon, while the ignemur was a hard stone, out of which seals were made." See Gem. Beckmann (Hist. Inserat. i, 87, Bohn) believes, with Braun, Epiphanius, and J. de Laet, that the description of the ignemur agrees well with the jacinthus of modern mineralogists, especially that species which is described as being of an orange-yellow color, passing on into a redish-brown (see Rosenmüller, Bibl. Albert. iv, i, 28). The hyacinth is a variety of crystalline zircon, containing also iron, which usually gives it a reddish or brown color. It generally occurs in four-sided prisms terminated by four rhombic planes. It is diaphanous, glossy, and hard. It occurs in the beds of rivers, the best being brought from the West Indies, but is now little esteemed as a gem, although the ancients used it for engraving. "It is also observed in the position (that is, the same place) identical with the jacinth or hyacinth) Hill (Notes on Theophrastus on Stones, § 50, p. 166) and Rosenmüller (Mineral. of Bible, p. 36; Bib. Cod. agree. It must be confessed, however, that this opinion is far from satisfactory; for Theophrastus, speaking of the properties of the jacynth, says that it attracts not only light particles of wood, but fragments of iron and brass. Now there is no peculiar attractive power in the hyacinth; nor is Beckmann's explanation of this point sufficient. He says: 'If we consider its (the ignemur's) attracting of small bodies in the manner above described, we shall, I think, find no difficulty in explaining the name, for the Greek name ligurion appears to be derived from ληγωρον, 'to lick,' 'to attract,' and doubtless was selected by the Sept. for this reason to express the Hebrew word, which has a similar derivation. Hence Dr. Watson (Philos. Trans.) says that the Greek intrepidus, with the tourmaline, or, more definitely, with the red variety known as rubellite, which is a hard stone, and used as a gem, and sometimes sold for red sapphire. Tourmaline becomes, as is well known, electrically polar when heated. Beckmann's objection, that had Theophrastus been acquainted with the tourmaline, he would have remarked that it did not acquire its attractive power till it was heated," is answered by his own admission on the passage, quoted from the Hist. de l'Academie for 1717, p. 7 (see Beckmann, i, 91). Tourmaline is a mineral found in the alluvial deposits of the Allegheny and other rivers, and the beautiful crystals were sent to Europe by the Noya purchased two of these stones in Holland, which are there called ochsenstriker. Linneus, in his preface to the Flora Zeylandica, mentions the stone under the name of lapis electricus from Ceylon. The natives call it tourmalan (Phid. Trans. i. c.). Many of the precious stones which were in the possession of the Israelites during their wanderings were no doubt obtained from the Egyptians, who might have procured from the Tyrian merchants specimens from even India and Ceylon, etc. The fine specimens of rubellite now in the British Museum belonged formerly to the king of Arav. (Lith. H. Lich. 'נפל, learned, wise counsellor; Sept. Annael v. v. Anehi, Vulg. Leo), the third named of the four sons of Shemeshid or Shemida, son of Manasseh (1 Chron. vii, 19; comp. Josh. xvii, 2). He does not appear to have had a number of any progeny, as his name does not occur in the account of the Manasite families (Num. xxvii, 17). B.C. post 1806.

Lillburne, John, a Quaker preacher, noted for his republican views, born on an old farm called Lillers, in Leicestershire, in 1618. In his early youth he was a clothier. He entered the ministry after he had suffered greatly by prosecution for his opposition to the government. His intrepid defence of his rights as a free-born Englishman became the admiration of the nations of the world, and such party gained for him the familiar appellation of "free-born John." He was condemned to receive five hundred lashes at the cart-tail, and to stand in the pillory; but his spirit was only aroused by this disgraceful punishment. His name became the watchword of the party known as Levellers. During the Revolution he fought bravely against the king at Edge Hill and Marston Moor, where he led a regiment. Lillburne's chief fault was the want of a more statesmanlike spirit, so that he was continually sinking from the leading position he might have held, in virtue of his integrity and intrepidity, to that of a demagogue. He blindly accused Cromwell and Ireton of treason, and the former tried in vain to make him comprehend the real situation of affairs, and seems at last to have given him up in despair, and to have prosecuted him from necessity, while he valued his steady qualities and incorruptible nature. Reduced to quiescence under the iron hand of the protector, his political enthusiasm subsided into the religious, and the famous John Lillburne became a preacher among the Quakers. He died Aug. 29, 1657.—Appleton's Cyclopaedia of Biography, p. 497.

Lillenthal, Michael, a German theologian, was born at Lielstadt, in Prussia, Sept. 6, 1856. He studied
theology at Königsberg and Jena, and became professor in the University of Utrecht. He afterwards visited Holland, Aethiopia, and studied philology and archaeology, and after his return was for some years professor at Köni-
gsberg. In 1714 he became assistant librarian of that university, and in 1719 was appointed deacon of one of the churches at Heidelberg. He was made member of the Académie des Sciences in 1717, and member of the Academy in 1738. He died at Königsberg Jan. 29, 1750. His principal works are Bibel-Azetische Bibliothek (Kö-
gigsberg, 1740-1744, 8 vols. 8vo) — Biblischer Archæarius d. Heiligen Schrifft (Königsberg, 1746-1746, 2 vols. 4to : it contains a list of Biblical commentators, arranged in the chronological order of their times); and Archæarius (Königsberg, 1749, 4to). See Herzog, Real-Encyclop., viii, 418; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxi, 225. (J. N. P.)

Lilienthal, Theodor Christopher, an eminent German theologian and writer, was born at Königsberg Oct. 8, 1711. He studied at the university of his native place, and afterwards at Jena and Tübingen, and, after making a journey through Holland and England, spent some time in the University of Halle. He was soon after appointed adjunct professor at Königsberg, and in 1744 became extraordinary professor and doctor of theology. In 1746 he was made pastor of the com-
munity of Neu-Rossgärten, and subsequently became ordinary professor of theology, and church and school counsellor. He died March 17, 1782. Among his works we notice: Die gute Sache der göttlichen Offenbarung sei-
der die Freunde derselben erwiesen u. gerettet (Königsberg, 1740-92, 16 vols. 4to: it contains various editions of the first four parts appeared in 1778, and also an augmented ad-
tion in the same year). It gives a full collection of the divers objections that have been urged against Chris-
tianity, and answers every one. It is consequently use-
ful as a book of reference on this subject, like Lardner's Credibility of the Gospel History, although, on account of its bulk and its antiquated apologetic stand-point, it is less fit to be in itself used as a weapon against incred-
ulity. He wrote also De Comme Missae Gregorianae (Leyden, 1739, 8vo) — Historia benta Dorotheae, Pras-
iae patronae, fabula variis metaulis (Dantzig, 1743, 4to) — Commentatio crctica duorum codic. Biblia He-
braica continentium (Dantzig, 1769, 4to), and a large number of sermons, dissertations, etc. See Schröck, K. Gesch. u. d. Reformation, vi, 291; Herzog, Real-Encyclop-

Lilith. See SIECREW-OWL.

Lillie, John, D.D., a minister originally of the Reformed (Dutch), but afterwards of the Presbyterian Church, was born in Kelso, Scotland, Dec. 16, 1812; graduated with the highest honors at the University of Edinburgh at the age of twenty-one years, prosecuted his theological studies for two years at Edinburgh, then came to America, and completed his course at the The-
ological Seminary of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, New Brunswick, N. J. In 1835 he was installed pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church in Kingston, N. Y. In 1841 he took charge of the grammar-school of the New York University, and in 1848 of a congregation which had gathered about him in the University Chapel, and afterwards (1846) occupied their new church in Stanton Street. From 1844 until 1848 he was the editor of the Journal. He emigrated to the American (Baptist) Bible Union as one of its translators from 1851 to 1857. In 1855 he received the degree of D.D. from the University of Edinburgh. In 1858 he accepted the call offered to him by the Presbyterian Church, Kingston, N. Y., and he there labored until his death, Feb. 23, 1867. Dr. Lillie's published productions are not numerous, but highly valuable. His revision and translation of the Epistles to the Thessalonians, the Epistles of John and Jude, and the Revelation, for the Anglo-
American edition of "Lange's Commentary," have won

the highest ecomiums. He was also the author of a

small work on The Perpetuity of the Earth, in which he
developed his pre-Darwinian views. Dr. Lillie was an

earnest Christian, a wise scholar, and a faithful pastor. See

Wilson, Preb. Hist. Alm. 1868, p. 117; Kingdon Arga

and Journal, Feb. 1867; Men. Sermos by Rev. W. Ir

British and Foreign Evangelical Review, lix, 169.

Lilly (לוֹלִית, shoshan), from its shibboleth, 1 Kings vii,

19; also לוֹלִית, shoshan, 1 Kings vii, 22, 26; Cant. ii, 16; iv, 5; v, 18; vi, 3, 5; vi, 22; andliv, shoshanamah,

2 Chron. iv, 5; Cant. i, 2, 15; Hos. xiv, 5 [see Shu-

shan (SHOSHANIM)]; Sept. and N. T. epivov, Matt vii,

28; Luke xvi, 22; there is a reference of this word, indigenous in Syria which might come under the de-

nomination of lilly, when that name is used in a general sense, as it often is by travellers and others. The term

shoshan or soosan seems also to have been employed in this

sense. It was known to the Greeks (Callinicus, for Dioecetes (iii, 116) describes the mode of preparing an

ointment called suasun, which others, he says, call epa-

rivos, that is, illinum. So Athenaeus (xiv, 513) identi-

fies the Persian suasun with the Greek krión. The Ar-

Aric authors also use the word in a general sense, several
countries being surrounded under the heading of lilia. The
t name is applied even to kinds of Iris, of which several

species, with various colored flowers, are distinguished.

But it appears to us that none but a plant which was

well known and highly esteemed would be found occur-

ring in so many different passages. Thus, in 1 Kings vii,

19-26, and 2 Chron. iv, 5, it is mentioned as forming

the ornamental work of the pillars and of the brazen

sea, made of molten brass, for the house of Solomon, by

Hiram of Tyre. In Canticles the word is frequently men-

tioned; and it is curious that in five passages, Cant.

ii, 2 and 16; iv, 5; vi, 2; and 3, there is a reference to

feeding among lilies, which appears unaccountable when

we consider that the allusion is made simply to an

ornamental or sweet-smelling plant; and thus the

shoshan appears to have been from the other passages in

which it is mentioned. Thus, in Cant. ii, 1, 'I am the

rose of Sharon and the lily of the valleys;' verse 2, 'as

the lily among thorns, so is my love among the daugh-

ters;' v, 13, 'his lips like lilies, dropping sweet-

smelling myrrh;' vii, 2, 'thy belly is like an heap of

wheat set about with lilies.' If we consider that the

book of Canticles supposed to have been written on the

occasion of the marriage of Solomon with a princess of

Egypt, it is natural to suppose that some of the im-

agery may have been derived from her native country,

and that the above lily may be a plant of Egypt rather

than of Palestine. Especially does the water-lily, or lotus

of the Egyptians, seem the most suitable to most of the

passages. Thus Herodotus (ii, 92) says, 'When the wa-

ters have risen to their extremest height, and all the

fields are overflowed, there appears above the surface an

immense quantity of plants of the lily species, which

the Egyptians call the lotus; having cut down these, they
dry them in the sun. The seed of the flowers, which resembles that of the poppy, they bake, and make

into a kind of bread: they also eat the root of this plant,

which is round, of an agreeable flavor, and about the

t size of an apple. There is a second species of the lotus,

which grows in the Nile, and which is not unlike a rose.

The fruit, which grows from the bottom of the root, re-

sembles a wisp's nest; it is found to contain a number of

kernels of the size of an olive-stone, which are very

grateful either fresh or dried.' All this exists even to

the present day. Both the roots and the stalks form

articles of diet in Eastern countries, and the large far-

naceous seeds of both the nymphaea and nelumbium are

roasted and eaten. Hence possibly the reference to

feeding among lilies in the above-quoted passages.

This flower (the Nymphula Lotus of the Greeks, and

the behais of the Hebrews) grows plentifully in the

Lower Egypt, flowering during the period of the an-

nual inundation. There can be little doubt the "Illy-


work" spoken of in 1 Kings vii, 19, 22, was an ornament in the form of the Egyptian lotus. There were formerly three descriptions of water-lily in Egypt, but one (the red-flowered lotus) has disappeared. "The flower," says Burckhardt, speaking of the white variety, or Nymphaea lotus, "generally stands on the stalk from one to two feet above the surface of the water. When the flowers open completely, the leaves form a horizontal disk, with the isolated seed-vessel in the midst, which bends down the stalk by its weight, and swells upon the surface of the water for several days until it is inspired. This plant grows at Cairo, in a tank called Birket el-Rotoli, near one of the northern suburbs where I happen to reside. It is not found in Upper Egypt, I believe, but abounds in the Delta, and attains maturity at the time when the Nile reaches its full height. I saw it in great abundance and in full flower, covering the whole inundated plain, on October 12, 1815, near the ruins of Tiney, about twelve miles south-east from Mansura, on the Damietta branch. It dies when the water retires." Among the ancient Egyptians the lotus was introduced into all subjects as an ornament, and as the favorite flower of the country, but not with the holy character usually attributed to it, though adopted as an emblem of the god Nophre-Atmû (Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians, i, 57, 256). As the Hebrew architecture was of the Phœnician-Egyptian style, nothing was more natural than the introduction of this ornament by Solomon into the Temple. It was in like manner borrowed by the Assyrians in their later structures (Layard's Nineve, ii, 336). Mr. Bardwell, the architect, in his work entitled Temples, Ancient and Modern (1887), says, "The two great columns of the pronaoi in Solomon's Temple were of the usual proportions of Egyptian columns, being five and a half diameters high; and as these gave the great characteristic feature to the building, Solomon sent an embassy to fetch the architect from Tyre to superintend the moulding and casting of these columns, which were intended to be of brass. Observe how conspicuous is the idea of the vase (the 'bowl' of our translation), rising from a cylinder ornamented with lotus-flowers; the bottom of the vase was partly hidden by the flowers, the belly of it was overlaid with net-work, ornamented by seven wreaths, the Hebrew number of happiness, and beneath the lip of the vase were two rows of pomegranates, one hundred each row. These superb pillars were eight feet in diameter and forty-four feet high, supporting a noble entablature fourteen feet high. See JACHIN and BOAZ. "In confirmation of the above, I have been informed by the head of the Ministry with the lotus-flower, we may adduce also the remarks of Dr. W. C. Taylor in his Bible Illustrated by Egyptian Monuments, where he says that the lilies of the 45th and 59th Psalms have puzzled all Biblical critics. The title, 'To the chief musician upon Shoshannim,' has been supposed to be the name of some unknown tune to which the psalm was to be sung. But Dr. Taylor says 'the word Shoshannim is universally acknowledged to signify lilies, and lilies have nothing to do with the subject of the ode. But this hymeinal ode was intended to be sung by the female attendants of the Egyptian princess, and they are called 'the lilies,' not only by a poetical reference to the lotus lilies of the Nile, but by a direct allusion to their custom of making the lotus lily a conspicuous ornament of their hair-dress.' Thus, there are passages of O. T. Scripture in which shoshan occurs appear to be explained by considering it to refer to the lotus lily of the Nile" (Kitto). "Lynch enumerates the 'lily' as among the plants seen by him on the shores of the Dead Sea, but gives no details which could lead to its identification (Travels, p. 299). He had previously observed the water-lily on the Jordan (p. 173), but omits to mention whether it was the yellow (Nuphar lutea) or the white (Nymphaea alba). 'The only 'lilies' which I saw in Palestine,' says Prof. Stanley, 'I observed in March and April, were large yellow water-lilies, in the clear spring of 'Ain Melahah, near the lake of Meron' (S. and Pal. p. 429). He suggests that the name 'lily' may include the numerous flowers of the tulip or amaryllis kind which appear in the early summer or the autumn of Palestine. The following mention of the Hûleh-lily from The Land and the Book, i, 394, were it more precise, would perhaps have enabled botanists to identify it: 'This Hûleh-lily is very large, and the three inner petals meet above and form a gorgeous canopy, such as art never approximated, and king never essayed, even in his most Remove glory. . . . We call it Hûleh-lily because it was here that it was first discovered. Its botanical name, if it have one, I am unacquainted with. . . . Our flower delights most in the valleys, but is also found on the mountains. It grows among thorns, and I have sadly lacerated my hands in extricating it from them. Nothing can be in higher contrast than the luxuriant velvety softness of this lily, and the crabbed, tangled hedge of thorns about it. Gazelles still delight to feed among them; and you can scarcely ride through the woods north of Tabor, where these lilies abound, without frightening them from their flowery pastures.' On the other hand, some of the passages in which shoshan occurs evidently refer to a field variety, as Cant, ii, 1, 2, and the tubular shape of the trumpet is sufficient to explain the transfer of the word to that musical instrument. See SHOSHANIM. "The Hebrew word is rendered 'tosis' in the Chaldee Targum, and by Maimonides and other Rabbinical writers, with the exception of Kimchi and Ben-Melech, who in 1 Kings vii, 19, translated it by 'violet.' In the Judeo-Spanish version of the Old Testament the Hebrew and shoshannim and 'shoshan' are translated by rosa, but in Hos. xiv, 5 the latter is rendered lirio. But spivov, or 'lily,' is the uniform rendering of the Sept., and is, in all probability, the true one, as it is supported by the analogy of the Arabic and Persian sasan, which has the same meaning to this day, and by the existence of the same word in Syriac and Coptic. The Spanish azahen, 'a white lily,' is merely a modification of the Arabic; but, although there is little doubt that the word denotes some plant of the lily species, it is by no means certain what individual of this class it especially designates. Father Soutey (Reverend of doct. Cord, 1715) laboured to prove that the lily used in the crown imperial, the Persian tust, the spivo vao-stovion of the Greeks, and the Frullaria imperialis of Linnaeus. So common was this plant in Persia that it is supposed to have given its name to Susa, the capital (Athen. xii, 1; Bochart, Phæleg, ii, 14); but it is no proof that it was at any time common in Palestine, and 'the lily' par excellence of Persia would not of necessity be 'the lily' of the Holy Land. Dioscorides (i, 62) bears witness to the beauty of the lilies of Syria and Palaestina, from which the best perfume was made. He says (iii, 106 [1183] of the spivo Bambaci, that the Persian call it spit (= shoshan), and the Africans digibambar, which Bochart renders in Hebrew characters בּ הַ לְיָ, 'white shoot.' Kuhn, in his note on the passage, iden-
LILY

The plant in question with the *Lilium candidum* of Linnaeus. It is probably the same as that called in the *Missal* 'king's lily' (*Kulaea*, v. 8). Pliny (xxi, 5) describes *epipon* as 'rubens lilium,' and Dioscorides, in another passage, mentions the fact that there are lilies with purple flowers, but whether by this he intended the *Lilium martagon* or *Chalcedoniacum*, {Kühn} leaves undecided. Now in the passage of Pliny where quoted it is said, *Σωκράτης γὰρ ἔρισε τὰ Ἐλάχιστα φωνήν τῷ εὐπον.* But in the *Etymologiam Magna* (s. v. *Sokrates*) we find τῷ ἐλάσθον τῶν Φωτισμῶν σύνεισις *λιγυρία.* As the *shukran* is thus identified both with *epipon,* the red or purple lily, and with *liripos,* the white lily, it is evidently impossible for itself to ascertain exactly the kind of lily which is referred to. If the *shukran* or *shoshannah* of the O.T. and the *epipon* of the Sermon on the Mount be identical, which there seems no reason to doubt, the plant designated by these terms must have been a conspicuous object on the shores of the Lake of Genesaret (Matt. vi, 26; Luke xii, 27); it must have flourished in the deep, broad valleys of Palestine (Cant. ii, 1), among the thorny shrubs (ib. ii, 16; iv, 5; vi, 3), and must have been remarkable for its rapid and luxuriant growth (Hos. xiv, 6; Ezek. xxxix, 14). The purple flowers of the *skoh,* or wild artichoke, which abounds in the plain north of Tabor and in the valley of Esraelon, have been thought by some to be the 'lilies of the field' alluded to in Matt. vi, 26 (Wilson, *Lands of the Bible,* ii, 110). A recent traveller mentions a plant, with lilac flowers like the hyacinth, and called by the Arabs *woshech,* which he considered to be of the species designated lily in Scripture (Borner, *Desert of Sinai,* p. 329)." Tristram strongly inclines to identify the scarlet anemone (*Anemone coronaria*) with the Scripture "lily" (*Nat. Hist. of Bible,* p. 443).

In the N. T. the word "lily" occurs "in the well-known and beautiful passage (Matt. vi, 26), 'Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin; yet I say unto you, Even Solomon, in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these:' so also in Luke xii, 27. Here it is evident that the plant alluded to must have been indigenous or grown wild in the vicinity of the Sea of Galilee, must have been of an ornamental character, and, from the Greek term *epipon* being applied to it, of a lillacous nature. The name *epipon* occurs in all the old Greek writers (see Dioscor. iii, 116; compare Claudian. *Epithalam. ser. 126; Marcial, v, 37, sq.; Calpurn. vi, 83; Athen. x, 677, 690; Virgil, *Ec.* x, 25; Pliny, xvi, 7; xxi, 11). The *proboscis first uses it,* and is supposed by Sprengel to apply it to species of Narcissus and to *Lilium candidum.* But the writers into whose hands it came used it imperfectly: one of them is supposed to be the *Lilium candidum* and the other, with a reddish flower, may be *L. martagon* or *L. Chalcedoniacum.* He alludes more particularly to the lilies of Syria and of Pamphylia being "well suited for making the ornament of lilies." Pliny enumerates three kinds, a white, a red, and a purple-colored lily. Travellers in Palestine mention that in the month of January the fields and groves everywhere abound in various species of lily, tulip, and narcissus. Benard noticed, near Acre, on Jan. 18th, and about Jaffa on the 23d, tulips, white, red, blue, etc. Gumpenberg saw the meadows of Galilee covered with the same flowers on the 31st. Tulips figure conspicuously among the flowers of Palestine, varieties probably of *Tulipa Graeciana* (Kitto's *Palestine,* p. 229). So Poeckoe says, 'I saw many tulips growing wild in the fields (in March), and any one who considers how beautiful those flowers are to the eye would be apt to conjecture that these are the lilies to which Solomon in all his glory was not to be compared.' This is much more likely to be the plant intended than some others which have been added, as, for instance, *V. kerchii,* *amarillys,* having white flowers with bright purple streaks, found by Salt at Adua. Others have preferred the *Crown imperial,* which is a native of Persia and Cashmere. Most authors have united in considering the white lily, *Lilium candidum,* to be the plant to which our Saviour referred; but it is doubtful whether it has ever been found in a wild state in Palestine. Some, indeed, have thought it to be a native of the New World. Dr. Lindley, however, in the *Gardener's Chronicle* (ii, 744), says, 'This notion cannot be sustained, because the white lily occurs in an engraving of the annunciation, executed somewhere about 1480 by Martin Schongauer; and the first voyage of Columbus did not take place till 1492. In this very rare print the lily is represented as growing in an ornamental vase, as if it were cultivated as a curious object.' This opinion is confirmed by a correspondent at Aleppo (*Gardener's Chronicle,* iii, 429), who has resided long in Syria, but is acquainted only with the box any of Aleppo and Antioc: 'I never saw the white lily in a wild state, nor have I heard of its being so in Syria. It is cultivated here on the roofs of the houses in pots as an exotic bulb, like the daffodil.' In consequence of this difficulty, the late Sir J. E. Smith was of opinion that the plant alluded to under the name of lily was the *Amaryllis lutea* (now *Opornastus luteus,* ) whose golden lilaceous flowers in autumn afford one of the most brilliant and gorgeous objects in nature, as the fields of the Levant are overrun with them; to them the expression of Solomon, in all his glory, not being arrayed like one of them, is peculiarly appropriate." Dr. Lindley conceives 'it to be much more probable that the plant intended by our Saviour was the *Isolirion montanum,* a plant allied to the *amarillys,* of very great beauty, with a slender stem, and clusters of the most delicate violet flowers, abounding in Palestine, where colored Chenney found it in the most brilliant perfection' (l.c. p. 744). In reply to this, a correspondent furnishes an extract of a letter from Dr. Bowring, which throws a new light upon the subject: 'I cannot describe to you with botanical accuracy the lily of Palestine. I heard it called by the title of *Lilae Smyraceni,* and I imagine under this title its botanical characteristics may be hunted out. Its color is a brilliant red; its size about half that of the common tiger lily. The white lily I do not remember to have seen in any part of Syria. It was in April and May that I observed my flower, and it was most abundant in the district of Galilee, where it and the *Rhododendron* (which grew in rich abundance round the paths) most
strongly excited my attention.' On this Dr. Lindley observes, 'It is clear that neither the white lily, nor the Opoponax luteus, nor Ixolitum, will answer to Dr. Bowring's description, which seems to point to the Chalcedonian or scarlet Martagon lily, formerly called the lily of Byzantium, found from the Adriatic to the Levant, and which, with its scarlet tubular-like flowers, is indeed a most stately and striking object' (Gardeneri's Chronicle, ii, 854) (Kitto). As this lily (the Lilium Chalcedonicum of botanists) is in flower at the season of of Christ. According to the Roman Catholic view, until Christ's death and resurrection, which constituted the decisive moments of the work of redemption, the doors of heaven were closed to all (Catech. Rom. i, 2, 7); since then they have been permanently open to all perfect saints. This doctrine was first advanced by pope Benedict XI, and afterwards sanctioned by the Council of Florence (Peronne, v, 218). According to the Roman view, until the coming of Christ, the souls of all departed were, without exception, sent into the place of punishment, or infernum, as is (according to Romish views) still the case with those who die without having arrived at perfection, or some penance still to be performed for sin. At present they use the word infernum to convey the idea that all sinners are in some place outside of heaven, and that, on account of their different personal qualities, they are divided into different classes, which have nothing in common except their exclusion from the happiness of heaven, and therefore divide these ob-dita receptacula (Augustine, Enchiridion ad Laurent. § 109), of which the place of punishment consists, into, 1, hell, in its fullest sense, that terrible, immense prison in which the damned, who died in a state of mortal sin, are to remain forever (Cis. Rom. i, 6, 5, 6); 2, purgatory, in which the souls of believers, and above all those who are justified, suffer until they are entirely free from sin; 3, the bosom of Abraham, where the saints who died before the coming of Christ were received, and where, while free from torments, they were nevertheless, on account of original sin, prevented by the habitus of their bodies from beholding the glory of God until the coming of the Redeemer, whose merits freed them from these bonds, and opened to them the doors of heaven. Compare here the statement of the early English reformers in "the invita-tion of a Christian Mon." on the fifth article of their creed: 'Our Saviour Jesus Christ, at his entry into hell, first conquered and oppressed both the devil and hell, and also death itself... afterwards he spoiled hell, and delivered and brought with him from thence all the souls of those righteous and good men which, from the fall of Adam, died in the favor of God, and in the faith and belief of this our Saviour, which was then to come.' The doctrine of the Church, as expressed in the sym-bols, names no other divisions. The third place which, in ecclesiastical phraseology, is usually called Limbus patrum, is even represented sometimes as a quiet habi-tation of the saints as an unpleasing name (sinistra illius custodia molestan), which two views, being difficult to conciliate, gave rise to many intricate questions unavoidable as soon as an attempt is made to establish a detailed topography of the places of futurity. The Limbo of Dante is placed in the region most of the nine circles of his Inferno. No weeping is heard within it, but perpetual sighs tremble on the air, breathed by an infinite crowd of women, men, and children, afflicted, but not tormented. These inhabitants are not condemned on account of sin, but solely because it was their fortune to live before the birth of Christ, or to die unbaptized. The poet was grieved at heart, as well he might be, when he recognised in this sad company many persons of great worth (comp. Milman, Latin Christianity, b. xiv, chap. ii).

from the authorities of the Church, we find that the admission of the belief in a purgatory had in the West great influence on the ideas concerning the future. The scholastics, in the course of time, erected these "views" into a system. Besides the above-mentioned three places of abode for departed spirits deprived of heavenly fulness recognised in the Roman Catholic Church, two others existed, the existence of a fourth, intended for children who died previous to baptism. Bellarmine (Purg., ii, 7) considers it a very difficult question to decide whether there may not be a fifth, in which the purified souls remain until their final admittance into the kingdom of heaven, and which must consequently be situated somewhere between purgatory and heaven (Bedas, Hist. v, 13; Dionysius Carthusianus, Dial. de jud. particular. 81; Lud. Blo-
THE necessity of asceticism to each of the last penalties is its special positive accident sufficiently for the fact that the word *limbus* is made to answer both for the place where the saints who lived before Christ remain, and for the abode of children who died without baptism. It appears to have been first set forth by Thomas Aquinas, and to have been once adopted by the Council of Trent. It is consequently found in the centre of the earth; next comes purgatory, which surrounds hell; then the *limbus infantum*, or *purgatorium*; and finally, as the central point between hell and heaven, the *limbus patrum*, or *Siclus Abraham*. Of course each of the last groups in its turn had special duties: in hell it *pons eternus damni et senae* in purgatory, *pons temporalis damni et senae* in the *limbus infantum*, *pons damni eternae* in the *limbus patrum*, *pons damni temporalis* (Thom. Aqu. iii, d. 22, q. 2, a. 1, q. 2, 3, 4; d. 21, q. 1, a. 1, q. 2; d. 45, q. 1, a. 1, q. 2, 3, 9, 32, 2, 4, 4; d. 45, q. 1, a. 1, q. 2, etc., Eiusdem, 64; Dante, *Inf.*, c. 38 sq.; Burckhardt, *De S. P. Sent.*, t. d. 22, q. 4; Sonnini, *Demonstr. rel. Chr.*, ii, 15, and ii, 4; Belleairnue, *Purif. ii*, 6; Andraeius, *Def. Trid. Sacr. mod., iii*, 229).

The *limbus patrum* is exclusively reserved to the saints of the Mosaic dispensation. They suffer only by the consciousness that they are deprived, in consequence of original sin, from beholding God, and by an ardent longing for the coming of their Messiah. Since Christ has atoned for original sin, and freed them from imputation, they enjoy the stages i, ii, and iii, and are accorded an important in a religious sense. It is called *limbus infersi*, *quia erat penam carentis*, *Siculus Abraham* *propert requiem, quia erat expectatio gloriae* (Belleairnue, *De Christo*, iv, 10; Bécansus, *Append. purif. Cult.*). This view is defended partly by means of some passages in Scripture, (such as Gen. xxvii, 35; i Sam. xxvii; Exod. xix, 11; Luke xxvi, 23; xx, 37; xxiii, 48; John viii, 56; Heb. xi, 5; 1 Peter iii, 19); but especially by oral tradition. This last is the more available because, with the exception of the later attempts at locating the different places, the Western Church has always taught the same things on this point, at least since St. Augustine (*De civ. Dei*, xx, 15), that the limbus in general was only the *caput mortuum* which the doctrine of the purgatory had yet left to the old Church. The Greek Church, on the other hand, holds such views (Smith, *Dict.* gr. *Theol.*), *e hliados d. alen u. neuen greek Kirkoe*, 1711, ii, 103).

The doctrine of the *limbus infantum*, or, rather, of the fate of unbaptized children, is insisted on with much greater force. On this point, however, the consequences of the *limbus* as such assert themselves. It is impossible to come into conflict, and therefore the Church has never officially proclaimed its views as to the exact nature of it, so that a certain latitude is given for different opinions concerning it. The fathers early held different opinions on this point. Ambrosius (Orat. 40) does not venture to give any view concerning unbaptized children. Gregory of Nazianzum (Orat. *in a. Bapt. xi, 21*) claims that *non etiam diezatvi&sigma;ta, &eta; &kappa;k&sigma;tau; et &sigma;tau; &tau;&sigma;tau; &tau;&sigma;tau; &tau; &tau; et &kappa;k&sigma;tau; &tau;&sigma;tau; et &sigma;tau; &tau; &tau; &sigma;tau; &tau; et &sigma;tau; &tau; *erit* (Sermo 294, n. 9 sq.; *Enchirid. c. 98*; De pecc. meriti, i, c. 16, n. 2; Contra Julianum, v, 44; *Epist. ad Hieronymum*, 128). This is the view most generally held in the Roman Catholic Church. General councils held at Lyons and at Florence decided that both those who died in mortal sin and those who were only tainted by original sin went down to the *infernum*, but that their punishment was different. The respect the damnation of unbaptized children because *de fide*, so it had to be in some way distinguished from that of adults. Carrying out this view, the most distinguished scholastics, such as Peter Lombard (Sent. 2, d. 35), Thomas Bonaventure, and Scotus, assign to them only *pons damni infantum*, in contradistinction to *pons damni temporalis*. The *limbus infantum* of Petavius (De Deo, ix, 10, 10) is based on an error, *Storia di Rimini*, t. ii, *Fleury*, *Hist. Eccles. i*, 142, n. 128).

Now, although the essential nature of the *pons damni* consists in the deprivation of the happiness of seeing God, there exists a difference in the manner of applying the idea to children and their inheritance of original sin. In the fifth session of the Council of Trent the Dominicans advocated the stricter view, making it in the *limbus infantum* a dark, underground prison, while the Franciscans placed it above in a region of light. Others made the condition of these children still better: they supposed them occupied with studying nature, philosophizing on it, and receiving occasional visits from angels and saints. As the council thought it too difficult to decide this point, theologians have since been free to embrace either view. Belleairnue (*De amius, grat. vi, 6*) considers their state, like Lombard, as one of sorrow. On the contrary, cardinal *Stendracht* (*Notae praeed. Gent.* 2, 16), and *Bivio, ii*, 103, 104, and Thomas, *Quest. de male*, a. 2) consider them as enjoying all the natural happiness of which they are capable. They do not even know that supernatural nature consists in the *visio clara Dei*, and can feel no pain from this, to them unknown, exclusion. Finally, Perrone (v, 275), who takes *Concil. Tr.*, c. 4, as including in *de fide* only the want of the supernaturalis beatitudin, says: *Si spectetur relative ad supernaturalem beatitudinem habet talis status rationem ponens et damnationis; si vero spectetur ideam status in se esse absolute, cum per peccatum de naturalibus nihil amissit, talis est ipsum conditioni, qualsuis fuisse, ad Adam neque pecespect neque elevatus ad supernaturalem statum fuisse, i. e. in conditione purae nature*. This attempt at conciliation agrees so well with the Roman Catholic view of original sin, that on this account it has been admitted (*Concil. Tr.*, v, 2, 3, 15, 16; *Bivio, ii*, 103, 104; *Hom. v*). Moreover, it is well known that Roman Catholic principles are of great elasticity in their application, so that there is always some way for the Church of getting out of difficulties. Thus, while the Catechism (ii, 128) continues to assert the *limbus infantum*, it is *nulla alia salutis comparans ratio*, we learn from the theologians from Duns Scotus down to Kies (*Dogm. iii, 119*), that the mere *desiderium baptismi* can be considered as valid for the children while yet in the mothers' womb, and is equivalent to the actual performance of the rite of baptism on the child. What becomes of the children who, though baptized, die soon after baptism, and who thus lose the merito e congruo necessary for justification, cannot here be taken into consideration. Protestantism has taken but little notice of all these views. It was considered by many that these theories were too unimportant. The old Protestant Church, on the contrary, tried to prove the untenability on Biblical or philosophical grounds of this changeable doctrine, its late original, and its inner contradictions. Neither did it forget the impossibility of separating the *pons damni* and *pons sensus* (Calvin, iii, 10, 9; Arelio, *Loc. 17; Rysa- senium, *Summa, xvii, 8, 3*; B. Pictet, ii, 265; Gerard, xxvii, 8, 3; S. Nienm, *De Distinct. Pontif. in intern. clausis, 1689*). The old Protestant theologians considered it as an undeniable truth that there exist no other infinities of divisions than heaven, hell, and Purgatory in this world; also that there can be no further distinction between the souls of the departed than that based on belief and unbelief, causing the former to be blessed and
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the latter to be damned. Still there arose questions which it was difficult for them to settle: the Reformers theologians disposed of them in a comparatively easy manner, for, as they admitted only of a gradual difference between the two dispensations, and upheld the identity of the action of grace and faith possible to both, they found no difficulty in ascribing likewise to the former dispensation a great deal also as well known that Zwingle went even further. Thus they also disposed of the doctrine of predestination, at least in regard to elect children, in which the idea seminulista was presupposed, and no one could deny, in view of Matth. xix, 14, that a mere natural distinction or infant baptism was not sufficient to justify, as was also among the earliest Commentarius in Acta Apost. et in Epistolas ad Romano et ad Hebraeos (Rotterdam, 1711, fol.). "This commentary, though written in the interest of the author's theological views, is deserving of attention for the good sense, clear thought, and unclouded reasoning by which it is pervaded" (Kitto). In addition, he edited many of the works of the principal Armenian theologians. See Nicccius, Hist. des Hommes illustres, xi, 89-88; Abrar. des armoric van der Hoven, De Jo. Clerico et Philippo a Limborch. (Amstelod. 1684, 8vo); Hoeffer, Nouv. Exég. Générale, xxxi, s. v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop., viii. s. v.; Farrant, Hist. Of Free Thought, p. 886, 399; Metaclim Quarterly Review, July, 1864, p. 518.

Limize. See Limmus.

Lime (Lime) s. i. pers. from its boiling or effervescing when slaked: Isa. xxxiii, 12, Amos ii, 1; rendered "plaster" in Deut. ii, 2, 4; the same word is used for lime in Arab. and Syriac., a well-known mineral substance, which is a very prevalent ingredient in rocks, and, combined with carbonic acid, forms marble, chalk, and limestone, the latter being the principal raw material of the building art. Limestone is the prevailing constituent of the mountains of Syria; it occurs under various modifications of texture, color, form, and intermixture in different parts of the country. The purest carbonate of lime is found in the mountains of Galilee, whose crystalline character shows the variety of forms, all, however, resulting from a primary rhomboid. Under the action of fire, carbonate of lime loses its carbonic acid and becomes caustic lime, which has a hot, pungent taste. See "chalk." Lime is subjected to an intense heat, it fuses into transparent glass. When heated under great pressure, it melts, but retains its carbonic acid. The modern mode of manufacturing common or "quick" lime was known in ancient times. Lime is obtained by calcining or burning marble, limestones, chalk, shells, bones, and other substances to drive off the carbonic acid. From Isa. xxxii, 12 it appears that lime was made in a kiln lighted with fire. Dr. Thomson Remarks, "It is a curious fidelity to real life that, when the thorns are merely to be destroyed, they are never cut up, but are set on fire where they grow. They are only cut up for the lime-kiln." (Land and Buildings, iv. 11). See "flint." Limestone, tolerably hard, is the basis of the views of others, learned, methodical, of a retentive memory, and, above all, had a love for truth, and engaged in the search of it by reading the Scriptures with the best commentators. Next to Arminius himself, and Simon Episcopius, Limborch was one of the most distinguished of the Armenian theologians, who exerted a beneficial reaction upon Protestantism by their thorough scientific attainments, no less than by the mildness of their sentiments" (Hagenbach's History of Doctrines, ii, 214). In 1690, having found among the papers of Episcopius, his maternal uncle, several letters relating to ecclesiastical affairs, he arranged a collection with Hartocker, Epistolas praestantium et eruditorum Vitorum (8vo). Limborch was specially noted for his doctrinal works. His principal work is Theologia Christiana (1688; 4th ed. Amst. 1715, 4to), translated, with improvements from Wilkins, Pilkington, and others, by William Jones, under the title, A Complete System or Body of Divinity, both speculative and practical, founded on Scripture and Reason (London, 1702, 2 vols, 8vo). This was the first and most complete exposition of the Armenian doctrine, displaying great originality of arrangement, and admirable perspicuity and judicious selection of material. The preparation of the work was undertaken at the request of the Remonstrants (q. v.). His other works are, De errante religionis Christiana, (1687), the result of a conference with the learned Jew, Dr. Orosius: — Historia Inquisitionis (1692, fol.); translated by Samuel Chandler, under the title The History of the Inquisition, to which is prefixed a large introduction concerning the rise and progress of persecution, and the real and pretended causes of it, London, 1781, 2 vols. (4to). The second ed. of the latter work is A Commentarium in Acta Apost. et in Epistolas ad Romanos et ad Hebraeos (Rotterdam, 1711, fol.). "This commentary, though written in the interest of the author's theological views, is deserving of attention for the good sense, clear thought, and unclouded reasoning by which it is pervaded" (Kitto). In addition, he edited many of the works of the principal Armenian theologians. See Nicc circumstances, Hist. des Hommes illustres, xi, 89-88; Abrar. des armoric van der Hoven, De Jo. Clerico et Philippo a Limborch. (Amstelod. 1684, 8vo); Hoeffer, Nouv. Exég. Générale, xxxi, s. v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop., viii, s. v.; Farrant, Hist. Of Free Thought, p. 886, 399; Metaclim Quarterly Review, July, 1864, p. 518.

Limbux. See Limmo.

Lime (Lime) s. i. pers. from its boiling or effervescing when slaked: Isa. xxxiii, 12, Amos ii, 1; rendered "plaster" in Deut. ii, 2, 4; the same word is used for lime in Arab. and Syriac., a well-known mineral substance, which is a very prevalent ingredient in rocks, and, combined with carbonic acid, forms marble, chalk, and limestone, the latter being the principal raw material of the building art. Limestone is the prevailing constituent of the mountains of Syria; it occurs under various modifications of texture, color, form, and intermixture in different parts of the country. The purest carbonate of lime is found in the mountains of Galilee, whose crystalline character shows the variety of forms, all, however, resulting from a primary rhomboid. Under the action of fire, carbonate of lime loses its carbonic acid and becomes caustic lime, which has a hot, pungent taste. See "chalk." Lime is subjected to an intense heat, it fuses into transparent glass. When heated under great pressure, it melts, but retains its carbonic acid. The modern mode of manufacturing common or "quick" lime was known in ancient times. Lime is obtained by calcining or burning marble, limestones, chalk, shells, bones, and other substances to drive off the carbonic acid. From Isa. xxxii, 12 it appears that lime was made in a kiln lighted with fire. Dr. Thomson Remarks, "It is a curious fidelity to real life that, when the thorns are merely to be destroyed, they are never cut up, but are set on fire where they grow. They are only cut up for the lime-kiln." (Land and Buildings, iv. 11). See "flint." Limestone, tolerably hard, is the basis of the views of others, learned, methodical, of a retentive memory, and, above all, had a love for truth, and engaged in the search of it by reading the Scriptures with the best commentators. Next to Arminius himself, and Simon Episcopius, Limborch was one of the most distinguished of the Armenian theologians, who exerted a beneficial reaction upon Protestantism by their thorough scientific attainments, no less than by the mildness of their sentiments" (Hagenbach's History of Doctrines, ii, 214). In 1690, having found among the papers of Episcopius, his maternal uncle, several letters relating to ecclesiastical affairs, he arranged a collection with Hartocker, Epistolas praestantium et eruditorum Vitorum (8vo). Limborch was specially noted for his doctrinal works. His principal work is Theologia Christiana (1688; 4th ed. Amst. 1715, 4to), translated, with improvements from Wilkins, Pilkington, and others, by William Jones, under the title, A Complete System or Body of Divinity, both speculative and practical, founded on Scripture and Reason (London, 1702, 2 vols. 8vo). This was the first and most complete exposition of the Armenian doctrine, displaying great originality of arrangement, and admirable perspicuity and judicious selection of material. The preparation of the work was undertaken at the request of the Remonstrants (q. v.). His other works are, De errante religionis Christiana, (1687), the result of a conference with the learned Jew, Dr. Orosius: — Historia Inquisitionis (1692, fol.); translated by Samuel Chandler, under the title The History of the Inquisition, to which is prefixed a large introduction concerning the rise and progress of persecution, and the real and pretended causes of it, London, 1781, 2 vols. (4to). The second ed. of the latter work is A Commentarium in Acta Apost. et in Epistolas ad Romanos et ad Hebraeos (Rotterdam, 1711, fol.). "This commentary, though written in the interest of the author's theological views, is deserving of attention for the good sense, clear thought, and unclouded reasoning by which it is pervaded" (Kitto). In addition, he edited many of the works of the principal Armenian theologians. See Nicc circumstances, Hist. des Hommes illustres, xi, 89-88; Abrar. des armoric van der Hoven, De Jo. Clerico et Philippo a Limborch. (Amstelod. 1684, 8vo); Hoeffer, Nouv. Exég. Générale, xxxi, s. v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop., viii, s. v.; Farrant, Hist. Of Free Thought, p. 886, 399; Metaclim Quarterly Review, July, 1864, p. 518.
aid does not here mean a "pilaster," but indicates that the stones, after they had been engraved, were covered with a coat of tenacious lime-white-wash, employed for similar purposes by the Egyptians, who, when the face of a rock had been sculptured in relief, covered the whole with a coat of this wash, and then painted their sculptured figures (Kittel's Fict. Bible, note ad loc.). See Moreau.

Limina Martyrum (the houses of the martyrs), a phrase sometimes used in ancient writers to designate churches.

Limiter (limi'tor), the name given to an itinerant and beggar employed by a convent to collect its dues and promote its temporal interests within certain limits, though under the direction of the brotherhood who employed him. Occasionally he is represented as a person of considerable importance. See Russell's Notes: Works of the English and Scottish Reformers, ii. 580, 542.

Lincoln, Ensign, a noted philanthropist and lay minister in the Baptist Church, was born at Hingham, Mass., Jan. 8, 1779. He was brought into the Church when about nineteen years old, under the ministry of the Rev. Dr. Baldwin. He had been apprenticed to a printer, and in 1800 he commenced business on his own account. He also advanced the interests of Christian truth by preaching, for which he was licensed about 1801, and though he was not ordained and therefore never relinquished his secular profession, he preached and prayed, and performed the ordinary offices of a minister of the Gospel with all the holy fervor of an apostle. He won the unaffected respect of all men, as a generous neighbor, an honest friend, and a virtuous citizen. He died Dec. 2, 1832. "If I should live to the age of Methuselah," he remarked, "I could find no better time to die." Mr. Lincoln was prominent in the organization of the Evangelical Tract Society, the Howard Benevolent Society, the Baptist Foreign Mission Society, the Massachusetts Baptist Education Society, and other institutions of a similar character. He edited Winchell's Watts, the Pronouncing Bible, and the series of beautiful volumes styled The Christian Library. His own Scriptural Questions and Sabbath-school Class-book are well known. See Dr. Sharp's Funeral Sermon; American Baptist Magazine, April, 1833. (J. H. W.)

Linda or Lindana, William Damars Van, a Roman Catholic prelate, noted as a controversialist, born at Dordrecht, Holland, in 1525, was professor of Roman theology at Louvain and Dillingen; later, dean in the Hague, and then bishop of Ghent. He is remarkable for the accuracy and grace with which he drove the inquisitor. In 1562 he was appointed by Philip II bishop of Rouenmond. He died in 1568 or 1568. His most popular work was Panoplia Evangelica (1563). See A. Haversius, Vita G. Lindani (1609).—Thomas, Biogr. Dict. p. 1483; Wetter und Weise, Kirchen-Lexikon, vol. xii. s. v.

Lindblom, Jacob Axel, a Swedish prelate, was born in Ostrogodish in 1747. He was professor of bellows in Upsala, and later became bishop of Upsala and Linköping in 1789, and was afterwards chosen archbishop of Upsala. He died in 1819. —Thomas, Biographical Dictionary, p. 1483.

Linde, Christoph Ludwigo, a German theologian, was born at Schmalkalden June 5, 1676. In 1698 he attended the University of Erfurt, and the following year, and also the next year, he was a private student, and became tutor, first at Leipzic, in order to develop his knowledge more fully, and in 1705 at his native place. In 1706 he accepted a call as preacher to Farnbach, in 1725 he returned to Schmalkalden as subdean, and in 1746 he was granted the position of pastor. He died Aug. 27, 1758. His publications are mostly dedicated to the youth and school-teachers of the Lutheran Church; we mention only his Theologia in Hymnis (Schmalkalden, 1712, 5vo.), —Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, vol. ii. s. v.


Lindgerius (Lindgerius), Sr., a noted theologian, was born about the year 743 in Friesland. He became a disciple of St. Boniface, who admitted him to holy orders, and afterwards he went for four years and a half to England to perfect himself under the renowned Alcuin, then living at the school of York. He was returned in 778, and in 776 was ordained priest by Alberic, successor of St. Gregory. He preached the Gospel with great success in Friesland, converted large numbers, and founded several convents, but was obliged to quit the country in consequence of the invasion of the Saxons. He then went to Rome to consult with the pope, Adrian II, and withdrew for three years to the monastery of Mount Cassin. Charlemagne having repulsed the Saxons and liberated Friesland, Lindgerius returned, preached the Gospel to the Saxons with great success, as also in Westphalia, and ultimately died the convent of Wenden. In 892 he was, against his wishes, appointed bishop of Mimiagarfoerd, which was afterwards called Munster. He always enjoyed the favor of Charlemagne, notwithstanding the intrigues of enemies jealous of his usefulness. He died in A.D. 899. —Hersorg, Best-Encyklop. vol. xix, s. v.

Lindsay, John (1), a learned English divine, who flourished about the middle of the 17th century, was educated at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, and for many years officiated as a minister of the nonjuring society in Trinity Chapel, Aldersgate Street, and is said to have been their last survivor. He was also for many years a priest of the church in the Deanery, and was the inspector of the press for Mr. Bowyer, the printer. He finished a long and useful life June 21, 1768. Mr. Lindsay published a Short History of the Regular Succession, etc., with Remarks on Whiston's Scripture Politics, etc. (1729, 2vo); a translation of Mansfield's Life of the Earl of Sandwich (1738, 4to); and the Select Works of the Arminians (1738, 2nd ed. 1739), which has a large and elaborate preface, containing "a full and particular series of the succession of our bishops, through the several reigns since the Reformation," etc. In 1747 he published Mason's Two Sermons preached at Court in 1720. See Gen. Encyclop. vol. xix. s. v.

Lindsay, John (2), a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Lynn, Mass., July 18, 1788; was converted in 1807; entered the New England Conference in 1809; was agent for the Wesleyan University in 1855-6; in 1857 was transferred to the New York Conference, and made presiding elder on New Haven District; next he filled two stations in New York City; in 1849 he was agent for the American Bible Society; was transferred in 1845 to the Troy Conference; was appointed to the Albany District in 1846; and died at Schenectady Feb. 10, 1850. Mr. Lindsay was an impressive and successful preacher, and a man of noble benevolence. He was very active in the founding of the Wesleyan Academy at Wilburham, and the Wesleyan University.—Minutes of Conf. 1V, 440; Stevens, Memorials of Methodism, vol. ii. ch. xli. (G. L. T.)

Lindsey, Theophilus, an eminent Greek Unitarian minister, was born at Middleton, in Cheshire, June 20, 1728 (O. S.). He entered Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in 1741, and, after taking his degrees, was elected fellow in 1747. About this time he commenced his clerical duties at an Episcopal chapel in Spital Square, London. Later he became domestic chaplain to Algermon, duke of Somerset, after whose death he traveled for two years on the Continent with Algermon's son. On his return, about 1758, he was presented to the living of Kirkby Wiske, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, and in 1756 he removed to that of Piddington, in Dor-
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Letters. In 1769 he married a step-daughter of his intimate friend architect Blackburne, and in 1768, chiefly for the sake of enjoying his society, took the living of Catterick. Lindsey, who had felt some scruples respecting subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles even while at Cambridge, began now to entertain serious doubts concerning the Unitarian doctrine, and by 1769 his association with the Rev. William Turner, a Presbyterian minister at Wakefield, and Dr. Priestley, then a Unitarian minister at Leeds, gave a more decided coloring to his Antitrinitarian views, and he actually began to contemplate the step of resigning his holy office. This step was induced to defer that step by an attempt which was made in 1771, by several clergymen and gentlemen of the learned professions, to obtain relief from Parliament in the matter of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, and in which he joined heartily, travelling upwards of 2000 miles in the winter of that year to obtain signatures to the petition which was prepared. The petition was presented on the 6th of February, 1772, with nearly 250 signatures, but, after a spirited debate, its reception was negatived by 217 to 71. It being intended to renew the application to Parliament at the session of 1774, he still delayed his resignation, but when the intention was abandoned he began to prepare for that important step. He drew up, in July, 1773, a copious and learned "Apology," and, notwithstanding the attempts of his diocesan and others to dissuade him, he formally resigned his connexion with the Established Church, and, selling the greatest part of his library to meet his pecuniary exigencies, he proceeded to London, and on the 17th of April, 1774, began to officiate in a room in Essex Street, Strand, which, by the help of friends, he had been enabled to convert into a temporary chapel. His desire being to deviate as little as possible from the mode of worship adopted in the Church of England, he used a liturgy very slightly altered from that modification of the national church-service which had been previously published by Dr. Samuel Clarke. This modified liturgy, as his opening sermon, Lindsey published. His efforts to raise a Unitarian congregation proving unsuccessful, he commenced shortly afterwards the erection of a more permanent chapel in Essex Street, which was opened in 1776. His published "Apology" having been attacked in print by Mr. Burgh, an Irish M.P., by Mr. Bingham, and by Dr. Randolph, Lindsey published a "Sequel" to it in 1776, in which he answered those writers. In 1781 he published The Catechist, or an Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Scriptures concerning the only True God, and the Sacrament of Baptism. In 1783, A Historical View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship, from the Reformation to our own Times, an elaborate work, which had been several years in preparation; and in 1786, anonymously, An Examination of Mr. Robinson's Cambridge's Plan for the Dechristianization of our Lord Jesus Christ, by a late Member of the University. In 1788 he published The Christian Prelates, a defence of his friend Dr. Priestley, in the form of an address to the students of Oxford and Cambridge; and this was followed, in 1790, by a Second Address to the Students of Oxford and Cambridge relating to the Origin of the great Errors concerning him. In 1792 he invited Dr. Disney, who then left the Established Church for the same reasons as himself, to become his colleague in the ministry at Essex Street; and in 1798, on account of age and growing infirmities, he resigned the pastorate entirely into his hands, publishing on the occasion a farewell discourse (which he felt himself unable to preach) and a revised edition, being the fourth, of his liturgy. In 1795 he reprinted, with an original preface, the Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever which Dr. Priestley had recently published in answer to Dr. Hume's Exposition of Reason; and in 1800 he republished in like manner another of Priestley's works, on the knowledge which the Hebrews had of a future state. Lindsey's last work was published in 1802, entitled

Conversations on the Divine Government, showing that everything is from God and for good to all. He died on the 3d of November, 1808. Besides copious biographical notices of Lindsey, which were published in the Monthly Repository and Monthly Magazine of Dec., 1806, the Rev. Thomas Belsham published, in 1812, a thick octavo, volume titled Memoirs, in which he gave a full analysis of Lindsey's works and extracts from his correspondence, together with a complete list of his publications. Two volumes of his sermons were printed shortly after his death. See Engl. Cyclop. s. v.; Robert Hall, A Discourse on the Death of a Religious Man (11th ed., 1858), iv. 188 sq.; London Quarterly Review, viii. 422 sq.

Lindsey, James Harvey, a Baptist preacher, was born in North Branford, Connecticut, May 5, 1787. Brought to consider his spiritual condition through a severe illness, he sought and found pardon in December, 1810. Shortly after he began a course of study, with the view of entering the ministry, and graduated at Yale College in 1817. For a number of years his health was so poor as to forbid his preaching, and he was engaged in teaching. He introduced into the Baptist denomination the religious meetings styled "Conference of the Church," and was the first to adopt the name of the first two. His first regular preaching was in Stratford, in a store hired by himself in 1831, and in the same year he received a regular license to preach. For five years he had charge of the churches in Milford and Stratford. In 1832 he began his work in Springfield, and for a part of the year assisted in the compilation of the Baptist Select Hymns. He died Dec. 29, 1843. Mr. Lindsey was a ready writer, and a large contributor to several of the periodicals of the day. His articles took a wide range, including politics, religion, moral reform, literature, and especially natural science.—Sprague, Ammals of the American Pulpit, vol. vi.

Lindale, Philip, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Morristown, N. J., Dec. 21, 1716, and graduated in the College of New Jersey (Princeton) in 1744. After teaching for some time, and completing his theological studies, he was licensed to preach in 1749, and settled in Newtown, L. I., where he preached as a stated supply. In 1812 he became senior tutor in Princeton College, and in 1818 was appointed to the professorship of languages, and chosen secretary of the board of trustees. To these offices were added those of librarian and inspector of the college, and in 1817, when he was ordained, that of vice-president. In 1824 he agreed to go to Nashville, solely induced thereto by the new and wide field of exertion which lay before him there. He continued more than a quarter of a century at Nashville, and his reputation was so high in the South and West that it was said that every university in those regions had solicited him to accept its headship. He was twice invited to preside over Dickinson College, in Pennsylvania, and was actually elected provost of the University of Pennsylvania in 1884. From this period he was successively moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, member of the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries at Copenhagen, professor of ecclesiastical policy and Biblical archeology in the New Albany Seminary (Indiana), 1850. He removed from New Albany in April, 1853, and returned to Nashville, where he died May 28, 1855. Dr. Lindale's works have been published entirely, with an introductory notice of his life and labors by Leroy J. Halsey. (Philadelphia, 1865, 3 vols. 8vo). Their contents are as follows: vol. i. Ecclesiastical History, Ecclesiastical and Religious Discourses; vol. ii, Miscellaneous Discourses and Essays.—Sprague, Ammals, iv. 465.

Lindwood. See Lindwood.

Line (represented by the following terms in the original: *Debet, car, measuring-line*, 2 Sam. viii. 2; Amos xvi. 7; hence a portion as divided out by a line, Psa. xvi. 6; elsewhere "cord," "portion," etc. *or* *or* *or*, a measuring-line, Isa. xxiv. 17; Ezek. xxiv. 28).
LINEAGE

2; either for construction, Job xxxviii, 5; Isa. xiv, 18; Jer. xxxi, 39; Zech. i, 16, or for destruction, 2 Kings xxi, 13; Lam. ii, 8; Isa. xxxiv, 11; metaph., a rule or norm, Isa. xxvii, 10, 13; like the Gr. κανών, 2 Cor. x, 13, 15, 16; Gal. vi, 16; Phil. iii, 16; also the rim, e.g. of a laver, 1 Kings vii, 23; 2 Chron. iv, 2; or string of a musical instrument, Ps. xlii, 8, but not q. d., Ezek. xix, 4; where Sept. θέματος, γένους, and so Rom. x, 18, Vulg. supersedes, once; strength, Isa. xxviii, 2, where "a nation met out" should be rendered a most mighty nation: in three of the above passages, 1 Kings vii, 23; Jer. xxxi, 39; Zech. i, 16, the text reads τάκτον, τάκτος, of the same import; and in Josh. ii, 18, 21, occurs μέτρον, μέτροκ, a cord, from the same root. Other terms less proper are: δαὐδι, a thread, for measuring a circumference, 1 Kings vii, 15; "fillets," Jer. iii, 21; elsewhere generally a "thread." λινος, a cord for measuring length, Ezek. vi, 18, elsewhere a "thread," "lace," etc., especially the string for suspending the signet-ring in the bosom, rendered "bracelet" in Gen. xxxviii, 18, 25. αὐτός, the aor. or stylus with which an artist graver the sketch of a figure in outline, to be afterwards sculptured in full, Isa. xiv, 18. There can be little doubt that the Hebrews acquired the art of measuring land from the Egyptians, as who had it whom it was early prevalent (Wilkinson's Anc. Egypt. ii, 256). In Josh. xviii, 9 we read, "And the men went out and passed through the land, and described it by cities into seven parts in a book, and came again to Joshua to the host at Shiloh." Thence on the northern side not less clearly indicates a survey of the whole country was made, and the results entered carefully in a book (see Kitt's Daily Bible Illustr. ad loc.). This appears to be the earliest example of a topographical survey on record, and it proves that there must have been some knowledge of mensuration among the Hebrews, as is moreover evinced by the other topographical details in the book of Joshua.


Linen has been made in the A. Version or elsewhere the representative of a considerable number of Heb. and Greek terms, to most of which it more or less nearly corresponds. The material designated by them in general is no doubt principally, and perhaps by some of them exclusively, the product of the flax-plant; but there is another plant which, as being a probable rival to it, may be most conveniently considered here, namely, hemp. See also Silk: Wool.

Linen was extensively cultivated in Egypt. In the present day, the cultivation of hemp is almost entirely confined to the Thracians for making garments. These were so like linen that none but a very experienced person could tell whether they were of hemp or flax; one who had never seen hemp would certainly suppose them to be linen. Hemp is used in the present day for school frocks and caps, and horse and medical enough. hemp are well known. Canna was mentioned in the works of Hippocrates on account of its medical properties. Dioscorides describes it as being employed for making ropes, and it was a good deal cultivated by the Greeks for this purpose. Though we are unable at present to prove that it was cultivated in Egypt at an early period, and used for making garments, yet there is nothing improbable in its having been so. Indeed, as it was known to various Asiatic nations, it could hardly have been unknown to the Egyptians, and the similarity of the word ἄκαρκτος to the Arabic ʿ ಶಃ to heark to the Arabic šesw would lead to a belief that they were acquainted with it, especially as in a language like the Hebrew it is more probable that different names were applied to totally different things, than that the same thing had two quite different names. Hemp might thus have been used at an early period, along with flax and wool, for making cloth for garments and for hangings, and would be much valued until cotton and the finer kinds of linen came to be known.

1. Phiset (φίστης, or, rather, according to Gessner, πιθηκ, from πίθους, to card) is rendered "linen" in Lev. xiii, 47, 48, 52, 59; Deut. xxxii, 11; Jer. xii, 1; Ezek. xii, 3; "staples of flax," i.e. woody flax, Josh. vii, 6 (where the Sept. has λινόκαμην, Vulg. stipula lini, but the Arabic Vers. stalks of cotton); and (2) wrought flax, i.e. "linen cloth, as made into garments, e.g. generally, Lev. xiv, 47, 48, 52, 59; Deut. xxxii, 11; Ezek. xiv, 17; a girdle, Jer. xiii, 1, a mitre, a pair of drawers, Lev. xii, 43, 44; a priest's ephod, Ezek. xvi, 18. A cognate term is πιθηκοσ, pitaχος, the plant "flax" as growing, Exod. ix, 31; spec. a stick, made of linen, i.e. of "flax," Isa. xiii, 3, or "tow" Isa. xiii, 17. To this exactly corresponds the Greek λινος (whence English linen), which, indeed, stands for pithikos or pishthik in the Sept. (at Exod. ix, 31; Isa. xiii, 9, xiii, 9; xii). It signifies properly the flax-plant (Xenophon, Hell. vi, 12), but in the N. T. is only used of linen raiment (Rev. xv, 6; comp. Homer, II. ix, 661; Od. xiii, 78), also the stick of a lamp, as being composed of a strip or ravellings of linen (Matt. xii, 20), where the half-expiring flame is made the subject of the story, and will be cheered instead of having its religious hopes extinguished by the Redeemer. In John xiii, 5 occurs the Latin term linteum, in its Greek form λινος, literally a linen cloth, hence a "towel" or apron (comp. Galen, Comp. Med. 9; Sueottonius, Calig. xxi, 2).

This well-known plant was early cultivated in Egypt. (Exod. i, 27; Isa. xiv, 19; comp. Pinya, x, 2; Hesiod, ii, 155; Hazael, Tetr. p. 500), namely, in the Delta around Pelusium ("linum Pelusiacum," Sil. Itali. iii, 25, 375; "linum Pelusiacum," Phedr. ii, 6, 12); but also in Palestine (Josh. ii, 6, Hos. ii, 7; compare Pococke, East. i, 380), the region which was the country of the Philistines, according to Josh. ii, 6; compare Hartmann, Hebr. i, 116). Linen or tow was employed by the Hebrews, especially as a branch of female domestic manufacture (Prov. xxxi, 18), for garments (2 Sam. vi, 14; Ezek. xiv, 17; Lev. xiii, 47; Rev. xv, 6; comp. Philo, ii, 230), girdles (Jer. xxxvi, 1) thread and ropes (Ezek. xii, 8; Judges xvi, 18), napkins (Luke xxiv, 12; John xix, 40), turbans (Ezek. xiv, 18), and lamp-wick (Isa. xi, 8; xiii, 17; Matt. xii, 20). For clothing they used the "fine linen" (τεχνης, 1 Chron. xxv, 27, where the Sept. has βασανοντος: see Hartmann, iii, 38; compare Lev. xvi, 4, 23; Ezek. xiv, 17), perhaps the Pelusiac linen of Egypt (see Mishna, Joma, iii, 7), of remarkable whiteness (comp. Dan. xii, 1; Rev. xv, 6; see Plutarch, Isis, c. 4), with which the fine Babylon linen manufactured at Borsippa doubtless corresponded (Strabo, xvi, 793), being the material of the splendid robes of the Perisan monarchs (Strabo, xiv, 719; Curt. viii, 9), doubtless the karpos, O.D., of Esth. i, 6 (see Gessner, Theor. Hebr. p. 715). Very poor persons wore garments of unbleshed flax (παθουρους, xii, 12); "costume, cloths. (Eccles. xii, 4). The refuse of flax or tow is called in Heb. ה. sooth (Judg. xvii, 9; Isa. 81). (See, generally, Celsius, Hierobol. ii, 285 sq.) See Flax.
2. Bcca (ἠχός, from a root signifying εὐχείνεσα) occurs in 1 Chron. iv. 21; xvi. 27; 2 Chron. ii. 14; iii. 14; v. 12; Esth. i. 6; viii. 15, Ezek. xxxvii. 16, in all which passages the A.V. renders it "fine linen," except in 2 Chron. v. 12, where it translates "white linen." The word is of Aramaean origin, being found in substantially the same form in Phœnician. It is the Hebrew word שֵׁש (šēš), and the Persian šeš or šesh. The word, however, is of the finest and most precious stuff, as worn by kings (1 Chron. xiv. 27), by priests (2 Chron. v. 12), and by other persons of high rank or honor (Esth. i. 6, 8, 15). It is used of the Syrian byzan (Ezek. xxvi. 17), which seems there to be distinguished from the Egyptian byzas or בְּרִנָה, shek (ver. 7). Elsewhere it seems not to differ from this Syrian stuff, or at any rate for put for it in late Hebrew (e.g. 1 Chron. iv. 21; v. 12; 2 Chron. iii. 14). Comp. Ezek. xxvi. 31; so the Syr. and Chald. equivalents of buts occur in the O. and N.T. for the Heb. ברִנָה and Gr. βίσιος.

That the Heb. garments made of this material were white may not only be certainly concluded from the etymology (which of ברִנָה confirms), but from the express language of Rev. xix. 4, where the white and shining raiment of the saints is emblematical of their purity. Yet we should not rashly reject the testimony of Pausanias (v. 5), who states that the Hebrew byzas was yellow, for cotton of this color is found as well in Guinea and India (Gospiotianum religiosum) as in Greece at this day (comp. Vossius, ed. Virg. Geo. ii. 220), although white was doubtless the prevailing color, as of linen with us. J. E. Faber (in Harmar, Oebr. ii. 382 sq.) suspects that the buts was a cotton-plant common in Syria, and different from the shek or tree-cotton. It has long been disputed whether the cloth of byzas were of linen or cotton (see Celsius, Hierobolii ii. 197 sq.; Forster, De byzas, London, 1776), and recent microscopic experiments upon the mummy-cloths brought to London from Egypt have been claimed as determining the controversy by discovering that the threads of these are linen (Wilkinson, Ant. Egypt. iii, 115). But this is not decisive, as there may have existed religious reasons for employing linen for this particular purpose, and the cloths used for bandaging the bodies are not clearly stated to have been of byzas. On the contrary, the characteristics ascribed to this latter are such as much better agree with the qualities of cotton (see Forster, De byzas, ut sup.).

The corresponding Greek word βίσιος occurs in Luke xvi. 19, where the rich man is described as being clothed in purple and fine linen, and also in Rev. xvii. 10, 12, and xiv. 12, 16, and xix. 14, among the merchandise the loss of which would be mourned by the merchants trading with the mystical Babylon. But it is by many authors still considered uncertain whether this byzas was of flax or cotton; for, as Rosenmuller says, "The Heb. word shek, which occurs thirty times in the two first books of the Pentateuch (see Celsius, ii. 259), is in these places, as well as in Prov. xxxi. 22, by the Greek Alexandrian translators, interpreted byzas, which denotes Egyptian cotton, and also the cotton cloth made from it. In the later writings of the O. T., as, for example, in the Chronicles, the book of Esther, and Ezekiel, buts is commonly used instead of shek as an expression for cotton cloth." The same ambiguity seems to be inferred by Statoon, and it is just as likely that improved civilization may have introduced a substance, such as cotton, which was unknown at the times when shek was spoken of and employed, in the same manner as we know that in Europe woolen, hempen, linen, and cotton clothes have at one period of society been more extensively worn than at another. Cotton is the product of a plant apparently cultivated in the earliest ages not only in India, Cyprus, and other well-known localities, but also in Egypt (Plyn. xix. 12; comp. Dacier, Diction. des Anciens, 104 and 110, and even in Syria (Ezek. xxxvii. 16) and Palestine (1 Chron. iv. 21; Pausan. v. 5, 2; Pococke, East, ii. 88; Arriuex, i. 306).

Two kinds of cotton are usually distinguished, the plant (Gospiotian herbaceum) and the tree (Gospiot. arboreum), although the latest investigations appear to make them essentially one. The former, which in Western Asia is found growing in fields (Olearius, Travels, p. 297; Korte, Reis. p. 457), is an annual shrub two or three feet high, but well cultivated, as Olivier, Truew. i. 461, it becomes a bush from three to five feet in height. The flowers are reddish at the bottom, the branches short, furry, and speckled with black spots; the leaves are dark green, large, five-lobed, and weak. The flowers spring from the junction of the leaves with the stem; they are bell-shaped, purplish white, and are succeeded by oval capsules of the size of a hazel-nut, which swell to the size of a walnut, and (in October) burst spontaneously. They contain a little ball of white filaments, which in warm situations attains the size of an apple. Imbedded in this are seven little egg-shaped, woolly seeds, of a brown or black-gray color, which contain an oily kernels. The Gospiotian arboreum (Gospiotianus) of Theophrastus was anciently (see Theop. Plant. iv. 9, p. 144, ed. Schneider), and still is indigenous in Asia (i.e. India), and attains a height of about twelve feet, but differs very little as to the leaves, blossoms, or fruit from the herbaceous cotton. See generally Belon, in Paulus's Stammil. i. 214 sq.; Kurrer, in the Holl. Encycl. viii. 209 sq.; Oken, Lehrb. d. Naturgesch. ii. 11, 1262 sq.; Ainslie, Metr. Ind. p. 292 sq.; Ritter, Erdk. vii. 1058 sq.

Cotton (ברינא, shek), according to Rosenmuller, Akert. i. 175; comp. Tuch, Gew. p. 300 sq.; later *P?ת, buts, see Faber, in Harman, ii. 388, comp. Geissen, Thesisar. p. 190 sq.; comp. Forster, De byzas, London, 1776) is manufactured in Fustat, the old Egyptian capital (tenu. xil. 42; comp. Plyn. xix. 12, and in Persia into cords (Esth. i. 6), but the primitive cotton cloth was probably made of byzas cloth (Exod. xxvi. 1, xxvii. 9), and clothing (Exod. xxvii. 9), and the Hebrew women were accustomed to similar false-silk (Olivier, Truew. i. 461) has also been regarded as the sumptuous appearance which the rich were able to afford (Luke xvi. 19, on the byzas of the Greeks and Romans, see Celsius, ii. 170, 177, and Wetstein, ii. 767). Nevertheless, the Hebrew shek does not designate exclusively cotton, but also stands sometimes, like the Gr. byzas often (as the material of the tree, Philost. Apoll. ii. 29; comp. Pollux, Onom. vii. 17; Strabo, xvi. 688; Arrian, Indic. vii), for the finest (Gospiotian) white linen (certainly in Exod. xxxii. 28, comp. xxxviii. 42; Lev. xvi. 4; see Plyn. xix. 2, 3), which in softness compared with cotton (Hartmann, Erdk. iii. 87 sq.). Indeed, the present material consists of the cotton plant (Bahr, Symbol. i. 254) is based altogether upon the custom of the Egyptians, whose priests were exclusively clothed in linen (Plyn. xix. 1, 2; comp. Philost. Apoll. ii. 20), which has likewise been contested was the ancient form of the cotton cloth (Kurtz, Mos. cir. 1. 341; Strabo, xvi. 688; Koch, Charkel. 333 sq.). In fine, the Orientals often employed a single term to designate both cotton and linen, but the word σιτος was incorrect, and is found in Homer (Herodot. ii. 259 sq., 167 sq.) that shek stands only for (fine) linen (see Faber, in Harman, ii. 380 sq.; Hartmann, Erdk. iii. 84 sq.). The same ambiguity that thus applies to shek is also found in the use of "shek (Esth. i. 6, viii. 15, Sept. βίσιος), by which perhaps cotton is meant, and is, after all, intended to signifies cotton. See generally J. R. Forster, De byzas antiquor. (Lond. 1776); Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. s. v. Byzas; Egypt. Antiq. In the Lib. of Entertainings Knowl. ii. 182-192; Penny Cyclopaedia, s. v. Cotton. Gossypium. See Cotton.
... but in 1 Chron. 25:10. It is well known that the official garments of the Egyptians (as of the Brahmin priests) were of linen (Rutshuler, *Bot. of the Bible*, p. 175), and hence the custom among the Hebrews (compare Ezek. xiv. 17, where the sacred apparel is expressly described as the product of flax, עָלָם). Celsius, however, is of opinion (Hierobol. ii. 89) that *bad* does not signify the common linen, as some have imagined, but the finest and best Egyptian linen (mod. Greek βαδις). After this, we may well agree that *bad* is the same as *buts*, namely, a species of linen in Egypt. With this view sees Gessinian concurs (*Theo- rishk. Hebr. p. 179*). The Talmudists appear to have been of the same opinion, from their fanciful etymology of the term *bad* as of a plant with a single stem springing upright from one seed (Brachia, De pot. art. p. 101). This interpretation is finally confirmed by the Arabic versions, which have a term equivalent to *byseus*. See No. 1 above. Perhaps, however, the requirement of the material in question for priestly garments may only signify that no stock should be employed in them, and they may therefore have consisted indifferently of either linen or cotton, provided it was entirely pure, and thus be represented by the equal term *byseus*. See No. 2 above.

4. *Sheesh* (*šēš*), prob. from the Egyptian *skesh*, in ancient Egyptian *cexh, i. e. linen, Bunsen, *Äg. i. 606*, which appears to have been applied to the most coarse flax, *šēš*, to be white; Sept. everywhere *βωσονα* occurs Gen. xl. 42; Exod. xxv. 5; xxi. 5, 8, 16; xxxvi. 9, 12, 15, 18; xxxvii. 2, 6, 8, 15, 39; xxxix. 6, 23, 25, 35; xxxvi. 8, 35, 37; xxxvii. 9, 16, 18, 28; xxxix. 2, 3, 5, 8, 27, 28, 29; Prov. xxxii. 22; Ezek. xvi. 10, 18; xxxvii. 7; in all which passages it is rendered "fine linen" in the Author. Ver. (except Prov. xxxii. 22, where it is rendered "white silk"). In Esth. i. 6; Cant. v. 15, the same term occurs, but is rendered, as it there signifies, "marble"; once *šēšruti* (šēš, from the same), Ezek. xvi. 13, text, "fine linen." This word appears to designate Egyptian linen of peculiar whiteness and fineness, and as such it is stated to have been imported from Egypt by way of Tyre (Ezek. xxvii. 7), in distinction from the Syrian linen or *baka* (בַּקָּה, verse 16). In the Pentateuch it is several times applied to *byseus*, of which, both as material spontaneously offered (Exod. xxv. 4; xxxix. 6, 23) and as woven fabrics (Exod. xxv. 25, 30; xxxvii. 23), were made both the curtains and veils of the sacred tabernacle (Exod. xxv. 1, 31, 36; xxvii. 5, 16, 18; xxxvi. 8, 35, 37; xxxix. 3, 5, 8, 27, 28, 29). Ezek. xvi. 10, 18, and the prayer of the high priest's ephod or shoulder-piece (Ezek. xxvii. 8, 6, 15, 39; xxix. 2, 5, 8, 27, 28, 29). Though it is unexpressed in the usual phrase, the distinction is stated to have been worn by noble persons alone, e.g. by Joseph as prefect of Egypt (Gen. xl. 46), and women of eminence (Prov. xxxii. 22). But that *skesh* is also spoken of linen articles is apparent from Exod. xxxix. 28, where the "linen breeches" (ין בְּרֵית) are said to have been made of "fine-twined linen" (יַעַנָּן בְּרֵית), as well as from the fact that בָּשָׂה, *pishkim*, linen garments, are sometimes (e.g. Isa. xxvii. 17; Ezek. xiv. 18) rendered by the Chaldee interpreter by בַּשָּׂי, *buts*. It thus appears that *skesh* is equivalent in general to *byseus*. See No. 2 above. See generally Celsius, Hierobol. ii. 259; J. R. Forster, *Liber singularis de byseus antiquorum* (London, 1776); J. F. Faber, *Observ. i. 399 sq.; Hartmann, *Synec- bräerius*, iii, 34 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Altert. IV, i, 175 sq.


6. *ERTU* (אֶרְתֻ, from an obsolete root perhaps signifying to bind, referring to the use of the material for ropes) occurs only in Prov. vii. 16, as a product of Egypt, "I have decked my bed with coverings of tapestry, with carved works, with fine linen of Egypt." As Egypt was from very early times celebrated for its cultivation of flax and manufacture of linen, there can be little doubt that *ertu* is correctly rendered, though somewhat doubtful that it may signify rope or string of Egypt, "finaς *Egyptiæ*, "finaς salignus v. intubecas;" a sense that it bears in Chaldee, for the Targums employ וָזָא in the sense of rope for the Heb. ובַּר and ובו (Josh. ii. 15, Num. iv. 32; I Kings xx. 32; Esth. i. 6, etc.). But, following the suggestion of Alb. Schultens, Celsius (Hierobol. ii. p. 89) observes that *erts* designates not a rope, but flax and linen, even as the Greek *διόσυνω* and *διόσδων*, derived from it, sufficiently demonstrate. "So Mr. Yates, in his *Textitum Antiqurorum*, p. 265, says of *διόσω* that it was in all probability an Egyptian word, adopted by the Greeks to denote the commodity to which the Egyptians themselves applied it." For *διόσω*, Greek translators put into Greek text references to become *διόσω* and *διόσδων*. Hesychius states, no doubt, correctly, 'that *διόσω* was applied by the Greeks to any fine and thin cloth, though not of linen.' Mr. Yates further adduces from ancient scholia that *διόσω* were made both of flax and of wool, and also that the siles of India are called *διόσω* emporion by the author of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*. It also appears that the name *διόσω* was applied to cloths exported from Cutch, Ougine, and Barach, and which must have been made of cotton. Mr. Yates moreover observes that, though *διόσω*, like *σιλκων*, originally denoted linen, yet we find they both applied to cotton cloth. As the manufacture of linen extended itself into other countries, and as the exports of India became added to those of Egypt, all varieties, either of linen or cotton cloth, wherever woven, came to be designated by the originally Egyptian names *διόσω* and *διόσδων*. Forester (De *byseus antiquorum*, p. 75) endeavors to trace the Egyptian form of the word, and Ludolf (*Comment. ad hist. Ethiop. p. 204*) renders it by the Ethiopic term for *frankincense*. But these efforts, as Gessinian remarks (*Theo- rishk. Hebr. p. 77*), are wide of the mark. Among the Hebrews the term is rendered "byseus of Egypt" (נָבָם *byseus*), and they properly have designated a linen material, similar to silk or *byseus in fineness, such as we know was manufactured in Egypt (Isa. xix. 9; Ezek. xxvii. 7; Barhebr. p. 218), q. d. *Egyptian yarn*, not less famous among the ancients than "Turkish yarn" has been among moderns. Kimchi, the Venetian Greek, and others understand *frankincense*, and apply it to goods hanging from the side of a bed, or something of that sort; rabbi Parchon, a *girdle* woven in Egypt—evidently more conjectures.

"In the N. T. the word *διόσω* occurs in John xix. 40: 'Then took they the body of Jesus and wound it in linen clothes* (διόσων); in the parallel passage (Matt. xxvii. 59) the term used is *διόσδων*, as also in Mark xv. 46, and in Luke xxii. 53. We meet with it again in John xx. 5, 'and he, stooping down, saw the linen clothes lying.' It is generally used in the plural to denote "linen hangings." *διόσω* is its primary sense. At Acta x. 11, and (Peter) saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending upon him, as it had been a great shek* knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth;' and also in xii, 5, where this passage is repeated. In Homer it is a matter of course (I. ii. 397, or wrought veils and under-garments for women (U. iii. 141; xvi. 193); in later writers linen cloths (Lucilius, *Dial. Mort. iii. 2*), especially for sails (Mel. 80; Anth. x. 5; Luc. *Jup. Troj. 45*). From the preceding observations it is evident that *διόσω*, whether answering to
the Heb. "stems," may signify cloth made either of linen or cotton, but most probably the former, as it was more common than cotton in Syria and Egypt. In classical writers the word signifies linen bandages (Luc. Phila., 34), specif. lint for wounds (Hipp. p. 772, etc.; At. Ach. 1170); also sail-cloth (Polybius, v. 88, Deum. 114). From these passages it appears to have been an ample garment, probably linen, worn under the other clothing in the manner of a skirt by men (Judg. xiv. 12, 13, 14), but a thin chitin by women (Is. 31:26). The Talmud describes it as made of the finest linen ("the sindon is suitable for summer," Menuch, xii, 1). The Targums similarly explain Psa. civ. 2; Lam. ii, 20. The corresponding Syriac is employed in the Peshito for soudgog, Luke xix. 20; Na'or, John xviii. 4. The Sept. has σώδες, Vulgate saindo; but in Is. iii, 28 the Sept. appears to have a paraphrase ῥυθονροσον σου φρασαυ και βασιλεως και βασιλευμι και βασιλευμιν. The passage in Prov. seems to refer to the manufacture of the cloth or material, probably linen, but possibly sometimes of cotton, that is, "linen skirts or raiment made of linen." These are evidently referred to; and in Isaiah we may infer that female under-clothing is in like manner alluded to.

From this Heb. term many have thought is derived the Greek word σωδες, which occurs of linen or muslin cloth, in 40 passages. It is a garment that had the appearance of a day-clothes, q. d. night-gown (Mark xiv. 51, 52, "linen cloth"); used also for wrapping around dead bodies, q. d. grave-clothes, ceremonies ("fine linen," Mark xv. 46; "linen cloth," Matt. xxvii. 59, "linen," Mark xv. 46; Luke xziii. 35). This appears to have been a fine fabric (probably usually, but not necessarily of linen), either the Egyptian (Pollux, vii, 16, 72) or Indian; called in Egypt ander (Peyron, p. 299), the Samarcit sindus (Jahronski, Oscar, i, 297 sq.). Others trace a connection with 'ερές, Sindus (Pavon, Lex. v. s. v.); some (as Eusyl. Meg.) from the city Sodom, etc. It appears to have specially denoted a fine cotton cloth from India (Herod. i. 200; ii. 95; iii. 86; vi. 181); also generally a linen cloth, used as a signal (Polyb. ii, 66, 10), for sargena's bandages (Herod. vii, 181), for mummy-cloth (Herod. ii, 86, or other purposes (Sophocles, Ant. 1222; Thuc. ii. 89); this word is therefore proper as descriptive to the material. See Schroder, De Vet. Mult. p. 289; Michaelis, Suppl. 1720; Wettstein, N. T. i. 681—Gesenius, Thes. Heb. s. v.

8. Karpas (Karpas, Sept. καρπασσω, Vulg. cardinums) occurs in the book of Esther (i, 6), in the description of the hangings 'in the court of the garden of the king's palace,' at the time of the greatest feast given in the city Shushan, or Susana, by Ahasuerus, who 'reigned from India even unto Ethiopia.' We are told that there were white, green, and blue hangings fastened with cords of fine linen and purple to silver rings and pillars of marble. Karpas is translated green in our version, on the authority, it is said, 'of the Chaldean paraphrase,' in which it is interpreted by-green. Hanmer's and others derive the Hebrew word from the Arabic καρπος, which signifies 'garner, parley.' Apium petroselinum, as if it alluded to the green color of this plant; at the same time arguing that as the word karpas is placed before two other words which undoubtedly denote colors, viz. the white and the purple-blue, it probably also does the same. But if two of the words denote colors, it would appear a good reason why the third should refer to the substance which was colored. This, there is little doubt, is what was intended. If we consider the circumstances related took place at the Persian court at a time when it held sway as far as India, and that the account is by some supposed to have been originally written in the ancient language of Persia, we may suppose that some foreign words may have been introduced to indicate even an already well-known substance; but more especially so if the substance itself was then first made known to the Hebrews. The Hebrew karpas is very similar to the Samarcit karpasum, karpas, or karpase, signifying the cotton-plant, whence also the Armen, karser, and the Turkish kars, karsam, etc. (Amst. Researches, iv, 281, Calculata). Celsius (Hy- erotob. i, 159) states that the Arabs and Persians have karpas and kirbas as names for cotton. These must no doubt be derived from the Samarcit, while the word karpas is employed throughout India, while to cotton with the need, and may even be seen in English present-day current. Karpas was occurs in the Periplus of Arrian, who states (p. 165) that the region about the Gulf of Bary- gaza, in India, was productive of carpusus, and of the fine Indian muslins made of it. The word is no doubt derived from the Samarcit karpase, and, though it has been translated fine musslin by Dr. Vincent, it may mean cotton cloths, or calico in general. Mr. Yates, in his recently published and valuable work, Tretrixion Anti- quorum, states that the earliest notice of this Oriental line in any classical author which he has met with is the line "Orsino, molochina, amplexus Sinus,

9. Shaatnez (שָׁתָנֶז, Sept. καρπισσων, Vulg. cardinum) was a kind of garments woven of two sorts of threads, linen and wool, like the Greek sparpas and tarsus. In Josephus, Ant. xiii. 4, 11, it is mentioned by name, with which the Hebrews were forbidden to use, as appears from the two passages in the Mosaic law where the word occurs: Lev. xix. 19, "Neither shall a garment mingled of linens and woollen come upon thee;" Deut. xxii. 11, "Thou shall not wear a garment of divers sorts, as of the female girt together." In the former of these passages the term Shaatnes is interpreted by פָּטָנֵה רַעַץ, a garment of two different kinds, i.e. of heterogeneous materials; and in the latter by the explicit definition, פּוֹלַשׁ רַעַץ, i.e. of wool and flax threads together. The Sept. renders εἰδεμα, i.e. adulterated; Aquila, avrōta-

10. Peshito and
LINGA

Samaritan, enargiated. Other ancient interpreters have either retained the original word, as Onkelos, or have entirely neglected it, as the Vulg., usually introducing the interpretation from Deut. into Levit., as the Venetian Greek (apokathw), Sandias, the Armenian, Erenpiaus, and the Persian. The derivation is uncertain. The early etymologists have sought in vain a Samar. origin for the word, as Bochart (Hieros, i, 545). The Talmud gives only fanciful derivations (Mishna, Kilain, ix, 5; comp. Nidda, 61 b; Buxtorf, Lex. Talm, s. v.). Abr. Geiger, Cogn. d. Mekheth, ii, 75), and the Targums are little better (see Pesh. in Deut. ad loc.). Ernest Meyer proposes the significance gradually formed, from a transposition of the letters and comparison with the Arabic and Ethiopic (Lee rad. Heb. p. 886). The word is prob. of Egyptian origin, although Festor (De Myst. antiemissorum, p. 95) and Jablonski (Opusc. i, 294 sq.) have not fully succeeded in tracing its original in the Coptic, which language, however, furnishes the nearest etymon (see Peyron, Lexicon, s. v., et alii). See Woolley.

10. Mixvet (Mixyát, a collection, as often) occurs only in connection with this subject in 1 Kings ii, 28, "And Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt, and linen yarn;" the king's merchants received the linen yarn at a price;" also 2 Chron. i, 16, where the same language occurs. In these passages it evidently signifies a company of horses, i. e., a drove or string, as brought from Egypt at a fixed valuation. The passage in most copies renders in  oluş or in  őlosch, otherwise  őlosch, as in 2 Chron.; the Vulg. has Coa in both places, as a proper name, referring, as some have thought, to Mischol (Pliny, v, 29), the country of the Trogodytes (see Calmet, Dict. s. v. Coa). Others have sought less direct elucidations (see Bochart, Hieros. i, 171, 172; Lud. de Dieu, ad loc.; Clericus and Dathe On Kings, ad loc.; Becke, Paraphr. Child. ad Chron., ad loc., p. 7; Michaelis, Suppil., 1741, and In Jure Mosonic, lii, 332; Bottecher, Specim. of these far-fetched explanations there is no occasion; the passages simply refer to a caravan of horse-merchants carrying on the commerce of Solomon with Egypt (see Taylor, Fragments, No. 190).

LINGENDES

Samaritan, enargiated. Other ancient interpreters have either retained the original word, as Onkelos, or have entirely neglected it, as the Vulg., usually introducing the interpretation from Deut. into Levit., as the Venetian Greek (apokathw), Sandias, the Armenian, Erenpiaus, and the Persian. The derivation is uncertain. The early etymologists have sought in vain a Samar. origin for the word, as Bochart (Hieros, i, 545). The Talmud gives only fanciful derivations (Mishna, Kilain, ix, 5; comp. Nidda, 61 b; Buxtorf, Lex. Talm, s. v.). Abr. Geiger, Cogn. d. Mekheth, ii, 75), and the Targums are little better (see Pesh. in Deut. ad loc.). Ernest Meyer proposes the significance gradually formed, from a transposition of the letters and comparison with the Arabic and Ethiopic (Lee rad. Heb. p. 886). The word is prob. of Egyptian origin, although Festor (De Myst. antiemissorum, p. 95) and Jablonski (Opusc. i, 294 sq.) have not fully succeeded in tracing its original in the Coptic, which language, however, furnishes the nearest etymon (see Peyron, Lexicon, s. v., et alii). See Woolley.

10. Mixvet (Mixyát, a collection, as often) occurs only in connection with this subject in 1 Kings ii, 28, "And Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt, and linen yarn;" the king's merchants received the linen yarn at a price;" also 2 Chron. i, 16, where the same language occurs. In these passages it evidently signifies a company of horses, i. e., a drove or string, as brought from Egypt at a fixed valuation. The passage in most copies renders in  oluş or in  őlosch, otherwise  őlosch, as in 2 Chron.; the Vulg. has Coa in both places, as a proper name, referring, as some have thought, to Mischol (Pliny, v, 29), the country of the Trogodytes (see Calmet, Dict. s. v. Coa). Others have sought less direct elucidations (see Bochart, Hieros. i, 171, 172; Lud. de Dieu, ad loc.; Clericus and Dathe On Kings, ad loc.; Becke, Paraphr. Child. ad Chron., ad loc., p. 7; Michaelis, Suppil., 1741, and In Jure Mosonic, lii, 332; Bottecher, Specim. of these far-fetched explanations there is no occasion; the passages simply refer to a caravan of horse-merchants carrying on the commerce of Solomon with Egypt (see Taylor, Fragments, No. 190).

LINGA (a Sanscrit word which literally means a sign or symbol) denotes, in the sectarian worship of the Hindus, the phallus as an emblem of the generative or generative power of nature. The Linga-worship practise with the Saivas, or adorers of Siva. See HINDUISM. Originally of an ideal and mystical nature, it has degenerated into practices of the grossest description, thus taking the same course as the similar worship of the Chaldeans, Grecians, and other nations of the East. The accounts how Linga became a representative of Siva vary greatly, but coincide in the main in that Siva, having scandalized the penitent saints by his amour with Parwati, was cursed by them to be changed into what occupied so much his being, and to lose his genitals, by which he had given offence; later, when finding the punishment not in proportion to the result, they resolved to hold that very sign in reverence. It is most probable that the organ of generation was here considered in the same light as Phallos and Priapus in Egypt and Greece. The manner in which the Linga is represented is generally inoffensive—the phallic flower, a pillar of stone, or other erect and cylindrical objects being held as appropriate symbols of the generative power of Siva. Its counterpart is Tami, or the symbol of female nature as fructified and productive. The Siva-Purana names twelve Lingas which seem to have been the chief objects of this worship in India. See Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.; Vollmer, Mythol. Wörterb. s. v.

LINGARD, John, D.D., LL.D., a Roman Catholic priest, and one of the most eminent of modern historians, was born at Winchester, England, Feb. 5, 1771. He studied at the Roman Catholic College of Douai, France, and remained there until obliged by the horrors of the French Revolution to return to England. The college was finally settled at Ushaw, near the city of Durham; and Mr. Lingard there performed the duties of some of its offices. He revisited France for a short time during the dangers period of the Revolution and on one occasion barely escaped being mobbed as a priest. In 1806 he wrote for the Newcastle Courant a series of letters, which were collected and published under the title of Catholic Loyalty vindicated (12mo). He afterwards wrote several controversial pamphlets, which in 1818 were published in a volume having the title of Tracts on several Subjects connected with the Civil and Religious Principles of the Catholics (reprinted by F. Lucas, Jr., at Baltimore, 1823, 12mo, and often). Dr. Lingard's great work, however, is his History of England, from the accession of William and Mary to 1807 (London, 1819—21, 5 vols.; 2d edit. 1823—31, 14 vols.; 3d edit. 1837, 18 vols.; 4th ed. 1849—50, 10 vols.; 5th ed. 1854—55, 10 vols.; American edit. published at New York by Dunigan, N.Y., vol. 1, ed. 1823—24; by Sampson & Co., of Boston, 1855—54, 13 vols.; of which the last is the best). It is a work of great research, founded on ancient writers and original documents, displaying much erudition and acuteness, and opening fields of inquiry previously unexplored. The narrative is clear, the dates are accurately given, and the style is adapted to its subject. The style is perspicuous, terse, and unostentatious. The work, perhaps, exhibits too exclusively the great facts and circumstances, military, civil, and ecclesiastical, and enter less than might be desirable into the lives of persons, arts, and institutions of the people. In all matters connected with the Roman Church the work is, as might have been expected, colored by the very decided religious opinions of the author, but those are not offensive set forth. Dr. Lingard, after the completion of his History of England, in 1824, wrote and published a work, the Great Days of England, in which he endeavored to make him cardinal, but he refused the dignity, partly because he did not feel qualified for the office, and partly because it would have interfered with his favorite studies. He spent the last forty years of his life in the small preceptory belonging to the Roman School-church at the village of Horpcs Hall, near Lancaster, enjoying the esteem and friendship of all, both Protestants and Roman Catholics. He died July 13, 1851, and was buried in the cemetery of St. Cuthbert's College, at Ushaw, to which institution he bequeathed his library. Lingard was also the author of a Catechism of the Doctrine and Worship of the Catholic Church (2d edit. Lond. 1840, 12mo; 3d edit. 1844, 18mo)—A Review of certain Anti-Catholic Publications (Lond. 1819, 8vo)—Examination of certain Opinions advanced by Bishop Burgess (anon.) (Manchester, 1819, 8vo)—Characters on Dr. Marsh's Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome (Lond. 1815, 8vo)—Observations on the Laws and Ordinances which exist in Foreign States relative to the Religious concerns of their Roman Catholic Subjects (anon.) (Lond. 1817, 8vo)—Documents to ascertain the Sentiments of British Catholics in former Ages respecting the Power of the Pope (Lond. 1819, 8vo)—The History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church (Lond. 1819, 1854, 2 vols.; Phil. 1841, 12mo). In 1856 he published anonymously an English translation of the N. T., which is said to be accurate and faithful in several passages where the Douai translation is faulty. See Engl. Cyclo. s. v.; the London Times (July 25, 1851); Gentleman's Magazine (Sept. 1851, p. 323 sq.); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vol. viii, s. v.; Lowndes, Brit. Lib. p. 1856 sq.; Brit. and For. Rev. 1844, p. 374 sq.; and the excellent articles in Ath. Soc. Brit. and Amer. Authors, ii, 1102—1105. (J. H. W.)

LINGENDES, Claude de, a noted French pupil orator of the Jesuits, was born at Mölins in 1591. He entered the order, and soon rose to high distinction. He was intrusted with several important missions. He died at Paris, where he was superior of his order, April
Lingendes, Jean de, a French pulpit orator, a relative of the preceding, was born at Moulins in 1695. As chaplain to Louis XIII, he became quite eminent for his great talents in the pulpit. He was made bishop of Macon in 1630. He died in 1665. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxi, 259.

Linck, Johann Wolfgang Conrad, a German theologian, was born at Pirmasens April 28, 1758. In 1771 he entered the University of Giessen, and in 1774 was graduated A.M. In 1775 he obtained the chair of philosophy at that university as professor extraordinary, and in 1776 he became pastor at Bischofsheim, near Darmstadt. He died suddenly Dec. 4, 1788. In addition to his theological researches, his extensive knowledge of modern languages enabled him to translate English works into German and German productions into English, the latter for the "universal English Library." Of his own compositions we mention Uber das hebräische Sprachstudium (Gießen, 1777, 8vo); Diss. de Schicklo a Jacobo predicto Genes. 49, 10 (ibid, 1774, 4to). See Düring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl. vol. ii, s. v.

Link, Wenceslaus, a German theologian, noted for his efforts in behalf of Martin Luther and the cause of the reformational movement, was born at Colditz, near Markkleeberg, Saxony, about 1498. He was an Augustinian monk of the convent Waldeck when he went to the Wittenberg University to pursue theological studies, and, after attaining to the distinction of doctor of theology, became successively prior of the convents at Wittenberg, Munich, Nuremberg, etc. He enjoyed great notoriety and popularity when the reformation was first assuming shape, but his leaning towards it made him unpopular with Romanists, and he gradually went over to the new cause. In 1529 he married, and two years later appeared as Protestant preacher at Nuremberg. He died there March 11, 1547. His works are not of any special merit. A list of them is given in Jöcher, Gelehrten Lexikon, ii, 2442 sq.

Linn, John Blair, D.D., son of the succeeding, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Shippensburg, Pa., March 14, 1777, and graduated in 1796 at Columbia College, where he distinguished himself by his proficiency in polite literature. Having avoided the study of law, he removed to Schenectady, where he studied theology, and was licensed in 1798. He was ordained in 1799, and installed in the First Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, where he continued until his sudden death, August 26, 1827. Linn was quite a poet, and most of his publications are of a poetical nature. His best works are, Pieces in Prose and Poetry:—A Sermon on the Death of Dr. Erving (1802) —A Poem on the Influence of Christianity:—a narrative poem, entitled Felixian, with a sketch of his life by Charles Brockden Brown (1805, 8vo); and two tracts against the doctrine of Dr. Priestley. See Sprague, Ammals, iv, 210; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.

Linn, William, D.D., a Reformed (Dutch) minister, was born near Shippensburg, Pa., Feb. 27, 1752. He graduated from Princeton College in 1772 with honor, studied divinity with Rev. Dr. Robert Coffer, of Middle Spring, Pa., and in 1775 was licensed to preach by Donegal Presbytery. Fired with the patriotism of the Revolution, he became a chaplain in Gen. Thompson's regiment, and was ordained to the ministry at this period. His regiment being soon ordered to Canada, for domestic service, he was ordered his chaplainship at Big Spring, he taught an academy in Somerset County, Md., with success, until in 1786 he became pastor of a Presbyterian church at Elizabethtown, N. J., from whence he removed to New York in the same year as one of the pastors of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church. He was full of genius and power. His sermons were written, and committed to memory. His delivery was graceful, natural, animated, and accompanied by that electric power which thrills and sways an audience. His imagination was vivid, his language choice and classical, and his pictorial ability remarkable. He was celebrated for his missionary and charitable discourses. "Earnest, pathetic, persuasive, and alarming in his addresses, he peculiarly excelled in awakening sinners and urging them to the refuge of the Gospel. On special occasions he showed, with impassioned lure, and regret, the feeling of his own self." In consequence of the failure of his health, he retired from the active ministry in 1805, and died at Albany Jan. 8, 1808. Among his published addresses are some of his celebrated missionary and charity sermons, historical discourses, controversial theologies, sermons on Washington, delivered before the New York State Society of the Cincinnati, and a sermon preached in 1776 to a regiment of soldiers who were about to join the army.—Sprague, Ammals, vol. ix; Dr. De Witt's History of the Diverse; Dr. Bradford's Funeral Sermon, etc. (W. J. T.)

Lintal (prop. γίππος, gippos), lit. a projecting cover: Exod. xii. 22, 88; "upper door-post," vers. 7; also γίππος, hippos, a chairlet, i.e. a capital of a column, Amos ix. 1; Zeph. ii. 14; elsewhere a "knop" of the candle-brum; and σπυρίς, spyris, a "row," as often; hence a pilaster or pillar in a wall, 1 Kings vi. 51, elsewhere "post," the head-piece of a door, or the horizontal beam covering the side-posta and jambs. See Poa. this the Iradists were commanded to work with the blood of the passchal lamb on the memorable occasion when the Passover was instituted. See PASSOVER.

Linus (usually Aivo, but prop. Aivo, the name originally of a mythical and musical personage, perhaps from Aios, Aio, one of the Christians at Rome whose Paschal feast went to Timothy (2 Tim. iv. 21), A.D. 64. He is said to have been the first bishop of Rome after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul (Irenæus, Adv. Haer. iii. 8; Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. iii. 2, 4, 13, 14, 81; v. 6; comp. Jerome, De Viris Illust. 15; Augustine, Epist. liii. 3; Theodoret, ad 2 Tim. iv. 21, but there is some discrepancy in the early statement respecting his date (see Heinichen ad Euseb. iii. 187; Burton, Hist. of the Christ. Church; Lardner, Works, ii, 81, 32, 176, 187). "Eusebius and Theodoret, followed by Baronius and Tillemont (Hist. Eccles. ii. 165, 591), state that he became bishop of Rome after the death of St. Peter. On the other hand, the words of Irenæus, "Peter and Paul, when they founded and built up the Church of Rome," committed the office of its episcopate to Linus," certainly admit, or rather imply the meaning that he held that office before the death of St. Peter; as if the two great apostles were the dischargers of that office. The church of Rome, after the death of Irenæus, "Peter and Paul," when they built and completed the church of Rome, committed the office of its episcopate to Linus," certainly admit, or rather imply the meaning that he held that office before the death of St. Peter; as if the two great apostles were the dischargers of that office. The church of Rome, after the death of Irenæus, "Peter and Paul," when they built and completed the church of Rome, left it under the government of Linus, and passed on to teach in some new region. This proceeding would be in accordance with the practice of the apostles in other places. The earlier appointment of Linus is asserted as a fact by Ruffinus (Proph. in Clem. Romig.), and by the author of ch. xlvii, bk. vii. of the Apostolic Constitutions. It is accepted as the true statement of the case by bishop Pearson (De Servis et Successionibus Priorum Romae Episcoporum, ii, 5, § 1) and by Fleury (Hist. Ecc. ii. 26). Some persons have objected that the undistinguishable mention of the name of Linus between the names of two other Roman Christians in 2 Tim. iv. 21 is a proof that he was not at that time bishop of Rome. But even Tilmont admits that such a way of introducing the bishop's name is in accordance with the simplicity of that age. According to tradition, he went to Rome when 22 years of age, made there the acquaintance of Peter, and was sent by him to Besançon, in France, to preach the Gospel. After his return to Rome Peter ap-
painted him his coadjutor; but, according to the Breviary, he was the one who \textit{praeux post Petrum gubernavi ecclesiam}. He is said to have enacted, on his accession to the bishopric, that, in accordance with 1 Cor. xi, 5, women should never enter the church with their heads uncovered.

The question of his episcopate is given by Eusebius \cite{EusebiusChron}, \textit{Church History}, as 66-76; by Baronius as 67-78; and by Pearson as 53-57. Pearson, in the preface already quoted (i, 10), gives his reasons for disturbing the chronology of Eusebius as regards the year of the early bishops of Rome, and he derives his own opinion from certain very ancient (but interpolated) lists of those bishops (see i, 13, and ii, 5). This point has been subsequently considered by Baratierus (De Successionibus Antiquissimis Episc. Rom., 1740), who gives A.D. 56-57 as the date of the episcopate of Linus.

"The statement of Ruffinus, that Linus and Cletus were bishops in Rome while St. Peter was alive, has been quoted in support of a theory which sprung up in the latter part of the 4th century and remained current until the decline of the authority of the Emperor at the hands of the Christian clergy. The statement is found in the works of Tertullian, who says (De Spiritu, cap. 31): "Christ, when he ascended to heaven, left two bishops behind him, Peter and Paul." Tertullian's statement took place immediately before he became bishop of Rome; and the statement of Ruffinus, so far as it lends any support to the above-named theory, is shown to be without foundation by Pearson (ii, 3, 4). Tillemon's observations (p. 590) in reply to Pearson only show that the establishment of two bishops in the Roman Church was not supposed to be continued beyond the lifetime of the Roman Church, since only the first bishop was recognized as such. In the case of the bishopric of Rome, the see was divided into two equal parts, and it was in one of these parts, and not in both, that the bishopric was first established. The latter part of the 4th century, when Ruffinus lived, is the time when the controversy over the authority of the Roman Church began. The controversy over the authority of the Roman Church was not decided by the Church, and it was not decided until the 2nd century, when the authority of the Roman Church was finally established. The authority of the Roman Church was established by the see of Rome, and not by the see of Lyons, which was established at a later date. The see of Rome was established by the see of Lyons, and not by the see of Rome.

\textit{Lion} (prop. \textit{león}, qvi, or \textit{limn}, ayrek; Sept. and N. T. \textit{λίον}), the most powerful, daring, and impressive animal of all carnivorous animals, the most magnificent in aspect and awful in voice. Being very common in Syria in early times, the lion naturally supplied many forcible images to the poetical language of Scripture, and not a few historical incidents in its narratives. The lion is reckoned by the Greeks as the king of the animals, and the symbol of power and courage. The lion is a symbol of the Church, and the lion's paw is a symbol of the Church's power and authority.

\textit{Lion} (prop. \textit{λεύκων}, or \textit{λεύκη}, ayrek; Sept. and N. T. \textit{λίον}), the most powerful, daring, and impressive animal of all carnivorous animals, the most magnificent in aspect and awful in voice. Being very common in Syria in early times, the lion naturally supplied many forcible images to the poetical language of Scripture, and not a few historical incidents in its narratives. The lion is reckoned by the Greeks as the king of the animals, and the symbol of power and courage. The lion is a symbol of the Church, and the lion's paw is a symbol of the Church's power and authority. The lion is the symbol of the Church, and the lion's paw is a symbol of the Church's power and authority.
the protection of the old pair to hunt independently (Ezek. xix, 2, 3, 5, 6; xii, 19; Psa. xci, 12; Prov. xix, 12; xxvi, 1; Isa. xxxiv, 1, Jer. vi, 38; Hos. vii, 4; Nah. ii, 11; Zech. xi, 2), old enough to roar (Judg. xiv, 5; Psa. civ, 12; Jer. ii, 15; Amos iii, 4); beginning to seek prey for itself (Job iv, 10; xxxviii, 39; Isa. ix, 29; Jer. xxvi, 38; Ezek. xiii, 5; Mic. v, 8), and ferocious and blood-thirsty in his youthful strength (Psa. xvii, 12; xci, 13; Isa. xi, 6). This term is also used tropically for cruel and blood-thirsty enemies (Ezek. xiv, 10; xxvi, 17; Jer. ix, 15; Pharaoh, king of Egypt, is called a "young lion of the nations," i.e., an enemy prowling among them (Ezek. xxxii, 2); it is also used of the young princes or warriors of a state (Ezek. xxxviii, 13; Nah. ii, 15). 3. "ny arī" (the puler in pieces, plur. masc. in 1 Kings x, 20, elsewhere fem.), or "my arēh" (the same with 17 paragogic, also Chald.), an adult and vigorous lion, a lion having paired, vigilant and enterprising in search of prey (Nah. ii, 12; 2 Sam. xvii, 10; Num. xxiii, 24, etc.). This is the common name of the animal. 4. בֵּית שָׁכַח (the roarer), a mature lion in full strength (Job iv, 10; x, 16; xxviii, 8; Psa. xci, 13; Prov. xxvi, 13; Hos. v, 14; xii, 7). Bochart (Hieroz. i, 717) understands the meek lion of Syria (Pliney, H. N. viii, 17), deriving the name from "ārēh, black, by an interchange of liquids. This denomination may very possibly refer to a distinct variety of lion, and not to a black species or race, because neither black nor white lions are recorded, excepting in Oppian (De Venat. iii, 45); but the term may be safely referred to the color of the skin, not of the fur; for some lions have the former fair, and even rosy, while in others, the color is perfectly black. An Asiatic lioness, formerly at Exeter Change, had the naked part of the nose, the roof of the mouth, and the bare soles of all the feet pure black, though the fur itself was very pale buff. Yet albism and melanism are not uncommon in the feline: the former occurs in tigers, and the latter is frequent in leopards, panthers, and jaguars. 5. שָׂכָה (the strong), a fierce lion, one in a state of fury, or rather, perhaps, a poetical term for a lion that has reached the utmost growth and effectiveness (Job iv, 11; Prov. xxx, 30; Isa. xxx, 6). 6. לֵבִישׁ, "levis," or "lebē, levis" (lounging, roaring), hence a lion, lioness (Numb. xxiv, 9; Hos. xiii, 7; Joel i, 6; Deut. xxxiii, 30; Psa. lxxi, 4; Isa. x, 29). Bochart (Hieroz. i, 719) supposes this word not to denote the male lion, but the lioness; and Genesisius (Theod. p. 788) says this rests on good grounds, as it is coupled with other words denoting a lion, where it can hardly be a mere synonym (Gen. xlix, 9; Numb. xxiv, 9; Isa. xxx, 6; Nah. ii, 11); and in the paschal ordinance (Job iv, 11; xxxviii, 39; Ezek. xii, 2; accord much better with a lioness than with a lion. 7. In Job xxxviii, 8, the Heb. words שָׂכָה, שָׂכִים, beney sha'achats, are rendered "the whale's whelps." The terms properly signify "sons of pride," and are applied to the larger beasts of prey, as the lion, leviathan, so called from their proud gait, boldness, and courage. The lion is often spoken of as "the king of the forest," or "the king of beasts," and in a similar sense, in Job xlii, 34, the leviathan or crocodile is called "the king over all the children of pride," that is, the head of the animal creation (see Bochart, Hieroz. i, 719). So Wunni. 8. As "king of beasts," "the lion is the largest and most formidable armed of all carnassier animals, the Indian tiger alone claiming to be his equal. One full grown, of Asiatic race, weighs above 450 pounds, and those of Africa often above 500 pounds. The fall of a force-paw in striking has been estimated to be equal to twenty-five pounds weight, and this, with the grasp of the claws, cutting four inches in depth, is sufficiently powerful to break the vertebrae of an ox. The huge laminate teeth and jagged molars, worked by powerful jaws, and the tongue entirely covered with horny papil-
Lions are monogamous, the male living constantly with the lioness, both hunting together, or for each other when there is a litter of whelps, and the mutual affection and care for their offspring which they display are remarkable in animals doomed by nature to live by blood and slaughter. It is while seeking prey for their young that they are most dangerous; at other times they bear abstinence, and when pressed by hunger will sometimes feed on carcases found dead. They live more than fifty years; consequently, having annual litters of from three to five cubs, they multiply rapidly when not seriously opposed. Zoologists consider Africa the primitive abode of lions, their progress towards the north and west having at one time extended to the forests of Macedonia and Greece, but in Asia never to the south of the Nerbudda nor east of the Lower Ganges. Since the invention of gunpowder, and even since the havoc which the ostentatious barbarism of Roman grandees made among them, they have diminished in number exceedingly, although at the present day individuals are not infrequently seen in Barbary, within a short distance of Ceuta” (Kitto).

“Lions do not exist in Palestine, though they are said to be found in the desert on the road to Egypt (Schwarz, Descrip. of Pal.; see Isa. xxxiii, 6). They abound on the banks of the Euphrates, between Bussorah and Bagdad (Russell, Aleppo, p. 61), and in the marshes and jungles near the rivers of Babylonia (Layard, Niniveh and Babylon, p. 566). This species, according to Layard, is without the dark and shaggy mane of the African lion (Ibid. 487), though he adds in a note that he had seen lions on the River Kardim with a long black mane. But, though lions have now disappeared from Palestine, they must in ancient times have been numerous. The names Lebath (Josh. xv, 32), Beth-Lebath (Josh. xix, 6), Aziel (2 Kings xxv, 26), and Laish (Judg. xviii, 7; 1 Sam. xxxv, 44) were probably derived from the presence of, or connection with lions, and point to the fact that they were at one time common. They had their lairs in the forests which have vanished with them (Jer. v, 6; xii, 8; Amos iii, 4), in the tangled brushwood (Jer. iv, 7; xxxv, 38; Obad xvi, 40), and in the caves of the mountains (Cant. iv, 8; Ezek. xix, 9; Nah. ii, 12). The cano-brake on the banks of the Jordan, the ‘pride’ of the river, was their favorite haunt (Jer. xlix, 19; l, 44; Zech. xi, 3), and in this reedy covert (Lam. iii, 10) they were to be found at a comparatively recent period, as we learn from a passage of Johannes Phocaus, who travelled in Palestine towards the end of the 12th century (Reland, Pol. i, 274). They abounded in the jungles which skirt the rivers of Mesopotamia (Ammian. Marc. xviii, 7, 5), and in the time of Xenophon (De Vasal. xi) were found in Nysa.”

“Naturalists are disposed to consider the lion as a genus, consisting of some three or four species. Two of these are found in Asia, the one called, from the scantiness of its mane, the maneless lion (Leo Goozeratensis), found only in Western India, and the other furnished with that appendage in its ordinary profession (L. Astatique), which is spread over Bengal, Persia, the Euphrates Valley, and some parts of Arabia. This is smaller, and more slightly built than the African lions, with a fur of a lighter yellow. It is doubtless, however, whether it is really more than variety.”

“The lion of Palestine was in all probability the Asiatic variety, described by Aristotle (H. A. ix, 44) and Pliny (viii, 18) as distinguished by its short curly mane, and by being shorter and rounder in shape, like the sculptured lion found at Aruban (Layard, Niniveh and

Lion at Aruban.

Babylon, p. 278). It was less daring than the longer-haired species, but when driven by hunger it not only ventured to attack the flocks in the desert in presence of the shepherd (Isa. xxxiii, 4; 1 Sam. xvii, 54), but laid waste towns and villages (2 Kings xvii, 25, 26; Prov. xxii, 13; xxxvi, 13), and devoured men (1 Kings xii, 24; xx, 36; 2 Kings xvii, 26; Ezek. xix, 8, 9). The shepherds sometimes ventured to encounter the lion single-handed (1 Sam. xvii, 34), and the vivid figure employed by Amos (iii, 12), the herdsman of Tekoa, was but the transcript of a scene which he must have often witnessed. At other times they pursued the animal in large bands, raising loud shouts to intimidate him (Isa. xxxi, 4) and drive him into the net or pit they had prepared to catch him (Ezek. xix, 4, 8). This method of capturing wild beasts is described by Xenophon (De Vasal. xi) and by Shaw, who says, ‘The Arabs dig a pit where they are observed to enter, and, covering it over tightly with reeds or small branches of trees, they frequently decoy and catch them’ (Travels, 2d ed. p. 172).

Benaiash, one of David’s heroic body-guard, had distinguished himself by slaying a lion in his den (2 Sam. xxiii, 20). The kings of Persia had a menagerie of lions (25, 568, Dan. vi, 7, etc.). When captured alive they were put in a cage (Ezek. xix, 9), but it does not appear that they were tamed. In the hunting scenes at

Persian Lion.
Beni-Hassan tame lions are represented as used in hunting (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt, iii, 17). On the bas-reliefs at Kouyunjik a lion led by a chain is among the presents brought by the conquerors to their victors (Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 189). Wilkinson says: "The worship of the lion was particularly regarded in the city of Leontopolis, and other cities adored this animal as the emblem of more than one deity." It was the symbol of strength, and therefore typical of the Egyptian Hercules (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt, v, 169). In Babylon it appears to have been the custom to throw offenders to be devoured by lions kept in dens for that purpose (Dan. vi, 7-29). This is thought to be confirmed by the evidence of several ancient monuments, brought to light by the researches of recent travellers, on the sites of Babylon and Susa, which represent lions destroying and preying upon human beings. See Den. The Assyrian monuments abound in illustrations of lion-hunting, which appears to have been a favorite pastime, especially with royalty (Layard, Nineveh, i, 180). See Hunting.

"The terrible roar of the lion is expressed in Hebrew by four different words, between which the following distinction appears to be maintained: לְבַרָא, šēdōq (Judg. xiv, 6; Psa. xxii, 13; civ, 21; Amos iii, 4), also used of the thunder (Job xxxvii, 4), denotes the roar of the lion while seeking his prey; נָזָהמ (Isa. v, 29), expresses the cry which he utters when he seizes his victim; נָזָה, הַדְּגָה (Isa. xxxi, 4), the growl with which he defies any attempt to snatch the prey from his teeth; while נָזָה, נַעֲר (Jer. ii, 38), which in Syriac is applied to the braying of the ass and camel, is descriptive of the cry of the young lions. If this distinction be correct, the meaning attached to נָזָה will give force to Prov. xix, 12. The terms which describe the movements of the animal are equally distinct: יַדְבַּר, rābēs (Gen. xlix, 9; Ezek. xix, 2), is applied to the crouching of the lion, as well as of any wild beast, in his lair; יַדְבַּר, šēdēhā (נָזָה, יַדְבַּר, Job xxxviii, 40), and וְיִשְׁתַּב, ṣūḇ (Psa. xxx, 9), to his lying in wait in his den; the two former denoting the position of the animal, and the latter the secrecy of the act; וְיִשְׁתַּב, rāmēs (Psa. civ, 20), is used of the stealthy creeping of the lion after his prey; and רַפְיָא, אֵיתָר (Deut. xxxiii, 22), of the leap with which he hurls himself upon it" (Smith). "The Scriptures present many striking pictures of lions, touched with wonderful force and fidelity; even where the animal is a direct instrument of the Almighty, while true to his mission, he still remains so to his nature. Thus nothing can be more graphic than the record of the man of God (1 Kings xiii, 28), disobedient to his charge, struck down from his ass, and lying dead, while the lion stands by him, without touching him. In the stainless body of the living animal, usually a favorite prey. (See also Gen. xlix, 9; Job iv, 10, 11; Nah. ii, 11, 12). Sambon's adventure also with the young lion (Judg. xiv, 6, 8), and the picture of the young lion coming up from the underwood cover on the banks of the Jordan, all attest a perfect knowledge of the animal and its habits. Finally, the lions in the den with Daniel, miraculously leaving him un molested, still retain, in all other respects, the real characteristics of their nature."

"The strength (Judg. xiv, 18, Prov. xxx, 30; 2 Sam. i, 29), courage (2 Sam. xvii, 10; Prov. xxvii, 1; Isa. xxxi, 4; Nah. ii, 11), and ferocity (Gen. xliv, 9; Num. xxix, 9) of the lion were proverbial. The 'lion-faced' warriors of God were among David's most valiant troops (1 Chron. xii, 8), and the hero Judas Maccabæus is described as 'like a lion, and like a lion's whelp roaring for his prey' (1 Macc. iii, 43)." Hence the lion, as an emblem of power, was symbolical of the tribe of Judah (Gen. xlix, 9). Grotius thinks the passage in Ezek. xix, 2, 8, alludes to this fact that Judas was among the nations like a lioness among the beasts of the forest; she had strength and sovereignty. The same type of sovereignty recurs in the prophetic visions, and the figure of this animal was among the few which the Hebrews admitted in sculpture or in cast metal, as exemplified in the throne of Solomon (1 Kings x, 19, 20) and the brazen sea (1 Kings vii, 29, 36). The heathen assumed the lion as an emblem of the sun, of the great war, of Area, Ariel, Arioth, Re, the Indian Siva, of dominion in general, of valor, etc.; and it occurs in the names and standards of many nations. This illustrates Dan. vii, 4, "The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings. The Chaldean or Babylonian empire is here represented (see Jer. xv, 7). Its progress, indeed, was rapid; but it had then deemed universal empire was rapid, and therefore it has the wings of an eagle (see Jer. xlviii, 40, and Ezek. xviii, 8). It is said by Megasthenes and Strabo that this power advanced as far as Spain. When its wings were plucked or torn out, that is, when it was checked in its progress by frequent defeats, it became more peaceable and humane, agreeably to that idea of Psa. ix, 20. A remarkable coincidence between the symbolic figure of Daniel's vision and the creations of ancient Assyrian art has lately been brought to light by the researches of Layard and Botta on the sites of Babylon and Nineveh. See Churb. In Isa. xxix, 1, 'Wo to the lion of God, the city where David dwelt!' Jerusalem is denoted, and the terms used appear to signify the strength of the place, by which it was enabled to resist and withstand the enemies. So of the great sea monster. The apostle Paul says (2 Tim. iv, 17), 'I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.' The general opinion is that Nero is here meant, or, rather, his prefect Elius Cesarianus, to whom Nero committed the government of the city of Rome during his absence, with power to put to death whomever he pleased. See Paul. So when Tiberius died, Maryus said to Agrippa, 'The lion is dead.' So likewise speaks Esther of Artaurus, in the apocryphal chapters of that book (ch. xiv, 13), 'Put a word into my mouth before the lion.' There are some commentators who regard the apostle's expression as a proverbial one for a deliverance from any great or imminent danger, but others conclude that he had been actually delivered from a lion let loose against him in the amphitheatre. That the same symbol should sometimes be applied to opposite characters is not at all surprising or inconsistent, since different qualities may be combined in one symbol, of which the good may be referred to the one, the bad to another. Thus in the lion reside courage and victory over antagonists. In these respects it may be and is employed as a symbol of Christ, called the Lion of the tribe of Judah (Rev. v, 5), as being the..."
LIONESS

Illustrated descendant of that tribe, whose emblem was the lion. In the lion also resided ferocity and rapacity.

In the ancient Jewish war, as in the image of Satan:

"Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." (1 Peter v, 8).

On the subject generally, see Bochart, Hieroz. ii. 1 sq.; Rosenmüller, Abrath. IV., ii, 111 sq.; Westfall, Synopsis Symbolica, s. v.; Fronius Cyclopaed., s. v.; World Bible, ed. 6, s. v.; Dietz-Hauck, Natural History of the Bible, p. 115 sq.

LIONESS. See LION.

Lip (לוב, laphak), usually in the dual; Gr. χίλιοι, besides its literal sense (e.g. Isa. xxxvi. 29; Cant. iv. 3, 11; Prov. xxxiv. 28), and in the original metaphorically for an edge or border, as of a cup (1 Kings vii. 26), of a garment (Exod. xxv. 32), of a curtain (Exod. xxvi. 4; xxxvi. 11), of the sea (Gen. xxxii. 17; Exod. ii. 8; Heb. xii. 12), of the Jordan (2 Kings ii. 13; Judg. vii. 22), is often used as an organ of speech, e.g. to "open the lips," i.e. to begin to speak (Job xi. 5; xxxvi. 20), also to "open the lips" of another, i.e. to cause him to speak (Ps. li. 17), and to "refrain the lips," i.e. to keep silent (Ps. xi. 10; Prov. x. 19). So speech or discourse is said to be "upon the lips" (Prov. xvii. 10; Ps. xvi. 4), once "under the lips" (Ps. cxxi. 4; Rom. iii. 13; comp. Ezek. xxxvi. 5), and likewise "singing with lips" (Job iii. 10; xii. 20; Ps. xvi. 3), and "uncircumcised of lips," i.e. not of ready speech (Exod. vi. 13), and "bald of the lips" (Job xii. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 5), and, by a bolder figure, "the calves of the lips," i.e. the face-offering ( Hos. vi. 2), finally, the motion of the lips in speaking (Matt. xv. 8; Mark vii. 6; from Isa. xxii. 13). By metonymy, "lip" stands in Scripture for a manner of speech, e.g. in a nation, a dis- sect (Gen. xi. 6, 7, 9; Isa. xix. 18; Ezek. iii. 5, 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 21, alluding to Isa. xxxvii. 11), or, in individuals, the moral quality of language, as "lying lips," etc., i.e. falsehood (Prov. xvi. 18; comp. xviii. 4, 7) or wickedness (Ps. cxxx. 2, 3), trust (Prov. xii. 19); "burning lips," i.e. ardent professions (Prov. xxvi. 23); "sweetness of lips," i.e. pleasant discourse (Prov. xxvi. 21; so Zeph. iii. 9; isa. vi. 5; Ps. xvi. 8, 9). To "shoot out the lip" at any one. i. e. to make mouths, has always been an expression of the utmost scorn and defance (Ps. xxii. 6). In like manner, "unclean lips" are put as a repre- sentation of unfitness to impart or receive the divine communications (Isa. vi. 5, 7). Also the "word of one's lips," i.e. communication, e.g. Jehovah's precepts (Ps. xvi. 4), comp. xxxvi. 16; spoken of something before unknown, Ps. lxxii. 6), elsewhere in a bad sense, i.e. vain words, and many such words (Isa. xxxvi. 5; Prov. xiv. 23), and so of the person uttering them, e.g. a man of talk, i.e. an idle talker (Job xii. 2), a prating fool (Prov. x. 8; comp. Lev. iv. 4; Ps. cxi. 32), See MOUTH.

The "upper lip" (לוע, slopham), a derivative of the above), which the leper was required to cover (Lev. xiv. 49), refers to the lip-beard or moustachios, as the Venet. Greek (μύκης) there and the Sept. in 2 Sam. xii. 24, render it, being the beard (in the latter passage), which Mephibosheth neglected to trim during David's absence in token of grief. The same practice of "cov- ering the lip" is seen in the "unclean lips" (comp. "unclean face"), as a sign of mourning, is alluded to in Ezek. xxiv. 17, 22; Mic. iii. 7, where the Sept. has στομα, χιλια. See MOUTH.

LIPPMANN, JOXOES (of Mithuhausen), also called Tob-Jomi (תוב-יום), a Jewish writer and rabbi of the Middle Ages, was born, according to some, at Cracow, Poland, but most authorities are now agreed that he was educated at Prague about the middle of the 14th century. While a resident of the Bohemian capital he brought forward his Nitschach (נתשהך, Victory), an important polemical work. It consists of seven parts, divided, he tells us himself in his preface, "according to the seven days of the week," and of 584 sections, "according to the number of days in the lunar year, in which is the mutual bound of every Jew to make every day his life, and to remove every obstruction from the boundaries of his faith." In his treatment of the subject, the denial of the authenticity of the Christian religion, Lipmann does not adopt any systematic plan, but discusses and explains every passage of the Hebrew Bible which is either adduced by Christians as a Messianic prophecy referring to Christ, or is used by sceptics and blasphemers to support their scepticism and contempt for revelations, or is appealed to by rational- istic Jews to elaborate their rejection of Christianity, or to create out of nothing, the resurrection of the body, etc., beginning with Genesis and ending with Chronicles, according to the order of the books in the Hebrew Bible, so that any passage in dispute might easily be found. The work, which, as we have seen from its dis- visions, partook both of the character of a Jewish pole- mic and an O.-T. apologetic, was, until near the middle of the 16th century, entirely controlled by Jews. They largely transcribed and circulated it in MS. form among their people throughout the world; and in the numerous attacks which they had to sustain by both rationalists and rationalists during the time of the Reformation, this book constituted their chief arsenal, supplying them with weapons to defend themselves. About 1642 the learned Haespan, then professor in the Bavarian University at Altdorf, was engaged in a controversy on the question of the Jewish character of Judges and Christian- ity with a neighboring rabbi residing in Schnei- tach, who in his dissertations frequently referred to this Nitschach (a MS. copy made in 1589), which Haes- pan asked the privilege to examine. Refused again and again, he at last called with three of his students to the rabbi, when he pressed in such a manner to produce the MS. that he could not refuse. He pretended to examine it, and when the students had fairly surrounded the rabbi, the professor made way to the door, got into a conveyance which was waiting for him, had the MS. speedily transcribed, and only returned it to the rabbi after much earnest solicitation. The professor enriched it by valuable notes and an index, and then presented the work procured in such a dastardly manner to the Christian world (Altdorf, 1644). It was rapidly reprinted, translated into Latin, correc- ted and refuted by Blumenau, and others as regards the Christian, etc., Latin concordem (Altdorf, 1645); Wag- genseil, Tela ignus Satanae (Altdorf, 1681); Sota, Liber Miscellaneus de Ueore Adullerae Suspecta (Altdorf, 1674), Appendix, and others (see Wolf, Bibl. Jud. i. 447 sq.). Lipmann's work was a true key to our understanding of the sub- sequent. Jewish historians represent him as having been among the prisoners arrested at Prague (Aug. 8, 1839) for irreverent mention, etc., of the name of Jesus. What punishment he suffered is not known; certain it is that he was not one of the seventy-seven Jews who were exe- cuted on the day of the character of King Wenceslas (Aug. 22, 1400), for he mentions the fact himself in the Nitschach. See Gritz, Gesch. der Juden, viii, 76 sq.; First, Biblioth. Judaica, ii, 408 sq.; Steinacher, Catal- ogus Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodleiana, col. 1410-1414; Guehrer, Proben Jud. Verteidigung gegen Christliche An- griffe im Mittelalter in Liehmanns Deutscher Volks- Kalender (Brieg, 1854), p. 9 sq.; Kittel, Cyclo. Bibl. Lit. vol. ii, s. v.

Lippe, sometimes also (but less properly) Lippe- Detmold, a small principality of Northern Germany, surrounded to the north and west by Westphalia, to the south and E. and N. by Hanover, Brunswick, Waldeck, and a detached portion of Hesse-Cassel, extends over an area of 488 square miles, and has a population (1895) of 228,250, mainly belonging to the Reformed Church. The earli- est inhabitants were the Cherusci; subsequently it was a part of the country of the Saxons. The first estab- lishment of Christianity in that province dates back to
Charlemagne. In the very beginning of his war against the Saxons, in 772, he took the castrum Areburgum (probably Radtberg, on the Diemel, near the southern frontier of the principality), and there destroyed the statue of the idol Irmannaei. In 776 he went to Lippe-
schützen, a new church on the edge of Paderborn, both on the southern frontier of the province, obliging whole tribes of the conquered Saxons to receive baptism. In 783 Charlemagne again vanquished the Saxons in the great battle of Theutoburg (Detmold), in the very heart of the present principality. The Saxony army was entirely destroyed, and Charlemagne, in commemoration of this event, erected a church which is still in existence. The next Christmas he spent at Skidroben-supra-Ambram, now Schieder, on the Emmen, where it is said he also erected a church. But his most important measure for Christianizing the country was his establishment of the bishopric of Paderborn, embracing the district of Lippe within its diocese, for which the house of the princes of Lippe furnished many a bishop.

The Reformation early found strong supporters in Lippe. The first city of the province to adopt it was Lemgo, moved to such a course by Luther's theses against indulgences. By 1524 the Reformation was further advanced in this part of Germany by the adherents it had gained in the town of Herford, adjoining Lippe to the south. The doctrine of Melanchthon had been circulated freely. Foremost among Luther's supporters there were his colleagues the Augustine monks. One of them, Dr. John Dreyer, a native of Lemgo and a personal friend of Luther, distinguished for his learning and eloquence, was the first to preach the Gospel in Herford. In spite of the priests, the people introduced the singing of the German hymns of Luther into their churches, and all attempts to put an end to this by violence gave way before the unanimous will of the people. The first to take the decisive step of separation was Moritz Fidelis, a priest, and former student of the more orthodox evangelical doctrines, and by his influence the city was carried for Luther's doctrines. Lippestadt embraced them nearly at the same time. The monks of the Augustine convent in that city, who had sent two of their number to Wittenberg to be instructed by Luther, on their return preached the Gospel with great success to the people of Lippe and of neighboring places; and they so quickly advanced the cause of the Reformers, that when an inquisitor was sent to Lippe from Cologne in 1526 to stay the heresy, he found the evangelical party so strong that he gave up the struggle without the attempt to control it, and retired to his home. In 1528 the town was besieged by the dukes of Cleves and Juliers, and the count of Lippe forced to surrender. The evangelical ministers were of course driven away, but it was not long before permission was granted for the preaching by Lutheran ministers again. After the death of the zealous Roman Catholic count Simon V, in 1536, the Reformation made more rapid progress in the province. The landgrave Philip of Hesse and count Jobst von Hoya, two determined partisans of the Reformation, became guardians of the children of the deceased count and caused them to be diligently instructed in the Protestant doctrines; and when, in 1538, both the nobility and the people loudly demanded a reform in the Church of the count de Hoya, John Timann, surmounted Amstelredamus, and Adrian Buxschoten, both of Bremen, were called and sent to Lippe to frame a plan of evangelical organization, which was submitted to the States and to Luther, and, upon approval (1538), it was promulgated throughout the principality, and Protestant ministers were everywhere appointed. Under John von Eyeter, of Wittenberg, then general superintendent of the new church organization, a church was drawn up and printed in 1571, with the authorization of the authorities, and it is still in our day in force among the Lutheran communities of the country.

In 1600, during the reign of count Simon VI (ruled 1583–1618), who had imbibed Calvinistic views at the court of Casel, Calvinism found an entrance in Lippe. It commenced by the appointment of a Calvinistic minister to preach at Horn in 1602. This preacher at once forbade the use of the Lutheran Catechism in the schools, administered the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in strict Calvinistic form, and established the Reformed mode of worship in spite of the local authorities and of the people. In 1605 the same step was taken at Detmold, and was supported by the government, notwithstanding the opposition of the people and city authorities. In this manner Calvinism was established throughout the country, the nobility alone and the city of Lemgo remaining Lutheran. It was not, however, until 1684 that Calvinism was sanctioned as the state religion. In that year count Simon Henrich promulgated the Reformed ecclesiastical organization, which recognizes as its foundation the confession of the Catechism of Heidelberg, and is in force in our day. The city of Lemgo resisted these measures, and succeeded in obtaining in 1717 an edict assuring its inhabitants the fullest religious liberty, the right of appointing their own ministers, etc. But as rationalism had obtained full control of the Reformed Church of Lippe in the 18th century, upon reaction towards the middle of the 19th century the whole country, including Lemgo, was subjected to the Reformed consistory, which, however, by the admission of one Lutheran member, was not theocratic, and the synodal council of doctrine, the Heidelberg Catechism was introduced.

In 1883 the principality numbered about 2700 Roman Catholics, 6500 Lutherans, 1150 Israelites; the remainder belonged to the Reformed Church. The latter is divided into three classes, at the head of which is a superintendent; at the head of the whole clergy is a superintendent general at Detmold. The supreme ecclesiastical board for both Reformed and Lutherans is the consistory at Detmold. The principality has 48 Reformed, 5 Lutheran, and 6 Catholic parishes: the Catholics having been legally declared a foreign church (ulterius extraecclesiam). See Herzog-Real-Encyklopädie, viii, 432; Falkmann and Preuss, Lippeches Regeaten (Lemgo, 1860–65, 2 vols. 8vo); Falkmann, Beiträge zur Gesch. der Fürstenst. (ibid. 1847–56); and his Geöffn. Simon VI sur Lippe (Detm. 1869, vol. i). (A. J. B.)

Lippomani, ALOYSIUS (or Ludovicus), born in Venice in 1510, was like renowned for his historical and linguistic learning and for the purity of his style. He was in turn bishop of Modena, Verona, and Bergamo. He was active in securing the pope's assent to the transfer of the Tridentine Council to Bologna; was for two years after the interruption of the council papal nuncio in Germany, and in 1549 one of the three presidents of the council in Poland. He made in Poland the Reformation; he had made great advances through the influence of the Hussites and of the Bohemian Brethren, as also through the Socinian movement. At the national Diet of Petrikau in 1550, 1551, and especially 1556, the prerogatives of the Catholic bishops were, through special influence of the king, Sigismund II, greatly diminished, and the Protestant theologians—such as Calvin, Melanchthon, Beza—were recognized as important authorities in matters of faith. The Confession of Hoiust, adopted in a provincial synod at Petrikau, obtained great acceptance with the people. Lippomani was specially commissioned by pope Paul IV, in 1556, as nuncio in Poland, to exert himself against this rapid progress of reform. His efforts made him peculiarly obnoxious to the adherents of Protestantism, but were without marked success. He died as bishop of Bergamo in August, 1559. He wrote commentaries on the Book of Exodus, and the Psalms, but they are of no special value to the exegete of to-day. See Wezet u. Wele, Kirchen Lexikon, s. v.; Krasinski, Hist. Sketch of the Reformation in Poland, vol. i, chap. vi. (E. B. O.)

Lipscomb, PHILIP D., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Georgetown, D. C., in October, 1798.
LIPSIIUS

He was converted probably in early life, and joined the Baltimore Conference in 1852. Among his brethren in Conference assembled he was pleasant, attentive to business, safe in council. He was many years one of the stewards of the Conference. He was also for a time treasurer of the Preachers' Fund Society. A number of the years of his ministry were given to the service of the Roman Catholic Society, and was appointed to that work he retired in 1863 to a place on the superannuated list.

A minister of this Conference, who knew him long and intimately, says, "His life was beautiful in its consistency." He died in January, 1870.—Conf. Minutes, 1871.

LIPSIUS, Justus, a Roman Catholic, renowned as a scholar in the 16th century, was born near Brussels in 1557. He was precocious, and he read his Via- ria lectiones at the age of 19. He was secretary to cardinal Granville about this time (1572-74). Later, as professor of history at Jena, he became a Protestant, and remained such for 15 years while professor of ancient languages at Leyden, but subsequently he returned to the Roman Catholic Church, and was made professor at Louvain (1602). He died March 20, 1606, holding at that time the appointment of historiographer to the king of Spain. His scholarship was honored by the pope and at several European courts. He distinguished himself especially by his commentary upon Tacitus, whose works he could repeat word for word, and by his enthusiastic regard for the stoical philosophy. He wrote De Cons- tantia mea ad philosophiam Stoicam:—Physiologi Stoicorum libri tres (new ed. Antv. 1605, fol.):—also De una religione, etc. His works were collected under the title Opera Omnia (Antv. 1663; 2d edit. 1677). See Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, vol. ii, s. v.; Theol. Uni- ver. Lexic. (Elberf. 1869), vol. i, s. v.

Liptines or Lestines, Synonym of (Concilia Lip- tinae). This synod was held at Liptinæ or Lestines, near the convent of Laubes, in Henegau, in 743, by order of Carloman, Bouilacius prelging. Four canons were published. The bishops, earls, and governors were promised in this council to observe the decrees of the Coun- cil of Germany (A.D. 742). All the clergy, moreover, promised obedience to the ancient canons; the abbots and monks received the order of St. Benedict, and a part of the Canons Regular of the Church, as well as a decree for a time to the prince, to enable him to carry on the wars then raging. (J. N. P.)

Liquor (λίκουρ), a clear, fig. of the juice of olives and grapes, Exod. xxiv. 22; 37:5, mez'g, mixed, i.e. highly flavored wine, Cant. vii. 3; ψυγμ, midhrah', maceration, i.e. drink prepared by steeping grapes, Numbr. viii. 3.) See Wine.

Lismanini, Francis, a Socinian theologian, was born at Corfu in the beginning of the 16th century. He studied in Italy, joined the Franciscans, and a few years after became doctor of theology; removed to Pol- land, and was appointed by queen Bona, wife of Sigis- mund I, her preacher and confessor. He became also superior of the Franciscans of Poland, director of all the convents of the nuns of St. Clara, etc. The society of Andrew Friciasco and the reading of Ochin's works led him to the inquiry of the mystery of the Church, yet he was not displaced on account of it, but continued in favor with the queen, and was sent by her to Rome, in 1549, to congratulate Julius III on his election as pope. On his return to Poland in 1551, Lismanini be- came acquainted with Socinian, and it is this association that no doubt gave rise to the mission with which he was intrusted by the king of Poland, ostensibly for the purpose of collecting works for the royal library, but in reality to study the position of the Reformation, and to report concerning it. Lismanini accordingly visited Padua, Milan, and Switzerland, where, forming his order, embraced the Helvetic confessional, and married. The king, fearing to be compromised by this overt act, broke all connection with him, ceased to supply him with funds, and Calvin, Ballinger, and Geemper in vain sought to obtain for Lismanini leave to return to Pol- land. It was not until 1556 that he was permitted to return, but the king's favor he never regained, notwithstanding the efforts of a large number of the Polish nobility in his behalf. His Socinian views on the doc- trine of the Trinity served still more to bring him into the discredit. He was again employed upon all sorts of work he retired in 1663 to a place on the superannuated list. A minister of this Conference, who knew him long and intimately, says, "His life was beautiful in its consistency." He died in January, 1870.—Conf. Minutes, 1871.

LITANY

List, Carl, Benignus, a German theologian, was born at Mannheim, in the grand-duchy of Baden, Feb. 5, 1755. He attended the universities of Jena and Straus- burg, and afterwards spent some time in Neuchatel to acquire French. About 1749 he was appointed court dean, in 1753 third pastor of his native city, and in 1758 was appointed an assistant-rector in the Evangelical­Lutheran Church. His productions, mostly of a corrective character in liturgy and hymns, were of great service to the Church to which he belonged. We mention Die Geschichte der Evangelisch­Lutherischen Gemeinde zu Mannheim (Mannheim, 1767, 8vo);—Neue Liturgie für die Evangelisch­Lutherische Kirche in der Churfürstl. (ibid. 1780, 8vo);—Die Doctrina in Theol. Deutschl. ('ibid. 1794, 8vo, s. v.)

Litany (λιτανεία, entertain), a word the specific meaning of which has varied considerably at different times, is used in the liturgical services of some churches to designate a solemn act of supplication addressed with the object of averting the divine anger, and especially on occasions of public calamity. Hooker, in his Ecclesiastical Polity (book v, p. 260), has the following: "As things invented for one use are by us converted to more, it grew that supplications with this solemnity for the appeasing of God's wrath and the averting of public evils were of the Greek Church termed litanies; rogamiones, of the Latins." The term litanies for a supplicatory form of worship among the pagans was early adopted by Christian writers.

In the fourth century we find such occasions as litanies connected with processions, the clergy and people in solemn procession using certain forms of supplication and making special entreaty for deliverance. Whether anything of this kind would have been ven- tured before Christianity became a "religio licita" (A.D. 270) may be doubted. The predominance of a Chris- tian population, however, in certain localities, and the intervals of respite between persecutions, admitted of their possibility at an earlier period. In these earliest de- velopments, moreover, of the processional litany, whether before or during the fourth century, they rested, doubtless, upon an earlier Christian habit and custom —that of special seasons of prayer and supplication. These, in some cases, would be by the assembled body of believers in a church house or place of assembly in others, for purposes of safety from the fury of their en-emies, in their individual homes and places of abode. Certainly the Church was not wanting in such occas- ions during the first centuries of her existence, when the course pursued by the disciples was "in secret" (Acts xii, 5), and for similar reasons, would need to be repeat- ed. Occasions of this particular kind would of course pass away with the passing away of persecution. But
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others of a different character would take their place. As early, indeed, as the times of Tertullian and Cyprian we find allusions to Christian prayers, and fasting, and supplications for the removal of drought, the repelling of enemies, the moderation of calamities; and later, in the
fourth and fifth centuries, we find the same thing, on a larger scale and in a more formal manner. These
votive, preliminary to a battle, spent the whole night in fasting and prayer, and in sackcloth went with the priests and people to make supplication in all the churches. So, again, in the reign of one of his suc-
cessors, the Empress Constantia, we find a prayer for a great earthquake made at Constantinople. In these
last cases, the element, to which allusion has been made, that of the procession, was undoubtedly present, and so
continued until the time of the Reformation; the name
litany, indeed, being sometimes used simply to describe
this part of it, as where seven litanies are directed by
Gregory the Great to proceed from seven different
churches (see below). The processions of the Arians in
the times of Chrysostom, and the counter movement,
on his part, by more splendid and imposing ones, to detract
from any popularity which they may have at
that time, is described by Socrates. It is said at
all improbable that in somewhat the same manner
the hymns of Arius became circulated in Alexandria in
the early part of the fourth century, and found lodgment
in the minds of the populace.

One division of litanies in the Western Church may
be recognized after the beginning of the fifth century;
and during the time of Charlemagne we find allusion
to large numbers of them, to be attended to as a matter
of special appointment. The Council of Orleans, A.D. 511,
expressly recognizes litanies as peculiarly solemn supplica-
tions, and enjoins their use preparatory to the celebration
of a high festival. In the Spanish Church, in like
manner, they were observed in the week after Pentecost.
Other councils subsequently appointed them at a variety
of other seasons, till, in the seventeenth Council of To-
ledo, A.D. 694, it was decreed that they should be used
once in each month. By degrees they were extended
two days in each week, and Wednesday and Friday,
being the ancient station days, were set apart for the
purpose. Gregory the Great instituted a service at
Rome for the 25th of April, which was named Litanim
Septiformis, because a form of it was formed in it of
seven different classes. This service is distinguished
as Litaniae Major, from its extraordinary solemnity.
The Litaniae Minores, on the other hand, are sup-
bposed by Bingham to consist only of a repetition of Kpntes
Kporeos, the customary response in the larger supplica-
tions, and the tri-week form of the first acts of the English Church,
A.D. 747, confirming the identity of litania and rospato,
but showing that originally there was a distinction be-
tween litania and exomologesis. Johannes de Janus
terms litany, properly, a service for the dead. But Du
Canje, by the authorities he cites for the early litanies,
hazards the assertion that they differ but little from
those in modern usage. In the Western litanies two
features are to be found not prevalent in the Eastern—
the invocation of saints, and the appointment of stated
annual seasons for their use, as the rogation days of the
Roman Church, and the tri-week form of the English Church.
There is, indeed, mention made of an annual litany in
commemoration of the great earthquake in the reign of
Justinian. But the general and present habit of the

patriarchate of Constantinople has been and is to con-
fine such services to their original purpose—extraordi-
nary occasions.

Freeman (Principles of Divine Service, ii, 825) insists
that in its origin the litany is distinctively a "eucharistic
feature," and not in the least connected with the eucharistic
sacrifice. So we find in the East, and
so it was originally in the West also, one most notable
feature being the pleading of the work of Christ in be-
half of his Church. In a Syrian form given by Rena-
dot, the priest, taking the paten and cup in his right
and left hand, begins to recite a series of prayers closely associated
with the eucharistic sacrifice. So we find in the East, and
then it was in the West, one most notable feature being the
pleading of the work of Christ in behalf of his Church.
In a Syrian form given by Rena-
dot, the priest, taking the paten and cup in his right
and left hand, begins to recite a series of prayers closely associated
with the eucharistic sacrifice. So we find in the East, and
then it was in the West, one most notable feature being the
pleading of the work of Christ in behalf of his Church.
In a Syrian form given by Rena-
dot, the priest, taking the paten and cup in his right
and left hand, begins to recite a series of prayers closely associated
with the eucharistic sacrifice. So we find in the East, and
then it was in the West, one most notable feature being the
pleading of the work of Christ in behalf of his Church.
In a Syrian form given by Rena-
dot, the priest, taking the paten and cup in his right
and left hand, begins to recite a series of prayers closely associated
with the eucharistic sacrifice. So we find in the East, and
then it was in the West, one most notable feature being the
pleading of the work of Christ in behalf of his Church.
In a Syrian form given by Rena-
dot, the priest, taking the paten and cup in his right
and left hand, begins to recite a series of prayers closely associated
with the eucharistic sacrifice. So we find in the East, and
then it was in the West, one most notable feature being the
pleading of the work of Christ in behalf of his Church.
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The three different forms now in use in the Roman
churches are called the "litanies of the saints" (which is the
litany of Our Lady, the "litany of Jesus," and the
"litany of Our Lady of Loreto." Of these the first
alone has a place in the public service-books of the
Church, on the rogation days, in the ordination service,
the service for the consecration of churches, the conse-
cration of cemeteries, and many other offices. The one
called by the name of litany of the saints bears its name
from the prayers it contains to the saints for their help
and intercession in behalf of the worshippers. Almost
every saint in the calendar of the Roman Church has his
particular form in the litany. The people's response in
this case is said thus: "Pax, rex, et salus." The litany
of Jesus consists of a number of addresses to Christ under
his various relations to men, in connection with the sev-
eral details of his passion, and of adjurations of him
through the memory of what he has done and suffered
for the salvation of mankind. The date of this form of
prayer is uncertain, but it is referred, with much proba-
bility, to the time of St. Bernardino of Siena, in the 15th
century. The litany of Loreto [see Loreto] resem-
bles both the above-named litanies in its opening ad-
dresses to the Holy Trinity and in its closing petitions
to "God the Father, who art the same in all ages, in all
the world;" but the main body of the petitions are address-
ed to the Virgin Mary under various titles, some taken
from the Scriptures, some from the language of the
fathers, some from the mystical writers of the medieval
Church. Neither this litany nor that of Jesus has ever
formed part of any of the ritual or liturgical offices of
the Catholic Church, but there can be no doubt that
both have in various ways received the sanction of the
highest authorities of the Roman Church. Those of
the Lutheran and English churches, which are very
much alike, are derived from the same sources, being
shorter in that these invocations are expunged.
In the Church of England it was originally a distinct
service, and seems to have been used at a different time
of day from the ordinary morning service, and only on
certain occasions. In 1644 it was given to the people
in a revised form by Henry VIII. Upon its insertion
in the Prayer-book published by Edward VI. A.D. 1549,
the litany was placed between the communion office
and the office of baptism, under the title "The Litany
and Suffrages," without any rubric for its use; but at the
end of the same office (Prayer-book of 1549) the follow-
ing rubric: "Upon Wednesdays and Fridays the Eng-
ish litany shall be said or sung in all places, after
such form as is appointed by his majesty's injunc-
tions, or as it shall be otherwise appointed by his
highness." In the revision of the Common Prayer in 1549,
the litany was struck out and regulations were made that
the rubric should be added to "be used on Sundays, Wednesdays,
and Fridays, and at other times when it shall be com-
manded by the ordinary." So late as the last revision
in 1661, the litany continued a distinct service by itself,
used in Stations and in the morning prayer (then read at
a very early hour) was concluded, the people returning
home between them. The rubric which inserts the litan-
y after the third collect in morning prayer is formed
from a similar rubric in the Scotch Common Prayer-
book, with this difference, that the English rubric en-
joints the omission of certain of the ordinary interces-
sional prayers; the Scotch rubric, on the other hand,
states expressly, "without the omission of any part of
the other daily service of the Church on those days."
The litany of the German and Danish Lutherans
closely resembles that of the Church of England and that
of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of
America, and needs, therefore, no special mention here.
The processional feature is still retained in the Greek
and Roman litanies on special occasions, but is not their
special accompaniment. Efforts towards its restoration
in the English Church occurred in the eighteenth cen-
tury, but it has not been usual since. Most of the
supplications have been abandoned, and in some
instances, use has been made of new supplications, depending
entirely on the discretion of the ordinary.
LITHUANIA

et Spiritus Sancti, hoc est et. v. u. quae elementa octogenerum, et quadrangentesimum, et primum significatum numerum. Petri quoque apostoli prima litera, id est ẹ et... ejus quoque, qui scribit, episcopi prima litera; qui scribatur secunda litera; accipientis tertia litera; civitatis quoque, de qua scribitur, quarta et indictionis, qui scribitur quintae literae, quinti usque ad octa
decim. Atque ita his omnibus Graecia literis... unum ductum, unum, unumqueque fuerit collecta, summam epistola te
nate, hanc qui spectis omni cum cautelis requirit expressa. Addit praestera separata in epistola etiam nonagennarium et nonum numerum, qui secundum Graecam ecclesiam, quin et octava, quinta, et sexta... sircolvau, litera pacifique, a kind of letters of dismission... 

Formato also contained the communications of one community to another, such as the information concerning the election of bishops, etc. (γράμματα ιεραποστολικα, Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. lib. vii, cap. 30; Evagrius, Hist. Eccl. lib. 4, cap. iv); notices of festivals, particularly Easter, etc. (παρεκκλήσιον, εορτασμοί, πολίτικαι τεσταλ, πασχαλεῖα, etc.); Conc. Arelat. i, s. 314, c. 1; Curthas, v. a. 401, c. 7; Bres
car. ii, s. 572, c. 7; Gratian. c. 24-26, dist. iii, "de conc.

The publication of ordinances was also made by synods. (De ecclesiis, circu
culares, tractoriae, etc.) See Du Frene, Glossar. Lat.; Suicer, Theaur. ecc. a. v. ιεραποστολικα; F. B. Ferrari De antiquo epistolario ecclesiasticorum generis (Meliol. 1618; and edit. G. Th. Meier, Helmstadt, 1678, 4to); Phil. Prioril De litteris ecumenicis dian. cum appendice de tractoria et synodalibus (Tib. 1678); J. R. Cassel, De stabili praestacia ecclesiae operi litterarii communicatorum cumbiu (Lipsia, 1745, 4to); Gonzalez Telles, Kommentar s. d. D debris (lib. ii, tit. xxxi, "De clercis pergermiae," cap. 3); Riehner, Kirchliche Archologie (Berlin, 1880).

Lithu., Johann Wilhelm von, a German theologian, was born at Anspach, in Bavaria, Feb. 4, 1678. In 1680 he entered the University of Jena, and became in 1694 A.M. In the following year he went to the University of Altdorf to continue his studies; in 1697 he studied at the University of Halle, and in 1698 he was admitted to the philosophical faculty of that university. His health failed, and he was obliged to leave for the native city. In 1707 he became dean at Wartburgtasting. In 1710 he accepted a call to his native city as preacher of a foun
dation and consistory; in addition to this he became in 1714 city pastor. He died March 18, 1740. Von Lith repeatedly declined calls to far

Lithuania, a grand-duchy in Eastern Europe, which formerly constituted a part of the kingdom of Poland, and which at the partition of the kingdom was partly united with Russia (the government of Vilna, Grodno, Mohilev, Minsk, and Vitebsk), partly with Prus
sia (the administrative district of Gomblinen). The area of Lithuania is about 105,000 square miles. In the earliest historic times the country of the Lithua
nians was subject to the neighboring tribes, in particu
lar to the Polock, and its name is that of the chiefl
state it appears for the first time about 1217 under Ercaiwi, who threw off the yoke of Polock, and con
quered Podlesia, Grodno, and Brezak. Eberward, about

1299, began to expel the Tartars from Lithuania, and

Ringold, about 1285, was the first independent grand
duke. His son Mindaugas, who had to cede Podlesia, Samogitia, and Courland to the prince of Halicz Note
gorod and to the Teutonic Order, was in 1265 baptized by the archbishop of Riga and crowned as king; but in
1290 he was deposed. In 1268 a treaty was made by the Lithuanian and Polish nobles with the Teutonic Order, and in 1268
was slain by Svitinorto, the governor of Samogitia, who in 1268 obtained control of the country. In 1291 Pod
lesia was reunited with Lithuania. In 1282 Witen became ruler of Lithuania, after murdering his predeces
or. His son Gedimin (1281-1323) conquered Samo
gitia and a portion of Livonia, and in 1307 he founded the towns of Vilna and Troki. The son of Gedimin, Olgerd, wholly expelled the Tartars from Po
dolia, and conquered the prince Demetrius of Russia at

Moscow, in 1380 at Moskau. His son Jagello was bap
tized on Feb. 14, 1386, at Cracow, and on this occasion received the name of Vasiliev. The marriage of Ja
gello with the princess Hedwig of Poland led to the un
ion of Lithuania with Poland, and made the latter the greatest power of Eastern Europe. In 1401, and
again in 1412, it was stipulated that the princes of Poland and Lithuania should be crowned jointly, and that the
consent of both nations. Under Witold, who in 1413 conquered Smolensk, Lithuania was a powerful state, which, embraced, besides Lithuania proper, the larger por
tion of White and Red Russia, Samogitia, and other

Lithuania now constitutes a majority only in the government of Vilna; they have within the boundaries of the ancient Lithuania the archdiocese of Mohilev, and the dioceses of Vilna, Samogitia, and Minsk. The Reformers have been most

Lithuania's government in the synod, which is divided into four districts, each of which has a superintendent
at its head. It has about 30 ministers, and annually holds a synod which often lasts three or four weeks, and which has to be attended by all the lay

The synod rules the Reformed Church under the superintendence of the ministry of St. Petersburg. It pays the salaries of the clergy and the lay members to the repairs of the churches, and has also the care of all schools and poor-houses. It has from donations an an

Editor.
congregations of Lithuania, which are less numerous, belong to the diocese of Courland. The orthodox Greek Church has within the limits of Lithuania the archbishop of White Russia and Lithuania, the bishop of Mohilev, the bishop of Vilna, and the bishop of Vitebsk. The dioceses of the two former belong to the eparchies of the second, those of the two latter to the eparchies of the third and fourth class. The following table of the five governments formerly belonging to Lithuania exhibits the total population, the Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Israelis; the remainder belong chiefly to the orthodox Greek Church:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grodno</td>
<td>357,474</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>5,668</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>124,971</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1,208,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musk.</td>
<td>200,928</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>153,796</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1,140,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohilev</td>
<td>46,836</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>152,471</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>1,146,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilna</td>
<td>734,866</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>139,751</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1,104,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitebsk</td>
<td>311,482</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>18,720</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100,470</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1,170,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,740,092</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>35,100</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>688,429</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>6,798,491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Krause, Lithauen u. dessen Bewohner (Halle, 1884); Giagarr, Lithauen und Litauer, gesammelte Skizzen (Tilsit, 1869). (A. J. S.)

Litter occurs in the Auth. Vers. as a translation of עַלָּלָל (taab, from עַלָּלָל, to more slowly), in Isa. lxvi, 20, (Sept. לֵעֶמְרָמָא), where a sedan or palauquin for the conveyance of a princely personage, borne by hand or upon the shoulders, or perhaps on the backs of animals, is evidently referred to. The original term occurs elsewhere only in Num. vi, 8, in the phrase בַּלָּלָל (egloth 'taab, carts of the litter kind, A. V., "covered waggons"), where it is used of the large and commodious vehicles employed for the transportation of the materials and furniture of the tabernacle, being drawn by oxen. The term therefore signifies properly a hand-litter, and secondarily a wagon. Litters or palauquins were, as we know, in use among the ancient Egyptians. They were borne upon the shoulders of men, and appear to have been used for carrying persons of consideration short distances on visits, like the sedan chairs of a former day in England (see Wilkinson, A. Egy. i, 78). In Cant. iii, 9, we find the word עַלָּלָל, oppannin (perhaps a foreign [Egyptian] word), Sept. ἀπαρς, Vulg. ferculum, which occurs nowhere else in Scripture, and is applied to a vehicle used by king Solomon. In the immediate context it is described as consisting of a framework of cedar-wood, in which were set silver stanchions supporting a gold railing, with a purple-covered seat, and an embroidered rug, the last a present from the Jewish ladies. This word is rendered "chariot" in our Authorized Version, although unlike any other word so rendered in that version. It literally means a moving couch, and is usually conceived to denote a kind of sedan, litter, or rather palauquin, in which great personages and women were borne from place to place. "The name as well as the object immediately suggests that it may have been nearly the same thing as the takht-ravan, the moving throne or seat of the Persians. It consists of a light frame fixed on two strong poles, like those of our sedan chair. This frame is generally covered with cloth, and has a door, sometimes of lattice-work, at each side. It is carried by two mules, one between the poles before, the other behind. These conveyances are used by great persons when disposed for retirement or ease during a journey, or when sick or feeble through age; but they are chiefly used by ladies of consideration in their journeys" (Kitto).

Some readers may remember the "litter of red cloth, adorned with pearls and jewels," together with ten mules (to bear it by turns), which king Zahr-Shah prepared for the journey of his daughter (Lane's Arabic Nights, i, 528). This was doubtless of the kind which is borne by four mules, two behind and two before. In Arabia, or in countries where Arabian usages prevail, two camels are usually employed to bear the takht-ravan, and sometimes two horses. When borne by camels, the head of the hindmost of the animals is bent painfully down under the vehicle. This is the most comfortable kind of litter, and two light persons may travel in it. "The akhširìch is another kind of camel-litter, resembling the Indian hóodzh, by which name (or rather kóddj) it is sometimes called. It is com-

Ancient Egyptian Palauquin, containing a military chief, borne by four men, with an attendant carrying a parasol behind him.

Camel bearing the Hóddj.

Little Christians is the name of a new sect, com-

Modern Persian covered Palauquin.

Double Persian Palauquin of Modern Syria.
posed of members lateley (1868) seceded from the Russ-
so-Greek Church at Atakars, in the province of Sar-
atoft, and diocese of the bishop of Tarzitin. The se-
ceders from the orthodox Church, or founders of this neww, sect, were about two hundred and fifty in number. "They set up a new religion, and began to preach a gospel of their own devising." They condemned saints and altar-
pieces as idolatrour, and abandoned the use of bread and
wine in the sacrament. Before they founded the new
Church, which, they claim, Christ commanded them to do,
it was merely recommmended, and also changed in their
names. "They have no priests, and hardly any
form of prayer. They keep no images, use no wafers,
and make no sacred oil. Instead of the consecrated
bread, they bake a cake, which they afterwards worship,
as a special gift from God." This cake is like a penny
bun in shape and size, but in the minds of these Little
Christians it possesses a potent virtue and a mystic
charm" (Dixon, Free Russia, p. 148, 144). The name
they bear they gave themselves. Persecuted by the
government, they have increased and are daily increas-
ing in numbers. See RUSIA. (J. H. W.)

Little Horn. See Antichrist; Daniel.

Littlejohn, John, an early Methodist Episcopal
minister, was born in Penrith, Cumberland Co., Eng.
Dec. 7, 1756; emigrated to Maryland about 1757; re-
celived his religious education in 1760; entered the Baltimore Conference in 1776; located on ac-
cont of poor health in 1778; removed to Kentucky in
1818; re-entered the Baltimore Conference in 1831, and
was the same year transferred to the Kentucky Confer-
ence as a superannuate, and died May 13, 1896. He pos-
sessed considerable mental power and energy. His piety
was deep and fruitful, and hisministrations were weighty and very useful.—Minutes of Conferences,
i, 496. (G. L. T.)

Littleston, Adam, D.D., a learned English divine,
was born Nov. 8, 1627, at Hales Owen, Shropshire, and
was educated first at Westminster School, and later (1647) at Christ-church, Oxford, where he was ejected by
the Parliamentary visitors in 1648. He was after-
ward usher, and taught as second master at Westmin-
ster School (1653). He became rector of Chelsea in
1674, and the same year was made prebendary of West-
minster, and received a grant to succeed Dr. Bushby in
the mastership of that school. He had for some years
been the king's chaplain, and in 1670 received his de-
gree in divinity, which was conferred upon him with-
out taking any in arts, on account of his extraordinary
merit. He was for some time subdean of Westminster, and
in 1687 was transferred to the church of St. Botolph,
Aldersgate, London, which he held four years. He died
June 30, 1694. He was an excellent philologist and
grammarian, learned in the Oriental languages and Rab-
bbinical lore. He was the author of a Latin Dictionarv,
long popular, but finally superseded by Ainaworth's. He
also published many sermons and other works.—Thomas,

Littleton, Edward, LL.D., an English divine,
was born about the opening of the last century, and
was educated at Eton and King's College, Cambridge,
entering the latter in 1716. He early turned his attention
to poesy, and also studied philosophy in 1720 Mr. L.
Littleton was recalled to Eton as an assistant in
the school, and in 1727 was elected a fellow, and presented
to the living of Maple Derham in Oxfordshire. He
was appointed June 9, 1750, chaplain in ordinary to the
king, and died in 1754. He published poems and sev-
ere works as an admiring and excellent scholar.—General Biogr. Dict. s. v.

Liturgy (Greek λiturγία), a function, service, or
-duty of a public character. These public services or
duties among the Greeks were frequently, if not always,
connected with religious ideas or ceremonies of some kind, even when the duties themselves were of a
secular character—those, for instance, which had refer-
ce to the supervision of theatrical exhibitions or the presiding in the public assemblies. The religious mean-
ing of the word in each case was necessarily in-
volved. In Isa. xiii, 8 (Sept.), the idea of religious serv-
vice predominates; in Rom. xiii, 6, that of the secular, as
under God; and again, in Luke i, 28, and in Heb. x, 11, it refers to the priestly function. At a later period we
find it used by Eusebius (Life of Constantine, iv, 47) in
connection with the taking of the work of the Christians by the liturgy, or the way in which the Church, in a natural
process, the word which thus designated the public function or service performed by the minis-
try, became restricted in its meaning to the form it self—the form of words in which such service was ren-
dered, and thus, certainly before the middle of the fifth century, we find in the Church a sense of the word liturgies, forms for the conducting of public worship and the administration of sacraments.

1. Jewish Liturgies.—This subject has, of course, its
connection with the question of a similar state of things
under the Jewish dispensation. Were there liturgical
forms among the Jews, and, if so, to what extent? We
find among the Greeks and Romans certain set forms in
connection with their sacrifices, passing, it would seem,
from mouth to mouth of successive priestly generations,
and a usual form of prayer for the civil magistrate (Dillingham and Jedamus, it is said; among the sacred books of India, hymns and prayers to be used on stated occasions (Miller's Chips from a
German Workshopp, i, 297); and in the Roman and in the
Mohammedan worship, formule of a similar character (Lamé's History of Egypt, 193). How was this, in some sense, a matter with the Jews? There was, of course, a ritual of
form; but was there with it also a form of words? The
reading of the law, although enjoined, could hardly be
said to meet this demand. There are, however, special
forms in the Pentateuch which are liturgical in the strictest sense of that expression. Some of these have reference to possible contingencies, and would therefore be only occasional in their employment. Instances of this class may be found in the formula (Deut. xxii, 19), where complaint should be made to the elders by par-
ties against a rebellious and incorrigible son. Of sim-
ilar character is the formula (Deut. xxxix, 8-9) rejected with
the refusal to take the widow of a deceased broth-
er or nearest kinsman, and so perpetuate his name in
Israel. Another, again, of the same class, was that ap-
pointed to be used by the elders and priests (Deut. xxii,
1-9) of cases in which the body of a murdered person should be found; and still another, and more of
the nature of a stated religious service, was the pre-
scribed declaration and mode of proceeding connected
with the going out to battle (Deut. xx, 1-8). These
were occasional and contingent. For some of them
there might never be the actual usage, though there was the case with the first—that of the complaint against
and the execution of a rebellious son. But there were
others of a more stated character, having reference to
regularly occurring seasons and ceremonies when they
were required to be used. The priestly benediction,
repeated, it would seem, upon every special gathering of
the people (Numb. vi, 23-27), is an instance of this
class. The form of offering of the first-fruits (Deut.
xxvi, 1-15) is another: in this latter the person making
the offering uses the formula, the priest receiving the
offering (which is the approbation of the sacrifice and
confession by the high-priest of the sins of the people over the head of the scape-goat is one of these; in any
such case, a set form, passing from priestly father to son,
not improbably came into use. The liturgical use of
the Psalms in the Temple worship was, of course, a
matter of much later arrangement. The fifteenth chapter
of Ecclesiastical describes an exceptional service, and is, moreover, too indefinite in its language to justify any conclusion as to its liturgical character. During this period, however, between the captivity and the times of the New Testament, there comes to view another ecclesiastical development of Judaism which has its connection with this subject—that of the worship of the synagogue. This, which in all probability originated during the Maccabean period, in the effort to supply the want occasioned by the loss of the worship of the Temple, would in many respects be like that Temple worship; in others, and from the necessity of the case, it would be very different. The greatest of these diversities would be in the fact of the necessary presence of the sacrificial and ceremonial order, the service and priestly, their complete absence in that of the synagogue. In the Temple the Levites sang psalms of praise before the altar, and the priests blessed the people. In the synagogue there were prayers connected with the reading of certain specific passages of Scripture, of which are distinctly discernible two chief groups, around which, as time wore on, an enormous mass of liturgical poetry clustered—the one, the *Shema* ('Hear, Israel,' etc.), being a collection of the three Biblical pieces (Deut. vii, 4-9; xi, 13-21; Num. xv, 37-41), expressive of the unity of God and the unchangeableness of his rule, strange together without any extraneous addition; the second, the *Tephillah*, or Prayer, by way of eminence (adopted in the *Koran* as *Suraat*, Sur. ii, 40; comp. v. 15), consisting of a certain number of supplications, with a hymnal introduction and conclusion, and following the form of the priestly blessing. The single portions of this prayer gradually increased to eighteen, and the prayer itself received the name *Shemoneh Ezech* (eighteen; afterwards, however, increased to nineteen: the additional one is now twelfth in the prayer, and is against apostates [to Christianity] and heathen [all who refused the Talmud, including consequently the Karaites]. The first addition to the *Shema* formed the introductory thanksgiving for the renewed day (in accordance with the ordinance that every supplication must be preceded by a prayer of thanks) called *Joser* (Creator of Light, etc.), to which were joined the three *Holies* (Yaphrah), and the sup- plication for spiritual enlightening in the divine law (Ahabah). Between the Shema and the Tephillah was inserted the *Geruth* (Liberation), or praise for the miraculous deliverance from Egypt and the constant watchfulness of God (see *Kaddish*, Sabbath and Ben- ediction) and certain psalms seem to have concluded the service of that period. This was the order of the *Shakaroth*, or morning prayer, and very similar to this was the *Maturah*, or evening prayer; while in the *Minckah*, or afternoon prayer, the *Shema* was omitted. On many days of the week, especially the fast days, the order for the day was the same as on week days; but since the festive joy was to overrule all individual sorrow and supplication, the intermediate portion of the Tephillah was changed according to the special significance and the memories of the day of the solemnity, and additional prayers were introduced for these extraordinary occasions, corresponding to the additional sacrifice in the Temple, and varying according to the special solemnity of the day (Massephal, Netilah, etc.) (Chambers). Compare Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 567 sq.; Prideaux, ii, 160-170. It is likewise to be noted that in the Temple worship there were occasions and opportunities in which the individual worshipper might confess the plague of his own heart, make individual supplication, or offer individual thanksgiving. Thus it was possible to go beyond the binding of Christ for the Jewish liturgies since then, under the influence of Rabbinism, and in view of the fact that the synagogue, so far as possible, supplies the absence of the Temple, have been very much enlarged, and extend to numberless particulars. It may, in fact, be said that the whole life of the most moderate Rabbinical is dependent upon the liturgies, and that there is a rubric for every moment and movement of

social as of individual existence. "The first compilation of a liturgy is recorded of Amram Gaon (A.D. 570-800); the work that has survived is that of Saadja Gaon (d. A.D. 942). These early collections of prayers generally contained also compositions from the hand of the compiler, and minor additions, such as ethical tracts, almanacs, etc., and were called Siddurim (Orders, Ritu- als), embracing the whole calendar year, week-days and the new moons, fasts and festivals. Later, the term was restricted to the week-day ritual, that for the festivals being called Mahzor (Cycle). Besides these, we find the *Selichoth*, or Penitential Prayers; *Kinnot*, or Elegies; *Hosannah*, or Hosannahs (for the seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles); and *Bakashoth*, or Special Sup- plication, for the remission of the temple tax, their presence justifying the absence in that of the synagogue. In the Temple the Levites sang psalms of praise before the altar, and the priests blessed the people. In the synagogue there were prayers connected with the reading of certain specific passages of Scripture, of which are distinctly discernible two chief groups, around which, as time wore on, an enormous mass of liturgical poetry clustered—the one, the *Shema* ('Hear, Israel,' etc.), being a collection of the three Biblical pieces (Deut. vii, 4-9; xi, 13-21; Num. xv, 37-41), expressive of the unity of God and the unchangeableness of his rule, strange together without any extraneous addition; the second, the *Tephillah*, or Prayer, by way of eminence (adopted in the *Koran* as *Suraat*, Sur. ii, 40; comp. v. 15), consisting of a certain number of supplications, with a hymnal introduction and conclusion, and following the form of the priestly blessing. The single portions of this prayer gradually increased to eighteen, and the prayer itself received the name *Shemoneh Ezech* (eighteen; afterwards, however, increased to nineteen: the additional one is now twelfth in the prayer, and is against apostates [to Christianity] and heathen [all who refused the Talmud, including consequently the Karaites]. The first addition to the *Shema* formed the introductory thanksgiving for the renewed day (in accordance with the ordinance that every supplication must be preceded by a prayer of thanks) called *Joser* (Creator of Light, etc.), to which were joined the three *Holies* (Yaphrah), and the supplication for spiritual enlightening in the divine law (Ahabah). Between the Shema and the Tephillah was inserted the *Geruth* (Liberation), or praise for the miraculous deliverance from Egypt and the constant watchfulness of God (see *Kaddish*, Sabbath and Benediction) and certain psalms seem to have concluded the service of that period. This was the order of the *Shakaroth*, or morning prayer, and very similar to this was the *Maturah*, or evening prayer; while in the *Minckah*, or afternoon prayer, the *Shema* was omitted. On many days of the week, especially the fast days, the order for the day was the same as on week days; but since the festive joy was to overrule all individual sorrow and supplication, the intermediate portion of the Tephillah was changed according to the special significance and the memories of the day of the solemnity, and additional prayers were introduced for these extraordinary occasions, corresponding to the additional sacrifice in the Temple, and varying according to the special solemnity of the day (Massephal, Netilah, etc.) (Chambers). Compare Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 567 sq.; Prideaux, ii, 160-170. It is likewise to be noted that in the Temple worship there were occasions and opportunities in which the individual worshipper might confess the plague of his own heart, make individual supplication, or offer individual thanksgiving. Thus it was possible to go beyond the binding of Christ for the Jewish liturgies since then, under the influence of Rabbinism, and in view of the fact that the synagogue, so far as possible, supplies the absence of the Temple, have been very much enlarged, and extend to numberless particulars. It may, in fact, be said that the whole life of the most moderate Rabbinical is dependent upon the liturgies, and that there is a rubric for every moment and movement of
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proud” (Prideaux). “Let slanderers have no hope, and all presumptuous apostates perish as in a moment; and may thine enemies, and those who hate thee, be suddenly cut off, and all those who act wickedly be suddenly broken, consumed, and rooted out; and humble thou them speedily in our days. Blessed art thou, O Lord, with thine own people, and thy house in the midst of them.” These forms of prayer, whether for the worship of the synagogue or for domestic and private use, are all appointed to be said in Hebrew. One of the best moves in this direction is the effort within the last century to remedy this evil by parallel translation. In the country the services in the synagogues are usually of this kind: either the Hebrew on one page and the English on the other, or both in parallel columns on the same page.

II. Early Christian Liturgies.—I. Their Origin. —So far as regards the primitive or apostolic age, the only testimony we have is of the kind that is contained in the Amen alled to in 1 Cor. xiv. 16; this latter an undoubted importation from the synagogue. As, moreover, we find the Master, with the twelve, singing a hymn, one of the psalms probably, on the night of the last supper, it is not at all improbable that such psalmody of the Old Testament Scripture, with which the early believers had been already familiar in the synagogue, should have still found favor in the Church. Even in free prayer fragments and sentences of old devotional forms, almost spontaneous through earlier use and sacred association, would naturally find utterance. This, however, would be the exception. Christian prayer, for its own full and peculiar utterance, must find its own peculiar modes of expression; and it would baptize into a new life and meaning any of those familiar expressions, the fragments of an earlier devotion. That men, however, who had been accustomed to liturgical worship under the old system should gradually go into it under the new, is not at all surprising; and to this special improvements before very long were presented. The demand for some form of profession of faith, of a definition of the faith, as dissensions and heresies arose, would be one of these occasions. The form of the Lord’s Supper, even by the Master, in its present usage, would become the nucleus of others. The fact, again, that the most solemn act of Christian communion, the Lord’s Supper, involved in the distribution of the elements a form of action, and that this action, in its original intenet, accompanied by a distinct formula, would have a like influence. That every thing in this respect, if not purely extemporaneous, was exceedingly simple in the time of Justin Martyr, is very manifest from his own writings. The same remark is applicable to the statement of Pliny (Ep. ad Trajan. in Ep. x. 97).

2. Primitive Type.—The earliest form in which liturgical arrangement, to any extent, is found, is that which presents itself in the Apostolic Constitutions. The following is the order of daily service, as given in these Constitutions: After the morning psalm (the sixty-third of our enumeration), prayers were offered for the several classes of catechumens, of persons possessed by evil spirits, and candidates for baptism, for penitents, and for the faithful or communicants, for the peace of the world, and for the whole state of Christ’s Church. This was followed by a short bidding prayer for preservation in the ensuing day, and by the benediction, and the whole closed with a benediction, and by his imposition of hands or benediction. The morning service was much frequented by people of all sorts. The evening service was much the same with that of the morning, except that Psalm cxii (Psalm xi. in the Liturgy of the Church) was added, and that a special collection seems to have been used sometimes at the setting up of the lights. See Service. This work, a fabrication by an unknown author, and taking its present form about the close of the third century, contains internal evidence (see Schaff, Church History, iv. 441) that much of its material belongs to an earlier date. It may be regarded as affording a type of the liturgical worship in use during the latter part of the ante-Nicene period. Bunsen (Christianity and Mankind, vol. ii) has attributed its composition, or large fragments of this and other liturgies, the probable form of which is prevailing. Krabbé, in his prize essay on this subject, regards the eighth book as of later date than the others. Kurtz, agreeing with Bunsen, substantially finds in this work the earliest extant form of liturgical arrangement, and the type of that of a later period. While, therefore, apocryphal as to its name and claims, yet in the character of its material, in its peculiarity of structure, in the estimation which it enjoyed, and in its influence upon later forms of devotion, it is of great historical significance. Taking it as it comes to our day, the eighth book contains an order of prayer, praise, reading, and sermon, followed by the dismissal successively of the catechumens, the penitents, and the possessed. After this comes the order of the Lord’s Supper for the faithful, beginning with intercessory prayer, this followed by collection of the penitents, and, last, the Amen alled to in 1 Cor. xiv. 16; this latter an undoubted importation from the synagogue. As, moreover, we find the Master, with the twelve, singing a hymn, one of the psalms probably, on the night of the last supper, it is not at all improbable that such psalmody of the Old Testament Scripture, with which the early believers had been already familiar in the synagogue, should have still found favor in the Church. Even in free prayer fragments and sentences of old devotional forms, almost spontaneous through earlier use and sacred association, would naturally find utterance. This, however, would be the exception. Christian prayer, for its own full and peculiar utterance, must find its own peculiar modes of expression; and it would baptize into a new life and meaning any of those familiar expressions, the fragments of an earlier devotion. That men, however, who had been accustomed to liturgical worship under the old system should gradually go into it under the new, is not at all surprising; and to this special improvements before very long were presented. The demand for some form of profession of faith, of a definition of the faith, as dissensions and heresies arose, would be one of these occasions. The form of the Lord’s Supper, even by the Master, in its present usage, would become the nucleus of others. The fact, again, that the most solemn act of Christian communion, the Lord’s Supper, involved in the distribution of the elements a form of action, and that this action, in its original intenet, accompanied by a distinct formula, would have a like influence. That every thing in this respect, if not purely extemporaneous, was exceedingly simple in the time of Justin Martyr, is very manifest from his own writings. The same remark is applicable to the statement of Pliny (Ep. ad Trajan. in Ep. x. 97).

3. Classical Type.—This bridge of liturgical forms which found acceptance and usage in particular communities. One remark in connection with these needs to be made. Whatever may have been the liturgical influences of the synagogue in shaping the worship of the early Church, they had, by this time, been superseded by another of a much more objectionable character, that of the Temple. In other words, the sacrificial idea of the Christian ministry, and the sacrificial idea of the Lord’s Supper, were making themselves felt, not only in the substance, but in the ministrature of form which the liturgies were assuming. Of these liturgies there is to be made the general division of Eastern and Western.

Liturgies of the Eastern Churches.—Chronologically those of the Oriental Church first demand examination. 1. The earliest, perhaps, is that of Jerusalem or Antioch, and this is the liturgy of St. James, written down in 670. The latter of the canon of the Church of St. James, the author of this form, it is to be observed, is still in use, and in both are portions of the material to be found in that of the Apostolic Constitutions. 2. The second of these liturgies is that of the Alexan
drian Church, called the Coptic Liturgy. It is clearly that of St. James, betraying its later origin. In this, as in the other two, there are materials previously existing; but the probabilities indicate Cyril of
LITURGY

Alexandria as the author of it in its present shape. The effort has been made to separate in it the apostolic from the later elements, as is also attempted by Neale with that of St. James. As the object of this effort seems to be to prove the sacerdotal character of apostolic Christianity, so all sacerdotal elements become proof of apostolic authorship. The conclusion is as false as the premise. The special historical interest of this liturgy of St. Mark is its relation to those of the Coptic and Ethiopic churches, of which it forms the main constituent. That of Coptic origin, as to its claim to inspired authorship, is well worthy of attention. "In my opinion," says he, "this appellation of St. Mark's liturgy began about the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century, after Basil had composed his liturgy, which was the first that bore the name of any man. Other churches then gave their liturgies the names of their founders, and so the Alexandrians and Egyptians gave theirs the name of Mark, while they of Jerusalem and Antioch called theirs St. James's, and early in the fifth century it appears that Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, perfected and improved the liturgy of St. Mark, from whence this improved and definitive form of it is called by the Byzantine, St. Cyril's, and by the orthodox St. Mark's." The peculiarity of this last, in Neale's estimation, is the difference from other liturgies in the position of the great intercession for quick and dead. That such intercession found place in the liturgy of the Orthodox Church, in the form of a sacerdotal origin, is not surprising in a church (3.) The third and last of these liturgies is that of Cæsarea or Byzantium, composed probably by Basil of Cæsarea, and held to have been recast and enlarged by Chrysostom; but more properly, perhaps, both those are to be regarded as elaborations of that of St. James. They, moreover, have historical and moral significance in the fact that, through the Byzantine Church, they have been received into that of Russia, and are used in its patriarchates, each for special occasions, at the present time. Such additions, of course, have been made as have been rendered necessary, through peculiarities of Greek worship, and accumulation of liturgical minutiae coming into use since these liturgies in their original forms were introduced. They now contain expressions not to be found in the writings of Chrysostom: e. g. the appellation of Mother of God, given to the Virgin Mary, which was not heard of until after the third General Council at Ephesus [A. D. 431]—the body which condemned the doctrines of Nestorius—held 24 years after the death of Chrysostom.

From these Oriental liturgies have sprung others, variously modified to meet doctrinal or other exigencies. The largest number is from that of Jerusalem. During the 5th century, from that of Basil. The most important is that of the Armenians, Monophysite, those of the Nestorians, and that of Malabar. For discussion as to the special origin of these subordinate forms, and the principles of classification, see Palmer's Original Liturgies, vol. 1; Neale's Primitive Liturgies; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, bk. iv, ch. i, sec. 6.

(6.) Liturgies of the Western Church. In the West liturgical development went on with less rapidity. (1.) That of the Roman Church, under the influence of the number of feeling zeal to come to above in the 4th century, as to Tiberius, and the alienation from Palmer, after it came into use, received the name of Peter, and was traced to his authorship. In point of fact, it probably first assumed definite shape under Leo the Great during the first half of the fifth century, was added to by Gelasius during the latter half of the same century, elaborated again by Gregory the Great not very long after, and through his influence secured its reputation and position. "His Ordo et Canon Missae, making allowance for the unavoidable changes taking place in it during the centuries intervening, was settled under Pope Vitalian, and in the 5th century. It was revised under Clement VII and Urban VIII, and forms at the present time the liturgical text of 'Roman worship'" (Palmer, in Herzog). The Liturgy of Milan seems to have been very much the same as that of Rome prior to the alterations of the latter under Gregory. These differences, at the greatest, were not of an essential character. The question of the independence of the Milanese and the supremacy of the Romans was probably the great issue upon which these differences turned. As nothing less than apostolic could enable the liturgy of Milan to sustain itself in such a conflict, its origin was traced to Barnabas; and miracles, it was believed, had been wrought for its preservation against the efforts of Gregory and Hadrian to bring it to the see of Rome. Nothing can decide in what form of this conflict was doubtless when Charlemagne abolished the Ambrosian Chant throughout the West by the establishment of singing-schools under Roman instructors to teach the Gregorian. The attachment of the people and clergy of Milan, however, to their liturgy could not be overcome, and it is still in their possession. Alexander VI established it expressly as the Ritus Ambrosianus.

Of even greater interest than the Roman liturgy are the Gallican and the Mozarabic.

(2.) The former is Gallican, claims, and it would seem justly, an antiquity greater than that of Rome. The connection of Gallican Christianity with that of Asia, whether through the person of Ireneus or by earlier missionaries, would lead to a liturgical development of an independent character. It was displaced by the liturgy of the Western church for a long time was almost lost sight of and forgotten. It does not seem to have been used or appealed to in the various conflicts of prerogative between the French monarchs and the pope, and no allusion to its existence is made in the Pragmatic Sanction. Public attention was again called to it during the controversy of the 16th century. Interest both of a literary and doctrinal character has been exhibited in connection with this liturgy. But there seems to be but little probability of its restoration to use. While unlike in certain specific features from the Roman Liturgy, it is otherwise in essentials. Like the others preceding, it has been traced to the hand of an apostle—to the Church at Lyons, through that of Ephesus, from the apostle John! The apex upon which this inverted historical pyramid rests is the single fact, which has been questioned, that Christianity was introduced into Gaul by missionaries from the Church at Ephesus.

(3.) The Mozarabic, that of the Spanish churches under Arabic dominion, has so many resemblances to the Gallican liturgy that it would seem probable they proceeded from the same source. It is described by Isaac von Romanesque, the 12th century, as the liturgy of the Moors, and in the time of the cardinal Ximenes, it received an addition of several rites. As Spanish territory was reconquered from the Moors, and came more fully under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the papacy in other respects, the effort was made, and eventually succeeded, although at times warmly resisted by the people, to displace the Mozarabic, and introduce the Roman liturgy. In the beginning of the 16th century cardinal Ximenes endowed a college and chapel at Toledo for the celebration of the ancient rites, and this is now, perhaps, the only place where this Mozarabic liturgy of that country and of Gaul is in some degree observed. The old British liturgy, which was displaced by the Gregorian after the decision of Osnabrig in 664, seems, like the Mozarabic, to have been essentially the same with the Gallican, and to have displaced it.

(4.) One other liturgical composition of some interest, dating from the close of the 4th century, is that of the Cathari, published by E. Kunitz (Jena, 1852). It is of interest as giving a more favorable view of the community for which it was composed than had been previously entertained. It is the liturgy with all these liturgies of the West, as already remarked of those of the East, that they are the names of many subordinate offices in use and prevalence in different portions of the Church. The discretionary
power of the bishops, both at this and at earlier periods, to modify and adapt prevalent liturgies to peculiar exigencies of time and place, naturally produced after a time this kind of diversity. The ecclesiastical confusion of

medieval times, and clerical ignorance and carelessness, would of course increase it. The traces, however, of the parent stock in any such case would not be difficult of recognition.

**TABLE SHOWING THE DESCENT OF THE PRINCIPAL LITURGIES NOW USED IN THE CHURCH.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liturgy of St. James, Antioch, or Jerusalem.</th>
<th>Liturgy of St. Mark, or Alexandria.</th>
<th>Liturgy of St. Peter, or Rome.</th>
<th>Liturgy of St. John, St. Paul, or Ephesus.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Liberal Liturgy of Scottish Church.</td>
<td>Present Liberal Liturgy of American Church.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Structure of Liturgies.**—The variations of detail which are found in the parent liturgies of the Christian world are all ingrained on a structural arrangement, which they possess in common, much as four buildings might differ in the style and form of their decorations, and yet agree in their plans and elevation, in the position of their several chambers, and in the number of their principal columns.

i. There is invariably a division of the liturgy into three portions—the office of the Prothesis, the Pro-Anaphora, and the Anaphora, the latter being the "Canon" of the Western Church, and the office of the Prothesis being a preparatory part of the service corresponding to the "Preparation" of the Western Liturgy, and not used at the altar itself. In the Pro-Anaphora the central features are two, viz.: (1) the reading of holy Scripture, and (2) the recitation of the Creed. In the Anaphora they are four, viz.: (1) the Triumphant Hymn or Threnosion; (2) the formula of Consecration; (3) the Lord's Prayer; and (4) the Communion. These four great acts of praise, benediction, intercession, and communion gather around our Lord's words of institution and his pattern prayer, which form, in reality, the integral germ of the Christian liturgies. They are also associated with other prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings, by which each is expanded and developed, the whole blending into a comprehensive service, by means of which the worship of the Church ascends on the wings of the eucharistic service, and her strength descends in eucharistic grace.

ii. In the second place, a substantial agreement among all the four great parent liturgies as to the formula of consecration (see Consecration; and comp. Blunt, *Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theol.* p. 425–426). Another point in which the four parent liturgies of the Church uniformly agree is in the well-defined sacerdotal character of their language. This is sufficiently illustrated by the preceding comparative view.

iii. There is also, in the second place, a substantial agreement among all the four great parent liturgies as to the formula of consecration (see Consecration; and comp. Blunt, *Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theol.* p. 425–426).

iv. The intercessory character of the primitive liturgies is also a very conspicuous feature common to them all. The holy Eucharist is uniformly set forth and used in them as a service offered up to God for the benefit of all classes of Christians, living and departed. Then," says St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "after the spiritual sacrifice is perfected, the bloodless service upon that altar of propitiation, we entreat God for the common peace of.
the Church; for the tranquillity of the world; for kings; for soldiers and allies; for the sick; for the afflicted, and, in a word, for all who stand in need of succor we all supplicate and offer this sacrifice. Then we commemorate also those who have fallen asleep before us, first, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that at their places a sweet and holy sacrifice is offered in the Church of God. Afterward also on behalf of the holy fathers and bishops who have fallen asleep before us, and, in a word, of all who in past years have fallen asleep among us, believing that it will be a very great advantage to the souls for whom the supplication is put up while that holy and most sweet sacrifice is offered, the sentence is pronounced: A simi-
lar intercession is to be found in the other liturgies, and it is evident that its use was one of the first principles of the Church of that day.

III. Modern Greek and Eastern Liturgies.—Three litur-
gies are in use in the modern Greek or Constantinopolitan Church, namely, that of the Giraud, that of the Bench, and that of the liturgy of the Presanctified. The liturgy bearing the name of Basil is used by the Constantinopolitan Church ten times in the year, viz., on the eve of Christmas Day; on the festival of St. Basil; on the eve of the Feast of Lights, also known as Epiphany (Greek, Lent, 1564); also on Easter Sunday, except the Sunday before Easter, on the festival of the Virgin Mary; and on Good Friday, and the following day, which is sometimes termed the great Sabbath. The liturgy ascribed to Chrysostom is read on all those days in the year on which the liturgies of Basil and of the Presanctified are not used. The liturgy of the Presanctified is an office for the celebration of the Lord's Supper on Wednesdays and Fridays during Lent, with the elements which had been consecrated on the preceding Sunday. The date of this liturgy is not known, some authors ascribing it to Gregory Thaumaturgus in the third century, while others ascribe it to Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, in the eighth century. These liturgies are used in all those Greek churches which are subject to the patriarchate of Constantinople, and in those countries which were originally converted by Greeks, as in Russia, Georgia, Mingrelia, and by the Melchite patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem (King's Rules of the Greek Church, p. 131-134; Richard et Giraud's Bibliothèque Sacrée, xvi, 222-224). The Coptic Jacobites, or Christians in Egypt, make use of the Liturgy of Alexandria, which formerly was called indifferent, or Symeon the Forerunner's, now the liturgy of the fraternity of the Christian Church at Alexandria, or the liturgy of St. Cyril, which caused it to be committed to writing. The Egyptians had twelve liturgies, which are still preserved among the Abyssinians; but the patri-
archs commanded that the Egyptian churches should use only three, viz., those of Basil, of Gregory the The-
ologian, and of Cyril. The earliest liturgies of the Church of Alexandria were written in Greek, which was the vernacular language, until the fourth and fifth centuries: since that time they have been translated into the Coptic and Arabic languages. The Abyssinians or Ethiopians receive the twelve liturgies which were for-
merly in use among the Coptic Jacobites; they are com-
monly found in the following order, viz.: 1. The liturgy of St. John the Evangelist. 2. That of the three hundred and eighteen fathers present at the Council of Nice. 3. That of Epiphanius. 4. That of St. James of Serug or Syrug. 5. That of St. John Chrysostom. 6. That of Jesus Christ. 7. That of the Apostles. 8. That of St. Cyril. 9. That of St. Gregory. 10. That of their patri-
arch Dionysius. 11. That of St. Basil. 12. That of St. Cyril. The Armenians who were converted to Christianity by Gregory, summoned the Illuminators, have only one liturgy, which is supposed to be that of the Church of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, in which city Gregory re-
cieved his instruction. This liturgy is used on every occasion, even at funerals. The Syrian Catholics and Jacobites have numerous liturgies, bearing the names of St. James, St. Peter, St. John the Evangelist, St. Mark, St. Dionysius, bishop of Athens, St. Xystus, bishop of Rome, of the Twelve Apostles, of St. Ignatius, of St. Ju-
lius, bishop of Rome, of St. Eustathius, bishop of St. Maruthas, etc. Of these, the liturgy of St. James is most highly esteemed, and is the standard to which are referred all the others, which are chiefly used on the festivals of the saints whose names they bear. The Maronites, who inhabit Mount Lebanon, make use of a missal printed at Rome in 1564, in the Arabic language; it contains thirteen liturgies under the names of St. Xystus, St. John Chrysostom, St. John the Evange-
list, St. Peter, St. Dionysius, St. Cyril, St. Matthew, St. John the Patriarch, St. Eustathius, St. Maruthas, St. James, and the second liturgy of St. Peter. The Nestorians have three litur-
gies—that of the Twelve Apostles, that of Theodorus, sur-
ammed the Interpreter, and a third under the name of Nestorius. The Indian Christians of St. Thomas are said to make use of the Nestorian liturgies (Richard et Giraud, Rules of the Greek Church, p. 156). A simi-
lar liturgy was used also among the Armenians, and the Chrysostomite liturgy of the second century at Rome.

IV. Liturgies of the Church of Rome.—There are various liturgical books in use in the modern Church of Rome, the greater part of which are common and gen-
eral to all the members in communion with that Church, while others are permitted to be used in particular places or by particular monastic orders.

1. The Breivaria (Latin breviarium) is the book con-
taining the daily service of the Church of Rome. It is frequently, but erroneously, confounded with Missal and Breviary. The Breviary contains the matins, lauds, etc., with the several variations to be made therein, according to the several days, canonical hours, and the like. It is general, and may be used in every place; but on the model of this have been formed various others, special-
ly appropriated to different religious orders, such as those of the Benedictines, Carthusians, Dominicans, Franciscans, Jesuits, and other monastic orders. The difference between these books and that which is by way of eminence designated the Roman Breviary, consis-
ts chiefly in the number and order of the psalms, hymns, ave-marias, pater-nosters, misereors, etc., etc. Originally the Breviary contained only the Lord's Prayer and the Psalms which were used in the divine offices. To these were subsequently added lessons out of the Scriptures, according to the institutes of the monks, in order to diversify the service of the Church. In the progress of time the legendary lives of the saints, replete with many superstitious facts, were inserted into the service, in accordance with the opinions and superstition of the ages. This gave occasion to many revisions and reformations of the Roman Breviary by the councils, particularly of Trent and Cologne, and also by several popes, as Gregory IX, Nicholas III, Pius V, Clement VIII, and Urban VIII; as likewise by some cardinals, especially cardinal Quignon, by whom various extravagances were removed, and the work was brought nearer to the simplicity of the primitive offices. In its present state the Breviary of the Church of Rome consists of the services of matins, lauds, prime, tierce, sext, none, vesper, compline, and the post-communion, that is of seven hours, on account of the saying of David, Septies in die laudem dixi.—"Sev-
en times a day do I praise thee" (Psalm cxix, 164). The obligation of reading this service-book every day, which at first was universal, was by the Benedictines confined to the beneficiary clergy alone, who are bound to do it on pain of being guilty of mortal sin, and of refunding their rev-
ences in proportion to their delinquencies in discharging this duty. The Roman Breviary is recited in the Latin language throughout the Roman Church, except among the Maronites in Syria, the Armenians, and some other Oriental Christians in communion with that Church, who rehearse it in their vernacular dialects.

2. The Missal, or volume employed in celebrating
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mass. According to a tradition generally believed by members of the Romish Church, this liturgy owes its origin to St. Peter. The canon of the mass was committed to writing about the middle of the fifth century. Various additions were subsequently made, especially by Gregory the Great, who reduced the whole into better order. This Missal is in general use throughout the Romish Church. See Mass.

3. The Ceremoniala contains the various offices peculiar to the pope. It is divided into three books, the first of which contains the administration of the holy sacraments and the consecration and coronation of the pope, the canonization of saints, the creation of cardinals, the form and manner of holding a council, and the funeral ceremonies on the death of a pope or of a cardinal, besides various public ceremonies to be performed by the pope as a sovereign prince. The second book prescribes what divine offices are to be celebrated by the pope, and on what days; and the third discusses the reverence which is to be shown to popes, cardinals, bishops, and other persons performing sacred duties; the vestments and ornaments of the popes and cardinals when celebrating divine service; the order in which they are severally to be seated in the papal chapel; incensing the altar, etc. The compiler of this liturgical work is not known.

4. The Pontifical describes the various functions which are peculiar to bishops in the Romish Church, and especially the consecration of ecclesiastical dignities; the pronouncement of benedictions on abbots, abbesses, and nuns; the coronation of sovereigns; the form and manner of consecrating churches, burial-grounds, and the various vessels used in divine service; the public expulsion of penitents from the Church, and reconciling them; the mode of holding a synod; suspending, reconciling, dispensing, deposing, and degrading priests, and of restoring them again to orders; the manner of excommunicating and absolving, etc., etc.

5. The Ritual treats of all those functions which are to be performed by the priest of the lower classes, both in the public service of the Church, and also in the exercise of their private pastoral duties. The Pastoral corresponds with the Ritual, and seems to be only another name for the same book.

V. Contemplative Reformed or Protestant Liturgies.—At the time of the Reformation there were, of necessity, great changes in the matter of public worship. The liturgies in use at its commencement included the prevalent doctrinal system, especially as connected with the Lord's Supper; and very soon changes were made having in view the restoration of Roman church forms; and the adaptation of reformed worship to the restored system of scriptural doctrine. The old forms, moreover, had there been no objection to them doctrinally, were liable to the practical objection that they were locked up from popular use in a dead language. The Reformation, to a very great degree, had opened the ears of the people to the intelligent hearing and reception of Christian doctrine. Its task was to open their mouths to the intelligent utterance of supplication—in other words, to provide forms of worship in the vernacular. This was done very largely by selection and translation from old forms, and, as was necessary, by the preparation of new material. With the English and Lutheran Reformers, the object seems to have been to make as few changes in existing forms as possible. Doubtful expressions, which admitted of a Protestant interpretation, but which, for their own merits, would never have been selected, were thus retained. It is to be said for the Reformers that they seem to have acted in view of the existing circumstances of the communities by which they were surrounded, and from one of them, the most eminent of all, John Calvin, who, in a sense, disproved all wish and expectation that his work, in this respect, should be imposed upon other churches or continued in his own any longer than it was found for edification.

a. Lutheran Liturgies.—As first among the Reformers we notice these liturgical works of Luther. Different offices were prepared by him, as needed by the churches under his influence, the earliest in 1529, the latest in 1534. These were afterwards collected in a volume, and became a model for others. In his "Order of Service" provision is made for daily worship in a variety of services for morning and evening, and a third might be held if desirable. These services consist of reading the Scriptures, preaching or expounding, with psalms and responsoria, with the addition, for Sundays, of mass or communion. He dwells earnestly, however, upon the idea, also mentioned above, that they are not to be considered binding otherwise than in the appropriate times and localities. These views and this action of Luther were responded to by similar action on the part of the churches which through him had received the doctrines of the Reformation. These drew up liturgies for themselves, some of them bearing a close resemblance to that of Wittenberg, others differing from it widely; the differences, in one direction, being conditioned by the Zwinglian or Calvinistic element, in the opposite by the Romish. These, in particular localities, have been changed at different times as circumstances seemed to require. No one Lutheran form has ever been accepted as obligatory upon all Lutheran churches, as is the case with the liturgy of the Church of England in all its dependencies; although it is claimed that there is essential unity—an essential unity of life and spirit, a general principle of order and form of particular states and churches. The tendency of the Rationalism of the last century was to neglect, to depreciate, and to mutilate the old liturgies, and then to procure changes which would substitute others in their stead. From this, and in connection with another movement, has followed a helpful reaction. This reaction may be seen in its effects upon the two great classes into which Lutheran Germany is now divided. It has controlled to a very great extent the efforts of the Unionists, who have given form to the Union liturgy, and this, while it is less rigid and formal than the older, tends to a more careful study and diligent use of the older liturgies. The object of this new liturgy, that of the king of Prussia, first published in 1822, revised once or twice since then, is to unite the worship of the members of the Lutheran and Reformed churches in the Prussian dominions. This excitement connected with this movement, in the way of attack and defense, has given a deeper and wider interest to all liturgical questions—an interest deeply felt by the Lutheran churches of this country. Here, where the use of such forms is optional, over a greater number of people than is the case to such use is on the increase. See LUTHERANISM.

In Sweden, which, although Lutheran, retains the episcopate, and may seem to demand a more special notice, there was published in 1811 a new, revised edition of the Liturgy, prepared at the time of the Reformation. This is divided into chapters, and contains the usual parts of a Church service, with forms for baptism, marriage, etc. In Denmark there is also a regularly constituted liturgy, of Bugenhagen's, which, besides morning and evening service for Sundays, contains three services for Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost.

b. Moravian Liturgy.—The liturgy of the Moravians, as recipients, through their great leader, of the Augsburg Confession, is not without its interest in this connection. It was first published in 1832. That which has been adopted by the renewal of the Church is mainly the work of Count Zinzendorf, who compiled it chiefly from the services of the Greek and Latin churches, but who also availed himself of the valuable labors of Luther and of the English Reformers. The United Brethren, in matter of a Church liturgy, has introduced into the morning service of every Sunday a Litany for the morning of Easter-day, containing a short but comprehensive confession of faith; two offices for the baptism of adults, and two for the baptism of children; two litanies at burials; and offices for confirmation.
tion, the holy communion, and for ordination; the Te Deum, and doxologies adapted to various occasions. All these liturgical forms in use in England are comprised in the new and revised edition of the Liturgy and Hymns for the Use of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren (London, 1849). Other services peculiar to this Church, which is in a sense a church of Manualists, may be observed, with musical responsoria as a litany. This litany is for Sundays. There is a short prayer of betrothal, a baptismal service, also a form on Easter, used in the church-yards, of expressing their confidence in regard to the brethren departed of the year preceding. The daily service, which is in a sense a service for the whole congregation, is a simple prayer-meeting. In this, as in the Sunday service, the prayers and exhortations are extemporaneous.

c. Calvinistic Liturgies.—The liturgy of Calvin, which, like that of Luther, constitutes the type of a class, differs from this latter in two important respects: the absence of responsive portions, and the discretion conferred upon the officiant in the performance of public worship. This discretion seems to have been limited, however, to the use of one form of prayer rather than another, given in the Directory. These prayers were begun by a general confession, followed by a psalm, a prayer again, a sermon, a prayer, and benediction. Two additional prayers were provided for occasions of communion, one coming before, the other after communion. That of communion was in use in time of war, calamity, etc. For the administration of the Lord's Supper there is an exhortation as to its intent—'fencing the tables,' as it is called in Scotland. This is followed by the distribution of the elements, with psalms and passages of Scripture appropriate to the occasion. The offices of baptism and marriage are simple, but not discretionary as to their form. In accordance with what seems to be the peculiar Genevan characteristic, they are not wanting in length. The present liturgy of Geneva is a development of that of Calvin, with certain modifications. It has no responses. Several additional prayers have been added. A distinct service for each day in the week is provided, also for the principal festivals, and for certain special occasions. So also as to the churches in sympathy with the system of Calvin. They have liturgies similar to that of Geneva, although not identical. Such is the case with the churches of Holland and Neuchatel, and the Reformed churches of France. A new edition of the old French Liturgy of 1562 was published in 1828, with additional forms for special occasions. The liturgy of the displaced church is in some parts of Scotland. It was drawn up at Frankfort by Knox and others, after the model of Calvin's, and was first used by Knox in a congregation of English exiles at Geneva. It was afterwards introduced by him into Scotland; its use enjoined in 1564, and such usage was continued until after his death. An edition of this liturgy was published in 1841 by Dr. Cumming. It differs from that of Calvin in that it more clearly leaves to the minister officiating to decide whether he shall use any form of prayer given or one of his own compositions extemporaneously or otherwise. It is in the style of Calvin's, and with the same form. This is followed by a psalm, by prayer, the sermon, prayer, psalm, and benediction. The book contains various offices and alternate forms; among other things, an order of excommunion, and a treatise on fasting, with a form of prayer for private houses, and grace before and after meals. The new book of Scotland of 1844 may be regarded as a modification of those of Knox and Calvin. In the Directory of the Westminster Assembly the discretionary power is greatly enlarged. Scriptural lessons are to be read in regular course, at the discretion of the minister, with liberty, if so desired, of expounding. Heads of prayer in that before the sermon are prescribed, and rules for the arrangement of the sermon. The Lord's Prayer is recommended as the most perfect form of devotion. Private and lay baptism are forbidden. The arrangement of the Lord's table is to be such that communicants may sit about it, and the dead are to be buried without prayer or religious ceremony.

d. Intermediate between these two great families of liturgies, the Lutheran and Calvinistic, are those of the other Reformed churches on the Continent, of which it may be said, in general, that the German-speaking portion of these churches approach and partake of the Lutheran spirit and forms, and the Swiss of the Calvinistic, though there are individual exceptions. In 1523, the same year with Luther's work already mentioned, Zwingle and Leo Judah published in Zurich certain services, a Supper, marriage, common prayer, and burial. This was followed by a more complete work in 1525, and subsequently by others. Similar works were published at Berne, Schaffhausen, and Basle at a later period. The peculiarity of these, according to Ebral, quoted in Herzog, is the liturgical character in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, in which they compare favorably with the Calvinistic liturgies; also the custom of announcing the dead, and the special prayers for the festivals. The liturgical issues which during this century had arisen from the Lutherans, had been by the Reformed rejected or modified according to those of the Reformed, not, however, to the same extent, nor with results of such decided character.

VI. Liturgies in the English Language.—Previous to the introduction of the Reformations on English ground, there were some in the public worship which were in Latin, that is, that of other Western churches, performed in the Latin language. But, though the language was universally Latin, the liturgy itself varied greatly in the different parts of the kingdom. The dioceses of Bangor, Hereford, Lincoln, Sarum, York, and other churches, used liturgies which were commonly designated by the "Uses," and of these the most celebrated were the Breviary and Missal, etc., secondum usum Sarum, compiled by Osmund, bishop of Salisbury, about the year 1080, and reputed to be executed with such exactness according to the rules of the Romish Church that they were also employed in divine service in many churches on the Continent. They consisted of prayers and offices, some of which had been transmitted from very ancient times, and others were of later origin, accommodated to the Romish religion. Compare Maskell, The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, according to the Uses of Sarum, Bangor, York, Hereford, and the Modern Roman Liturgy (London, 1844, 8vo). Also by the same, Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae: or, Occasional Offices of the Church of England, according to the Ancient Use of Sarum: the Psalter in English, and other Prayers and Forms (London, 1846, 3 vols. 8vo).

The first attempt in England to introduce the vernacular was made in 1586, when, in pursuance of Henry VIII's injunctions, the Bible, Psalter,Creed, and Decalogue were set forth and placed in churches, to be read in English. In 1545 the King's Primer was published, containing a form of morning and evening prayer in English, besides the Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Ten Commandments, the Seven Penitential Psalms, Litany, and other devotions, and in 1547 the Edward VI, according to Cranmer, bishop Ridley, and eleven other eminent divines, martyrs, and confessors, were commissioned to draw up a liturgy in the English language "free from those unfounded doctrines and superstitious ceremonies which had disgraced the Latin liturgies." This was ratified by new acts of Edward VI, in 1548, and published in 1549. This liturgy is commonly known and cited as the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. In the great body of their work Cranmer and his associates derived their materials from the earlier services which had been in use in England; but in the regular offices they were indebted to the liturgies of Melancthon and Bucer, and through them to the older liturgy of Nuremberg, which those reformers were instructed to follow (Dr. Cardew's Two Books of Common Prayer, set
Liturgy

Forth... in the reign of King Edward the Sixth, compared, p. xiv, Oxford, 1880). In consequence, however, of exceptions being taken at some things in this book, which were thought to be too much of superstition, it was altered and further altered in 1551, when it was again confirmed by Parliament. This edition is usually cited as the Second Prayer-book of Edward VI.: it is very nearly the same with that which is at present in use. The two Liturgies, A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552, with other Documents, set forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward VI., were very carefully edited for the Parker Society by the Rev. Joseph Ketley, M.A., at the Cambridge University Press, in 1944, in octavo. The two acts of Parliament (2 and 3 Edward VI., c. 1, and 5 and 6 Edward VI., c. 1) which laid down the basis of all subsequent Anglican worship were in the first year of Queen Mary, who restored the Latin liturgies according to the popish forms of worship. On the accession of Elizabeth, however, the Prayer-book was restored, and has been in use ever since. For the subject, including liturgical books in England, Scotland, and America, see Common Prayer.

Among the curiosities of the subject we notice the following:

(a.) Liturgy of the Primitive Episcopal Church.—The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the Primitive Episcopal Church, revived in England in the Year of our Redemption One thousand eight hundred and thirty-four, together with the Offices for the Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, authorised by the Government of the United States of America, was printed at Livorno, but was never published. It was edited by the Rev. George Montgomery West, M.A., a presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state and diocese of Ohio, in North America. This volume is of great rarity, not more than five or six copies being found in the libraries of the curios in ecclesiastical matters. The liturgy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America is the basis of this edition, excepting two or three alterations in the office for the ministration of baptism, and a few verbal alterations to fit it for use in England and in America. The Primitive Episcopal Church, revived in England in 1881, had a short existence of little more than twelve months.

(b.) Deutecial Liturgy.—In 1792 a liturgy was published in Liverpool by some of the Presbyterians, as A Liturgy framed and published in the Church of Christ whose name is hardly mentioned in it, and the third part of the Godhead is not at all recognised in it. It is known also by the name of "Liverpool Liturgy." In 1776 it was published: "A Liturgy on the universal Principles of Religion and Morality." It was compiled by David Williams, with the chimerical design of uniting all parties and persuading in one comprehensive form. This liturgy is composed in imitation of the Book of Common Prayer, with responses celebrating the divine perfections and works, with thanksgivings, confessions, and supplications. The principal part of three of the hymns from morning and evening service is selected from the works of Milton and Thomson, though considerable use is made of the language of the Scriptures (see Orton, Letters, i. 60 sq.; Bogue and Bennett, Hist. of the Dissenters, iii. 94). VII. Literature.—Of bibliographical treatises on the literature of liturgy we may name Zaccaria, Bibliotheca Rituali (Rome, 1776-8, 4 vols. 4to); Guérard, Institutio Liturgicae (Paris, 1840-51); Kercher, Bibliotheca Liturgica, etc., p. 693-666; Liturgiae and other Documents of the Roman Catholic Church (Ante-Nicene Library, Edinb., 1872, 4to), Special works of note on the subject of the liturgy are: G. Goer, Exegesia, sive Ritualis Graecorum, etc. Gr. and Lat. (Par. 1647; Venice, 1740); Jos. Aloysi, Assenmei (R.C.), Codex Liturgiae eclesiastica universalis, etc., quo continentur libri rituales, missales, pontificales, officia, deuthica, etc., ecclesiastae Occidentis et Orientalis (published under the auspices of pope Boniface XIV, Rome, 1749-66, 13 vols.); Eus. Renaudot (R.C.), Liturgi- trium Orientalium collectio (Paris, 1716; reprinted in 1847, 2 vols.); L. A. M. Morison (R.C.), Liturgia Romana, etc., sive rebus (Venetiis, 1746, 2 vols., contains three documents of Leo, Gelasius, and Gregory I, also the Missale Gothicum, and a learned introductory dissertation—De rebus liturgiis: W. Palmer (Anglican), Ordines Liturgice (London, 1862 and 1845, 2 vols. 8vo), with special reference to liturgical history; G. B. Best, Collection of the Principal Liturgies used in the Christian Church in the celebration of the Eucharist, particularly the ancient (translated into English), with a Dissertation upon them (London, 1838); W. Trollope (Anglican), The Greek Liturgy of St. James (Edinb., 1848); Daniel (Lutheran), Ein liturgischer Versuch, 2 vols., Latin edition; G. Duchesne, Liturgiae ecclesiasticae in episcopum redactae (Lyis, 1847, 4 vols.; vol. I contains the Roman, vol. IV the Oriental liturgies); Fr. J. Mone (R.C.), Latinische u. Grie- sische Messen aus dem 5. bis 9. Jahrhunder (Frankl. a. M. 1850), contains valuable treatises on the Gallican, African, and Roman Missæ; J. M. Neale (Anglican, the most learned English ritualist and liturgist), Tetralogia liturgica; St. Chrysostom, St. Jacobææ. St. Marcæ divina missæ: quibus accedit ordo Molossaricus (London, 1849); the same, The Liturgiae of St. Mark, St. James, St. Clem., St. John, etc., St. Beatus, etc., according to the Churches of Alexandria, Jerusalem, Constantinople (London, 1859, folio, in the Greek original; and the same liturgies in an English translation, with an introduction and appendices, also at London, 1859); the same, Hist. of the Holy Eastern Church (London, 1860-72, 6 vols. 8vo; Gen. Introduct. vol. I); the same, Essays on Liturgy and Church History (London, 1863) (this work, dedicated to the metropolitan Philaret of Moscow, is a collection of various learned treatises of the author from Christian Ecclesiastor, on the Roman and Gallican Breviary, the Church Collecta, the Monstrance and Ambrosian liturgies, and a number of liturgical quotations, etc.); Bitter, Denkwiirdigkeiten d. Christ-Kathed. Kirch., Freeman, Principles of Divine Service (Oxf. 1855, 8vo, enlarged in 1868); Mabillon, De Liturgiae Gallicanae, etc. (1869), Etheridge, Syria Ch. p. 188 sq.; Coleman, Ancient Christianity Examplified, p. 234 sq.; Gemayel, Engravings of the Monuments of Prayer and Ritualism (Phil., 1869, 12mo), p. 275 sq.; Riddle, Christian Anicuities, p. 996 sq.; 602 sq.; Sircl, Humb. d. Christ. Kirch. A. trkämmer, iii. 202 sq.; Augusti, Hemb. d. Christ. Archæol. i. 191 sq.; ii. 537 sq.; iii. 704 sq.; 714 sq.; Blunt, Dict. of the Bible, s. v. History of Art. in the Church, vol. ii; A. Hulse, Hymns and System of Church, Huntingdon, 1864, 2 vols.; A. Bunnen, Christianity and Mankind (London, 1864), vol. vii, which contains Reliquiae Liturgicae (the Irvineight work); Readings upon the Liturgy and other Divine Offices of the Church (London, 1848-54); Hoffing, Liturgiæs Urbannæc. (Leipsic 1854); Hefeke (C. J.), Diez, der Kirchen- geschichten, Archiv d. Liturgik (Thol. 1864), vol. ii; Döllinger, Heathenism and Judaism; Schaff, Hi, ii, 100; Echid. Rev. 1852 (April); The Round Table, 1867 (Aug.-Oct); New Englander, 1867 (July), art. vi.; Mercersbury Review, 1871 (January), art. v.; Brit. and For. Miss. Rev. 1867 (July). (C.W.)

Lutprand. See LUTPRAND.

Lever (לו'ר, käbbel, so called as being the heaviest of the viscera) occurs in Exod. xxix, 13, 22; Lev. iii, 4, 10, 15, iv, 9, v, 7, vii, 4, viii, 16, 25; ix, 16, 10; Prov. vii, 20, Lam. iv, 11; Ezek. xxi, 21. In the Pentateuch it forms part of the phrase translated in the Authorized Version "the caul that is above the liver," which Genesius (Theaur. Hebr. p. 645, 464), reasoning from the root, understands to be the greatlobe of the liver itself rather than the caul which, latterly he, describes in a different part of the text. Jahn thinks the smallerlobe to be meant. The phrase is also rendered in the Sept. "the liver or lower lobe of the liver," the chief object of attention in the art of hepatoscopy, or divination by the liver, among the ancients. Jerome gives "the net of the liver," "the net," and "the fat,"
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see Bochard, Hiera., i, 498.) See CAUL. It appears from the same passages that it was burnt upon the altar, and not eaten as sacrificial food (Jahh, Bibl. Arch.-

col. § 378, n. 7). The liver was supposed by the ancient Greeks and Romans to be the seat of the passions -pride, love, etc. (see Anacreon, Ode iii., fin.; Theocritus, Idyl. ii., 10; Virgil, Aen., ii., 407; Propertius, i., ii., 11; and the Notes of the Delphic edition. Comp. also Per-

sia, Sat. v., 12; Juvenal, Sat. v., 647.) Some have ar-

gued that the same symbol prevailed among the Jews

rendering נַשָּׁה, in Gen. xxix., 6, "my liver," instead of "my honor," Sept. וַדִּקְרַא; compare the Hebrew of Prov. xvi., 9; iv. 9; vii., 22; but Geuenius (Hebr. Lex. a. y. נַשָּׁה) denies this signification in those passages.

Wounds in the liver were supposed to be mortal; thus the expression in Prov. vii., 22, "a dart through his liv-

er," and Lam. iii., 11, "my liver is poured out upon the

earth," are each of them a preparation for death itself. Achabhus uses a similar phrase to describe a mortal wound (A. gusemmon., I, 442). See HEART.

The liver is largely used in Ezekiel (xxi., 21) as an interesting reference to the most ancient of all modes of divination, by the inspection of the viscera of animals, and even of mankind, sacrificially slaughtered for the pur-

pose. It is there said that the king of Babylon, among other modes of divination referred to in the same verse, "looked upon the liver of the ram." The spleen is con-

sidered the most important organ in the ancient art of

extripicium, or divination by the entrails. Phialo-

stratus felicitously describes it as "the prophesying tripod of all divination" (Lile of Apollonius, viii., 7, 5). The rules by which the Greeks and Romans judged of it are

ample detailed in Adam's Roman Antiquities, p. 261 sq.

(Lond. 1834), and in Potter's Archæologia Classica, i, 316

(Lond. 1775). Vitruvius suggests a plausible theory of the first rise of heptacopdy. He says the ancients in-

spected the livers of those animals which frequented the places where they wished to settle, or who were found in the liver, to which they chiefly ascribed the process of

sanctification, was injured, they concluded that the wa-
ter and nourishment collected in such localities were ushohome (4. 4). But divination is coeval and co-

extensive with a belief in the divinity. Cicero ascribes divination by this and other means to what he calls "the heroic ages," by which term we know he means a period antecedent to all historical documents (De Divi-
natione). Promethesus, in the play of that title (i, 474 sq.), lays claim to having taught mankind the different kinds of divination, and that of divining the rest; and Prometheus, according to Servius (ad Virg. Edid, vi, 42), instructed the Aryanis; and we know from sacred record that Asia was one of the countries first peopled. It is further important to remark that the first recorded instance of divination is that of the teraphim of Jupiter, a native of Padan-Aram, a district bordering on that country (1 Sam. xix., 16, 10), by which term

both the Sept. and Josephus understood "the liver of goats" (Ant. vii., 11, 4). See TERAPHIM. See gener-

ally Whiston's Josephus, p. 108, note (Edinb. 1828); Bo-

chart, i, 41, De Corporum Nominibus; Encyclopedic Me-

topolitana, a. s. Divination; Rosenmüller's Scholicon on the several passages referred to; Perizonious, ad Epik., ii., 31; Peucer, De Precipue Divinationum Generibus, etc. (Wittenberg, 1660). See DIVINATION.

Liverpool Liturgy. See LITURG.

Living Creatures. These, as presented in Ezek. i., 10, are identical with the cherubim. Besides the general resemblance in form, position, and service, we have, Ezek. x, 20: "I knew that they were the cherubim." Ezekiel, being a priest, was familiar with these symbolical forms. The living ones present some variation from the cherubim, but not greater than appear in the other figures of olive-tree, and the cherubim. We should not be surprised if their forms and probable uses had already given rise, and is not here resumed. See CHERUB. They are taken up here to give a more careful attention to their symbo-

lic utility. The importance of these symbols is mani-

fested, 1, in the very minute description of them; 2, in the fact that they do in some way pervade the entire per-

iod of grace, from the expulsion of Adam till, in the apocalyptic vision, we arrive at the gates of the city,

having a right to the tree of life in the midst of the par-

adise, and the promise of its fruit, if right as God shall

attained. They were placed first at the front of the garden of Eden; renewed in the tabernacle; extended in

the Temple; resumed in the visions of Ezekiel; incor-

porated in the book of Psalms; and in the prospec-

tive history of Revelation they are left with us till the end of the world. The significance of these figures ap-

pear in all respects to be the same; though differing in

name and in position, they perform the same service. Even the idolatrous images, the teraphim, were prob-

ably an unwarranted and superstitious imitation of the

figures at the test of Eden. True, there are no periods when they are under a cloud, e.g., from the Deluge till

the erecting of the tabernacle; still, we dare not say they were extinct, for before the tabernacle was built in the

wilderness we read of another, called the tabernacle of the congregation (Exod. xxxiiii., 7-11). There is much mystery and many events among expositors in relation to them. 1. They are not angels, nor do they represent the peculiar ministry of angels. (a) The Scriptures know no such orders as

angels, archangels, cherubim, and seraphim; the orders of

angels are described as three, or thrones, dominions, prin-

cipalities, powers (Col. i., 16). (b) Angelic power

would have been a very ineffectual agency for officiating

the sword of flame, and was not needed to wield that

sword which turns on its own axis. (c) The living

ones are distinguished from angels in Rev. xi., 7. (d) They join the elders in the new song, "Hast redeemed

us to God by thy blood," etc. (Rev. v., 9). (e) Angels
take but a small part in the direct administration of grace; they rather point the inquirer, and furnish as-

sistance to the administrator (Acts x., 3; Rev. i, 1; Chron. xxix., 18; Acts xii., 7). Nothing vindictive or judi-
crional belongs to them. (f) There is no need of such

power; the sword and the fire imbody the whole power of justice. (b) We never find them executing judgment, though they concur in it when executed. (c) They warn of danger from divine justice (Isa. vii., 3-5). (d) They call attention to justice (Rev. vi., 1, 5, 7, 8). (e) They deliver the commission to those who execute it (Ezek. iv., 7, 27; Rev. xiv., 7). (f) They join in celebra-
ting the triumph over the victims of judgment (Rev.

xix., 4). Very different is their function in the admin-

istration of grace; there they make application of the

remedy to the sinner (Isa. lv., 5, 7). Almost all are

devoid of human sympathy. (a) They have the face of

a man. (b) They have the hands of a man under their wings (Ezek. i., 8). (c) When the prophet was alarmed ("undeone"), one of them brought him instant relief—just such relief as he felt in need of. (d) The throne which they bear has a man above it (Ezek. i., 26). (e) In Rev. iv., 6, we find them in the midst of the same throne, and round about it. (f) They associate with the elders in sympathy with the one hundred and forty-four thousand who sing the new song (Rev.

xv., 8), and who at the Church in celebrating the over-
throw of her enemies (Rev. xiv., 4). They thus abound in the sympathies of a redeemed humanity.

(L) In general terms they represent mercy, as con-

distinguished from justice. 1. They are distinct from the

sword, as already shown. They are mercy, but seem to be evolved out of the fire, this is no more than

we have already in the first promise, where death of

death is our life; and in Psa. xxxxi., 10 sq. They were

united to the נַשָּׁה, the mercy-seat itself. 3. They belonged to the holy of holies, both the larger

room of the tabernacle, and the inner rooms of the

temple; but this chamber was a type of heaven (Heb. ix., 24). 4. Other cherubic emblems were wrought on the inner cur-

tains of the tabernacle, and inner walls of the Temple,
both Solomon's and Ezekiel's (1 Kings vii, 29; Ezek. xli, 18-20). All is mercy inside of the Temple. 5. The like figures were made on the weshanats of the Temple, interspersed with lions and oxen (1 Kings vii, 29; "lions and palm-trees," ver. 36; comp. Eph. v, 26; Titus iii, 5). 6. The firmament over their heads, with its throne and man upon it (1 Kings vii, 27, comp. Ezek. xxi, 24-27, with Rev. i, 13). 7. The iring surrounding all this glory of the Lord puts on the finish to that institution where mercy rejoices against judgment (Ezek. i, 29).

(II.) They seem to represent mercy in its dispensation, so to speak—in its instrumentality, with all their inward and outward glorifications. While the whole power of justice, deters man from entering the earthly paradise; drives men away in their wickedness; awakes against the Shepherd; torments enmity in the second death; on the contrary, the living ones represent the entire administration of mercy (Ezek. i, 12: "Whither the spirit was to go, they went;"); ver. 20: "Thither was their spirit to go"). Whether an organized Church, an open Bible, an altar, or a temple; whether patriarchs or prophets, priests or presbyters; apostles, John the Baptist, or Christ himself; evangelists, pastors, or teachers; whether Gospel messages, or the children, be the instrumentality in dispensing the grace of God, the qualities of cherubim are, and ought to be, the characteristics with which they are imbued: the courage and power of the lion; the patience and perseverance of the ox; the uprightness, rapidity, and imitation of the eagle; with the sympathetic love and prudent forecast of our own humanity; each one full of eyes, within and without (Eph. iv, 16). In this view they do, as it were, bring God near to men.

(III.) The cherubim, in this dispensation of mercy, bring out prominently the idea of the throne of God—the throne of grace (Ezek. i, 25: "Likeness of a throne"). In Psalm xxvii, 1, "The Lord reigneth" is parallel with "inhabiting the cherubim." Both in the tabernacle and Temple the Shekinah was between the cherubim, which seemed to constitute, with the lid of the ark, the very throne itself, according to Exod. xxv, 22, and Ezek. xliii, 7. In the versions of Ezekiel, the cherubim seem to support the throne; in Isa. vi, 2, and Rev. iv, 6-9, they appear as attendants. To the English reader the seraphim might seem to be above the throne, but the original places them above the Temple, in which position they may still be below the throne, for the skirts of his robe flow down and fill the holy house.

(IV.) The idea of carrying the throne, or bearing royalty in his throne from one place to another, brings us to the idea of the whole cherubim system—"the chariot of the Lord." The key-note of this is given in 1 Chron. xxviii, 18: "Gold for the pattern of the chariot... the cherubim that spread out their wings and covered the ark of the covenant of the Lord." compare Psa. xlvii, 10: "He rode upon a cherub;" and Hab. iii, 8, 13, 15. These figures constituted a "moving throne.

See CHARACTER.

Livingston, Gilbert Robert, D.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, a descendant of the celebrated Rev. John Livingston (q. v.), was born at Stannom, Conn., Oct. 8, 1786, and graduated at Union College in 1805. He studied law under Rev. David Hartley, Conn., and Rev. Dr. John Henry Livingston (q. v.). In 1811 he became pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church in Cossacksey, N.Y., where about six hundred persons were the fruits of his ministry of fifteen years. In 1826 he removed to Philadelphia as pastor of the First (Dutch) Reformed (or Crown Street) Church. Here again his ministry was greatly blessed, three hundred and twenty persons being added to the Church, and over one hundred in a single year. He died March 9, 1834. He was a man of large physical frame, benevolent countenance, and amiable temper. His preaching was practical, and addressed more to the understanding and conscience of the people than to their feelings. His pastoral labors were incessant and successful. At one period of his life he embraced what were generally known as "New Measures," but he lived to abandon them in his later ministry. A single sermon and a tract are all that is known to have published.—Sprague, Annals; Cornin's Manual Ref. Church; Funeral Sermon by C. C. Cuyler, D.D.; Historical Discourse by W. H. Channing, D.D. (p. 278, Volume xiv, 1847). Livingston, Henry Gilbert, son of the preceding, was born at Columbus, N.Y., Feb. 3, 1821, graduated at Williams College in 1840, was principal of Clinton Academy (now Hamilton College) for two years, studied theology in Union Theological Seminary, N.Y., where he graduated in 1844, and was licensed to preach by the Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia. In 1845 he became pastor of the Presbyterian church of Carmel, N.Y., in 1844, but removed in 1849 as pastor of the Third Reformed Dutch Church of Philadelphia. Resigning in 1854 on account of feeble health, he returned to Carmel, and became principal of the Raymond Institute, and also supplied the vacant church of which he was formerly pastor. He died suddenly, Jan., 25, 1855. "No doubts, no fears, no darkness" sealed his dying hours. Mr. Livingston was a man of noble mould, tall, massive, intellectual, modest, amiable, dignified in manners, somewhat reserved, diffident, and self-distrustful. His character was finely balanced. True manliness, transparent simplicity, moral purity, generosity, and the most delicate sensibility, were blended with deep piety and beautiful consistency of life, with a holy ministry and a few divine talents. Only his few courses were published. See Memorial Sermon by W. J. Taylor, D.D., and Sprague's Annals, vol. ixx.

Livingston, John, a noted Scottish Presbyterian divine, was born in 1608, and was educated at Glasgow, where he took the degree of A.M. in 1621. He entered the ministry, and soon distinguished himself as an able preacher and powerful orator. As a zealous champion of the Reformed principles, he was a correct ascendant of the ecclesiastical government of the Church after the Restoration, and on this account suffered many inconveniences. Very remarkable in his life was the result which followed his preaching on a special fast-day appointed by the Kirk of Scotland, June 21, 1630. He was at this time domestic chaplain to the countess of Wigtown. Later he became minister at Ancram. He was twice suspended from his pastoral office, but, his opposition to the government continuing, he was banished the kingdom in 1662. He retired to Holland, and became minister of the church at Rotterdam, and in 1667, received the municipal government of the city in 1672. He wrote his autobiography (Glasgow, 1754, 12mo): also Lives of eminent Scottish Divines (1754, 8vo). See Chambers, Biog. Dict. of eminent Scotmen, s. v.; A. Gunn, Memoirs of John Livingston (N. Y. 1829); Gorton, Biog. Dict. vol. ii, s. v.

Livingston, John Henry, D.D., S.T.P., the "father of the Reformed Dutch Church in his country," and in many respects its most celebrated representative, was born at Poughkeepsie, N.Y., May 80, 1746, son of Henry Livingston, and a lineal descendant in the fourth generation from the Rev. John Livingston, of Scotland. He graduated at Yale College in 1762, and then studied law for two years, when his health gave way under his close application, and he was obliged to discontinue it. About this time he was converted, and then directed his attention to the Christian ministry. By advice of Dr. Laddie, of New York, he went to Europe to complete his theological studies, and entered the University of Utrecht, in Holland, where he remained four years, and was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Classics of Amsterdam. Having received a call to become pastor and second preacher in English of the Church of New York, he passed examination at the university for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity in 4 years, and was licensed to the ministry on April 3, 1770, and at once began his labors as pastor of the Church. Here he soon established his great reputation as a pulpiter orator and as a learned theologian; but his
grand ecclesiastical achievement was the settlement of the old and bitter controversy between the "Coetus" and "Conferentia" parties of the Reformed Dutch Church, and the consummation in about two years of the union, which has never since been broken. His pastoral relation to the Church in New York continued forty years—1770 to 1810—although during the Revolutionary War he was obliged to leave the city, and upon his return in 1783 he was again solely pastor, to remain in the ministry for three years. The next year he was appointed professor of theology, and retained this office, with his pastorate, until 1810, when he removed to New Brunswick, N. J., at the request of the synod, and opened the theological seminary in that city, occupying, in connection with the independent academy of Rutgers, in 1826 made the college of Rutgers University. These two offices he held until his death in 1825. It is difficult, in this brief notice, even to sum up the services and character of this eminent man. More than four hundred souls were received into the Church on profession of their faith during the three years of his sole pastorate after the war. Nearly two hundred young men were trained by him for the ministry of the Church. To him, more than to any other man, is due the credit of the separate organization of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in this country. He proposed the first organization of the church in 1791. Among his most characteristic productions were the first psalm and hymn book. His theological lectures still form the basis of didactic and polemic instruction in the theological seminary of which he was the founder and father. The whole denomination is reaping to-day the fruits of the sacrifices which he made for it. His influence in the Church was like that of Washington in the nation. His grand and eloquent sermon, preached before the New York Missionary Society in 1804, from Rev. xiv. 6, 7, was one of the leading influences in that revival of the missionary spirit which gave Samuel J. Mills and his young friends to the work, and which resulted in the subsequent organization of the "American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions" in 1813. Several of Dr. Livingston's occasional productions were published by himself, and in a posthumous volume, containing a syllabus of his theological lectures, was issued by the Rev. Jesse Fonda, one of his pupils. His death, at his residence in New Brunswick, January 19, 1825, was like a translation, without pain or complaint, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye." His wife, Sarah Livingston, whom he married in October, 1776, was one of the original signers of the Declaration of Independence. Like him, Dr. Livingston was an ardent and fearless patriot, and during all of the Revolutionary struggle he earnestly sustained the cause of freedom. In person Dr. Livingston was tall, commanding, dignified, and imposing. His features were good and manly, and his manner was refined and studiously polite. He was the model of the Christian gentleman. In his later years his appearance was truly patriarchal. His piety was all-pervading. As a preacher, he possessed eminent abilities. His oratory was powerful, his manner effective. It was full of action, variety, and power. As a theological teacher, he was clear, concise, learned, systematic, and practical. His influence over his students was wonderful. His great aim was to make them experimental ministers of Christ, and they loved and revered him almost as an apostle. Whatever faults he had were more than covered, to the eyes of his friends, by his majestic bearing, his admirable character, his pious life, and fruitful ministry, and by his services to the Church of Christ. See Dr. Gunn's Life, etc., abridged by Dr. T. W. Chambers; also Sprague, A. Sauls, vol. ix, an admirable sketch; also several funeral discourses, etc. (W. J. R. T.)

LIVONIA, the largest of the Baltic provinces of Russia; area 18,188 sq. m.; pop. in 1887, 1,173,951. The Germans, who chiefly live in the towns, number about 64,000 inhabitant of the province; the Latins and other Latins (a branch of the Slavik, kindred to the Lithuanians, or Estonians, who are of Finnish descent. Christianity was first introduced at Riga about 1180 by merchants from Bremen. The great missionary was the Augustinian monk Meinard, who 1180 built the first church at Wexkull, on the Duna, and in 1191 was consecrated bishop of Livonia. His successor, abbott Berthold, of Loccum, endeavored to accelerate the conversion of the Livonians by force of arms, and in 1198 fell in a victory of the German army over the bishop and army of the Order of the Sword, and gradually overcame the persistent opposition of the Livonians to the enforcement of Christianity. After his death (1229) the see of Riga was separated from the ecclesiastical province of Bremen, and, in 1246, made an archbishopric. The bishops of the Order of the Sword with the Teutonic Knight secured the submission and Christianization of Livonia, but involved the bishops in long-protracted conflicts with the order, which hastened the decay of the Church. The army-master, Walter of Plettenberg (1494-1531), adopted the doctrines of the Reformation. It then became the practice in the secular church. The centre of the reformation movement was in Riga, where the Huseite Nicolaus Russ, of Rostock, had, from 1511 to 1516, prepared the way for a religious reform. The first prominent reformer was Andreas Koppen, a Lutheran schoolteacher from Trepow, in Pomerania, who arrived in Riga in 1521, and Sylvester Tagtmeier, from Hamburg, who arrived in the following year. Both were appointed preachers by the town council, in spite of the remonstrances of the archbishop. In Wolmer and Dorpat, Melchior Hoffmann labored so violently in behalf of the Reformation that he created dissatisfaction even among the friends of the movement, and had to leave Livonia. Luther's epistle of congratulation and exhortation (1528) referred to the congregations of Riga, Revel, and Dorpat shows that at that time the Reformation had made considerable progress. In 1524, the archbishop, Caspar Linde, died, died, deeply mortified at the utter failure of his zealous efforts for saving the Catholic Church. His successor, John VII Blankenfeld, previously bishop of Dorpat and Revel, was no longer recognized by the town council of Riga as sovereign, and in 1525 he was even made a prisoner. Under the archbishop Wilhelm, margrave of Brandenburg, who in 1589 succeeded Thomas Schonning, the Reformation spread throughout Livonia; and the archbishop himself became a favorer of the doctrine, and at the time of his death the Catholic Church in Livonia had almost ceased to exist. Johann Briesmann (1597-91), who was called from Königsberg to Riga, drew up in 1580 the first agenda. The liturgy for Revel appeared in 1561, but in 1672 to yield to the Reformed Church. That of fourteen common languages. The Estonian hymn-book of Mathias Knöpken were likewise published in 1661. In the same year the army-master Ketteler concluded a treaty with Poland, by virtue of which Livonia was placed under the sovereignty of Poland; it was stipulated, however, that the Eastern Church of Livonia should not be interfered with. In violation of this treaty, the Jesuits at once began their agitation for the restoration of the Catholic Church, but the Swedish rule again secured the predominance of Protestants, and greatly strengthened it by establishing the University of Dorpat. A new liturgy was introduced in 1652, a new agenda in 1633; at the same time, a Lettish and Estonian translation of the Bible was published. In the 18th century the religious life of the province suffered greatly from the fact that most of the churches, being called from Germany, were unable to preach in the native languages. The partial destitution of many country districts attracted the Moravians, who continued their zealous labors even when, in 1748, their meetings had been forbidden. For a long time they confined themselves to the Lutheran Church, but the large attendance at these meetings droned on (since 1817) to separate from the Lutheran Church.
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The latter therefore began, in 1848, to engage in a vigorous contest with the Moravians, invoking the stipulations of the peace of Nystad (1721), in which Sweden had ceded Livonia to Russia, while the latter confirmed the privileges of the Lutheran Church. The Russian government supported the Lutherans against the Moravians, and in 1849, the Greek Church was required to make great efforts to prevail upon the Lettish peasants to join the Greek Church. Several thousands of Letts and Livonians succumbed to the pressure brought upon them by the government, and, after having once joined the orthodox Greek Church, they were forbidden (as many had done soon desire) to return to the Lutheran Church. All the children born of mixed marriages (Lutheran and Greek) must be educated in the Greek religion. In 1853, the Lutheran bishop Walter, who vigorously stood up for the defence of the rights of his Church, had to yield to an intrigue, and not until 1868 was the rigor of the Russian government against the Lutheran Church somewhat relaxed. These conflicts have awakened a general interest in the religious community, to which the re-establishment of the University of Dorpat (1802) has been greatly instrumental. The number of Roman Catholics is about 5,000, that of Greek Catholics is estimated at 145,000; the remainder are Lutherans. (A.J.S.)

Lizard appears in the Auth. Ver. in but one passage (Lev. xvi, 30) as the rendering of ἑρμῆς, ἑρμαία; but different species of the animal seem to be designated by several Hebrew terms, variously rendered in the English translation. In the East numerous varieties of Lizards are met with in abundance, several of which are regarded as venomous (Hassall, Trav. p. 241, 344 sq.). Others, again, are used by the modern Arabs for food (comp. also Arrian, Mar. Eryth. p. 17, ed. Hudson), whereas the Mosaic Law (Lev. xi) classifies them among unclean animals.

(1) ko'ocur (ṣ2, strength, Lev. xvi, 30; Sept. yannai, 7.3, xain, xain-shelem, X. 11) prob., the Lacerta stel- ko, an olive-brown lizard, with black and white spots, and a tail so long that the whole body itself is scarcely of this length (Hassall, Trav. p. 352; figure in Rupell, Atlas, tab. 2). Bochart (Hieroz. ii, 498 sq.) understands this term to refer to the species called El-sa'ar, which exhibits its great strength (hence its name) in combat with the crocodile and serpents, is digesting in appearance, and said to be poisonous (Leon. Afric. Descrip. Afric. ix, 53). But Michaelis (Suppl. 2221) and Rumphius have long since remarked that the description of the name seeking is borrowed from a different root. According to the Arabic interpreters, it is the land crocodile, or a species of it, perhaps the Waran el-had or iskik (Lacerta scincus), which sometimes attains a length of six feet or more. See CHAMELEON.

(2) lelaih (םַלְאָה, perch. so called from its hiding; Lev. xvi, 30; Sept. yannai-shelem, Vulg. stelko, Auth. Ver. "lizard"), perhaps the species called in Egyptian Shekal-ḥêt, described by Forskal (Descrip. p. 18) as a delicate little animal, about a span in length and of the thickness of the thumb, found in the neighborhood of houses. Bochart (Hieroz. ii, 497 sq.) maintains that it is the se'rat of the Arabs, a kind of lizard that clings close to the ground (hence its derivation from an Arabic root, signifying to stick to the earth), to which also the Sept. alludes (comp. Oken, Naturgesch. III, ii, 288). Geddes regards it as identical with the Lacerta gecko.

(3) cho'mer (כֶּם, so called from lying close to the ground; Lev. xvi, 30; Sept. anaipa, Auth. Ver. "small") has been supposed by Bochart (ii, 500 sq.) to mean the Geckos (also Linn.) that burrow under sand (see the precursory interpretation of the Talmud). The interpretation seem rests on no better foundation. Both the Arabic interpreters understand the chameleon. The species intended is uncertain. (See Fuller, Miscell. vi, 9.)

(4) anakah (אֲנָאָכָה, a shrike; Lev. xvi, 30; Sept. and Vulg. stremmeus, Auth. Ver. "ferret") is regarded by the Arab. Erpem. as the Waral, considered by some as identical with the Lacerta nilotica (Hassall, Trav. p. 361 sq.), but which last Forskal (Descrip. Animal. p. 18) calls Waran (comp. Robinson, ii, 253). The Waral is described by those who have personally seen it (see Leo Africae, cix, 61) as having a length of three or four feet, a very strong, grayish-yellow skin, and is regarded as poisonous in every part. (See Rosenmüller, Alterh. IV, ii, 256 sq.; Gesen. Thesaur. p. 128.)

(5) Trans (חָסַפ, prob. from its sluggishness; Lev. xi, 29; Sept. and Vulg. the crocodile, Auth. Ver. "tortoise") is doubtless the species of lizard still called by the Arabs el-Dhuba or Dhuba (Hieroz. ii, 483 sq.), called by the Arabs Lekara (τραπέζους), a species of lizard, probably the Gecko (Hassall, Trav. p. 356 sq.), a kind described as having a round tail of moderate length, and tufted feet, lamellated lengthwise on the bottom, said to be peculiar for excluding poison from the division of its toes, superably seeking to remain on the rocky waters. According to Leo Afric. (ix, 52), it is about a yard long, without poisonous qualities, and incapable of drinking. They are caught and eaten in the desert. Forskal (Descrip. Animal. p. 13) and Hasselquist (Trav. p. 356 sq.) appear to have described it under the name of Lacerta Erythræa (comp. Paulus, Samuil, ii, 268). According to Burkhardt (ii, 863 sq.), it has a scaly skin of a yellow color, and sometimes attains a length of eighteen inches.

(6) Tinshe'meth (תינשנ) the hard breather; Sept., Vulg., and Auth. Ver. mole; Lev. xvi, 30; being the same Heb. word used in Lev. xi, 18; Deut. xiv, 16, to describe a "swan" (אֶשֶּנִי) and also the "swan" (אַשֶּנִי) a species of lizard, probably the Gecko (Hassall, Trav. p. 356 sq.), a kind described as having a round tail of moderate length, and tufted feet, lamellated lengthwise on the bottom, said to be peculiar for excluding poison from the division of its toes, superably seeking to remain on the rocky waters. According to Leo Afric., (ix, 52), it is about a yard long, without poisonous qualities, and incapable of drinking. They are caught and eaten in the desert. Forskal (Descrip. Animal. p. 13) and Hasselquist (Trav. p. 356 sq.) appear to have described it under the name of Lacerta Erythræa (comp. Paulus, Samuil, ii, 268). According to Burkhardt (ii, 863 sq.), it has a scaly skin of a yellow color, and sometimes attains a length of eighteen inches.

(7) Shemaimith (שםאמית, the hard breather; Sept., Vulg., and Auth. Ver. "mole"
(8) Tannim (תננים) or Tannim (תננים) otherwise Tann (תנ), seems occasionally to signify a huge land serpent or saurian. See Dracon.

(9) Livyathan (ליביתאנה) sometimes stands for the largest of the lizard tribe, the crocodile. See Livia- than.

Under the denomination of lizard the modern zoologist places all the cold-blooded animals that have the conformation of serpents with the addition of four feet. Thus viewed as one great family, they constitute the Saurians, Lacertina, and Lacertides of authors, embracing numerous generic divisions, which commence with the largest, that is, the crocodile group, and pass through the smaller species, from the most sluggish, digesting, or pleasing in appearance—some equally frequenting the land and water, others absolutely confined to the earth and to the most arid deserts; and, though in general harmless, there are a few with disputed properties, some being held to poison or corrode the limbs of men by the exudation of an ichor, and others extolled as aphrodisiacs, or of medicinal use in pharmacy; but these properties in most, if not in all, are undefined or illusory. One of the best known of these is the common chameleon (Chamaeleo calyptratus). See CHAMELEON. When it is considered that there are no species of Syria, Arabia, and Egypt are overrun with animals of this family, there is every reason to expect aullusion to more than one genus in the Scriptures, where so many observations and similes are derived from the natural objects which were familiar.
Chamaeleo Vulgaris.

to the various writers. Among the names enumerated above, Bochart refers ταῦτα (Lev. xi, 30), to one of the group of Monitors or Varanus, the Nilotic lizard, Lacerta Niloticus, Varanus Niloticus, or Waron of the Arabs. Like the others of this form, it is possessed of a tail double the length of the body, but is not so well known in Palestine, where there is only one real river (Jordan), and that not tenanted by this species. It appears that the true crocodile frequented the shores and marshes of the coast down to a comparatively late period, and therefore it may well have had a more specific name than leviathan—a word apparently best suited to the dignified and lofty diety of the prophets, and clearly of more general signification than the more colloquial designation. Jerome was of this opinion; and it is thus likely that ta'h was applied to both, as Waron is now considered only a variety of, or a young, crocodile.

There is a second of the same group, Lacerta scincus of Merrem (Varanus armariae), Waron el-bard, also reaching to six feet in length; and a third, not as yet clearly described, which appears to be larger than either, growing to nine feet, and covered with bright cupreous scales. This last prefers rocky and stony situations. One of the last mentioned pursues its prey on land with a rapid bounding action, feeds on the larger insects, and is said to attack game in a body, sometimes destroying even sheep. The Arabs, in agreement with the ancients, assert that this species will do fierce and victorious battle with serpents. Considerations like these induce us to assign the Hebrew name תָּאָשׁ, ta'ash (a designation of strength) to the species of the desert; and if the Nilotic varron be the ta'ash, then the Arabian dhaib, as Bruce asserts, will be Varanus armariae, or varcon el-bard of the present familiar language, and chamaeleon the larger copper-colored species above noticed. But it is evident from the Arabic authorities quoted by Bochart, and from his own conclusions, that there is not only confusion among the species of lizard, but that the ichneumon of Egypt (Harpesites Pharaonis) is mixed up with the history of these saurians.

We come next to the group of lizards more properly so called, which Hebrew commentators take to be the תָּאָשׁ, letash, a name having some allusion to poison and venom. The word occurs only once (Lev. xi, 30), where saurians alone appear to be indicated. If the Heb. root were to guide the decision, letash would be another name for the gecko or elomakh, for there is but one species which can be deemed venomous; and with regard to the quality of venomess, though the geckos possess it most, numerous common lizards run up and down perpendicular walls with great facility. We therefore take תָּאָשׁ, chamaeleon, or the sand lizard of Bochart, to be the true lizard, several (probably many) species existing in myriads on the rocks in sandy places, and in ruins in every part of Palestine and the adjacent countries. There is one species particularly abundant and small, well known in Arabia by the name of Sauraudhi. We now come to Stellomions, which have been confounded with the noxious geckos and others from the time of Al-drovanus, and thence have been a source of inextricable trouble to commentators. They are best known by the lenticles of star-like spangles on the body. Among these Lacerta stellio, Stellio Orientalis, the κροκείδας of the Greeks, and hardun of the Arabs, is abundant in the East, and a great frequenter of ruinous walls. The genus Uromastix offers Stellio spinipes of Daudin or Or-spinipes, two or three feet long, of a greyish green, and is the species which is believed to strike with the tail; hence formerly denominated Cauda verbera. It is frequent in the deserts around Egypt, and is probably the Qasir of the Arabs. Another subgenus, named Trupheus by Cuvier, is exemplified in the Tr. Aspygopus of Geoffr., with a spi-nous swelled body, but remarkable for the faculty of changing color more rapidly than the chameleon. Next we place the Gelkotians, among which comes פַּעְעַף, amalk, in our versions denominated ferret, but which is with more propriety transferred to the noisy and venomous abu-dars of the Arabs. There is no reason for admitting the verb פַּעְעַף, to groan, to cry out, as radical for the name of the ferret, an animal totally unconnected with the preceding species, but a species of mustela or ָא, and originally found, so far as we know, only in Western Africa, and thence conveyed to Spain, prowling noiselessly, and beaten to death without a groan, though capable of a feeble, short shrill when at play, or when suddenly wounded. Taking it as the interpreted name, פַּעְעַף, to cry out, so little applicable to ferrets, in conjunction with the whole verse, we find the gecko, like all the species of this group of lizards, remarkable for the loud grating noise which it is apt to utter in the roofs and walls of houses all the night through; one, indeed, is sufficient to dispel the sleep of a whole family. The particular species most probably meant is the Lacerta gecko of Hasselquist, the Gecko lobatus of Geoffroy, distinguished by having the soles of the feet dilated and striated like open fans, from which a poisonous ichor is said to exude, inflaming the human skin, and infecting food that may have been bitten upon by the animal, or coming in contact with it. Hence the Arabic name of abu-dars, or "father of leprosy," at Cairo. The species extends northwards in Syria, but it may be doubted whether the Gecko fascicularis, or tarentola of South-eastern Europe, be not also an inhabitant of Palestine; and in that case the פַּעְעַף, sema-mak, of Bochart, would find an appropriate location. To these we add the Chameleon proper; and then follows the Scincus (in antiquity the name of Varanus armariae), among which Lacerta scincus, Linn., or Scincus officinalis, is the Et-odda of the Arabs, figured by Bruce, and well known in the old pharmacy of Europe. S. Cypris, or Lacerta Cypris scincoides, a large greenish species, marked with a pale line on each flank, occurs also; and a small Scincus variegatus or varicus, often noticed on account of its round black spots, each marked with a pale streak, and commonly having likewise a stripe on each flank, of a pale color. Of the species of Sepia, that is, viviparous serpent-lizards, having the body of snakes, with four weak limbs, a species with only three toes on each foot, the Lacerta chalcites of Linn., appears to extend to Syria. See further details in the Penny Cyclopaedia, s. v. Varanid; Wood, Biblical Animals, p. 534 sq.

From this examination, it appears probable that the generic name for the lizard among the Hebrews (being the only one thus rendered in the Authorized Version) is the פַּעְעַף, letash, which, although an unclean animal, does not usually designate a poisonous species. Among the
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various kinds with which the East abounds, the Laocerta stellata, or starry lizard, may be selected as probably affording the best type of the scriptural serpents, or at least of 
leviats in general, as it is the most common in Egypt and Palestine. It is covered with tubercles, and is of a 
gray color. It lives in the holes of walls, and under stones, and covers itself with dirt. Belon states that it

sometimes attains the size of a weasel. This is said to be the lizard which intests the Pyramid, and in other 
countries where it is found, harbors in the crevices and between the stones of old walls, feeding on flies and other 
 winged insects. This may be the species intended by Bruce when he says, "The number I saw one day, in 
the great court of the Temple of the Sun at Baalbek, 
amounted to many thousand; the ground, the walls, 
the stones of the ruined buildings, were covered with 
them; and the various colors of which they consisted 
made a very extraordinary appearance, glittering under 
the sun, in which they lay sleeping and basking." Lord 
Lindsay also describes the ruins at Jerash (the ancient 
Gerasa) as "absolutely alive with lizards." Near Suez, 
he speaks of a species of gray lizard; and on the 
scent towards Mount Sinai, "hundreds of little lizards of 
the color of the sand, and called by the natives sarai-

&andi, were darting about." In the Syrian desert, 
Major Skinner says, "The ground is teeming with lizards; 
the sun seems to draw them from the earth, for some-
times, when I have fixed my eye upon one spot, I have 
fancied that the sands were getting into life, so many 
of these creatures at once crept from their holes." Wil-
kinson says, "In Egypt, of the lizard tribe, none but the 
crocodile seems to have been sacred. Those which 
occurred in the hieroglyphics are not emblematical of 
the gods, nor connected with religion." See SNAIL.

LIZEL, GEORG, a German theologian, was born at 
Uluit, in Wurttemberg, Nov. 23, 1691; attended success-
ively the universities of Strasburg, Leipsic, Jena, Halle, 
Wittemberg, Aldorf, and Tubingen, and in 1735 became 
vicar at Weidenstetten, and soon after pastor at Steinm 
Kirch; but in 1736, on account of false charges against 
his character, he lost his situation. In 1737 he was ap-
pointed subrector at the Gymnasium of Ulm, afterwards 
inspector of the alumni and imperial poet laureate. The 
Prussian Royal Society of Duisburg, and the German 
Society of Jena, elected him a member of their respect-
ive bodies. He died Mar. 22, 1761. His life was spent in 
the investigation of science, and in the cause of reli-
gion and education. While at the universities he ex-
plored not only the ancient libraries, and the results he 
gave to the public in more than twenty volumes. As a 
thological Lizel was faithful to his Church, and con-
fronted and challenged Romanism. For a list of his 
works, see Daring, ciehtere Theol. Deutsch., vol. ii, s. v.

LIOUERTE, DON JUAN ANTONIO, the noted author 
of a history of the Inspiration, etc., was born at Rincon 
del Soto, near Calahorra, Spain, March 80, 1756. 
He studied at Tarascone with great success, and received 
the tonsure when but fourteen years of age. In 1779 
he was ordained priest, and took his degree in canon law. At this time the liberal ideas prevailing in France were 
beginning to make their way into Spain, and Llorente became interested in them. In 1781 he was named 
advocate of the Council of Castile, and in the year fol-
lowing was made general vicar of the bishopric of Cala-
horra. While in this position he appears to have con-
cluded himself with the Freemasons, and, although al-
though they seem to have been generally credited, he was 
nevertheless appointed commissary of the Inquisition in 
1785, and general secretary in 1789. After the down-
fall of the grand inquisitor he attached himself to the 
liberal minister Jovellanos, who contemplated a religi-
ous and civil reformation of Spain. The project increased and he was further fall, and Llorente was involved in his fall, the more 
surely as he openly expressed his sympathy for him. 
Suspected by his superiors, he was closely watched. He 
was subjected to innumerable petty annoyances, his let-
ters were opened, and, without any reason being given 
for the measure, was deposed from his situation and 
imprisoned in a convent for one month. In 1805 he 
was again received into favor as the reward of a liter-
ary service of a very questionable character which he 
rendered to the minister Godoy. The latter purposed 
abolishing the "noble privileges of the Inquisition," the 
confiscations, and carrying out in Spain a thorough system 
of centralization; to accomplish this, he deemed it advan-
tageous to prepare the way by means of a historical es-
say, disproving the ancient liberties of those provinces. 
The mission was given to Llorente, who wrote No-
structoria hispánica sobre las tres provincias Biscayenses 
(Madrid, 1806-8, 8 vol. v800), a work not in any way 
remarkable for historical truthfulness. Llorente was now 
again favored with several high offices. His tendency 
towards the French ideas, centralization among others, 
angered him perhaps a reformer master rather than a religious 
and political slavery. In 1809 the Spanish Inquisition was 
abolished in Spain, and Llorente was commissioned to 
search its records for the purpose of writing a history of 
that tribunal. He had already, as early as 1789, be-
egan to collect materials for this purpose, yet two more 
years were necessary to the aid of several assistants in 
complying the voluminous records. When the conven-
ents were abolished he was given the direction of the pro-
ceedings, and the charge of the sequestered goods, as 
also the administration of the national properties, an 
ungrateful and not very creditable task, for these prop-
erties were the result of sequestration; yet he claimed 
awardedly to have introduced many favorable changes 
in the administration, such, for instance, as that of 
leaving the management of the property belonging to 
parties put under the ban to the members of their fami-
ly, and the many distinguished persons to whom he 
appointed in corroboration of his assertion have 
never denied its truth. He was, however, accused of 
embezzlement to the amount of 11,000,000 reals, and 
lost his position; but the accusation not being substanci-
ated, he was indemnified by another situation. In the 
mean time he continued to advocate the cause of Joseph 
Bonaparte both by his pen and in public addresses, and 
when the celebrated Constitution of the Cortes of Castil 
was proclaimed he was one of its most zealous opposi-
tives. When Joseph lost the Spanish throne (1814) 
Llorente was obliged to quit the country. After his 
flight, banishment was pronounced against him, 
and his property, and his library of 8000 volumes, some
of which were rare and costly manuscripts, were consecrated. After a short time in London, Llorente settled in Paris, where he completed the work of which he had published a sketch in Spain: Histoire critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne (4 vols. 8vo). It was written in Spanish, but was immediately translated into French by Alexis Pelletier, under Llorente's own supervision (Par. 1812). It has been translated into most of the languages of Europe and made shortly afterwards. One of the best English editions was published in London in 1826. (For a review, see British Critic, i, 119.) Llorente was now the outspoken enemy of the Church, and he was forbidden to officiate as priest in Paris, and thus deprived of his support. He had therefore to seek means to earn a living by teaching Spanish, but the University of Paris forbade him to teach in public, and he became altogether dependent on his literary labors and the assistance of his masonic brethren for a support. To what straits he found himself reduced is seen in the fact that he translated Faublas into Spanish. In 1822 he published his Portraits politiques des Popes, which still increased the animosity of the clergy against him, and in this instance it must be granted that he recklessly provoked this enmity by accepting as unapproved facts the statements of contemporary historians, etc., while his friends were obliged to admit that the nature, tendencies, and even the tone of the work were not becoming the character of a priest. In December of the same year (1822) he received orders to leave France within 24 hours. Exiled from France by the refusal of his adoption, he returned to that of his birth, but died shortly after (Feb. 5, 1823) at Madrid, in consequence of the hardships he had undergone during his journey.

Llorente's character and writings have been the object of as extravagant praise by some as of extravagant cen.sure by others. He lived in a time of great fermentation, and in a country where the struggle between progress and conservatism gave rise to innumerable parties; under these circumstances he remained true to progress, and if he did not remain true also to any of the divers political parties, it was because he could not maintain his fidelity to both. When writing the history of the Inquisition, he was yet a fervent Roman Catholic; and in attacking an institution which he considered and proved to have been more political than religious, he undeservedly received the censure of a large proportion of the Roman Catholic press. His ideas did not mean to attack the Romish Church, but, on the contrary, to vindicate it from the imputation of having been solidly concerned in the transaction of that fell tribunal. If in his subsequent works he went further, and attacked the Church itself, it is because he was to be found in the persecutions he endured at the hands of that Church. Llorente is not to be considered as a historian; neither his literary talents, nor his historical knowledge, nor the gift of correctly combining and connecting events, gave him any title to that appellation. His greatest production, the Critical History of the Inquisition, such Protestant historians as Prescott and Ranke judge to be of but little value, because of its partisan character, and the exaggerations in which it abounds, and, as the readers of this Cyclopaedia must have noticed, in the article Inquisitores (see especially p. 603, col. 1), he has rarely been quoted. His only credit in the work is that he brought together much material before inaccessible. We might say Llorente was a good and diligent compiler, but too ardent a partisan to be said a historian. See his autobiography entitled, Notice biographique et épitaphique sur Don J. H. Llorente (1823); Prescott, Hist. of Ferdinand and Isabella, i, pt. ii; Ranke, Hist. of the Popes, i, 142, 272; ii, 293; Monthly Review, xci (1820), Appen; Review Eugénique (1823).

Lloyd, Charles Hooker, a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Haven, Conn, Feb. 21, 1833. His early life was spent in mercantile pursuits in New York City. In 1856, however, pursuing to become a missionary to the heathen, he entered New York University; later he studied divinity in the theological seminary at Princeton, N.J., and graduated in 1862. He was licensed and ordained as an evangelist by the New York Presbytery April 29, 1862, and appointed (June 21, 1862) by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to go to the coast of Africa. His labors there were of much effective mission work, as he died Feb. 10, 1865. Mr. Lloyd, as a preacher, was eminently wise to win souls. He was gifted with a strong passion for music, and wrote and arranged many chants and hymns for the African converts. See Wilson, Pred. Hist. Amacon, 1868, p. 167.

Lloyd, Thomas, a noted Quaker preacher, was born in North Wales in 1649. While a student at Oxford University, he visited, during a vacation, his brother Charles, who had been imprisoned for Quakerism at Welch-Pool, and by the latter's influence became himself a convert to the religion of the Friends. He immediately left Oxford, suffered with the Quakers in their persecutions, and became an "instructor" on their "First-days." On account of persecution, reproach, and loss of property for his religion's sake, he emigrated to Pennsylvania soon after the first settlement of that province. He died July 10, 1894. As president of the council, and subsequently as deputy governor of Pennsylvania, he exercised a substantial influence upon the interests and progress of the colony. See Janney's History of Friends, i, ch. xvi; iii, ch. ii.

Lloyd, William, a noted English prelate, was born in Berkshire in 1627, and was educated at Oriel College, Oxford. In 1640 he removed to Jesus College, where he became fellow in 1646. He took deacon's orders from Dr. Skinner at the time of Charles's execution. He was ordained priest in 1656, and acted as tutor of John Backhouse, son of Sir Wm. Backhouse, at Wadham College, Oxford. In 1660 he became master of arts at Cambridge, and was also made a prebendary of Ripon, in Yorkshire. In 1666 he was appointed king's chaplain, and in 1667 was collated to a prebend of Salisbury, and proceeded doctor of divinity at Oxford. In 1668 he was presented to the vicarage of St. Mary's, in Reading, and also installed archdeacon of Merioneth, in the church of Bangor, of which he became deacon in 1672, besides being made prebend in St. Paul's Church, London. In 1674 he was chosen a canon of St. Paul's, and in 1676 promoted to the see of Exeter, the vicarage of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, Westminster. In 1680 he was appointed bishop of St. Asaph, was translated to Lichfield in 1692, and to Worcester in 1689-1700. He took an active part in all the transactions between the Romanists and Protestants in 1678. He preached the funeral sermon of Sir Edmund Godfrey, believed to have been murdered in carrying out what is known as the popish plot for overthrowing Protestantism in England. In 1688, with six other bishops, he signed, and, as spokesman, presented to the king, a memorial against the publication of his declaration of indulgence to Romanists and Dissenters. He was one of the six bishops who, together with archbishop Sancroft, composing the illustrious seven bishops, for their refusal to publish the king's declaration, were shortly after imprisoned by James II in the Tower, and after trial, acquitted, to the great joy of all England. He became almoner to William III, and later also to queen Anne. He died at Hertford Castle Aug. 30, 1717. Lloyd furnished valuable materials to Burnet's History of his Own Times, and wrote Considerations on the Press Popery in this Kingdom, etc. (Lond. 1684, 8vo, 3d edit.) [a work which was attacked by MacKenzie (Defence of the Antiquity of the Royal Line of Scotland, etc.), and was defended by bishop Stillingfleet (Origines Brit., 1717; 2 vols.), who reprinted it, with Notes by T. P. Panton (Oxford, 1842, 2 vols. 8vo).—History of the Church of Great Britain.—A Dissertation on Demotic's Seventy Weeks;—A System of Chronology (1712).—Har-
mony of the Gospels, etc., etc. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, vol. ii; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. (Restoration), i, 600, ii, 5, 28, 141 sqq., 146; Strickland, Lives of the Seven Bishops.

Loaf (properly אֲרוֹם, kikkar'), a circle, in the phrase בָּלֶד אֲרוֹם, a round of bread, i.e. circular cake, being the form of Oriental bread, or rather biscuit, Exod. xxix, 23, Judg. viii, 5, 1 Sam. x, 8; 1 Chron. xvi, 3; rendered "piece" or "morsel" of bread in Prov. vi, 36; Jer. xxxvii, 21, 1 Sam. ii, 26; sometimes simply בָּלֶד, lechem, bread, Lev. xxiii, 17; 1 Sam. xvii, 17; xxxv, 18; 1 Kings xiv, 3; 2 Kings iv, 42; and so likewise the Greek ἄρος, bread, espec. in the plural, Matt. xiv, 17, 19, xv, 34, 36; xvi, 9, 10; Mark vi, 38, 41, 44, 45; Mark vii, 5, 6, 14, 19; Luke ix, 16, 17; xi, 5; John vi, 11, 13, 25), a round cake, the usual form of bread among the ancients. See Shew-Bread. The bread of the Jews was either in small loaves, or else in broad and thick cakes, as is the present custom in the East. Bread was always broken into such portions as were required, and distributed by the master of the family. See Bread.

Ancient Roman Bread (from a painting on the walls of the Parhe- non).

Ancient Egyptian Bread. (The first two figures are from the Monuments, the others from specimens in the British Museum.)

The word אֲרוֹם, chollah', "cake" (2 Sam. vi, 19), often refers to a cake of oblation (Exod. xxix, 23; Lev. viii, 26, Numb. vi, 15, etc.), from the root אָרָם, chollah, to pierce through, because they were pricked, as among the Arabsians and Jews of the present day. We also find, on the paintings in the monuments of Egypt, representations of offerings of cakes pricked. See Cake.

The two wave loaves mentioned in Lev. xxviii, 17 are called in Hebrew אֲרוֹם כּוֹנְכָּה, lechem temephah, signifying the act of waving or moving to and fro before Jehovah, a ceremony observed in the consecration of offerings; hence applied as a name to anything consecrated in this manner. See Offering.

Lo-am-mi (Heb. Lo-ammi, not my people, as it is explained in the context, Hosea i, 9; Sept. Os λόγος μου, Vulg. Nos populus meus; in the parallel passage, Hosea ii, 25, διὸ, the Sept. Os λόγος μου, Vulg. Nos populus meus). See Note on 2 Kings xvi, 9, 10. Ye shall not now henceforward call me, My people, neither shalt thou call the land, My land. Ye shall scarce call me your Father, and you will not mind me, says Jehovah to the people of Israel, signifying their unbelief (Hosea i, 9; ii, 28; comp. ii, 1). B.C. cir. 725. See Hosea.

Loans (properly, skotot'; 1 Sam. ii, 20, a petition or request, as elsewhere rendered). The law of Moses did not contemplate any raising of loans for the purpose of obtaining capital, a condition perhaps alluded to in the parables of the "pearl" and "hidden treasure" (Matt. xiii, 44, 46; Matthew, Comm. on Laces of Mo- ses, art. 147, ii, 297, edit. Smith). See Com- m. on Laces of Moses. Such persons as bankers and money-lenders, in the commercial sense (Prov. xxvi, 26, Neh. vi, 8), were unknown to the earlier ages of the Hebrew commonwealth. The Mosaic laws which relate to the subject of borrowing, lending, and repaying are in substance as follows: If an Israelite became poor, what he desired to borrow was to be freely lent to him, and no interest, either of money or produce, could be exacted from him; interest might be taken of a foreigner, but not of an Israelite by another Israelite (Exod. xxii, 25; Deut. xxi, 19, 20; Lev. xxv, 35-38). At the end of every seven years a remission of debts was ordered; every creditor was to remit what he had lent: of a foreigner the loan might be ex- tended, not of a brother. If an Israelite wished to borrow, he was not to be refused because the year of remission was at hand (Deut. xv, 1-11). Pledges might be taken, but not as such the mill or the upper millstone, for that would be to take a man's life in pledge. If the pledge was raiment, it was to be given back before summer, as being needful for a covering at night. The widow's garment could not be taken in pledge (Exod. xxi, 26, 27; Deut. xxxiv, 6, 17). The law thus strictly forbids any interest to be taken for a loan to any poor person, either in the shape of money or of produce, and at first, at all events, even in the case of a foreigner; but this prohibition was afterwards limited to Hebrews only, from whom, of whatever rank, not only was no usury on any pretence to be exacted, but relief to the poor by way of loan was enjoined, and excuses for evading this duty were forbidden (Exod. xxii, 25; Lev. xxv, 35, 37, Deut. xv, 5, 7-10; xxiii, 19, 20). The instances of ex- tortionate conduct mentioned with disapprobation in the book of Job probably represent a state of things previous to the law, and such as the law was intended to remedy (Job xxii, 6, xxx, 7, 3). As commerce increased, the practice of usury, and so also of suretyship, grew up, but the execution of it from a Hebrew appears to have been regarded to a late period as discreetable (Prov. vi, 14; xi, 13; xvii, 18; xx, 16; xxii, 26; Ps. xv, 5; xxvii, 13; Jer. xv, 10; Ezek. xviii, 13; xxii, 12). Systematic breach of the law in this respect was corrected by Nehemiah after the return from captivity (Neh. v, 1, 13; see Michaelis, ibid. art. 148, 151). In later times the practice of borrowing money appears to have prevailed without limitation of race, and to have been carried on upon systematic principles, though the original spirit of the law was approved by our Lord (Matt. v, 24; xxv, 27; Luke i, 5, 10). The money-changers (συμπετρικοὶ καὶ σαλαμπορίων), who had seats and tables in the Temple, were traders whose
premia arose chiefly from the exchange of money with those who came to pay their annual half shekel (Pul-
ant, xxi, 27; Deut. xxii, 42; 13; comp. Exod. xxiii, 36; Prov. xxii, 27; Wahl, Z. A. M. p. 224; Burckhardt, Notes on Bed. i, 47, 231; Niebuhr, Deor. de l'Ar. p. 56; Lane, Mod. Eg. i, 57; 58; Gesen. Theur. p. 408; Michaelis, Laws of Moses, arts. 145 and 150). 2. The prohibition was absolute in the case of (a) the widow's garments (Deut. xxv, 17, 20) and (b) a millstone of either kind (Deut. xxv, 6). Michaelis (art. 150, ii, 321) supposes also all indispensable animals and utensils of agriculture; see also Mishna, Maaser Sheni, i. 3. A creditor was forbidden to enter a house to reclaim a pledge, but was to stand outside till the borrower brought the money or the property (Lev. xix, 7-11). 4. The original Roman law of debt permitted the debtor to be enslaved by his creditor until the debt was discharged (Livy, ii, 23; Appian, Ital. p. 40); and he might even be put to death by him, though this extreme does not appear to have been ever practised (Cicero, De Leg. ii, 1, 10; Smith, Dictionary of Classics, a. v. topon. Censorio, Nuxem). In Athens also the creditor had a claim to the person of the debtor (Plutarch, Vit. Sol. 15). The Jewish law, as it did not forbid temporary bondage in the case of debtors, yet forbade a Hebrew to treat a foreigner as a bondman longer than the seventh year, or at utmost the year of jubilee (Exod. xxii, 2; Lev. xxv, 39, 42; Deut. xv, 9). If a Hebrew was sold in this way to a foreign sojourner, he might be redeemed at a valuation at any time previous to the jubilee year, and in that year was, under any circum-
cumstances, to be released. Foreign sojourners, how-
ever, were not entitled to release at that time (Lev. xxv, 44, 46, 47, 54; 2 Kings iv, 2; Isa. i, 1; iii, 9). Land sold on account of debt was redeemable either by the seller himself, or by a kinman in case of his inabil-
ity to repurchase. Houses in walled towns, except such as were sold to Lot without redemption, were not one year after sale, alienated forever. Michaelis doubts whether all debt was extinguished by the jubilee; but Josephus's account is very precise (Ant. iii, 12, 3; comp. Lev. xxv, 25, 34; Ruth iv, 10; see Michaelis, § 195, ii, 565, § 192, 296). A law on personal property first introduced by Moses was superseded by a law, probably introduced by the Romans, by which the debtor was liable to be detained in prison until the full discharge of his debt (Matt. v, 26). Michaelis thinks this doubtful. The case illustrated in the parable of the unmerciful servant belongs rather to despotic Oriental than to Jewish manners (Matt. xvii, 9, 34; Michaelis, Ææ. art. 149; Trench, Parables, p. 141). Subsequent Jewish opinions on loans and usury may be seen in the Mishna, Baha Meisah, c. iii, x. See Cuban.

These laws relating to loans may wear a strange and somewhat unreasonable aspect to the mere modern reader, and cannot be understood, either in their bearing or their sanctions, unless considered from the Biblical point of view. The land of Canaan (as the entire world) belonged to its Creator, but was given of God to the de-
scent of Abraham under certain conditions, of which this liberality to the needy was one. The power of getting loans, therefore, was a part of the poor man's inheritance. It was a lien on the land (the source of all property with agricultural people), which was as valid as the title of the government by which the family to whose lot it had fallen. This is the light in which the Mosaic polity represents the matter, and in this light, so long as that polity retained its force, would it, as a matter of course, be regarded by the owners of the property. The execution of the right of redeeming was secured by the entire force with which the constitu-
tion itself was recommended and sustained. But as human selfishness might in time endanger this particular set of laws, so Moses applied special support to the possibly weak part. Hence the emphasis with which he enjoins the duty of lending to the needy. Of this emphasis the real essence is the sanction supplied by that special providence which lay at the very basis of the Mosaic commonwealth, so that lending to the desti-
tute came to be enforced with all the power derivable from the express will of God. Nor was an aversion wanting, arguments sufficient to vindicate these enactments in the light of sound political economy, at least in the case of the Jewish people. Had the Hebrews enjoyed a free intercourse with other nations, the permission to take usury of foreigners might have had the effect of im-
poverishing Palestine by affording a strong inducement for employing capital abroad; but, under the actual restric-
tions of the Mosaic law, this evil was impossible. Some not incon siderable advantages must have ensued from the observance of these laws. The entire aliena-
tion of the land to the lent property, and the continuance of that peculiar institution which restored to every man his property at the great year of release. In the in-
trval between the jubilees the system under considera-
tion would tend to prevent those inequalities of social condition which always arise rapidly, and which have not seldom brought about destruction and ruin. The affluent were required to part with a portion of their affluence to supply the wants of the needy, without ex-
acting that recompense which would only make the rich more wealthy and the poor more needy, thus superin-
tening at least the state of things so far as the system of one than to the other of these two parties. There was also in this system a strongly conservative influence. Agriculture was the foundation of the constitution. Had money-lending been a trade, money-making would also have been eagerly pursued. Capital would be with-
drawn from the land; the agriculturalist would pass into the usurer; huge inequalities would arise; commerce would assume predominance, and the entire common-
wealth be overthrown—changes and evils which were prevented, or, if not so, certainly retarded and abated by the code of laws regarding loans. The gradual increase in wealth of the country was in the main laid out on the soil, so as to augment its produc-
tiveness and distribute its bounties. The same regula-
tions, moreover, prevented those undue expansions of credit and those sudden fluctuations in the relative value of money and goods which were so common in modern times and brought on financial collapses and prostration in mod-
ern communities. While, however, the benign tenden-
cy of the laws in question is admitted, and special ob-
jects may be adduced as attainable by them, may it not be questioned whether they were strictly just? Such a doubt could arise only in a mind which viewed the subject from the position of our actual society. A mod-
ern might plead that he had a right to do what he pleased with his own; that his property of every kind—land, food, money—was his own; and that he was justified to turn all and each part to account for his own benefit. Apart from religious considerations, this position is impregnable. But such a view of property finds no support in the Mosaic institutions. In them property has a divine origin, and its use is intrusted to man on certain conditions, which conditions are as valid as the tenure of the property itself—whence it may be asked, indeed, the entire land—all property—was a great loan, a loan lent of God to the people of Israel, who might well, therefore, acquiesce in any arrangement which required a portion—a small portion—of this loan to be under cer-
tain circumstances accessible to the family to whose
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therefore lay beyond the sphere embraced by this special arrangement. It would open to a wide field did we proceed to consider how far the Mosaic system might be applicable in the world at large; but this is very clear to our mind, that the theory of property on which it rests—that is, making property to be divine in its origin, and therefore tenable only on the fulfillment of such conditions as the external laws of religious or civil morality enforce—is more true and more philosophical (except in a college of atheists) than the narrow and baneful ideas which ordinarily prevail. These views may prepare the reader for considering the doctrine of property. To return to the subject of law and politics. It is found forcibly expressed in Luke's Gospel (vii, 39, 35): "If ye send to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners also send to sinners, to receive as much again; but love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest: for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil." The meaning of the passage is distinct and full, unmistakable, and not to be evaded. He commanded men to lend, not as Jews to Jews, but even to enemies, without asking or receiving any re- turn. It is the banishment of the Greed of the Universal world, who sends down his rains and bids his sun to shine on the fields of the unjust as well as of the just. To attempt to view this command in the light of reason and experience would require space which cannot here be given. In the meantime, he must add, that as a precept to explain the injunction away is most unworthy on the part of professors of the Christian religion; and that, not impossi- bly at least, fidelity to the behest of his whom we call Lord and Master would of itself answer all doubts and remove all misgivings by patriotically showing that this, as every other doctrine that fell from his lips, is indeed of God (John xii, 17). Yet, while we must maintain the paramount obligation of our Sav- iour's precept, corroborative—and, indeed, explicable— as it is, of the essential principle of the Mosaic economy; namely, the inoculation of universal brotherly love, nev- ertheless common sense, no less than sound morality, dictates at least the following co-ordinate considerations, which should likewise be taken into the account in the exercise of Christian liberality, in loans as well as in gifts: 1. Due inquiry should be instituted, so as to satisfy the lender of the moral worthiness of the credi- tor, lest the loan, instead of being a benefaction, should really be but a stimulus to vice, or, at least, an encour- agement to idleness. 2. The wants of one's own family and nearer dependents must not be sacrificed by il- lusory liberality. 3. A kindly generosity, which is held in trust should be carefully discriminated from one's own personal property, and a greater degree of caution exer- cised in their administration. 4. We have no right to loan what is already due for our own debts—"we must be just before we are generous." In fine, the great fact that we are but stewards of God's bounty should be the ruling thought in all our benefactions, whether in the form of loans or gifts, and we should therefore dispense funds so as to contribute most to the divine glory and the highest good of the recipients. This principle alone is the true corrective of all selfishness, whether parsimony on the one hand, or prodigality on the other. See BORROW; LEND, etc.

LOAYSA, GRACIA DE, an eloquent Dominican preach- er and Spanish cardinal, was born in 1479 at Talavera, Castile; entered the Dominican Order at St. Paul de Penmary; was made doctor of philosophy, next of theology, director of studies, re- ctor at St. Gregory, prior of the convent of Avila and of Valladolid, provincial of Spain (1518), and finally gen- eral of his order. In 1532 he was chosen confessor to Charles V, of whom he had previously been a teacher. In the following year Charles V made him bishop of Ossa. He admitted him into his private council, and very soon made him president of the Royal Council of the Indies, and president of the Crusade. Loayza strongly opposed the release, without ransom or condition, of Francis I, king of France, made prisoner by Charles at Pavia. Succeeding events proved his coun- sel good. In 1580 Charles V obtained a cardinalship for him from pope Clement VII, and also the title St. Suzanne. In the same year he named him bishop of Burgos and of Aragon. In the great controversy on the history of the Inquisition, it is said to have been in- fluenced by its grand inquisitor of Spain. He was fre- quently ambassador for Charles V, and kept up a private correspondence with him, some of the letters of which (from 1580 to 1592), embracing Charles's stay in Ger- many, are among the most important in the history of the Inquisition, are published by G. Heine from the archives of Simancas. These letters prove Loayza very bitter against the "heretics." Loayza died April 21, 1546, at Madrid. See Antonio, Biblioth. Hispana Nova, iii, 514; Eckard, Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum, ii, 39; Le P. Touron, Hommes Illustres de l'Ordre de Saint- Dominique, iv, 98; Table du Jour, des Sorcans, vol. vi; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, vol. xxxi, s. v.; Vehe, Memoires de la Court of Austria, i, 156 sq.; Thomas, Dict. de Biog. et Mythol. s. v.

LOBBE, a celebrated convert in Hennegouw, near Liege, in Belgium, founded by St. Laudemel, is noted peculiarly for his holiness and austerity. At the age of 27, as it is said, he sold his sacred vestments, bought a horse, and set up his abbot, the celebrated monk Heriger, who flourished towards the close of the 10th century. His whole history is so thoroughly entangled in mythical narratives that it is well-nigh impossible to tell when Heriger first came to Hennegouw, and when he was elected abbot (Reg. Benedict. iv, 157, v, 753), it thinks probable that Heriger entered Lobbes in 960, and that he could not, because of the low condition of the inmates of that monastery previous to this date, have been educated there. Heriger wrote Vita St. Uramari:—Orta episcoporum Tournensium et Ledecian- sium (after Aug. 978)—Vita St. Landwardi (about 980), etc. He died Oct. 51, 1007.

LOBER, GOTTHILF FRIEDMANN, a German theologian, was born at Bonnebec, in the duchy of Sachsen-Altenburg, Oct. 22, 1722. In 1743 he entered the Uni- versity of Jena, where, in 1741, he lectured on linguistics of the Old and New Test., and later on philosophy. Notwithstanding his splendidly prosperous life in this sphere, he gave up academical life in 1748, and removed to Al- tenburg as assistant court preacher (his aged father was then chief court preacher). In 1745 he became assessor of the Consistory; in 1747, archdeacon; in 1751, preach- er of a foundation and councillor of the Consistory; in 1756, superintendent of a principal; in 1792, year of his death, of the Consistory; in the following year he celebrated his jubilee of fifty years of office. He died August 22, 1799. By reason of his extensive learning, profound linguistic attainments, accurate knowledge of all the branches of theology, and great piety, he is considered one of the greatest Lutheran theologians of the 18th century. Of his productions, we mention Observationes ad historiam eis et mortis Jesu Christi in ipso estatis floro obvia spectante (Altenburg, 1787, 8vo).—Döring, Celebrit. Theol. Deutschlands, s. v.

LOBETAN, JOHANN KONRAD, a German theologian, was born at Habel, near Homburg, Sept. 29, 1668. In 1705 he entered the University of Marburg; later, he spent three years in Cassel, and in 1717 went to Bremen to continue his studies. In 1714 he accepted a call to Weimar as court preacher of the duchess dowager Charlotte Dorothea Sophie; in 1730, to Cöthen, as chief minis- ter and superintendent, with the dignity of a counsellor of the Consistory. Subsequently he was, for several years, the first minister and councillor of the Consistory of the German Reformed Church at Magdeburg. The latter portion of his life he spent at Cöthen, where he died Nov. 22, 1755. Lobethan was a most eminent preacher; the earnest and warm mode of his delivery always captivated the attention of his audience. Of his productions, mostly of a ascetical character, we
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In 1790 he again returned to Strasburg as professor and preacher, and there died, June 29, 1794. Lobstein's above-mentioned stay in Paris not only offered him the opportunity of hearing some of the best Orientalists of the day (a fact which chiefly contributed to his extensive and accurate knowledge of the Oriental languages), but also made him acquainted with many great men of that city. Of his scholarly productions we only mention Diss. de Arina emini pace, sermo consili Argenaretatis, 1766, 4to—Commentatio historico-philologica de monibus Ebal et Garizim (ibid. 1770, 4to) ;—Observaciones críticas en loca Pentateuchí illustria (Gessi et Fran. col.1797, 8vo). He published also the Samaritan Codex, after the Copy in the Royal Library at Paris—Düring, Gelíchte Th. Deutsch, s. v.

LobWASSER, AMBROSE, a German Protestant poet, was born at Schwerin, in Saxony, April 4, 1615. He studied law, and became chancellor of Misnia, which position he resigned in 1658, to assume the duties of a professorship at the University of Königsberg. He died Nov. 26, 1685. Lobwasser exerted great influence over the religious concerns of the duchy of Prussia, which, being at first exclusively Lutheran, had to be about equally divided among Lutherans and Calvinists. His reputation chiefly rests, however, on his German version of the Psalms (based upon the French translation of Clement Marot and Theodore Beza), published under the title Die Psalmen und Propheten in deutschen Reimen (Lpz. 1573, 8vo; Heidelberg, 1574; Lpz. 1579; Strasb. 1597, Amsterd. 174(4). The translation was so symmetrical that the music made for the French by Claude Gondimel was exactly adapted to the German. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that it is entirely devoid of poetical merit, as might naturally be expected, for a translation from a translation can seldom have any of the original spirit. These Psalms were nevertheless used in the German Reformed churches until the middle of the 18th century, on account of the people's aversion against singing any but sacred productions. Lobwasser wrote also Sammern aller Kopfelt d. heiligen Schrift, in deutschen Reimen (Lpz. 1584, 8vo). See Jicher, Gelehrten Lexik. Kon.; Koch, Gesch. d. Kirche; Herzog, Real-Encyclopäd. x, 447; Hoefez, Neues. Dic. Gen. xxxi, 429. (J. N. F.)

Local Preachers. The term "local," as applied to preachers in Methodist churches, is used in contradistinction to the term "itinerant" or "travelling," which designates members of Annual Conferences. Local preachers are lay preachers. They are not subject to appointment by bishops or stationing committees, as are itinerant ministers. Nevertheless, they are formally licensed, and subject to the direction and exhortations of the pastoral authority in the charge in which they reside. By special arrangement, and by authority of the presiding elder, a local preacher is sometimes appointed preacher in charge or pastor for a longer or shorter period.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church the following is the process of the appointment of any person as a local preacher. 1. He must be recommended by the leadings meeting of the Church to which he belongs. He must be elected by a Quarterly Conference before which he has been examined on the subject of doctrines and discipline. 2. An election by the Quarterly Conference at this stage appoints a candidate to the office of a local preacher. In proof of his appointment, he is furnished with a license signed by the president of the Conference. The license is given for one year only, and, in order to be re-elected, must be re-signed by the next Quarterly Confer-

ence. 3. Subject to the following prerequisites, a local preacher may be ordained: (1) He must have held a local preacher's license for a four consecutive years before his ordination. (2) He must have been examined in the Quarterly Conference on the subject of doctrines and discipline. (3) He must have received a "testi-
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monial" from the Quarterly Conference, signed by the president and countersigned by the secretary. This testimonial must recommend the applicant as a suitable person to receive ministerial orders. (4) He must pass an examination as to character and qualifications before the Annual Conference, and obtain its approbation and appointment to orders.

Local preachers are amenable to the Quarterly Conferences of which they are members. An ordained local preacher is not required to have his credentials renewed annually, although his character must be approved each year by the Quarterly Conference. No person is entitled to admission on examination to an Annual Conference who is not a local preacher, and specially recommended by the Quarterly Conference as a suitable candidate for the "travelling connection." Thus the local or lay preacher's office is made preparatory to the itinerant or fully-constituted ministry. Local preachers are subject to all the moral and religious obligations of the regular ministry. Although expected to devise and execute plans for doing good to the extent of their individual ability, they are nevertheless required to act under the direction of their pastors or preachers, when so requested by the Discipline of the Church to give local preachers regular and systematic employment on the Sabbath.

On large circuits, and on stations embracing missionary work, and where the number of local preachers is considerable, it has been customary to print a Plan covering all the appointments of a quarter, and designating the time and place of each individual's services. In the Wesleyan Methodist Church of Great Britain the insertion of a local preacher's name on the current plan of the charge is deemed a sufficient license and public authentication for his office. In his measures for training and employing lay workers in the Congregational Church, Rev. T. Dewitt Talmage, of Brooklyn, has adopted the system of mapping out the work of his lay preachers in a printed plan, after the manner above alluded to.

According to official statistics, the number of local preachers in the Methodist Episcopal Church at the close of 1889 was 18,558, a number less by but 1387 than that of the itinerant ministers of the same Church. The number of local preachers in the eight other Methodist bodies of the United States is supposed to be about 10,000. In all but a few exceptional cases, the individuals forming this great body of evangelical workers render their services to churches and people without fee or reward. Many of them faithfully and zealously obey the command of the great Teacher, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel," quicken into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in bitter the poor, and the maimed, and the halt, and the blind;" also, "Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled." While preaching laboriously on the Sabbath, they support themselves by diligence in business during the week.

Within a few years past a spirited effort has been made among the local preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church for mutual improvement, and the general increase of their intellectual and spiritual power of the body. A National Local Preachers' Association has been formed, which has held public sessions in various parts of the United States. "At these annual gatherings representatives from all parts of the world come together for counsel, and for the comparison of personal experience, and observations, and methods of labor; also to discuss questions bearing upon their work generally." This association also encourages the organization of branch associations in different sections of the country. The National Association referred to memorialized the General Conference of 1872, requesting the following legislation, viz.:

(1) To organize in each presiding elder's district a District Conference, to be composed of all the travelling and local preachers in the district, and to be presided over by the presiding elder, and meet semi-annually.

(2) To give this District Conference authority to receive, license, try, and expel local preachers, and also to recommend suitable persons to the Annual Conference to be received into the travelling connection, and for ordination as local deacons and elders.

(3) To authorize the District Conference to assign each local preacher his field of labor for the next session, and hold him strictly responsible for an efficient performance of his duties.

This scheme of District Conferences being analogous to that long practiced by the Wesleyans of Great Britain, was, with sundry additions and modifications, adopted, but, nevertheless, made subject to the opinion of a majority of the Quarterly Conferences in any given district. The local preacher's office may be considered a feature in the Church's work in all the lands of the world, and in all parts of the world. By means of its lay preaching it is not only sanctioned, but regulated and made auxiliary to regular Church and missionary movements. In England a monthly magazine is published, entitled The Local Preacher's Magazine, to furnish lay preachers material for study, etc., since 1851. See also, The Establishment of Probation, The Local Ministry, its Character, Vocation, and Position (1851); G. Smith, Wesleyan Local Preacher's Manual (1851); Mills, Local or Lay Ministry (1851).

Lochman, John George, D.D., a Lutheran minister, widely and favorably known, was born in Philadelphia, June 18, 1769. He entered the University of Pennsylvania, at which he was graduated in 1789, and from which institution he subsequently received the doctorate. He studied theology under the direction of Dr. Helmuth, and was licensed to preach the Gospel in 1794. Soon after, he accepted a call to Lebanon, in Pennsylvania, where he remained twenty-one years, laboring with great fidelity and the most satisfactory results. In 1815 he was elected pastor of the Lutheran Church at Harrisburg, Penn. His successful labors here were terminated by death July 10, 1826. Dr. Lochman was a typo of those clerical and popular preachers who were held in high estimation by the Church, and exercised an unbounded influence. See Sprague, Ammula A. M. Pulpi, ix, 110 sq. (M. L. S.)

Loci Communes Theologici is the name given to expositions of evangelical dogmatics in the early times of the Reformation. It originated with Melanchthon, and was retained by many as late as the 17th century. Melanchthon was led to adopt it in consequence of its classical signification, the word loci being then used to denote the fundamental principles of any system or science, and he considered it desirable that the loci of theology should also be regularly established and defined. "Sic etiam in summo pendet omne rerum sordidum et rigenda sint studia intelligatur" (Loci communes a. hypothyses theologian, 1521); "Prodest in doctrina Christ. ordine colligere praecipue luct us intelligi posse; quid in summa profetiarum doctrina Christiania, quid a d omnem partem, quid non pertinent" (Loci communes, 1583, init.). But, as the very first principle of the R. E. Form Universalis, the Bible was as a source of saving truth, it is evident that the Loci communes theologice could be nothing else than the Scriptures themselves. In the first edition of his Loci Melanchthon confined himself almost exclusively to the Epistle to the Romans, in the exposition of which he collected the Communiantiorem rerum theologico- rum loci; in his second work (1583) he extended his field, following the historical order, and this plan has been generally adopted since. The most striking progress accomplished by this method, compared with the former systematic treatment of dogmatics, is, as Melanchthon himself pointed out, a return to the Bible on all points, instead of to the sentences of Peter Lombard, "Quia ine recitare dogmata ut nec muniat lectorem Scripturae testimonii nee de summa Scripturae disputatum." As the loci were restored to the Bible, it was natural that the Loci theol. also should be less scientific and learned works than such as could help the people to a clearer understanding of the Scriptures. Hence
they were published in German by Spalatin (1521), afterward by J. Jonas (1586), and finally by Melanthon himself (1587), and designated by them as the chief articles and principal point of Scripture (Hauptartikel u. fremdlinge Punkte d. gottes kraft, Schrift), or of Christian doctrine (Hauptartikel christlicher Lehre). Melanthon, however, in the third part of his Locii (1548–59), gradually withdrew from this position, and adopted a manner of treating the subject more akin to scholasticism. This was subsequently the case with the Locii theologici of Abdius Prætorius (Schulze) (Wittsemburg, 1689) and Strigel (ed. Pezel, Neust, 1681), who held the same views, as well as those of Martin Chemnitius (ed. P. Lërter, Franc. a. M. 1611) and Hafenreifer (Tub. 1690), who differed from him; also of Leonard Hutter (Wittsemburg, 1619), who went on an entirely different principle, which John Gerhard tried to soften down in his renowned Locii theol. (Jena, 1610), while A. Calov, in his Systema locorum theol. (Wittsemburg, 1658), carried it to its full extreme. After this time the expression Locii theologici ceased to be used in Lutheran dogmatics.

In the Reformed Church it was used by Hyperius (Basle, 1566), W. Musculus (Berne, 1661), Peter Martyr (Basle, 1590), J. Macer (Franeker, 1693), and D. Chemnitz (Gera, 1658). See Gass, Greek, d. prot. Dogmatik (1854, vol. 1); Huppe, Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus, etc. (1857, vol. 1); C. Schwartz, Studien u. Kräften (1855, i. and 1857, ii). — Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, viii, 449. (J. N. P.)

Locke (𝕃וק, nøl), to bar up a door, Judg. iii, 23, 24; rendered “bolt.” 2 Sam. xiii, 17, 18, “inclose,” “shut up,” in Cant. iv, 12; hence לָמַשׁ, lamash, “the bolt;” or fastening of a door, Neh. iii, 8, 16, 18, 14, 16; Cant. v, 6. The doors of the ancient Hebrews were secured by bars of wood or iron, though the latter were almost entirely appropriated to the entrance of fortresses, prisons, and towns (comp. Isa. xiv, 2). Thus we find it mentioned in 1 Kings iv, 13 as something remarkable concerning Bashan that “there were trescore great cities, having walls and brazen bars.” These were almost the only locks known in early times, and they were furnished with a key and a keyhole, which was applied to the bar through an orifice on the outside, by means of which the bolt or bar was slipped forward as in modern locks (Judg. iii, 24). There were smaller contrivances for inner doors, and probably projecting pieces by which to move the bolt with the hand (Cant. v, 6). See Bar. Numerous modern locks. 2. Every door is furnished with a wooden lock, called a lock cylinder, the mechanism of which is shown by a sketch here inserted. No. 1 is a front view of the lock, with the bolt drawn back; Nos. 2, 3, and 4 are back views of the separate parts and the key. A number of small iron pins (four, five, or more) drop into corresponding holes in the sliding bolt as soon as the latter is pushed into the hole or staple of the door-post. The key also has small pins, made to correspond with the holes, into which they are introduced to open the lock, the former pin being driven up, the latter down, by the key. The wooden lock of a street door commonly has a sliding bolt about fourteen inches long; those of the doors of apartments, cupboards, etc., are about seven, eight, or nine inches. The locks of the gates of quarters, public buildings, etc., are made of the same kind as those of the above dimensions; in small buildings, two feet in length, or more. It is not difficult to pick this kind of lock.” (Mod. Egyptians, i, 25). Hence they were sometimes, as an additional security, covered with clay (q. v.), and on this a seal (q. v.) impressed (comp. Job xxvii, 14). (See Rauwolf, Prév. in Ray, t. 17; Russell, Synopsis Volney, p. 498; V. C. Hughes, iv. 129; Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt., abridgment, i, 15, 16.)

See Door.

The other terms rendered “lock” in the Auth. Ver. refer to the hair of the head, etc.: they are the following: מַעַלְיָה, maaleh, “macklophoth,” braids or plaits, e. g. of the long hair of Samson (Judg. xvi, 19, 19), מַעַלְיָה, maaleh, "macklophoth," the forelock on the head (Ex. xiii, 9); also a "fringe" or tassel, Numb. xx, 88, 39; comp. Matt. xxiii, 5; מַעַלְיָה, maaleh, "macklophoth," the forelock of a man’s or woman’s hair (Cant. vii, 4, 12; comp. Schultens, Op. min. p. 246); but מַעַלָה, maalah, "macklophoth," the veil or face covering for the head and face, usual in the East (Cant. iv, 1, 6; vi, 7; Isa, xliii, 2). See Hair.

Locke, George, a Methodist preacher, was born in Cannontown, Pa., June 8, 1797, and reared in Kentucky. His early educational advantages were few, but he improved all opportunities to secure knowledge. His parents were Presbyterians, but George was made a Methodist through the preaching of Edward Talbot when a saddler’s apprentice. In 1817 he was licensed to exhort, and to supply the vacant church. In 1818 he entered the Tennessee Conference, and was successively appointed to Little River Circuit, to Powell’s Valley, and to Bowling Green Circuit, Ky. In 1822 he located in Shelbyville, and engaged in secular business. His conscience forced him to re-enter the ministry, and he successively preached on Jefferson Circuit and Hartford Circuit (Kentucky Conference). In 1826 he was transferred to Corydon Circuit, Illinois Conference. In 1828 he labored on Charleston Circuit, and was the means of one of the greatest revivals that Southern Indiana has ever witnessed; while he was making thesame name, he was appointed presiding elder of Wabash District, which comprised an area of territory in Indiana and Illinois of at least 100 miles from east to west, by 200 miles from north to south, on either side of the Wabash River. While on this district he contracted the consumption, and was obliged to become supernumerary. He died in Albany, Ind., in July, 1834. See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, vii, 608.

Locke, John, the most notable of modern English philosophers, who has exercised the greatest influence on all subsequent speculation, in both psychology and politics, and whose doctrines, under various modifications or exaggerations, will contribute largely to mould the opinions of the civilized world. He has in great measure determined the complexion of British psychology. As the most strenuous antagonist of Cartesianism; as the precursor and teacher alike of the French encyclopedia and of the Scotch school; as the oracle of the freethinkers, the target of Leibnitz, and the stimulator of Hartley, Berkeley, and Hume, Locke must always attract the earnest consideration of the student of metaphysics. For nearly two centuries his name has been a battle-cry, and his dogmas have been fought over by the shadowy host of warring ideologues with the zeal and the fury with which the Greeks and the Tro-
Locke was acquainted with the body of Patroclus. His labors in the department of mental philosophy constitute only a part of his claims to enduring regard. His inquiries have been scarcely less fruitful in political philosophy and political economy. In the former he is the arantiacus of Rousseau; in the latter science, of Adam Smith. In each he has laid the foundations on which later theorists and later statesmen have been content to build.

Life.—John Locke was born Aug. 29, 1632, at Wrington, Somersetshire, and was educated first at Westminster School, and later at Christ Church College, Oxford. Here he prosecuted the prescribed studies with diligence and success, but deviated from the beaten path by devoting himself to the disconcerted writings of Des Cartes, who had died a few years before. He obtained the baccalaureate in 1655, and the master's degree in 1658, and then applied himself to the study of medicine, rather for the sake of knowledge and of his sickly frame than with the purpose of practicing his profession.

In 1664 Locke accompanied the embassy to the elector of Brandenburg as secretary of legation, but he returned to Oxford within the year, and applied himself to experimental philosophy, then rising into favor. An accident now decided his course of life, and occasioned his acquaintance with Lord Ashley—the celebrated Earl of Shaftesbury—whom with he was persuaded to accompany to England in the next year. By his skill and good luck he relieved his patron of a disease which endangered his life, and was induced to confine his medical practice to a small circle of the lord's friends, and to give his chief attention to political speculations and questions of state. He thus became a man of the world before he became a philosopher. In 1666 Locke accompanied the earl and countess of Northumberland to France. The earl proceeded towards Rome, and died on the way. Locke returned with the countess to England, and again found a home with Ashley—chancellor of the exchequer. The frequent absence of the earl's court was employed to superintend the education of Ashley's heir, a feeble boy of sixteen. He was afterwards commissioned to select a wife for him, and did so satisfactorily. In due course of time he took charge of the education of the eldest son of this marriage, the author of "The Characteristics." "To such strange uses may we come at last?"

Though residing with Lord Ashley, Locke retained his connection with Oxford, which he frequently visited. On one of these visits, in 1670, the conversation of Dr. Thomas Sprat was turned to the difficulties of making a living. "A mind, he was told, as capable as his was, was not considered among the difficulties, still unsettled, and perhaps insoluble question of the nature and limits of human knowledge. This supplied the germ of the Essay on the Human Understanding, though nearly twenty years elapsed before the completion and publication of the work. In 1672, Ashley, the master-spirit in Charles II's Cabinet, was created earl of Shaftesbury, and soon after he was made lord high chancellor. Locke was appointed secretary of the board. Next summer Shaftesbury surrendered the great seal, and became president of the board of trade. Locke was made secretary to the board. It was at this time that he produced for his noble friend and the other proprietors the Constitution of the Carolinas. In another year the commission of trade was dissolved, Locke lost his post, and he dreamt of making a livelihood by his profession. But his health was feeble, and he travelled in France, acquiring at Montpellier the intimacy of the earl of Pembroke, to whom he afterwards dedicated his "Essay." On Shaftesbury's restoration to office as lord president of the council, 1679, he sent for Locke, but the minister in October of that same year. In two years more he was brought to trial for treason, but the grand jury ignored the indictment. Shaftesbury, however, was compelled to escape secretly to Holland, where he died, June 21, 1683. Locke had followed him, and wrote an affectionate tribute to his memory.

The hostile testimony of bishop Fell proves that Locke had held himself aloof from the intrigues in which Shaftesbury was involved. He did not avoid the malice which such an intimacy invited. He was deprived of his studentship at Christ Church, and vainly attempted to regain it at the Toleration. He was accused of January 11, his successor was demanded from the state's general on the charge of complicity in Monk's insurrection. He was concealed by his Dutch friends. William Penn offered to procure his pardon, but the office was nobly declined. During this exile Locke composed his first essay on Toleration, and produced his plan of "A Commonplace Book"—if it be a—cumbrous and inadequate device, which admits of easy improvement. During this period—towards the close of 1687—he finished the Essay concerning the Human Understanding. The mode of its composition has left painful traces on the completed work, as was apprehended and acknowledged by its author.

The Revolution of 1688 restored Locke to his native land. He signalized his return by the publication of his great philosophical work. An attempt was made to prohibit its introduction into the University of Oxford. In 1690 he issued his two treatises On Government. They controverted the doctrine of the divine right of kings, and referred the origin of government to a social compact, which is equally disproved by theory and by history. They were a greater service by recognizing labor as the foundation of property, though the idea was pressed too far.

Locke continued to decline diplomatic honors, but accepted the place of Commissioner of Appeals, with the modest salary of £200. He directed his regards in these years to the coinage of the realm, which was much debased; and published in 1691 his Considerations on the Lowering of Interest and Raising the Value of Money, which was followed in 1696 by Further Considerations on Raising the Value of Money. He was in frequent correspondence with Clarendon, who brooked on the subject of that restoration of the British coinage which was brought about by the concurrent action of Lord Somers and Sir Isaac Newton.

In 1695 Locke withdrew from the dull, heavy atmosphere of London, and accepted a pleasant retreat for his increasing asthma and advancing age at Oates, in Essex, the seat of Sir Francis Masham, who had married the accomplished daughter of Dr. Cudworth. It had been the fortune of Locke through life to live "quadrus ulenia." His last quarters were at Oates. This was his first home, upon his return home in the great rage, where he waited in cold abstraction's apathy for a miracle to reanimate his spirit, according to the dogma of The Reasonableness of Christianity (produced in 1685). This work sought the union of all Christian believers by advancing the doctrine that the only necessary article of Christian belief is comprised in the acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah, making all the requirements beyond this to consist of practical duties, of repentance for sin, and obedience to the moral precepts of the Gospel. It will be remembered that king William III, of England, entertained the design of uniting Catholics, Presbyterians, and Dissenters upon common ground, and to further this scheme Locke wrote The Reasonableness of Christianity (comp. Quarterly Review, Lond, 1841, July). About the time of his retirement from the city Locke published his third Letter on Toleration, and in the first year of his seclusion wrote his little tract on the Education of Children. The same year which brought out his exceedingly heterodox essay on Christianity was marked by his philosophical controversy with Dr. Stillingfleet, bishop of Worcester.

Locke's circumstances were now rendered perfectly easy by his appointment as commissioner of Trade and Plantations, with emoluments amounting to £1000 per annum. Locke, however, had an aptitude for losing or dropping the gifts of the fairies. Increasing debility made him resign his comfortable sinecure in 1706, and
four years later, he died calmly at Oates, Oct. 28, 1704. He was buried at the neighboring church of High Lavenborough, according to the wishes of those who, like Christina of Sweden or Euler's predecessor, followed with her sympathies the studies she could not understand, placed Locke's bust with those of Bacon, Newton, and Clarke, in the mausoleum erected by her at Richmond Park to commemorate the glories of English philosophy.

Locke's health was always exceedingly feeble, and his existence was prolonged only by constant vigilance and care. This doubtless contributed to his absence from any energetic vocations, and probably influenced his theories as well as his character and conduct. It rendered his existence a career of tranquil and learned leisure, except so far as it was interrupted by the suspicions and malice which civil discord directs against every man of note. The self-regarding habits of a valeudinarian may have impelled the thoughts of the philosopher to that continual introspection and that exaggeration of personal impressions which so strongly mark his philosophy. His love of ease and security showed itself in his general demeanor. He was cautious and retiring, affable and genial in his intercourse, kindly and affable in his nature, free from personal animosities, notwithstanding his transitory difference with Newton and his controversy with bishop Stillingfleet. He avoided the incumbrances of maternity; and the deficient experiences of an old bachelor—the want of that most suggestive knowledge, the dawn of intelligence in infancy—may be noted in his whole psychology. His life was, however, worthy of his eminence, and was such as to make him a suitable compere of those fortunato minim—those happy philosophic dispositions which are represented by Malebranche, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Berkeley, and Hume.

Philosophy. The philosophy of Locke is very simple, if not very coherent, and very unsystematic in its treatment by himself. It consists rather of one prolife principle and its explanations than of any complete and orderly scheme. That principle furnishes a foundation for a distinctive method, which was only imperfectly and inconsistently developed by him. That method is psychological, and Locke has been too hastily regarded as its inventor, whereas he only applied it too exclusively and within too narrow limits. Locke's controversial works are naturally directed to the removal of the objections and refutations of those with which his fundamental tenet and its applications are obnoxious: but even the Essay itself is mainly employed in the discussion of topics which illustrate the dogma rather than establish a formal body of doctrine, and with the determination of the boundaries of philosophy much more than to philosophy proper.

An examination of the analysis usually prefixed to the "Essay" will show how small a portion of the work really belongs to the regular exposition of a metaphysical system; how much is occupied with the anticipation of objections, or the simplification of apprehensions of difficulties. The treatise is divided into four books. The first repudiates the Cartesian doctrine of innate ideas, and is therefore controversial and negative. It does not seem to have been very highly regarded by Locke himself. The second is an inquiry into the origin and limits of human knowledge, and is the characteristic portion of Locke's philosophy. The third is given to the consideration of words, and is in many respects the most valuable part of the book, affording useful suggestions for guarding against the multidimensional structure of the "Idola Rasa." It is dialectical rather than philosophical, though it affords frequent opportunities of confirming or expounding his cardinal tenet, and of exhibiting its inadequacy. The fourth book is on the nature of knowledge in general, and does little more than the others, having already reached to the determination of the degree, extent, and quality of human knowledge, which is reduced by him not merely to relativity, but to a beggarly and unsatisfactory relativity.

The circumstances which provoked the composition of Locke's celebrated treatise account in a most instructive manner for the character of his doctrine. His addiction to the writings of Des Cartes in his college days—his rejection of his postulates and conclusions—his fondness for the physical and natural sciences—his utter defect of poetic sensibility—his association with great and with the beau monde—his political and practical proclivities, confined his attention to observed phenomena, cramped and discouraged the criticism of those phenomena, and withdrew his thoughts from what lay beyond, and as it was required for the intelligent observation and interpretation of the phenomena supposed to be observed. Hence he was led to ignore the spirit of human thought—to exaggerate the importance of the words which served for the counters of metaphysical speculation—to make much of his philosophy turn upon the precision and determinateness of terms, and to consider that a scrupulous recognition of their import in their acceptance and employment constituted the main part of philosophy. Hence, when he undertook to examine our own abilities, and see what objects our understandings were or were not fitted to deal with, the examination of the senses, to which he prefixed an account of the experimental method of metaphysics, but revolved tediously and with needless prolixity around the limits of the meanings of words. He thus necessarily arrived at an excessive, though far from rigorous nominalism.

In the impotence of the nominalists, and in the philosophers of the latter part of the 17th and the first quarter of the 18th century—Cartesianism. The influence of the suspected doctrine was manifested at the outset of his labors by his proposition to substitute the phrase determinate ideas for clear and distinct ideas—though a mere change of name, and such a change, could effect little in producing a complete reform of system. It is a startling commentary on the insufficiency of this substitution that no writer has been more capricious and vacillating in his employment of terms than Locke himself, and that the very term idea, which he elaborately defines, is used by him without determinate meaning, and in almost every possible sense except its true one. He, however, furnished neither the first nor the solitary example of the abuse of this fine Platonic invention. Locke's popularity may be due to the ease, and vigor, and the vivacity of his teaching. The materialism of which his fundamental tenet and its applications are obnoxious is rugged, ambiguous, conversational, and as far removed from philosophical propriety as it is from literary elegance.

The influence of Des Cartes, edging antagonism, tempted Locke to commence his investigation by an assault on the hypothesis of innate ideas, which unquestionably formed the latent substratum of the Cartesian delusions. Certainly the clear and distinct ideas of Des Cartes had no title to be accepted as innate. Locke had thus an easy task in refuting the Cartesian positions. He failed to recognize that the incorporated doctrine was not thereby refuted. The "tabula rasa" of Locke was just as much an assumption and as much a fallacy as the innate truths of his opponent—unless by the tabula rasa is understood, what Locke would not have understood, the sensitive and sympathetic tablet ready to restore in the sunlight of life all images presented to it. It is perfectly true that distinct conceptions and formulated maxims are not innate, or anterior to all excitation. This admission does not disprove the reality of congenital and constitutional preadaptations of the intellect, such as are the peculiarities of the particular conceptions and propositions when suitably presented to the mind and apprehended by it. Locke's doctrine on this point has consequently been surrendered, and the doctrine opposed by him has been accepted, under jester limitations, by many who do not entertain the profoundest reverence for his general procedure. The Cartesian postulate compelled the assertion of a divine in-
fluct to explain the operations of the mind, and suggested Malherbe's celebrated thesis of "seeing all things in God." Locke, who had assailed the heresiah, felt the necessity of controverting the hazardous modification proposed by the fervent acolyte. But the tenet to which Locke was himself driven by the compulsion of his own erroneous principles was equally hazardous and still more seditious to his idea of God is obtained by sensation and reflection.

Having got rid of innate ideas—tenues sine corpore vitae—the English philosopher proceeded to investigate the origin of human knowledge—the averted object of his main inquiry. Locke was an inversion of logical order, as Morell has observed, in seeking the ratio essendi of the phenomena before ascertaining the containing phenomena themselves; but the accidental connection between the first and second pages of the Essay is very intimate. If knowledge be not deduced ab intra, it might naturally appear to be derived ab extra. Hence Locke concluded that all knowledge is obtained from sensation and reflection. This is his principle, and his principle is his philosophy—the curtain is the picture. The distinction between the sensation and its intellectual apprehension is not by him; it is observed that if sensation and reflection upon sensation are the exclusive sources of knowledge, the knowledge of reflection is derivative from and dependent upon sensation, and all knowledge springs from sensation alone. This oversight occurred his very inadequate explanations of our sense, our language, our God; it furnished Hume with his cardinal positions in regard to impressions and ideas; it rendered Locke a suitable patron for the French encyclopedists and the materialists, and created the belief that he espoused the tenet "We have no innate Ideas in us at our birth."

This tenet was held by neither Aristotle nor Locke, but Locke's development of his own principle often seems to assert and to rest upon that tenet, and both provoked and justified the celebrated response and refutation offered by Leibnitz in the proposed addition to the maxim of the words "nisi intellectus ipse." Locke might have accepted that addition, but it was not declared by his language, nor clearly indicated by his teachings; and its frank acceptance would have been fatal to his philosophical expositions; for, if reflection be considered as a source of knowledge distinct from sensation, it must be external, and rational deduction the foundation of the mind itself to the intellectual product. Locke's original attitude was that of a polemic engaged in the refutation of Des Cartes; this attitude he never altogether abandoned; it determined his habits of speculation and organized his manner of writing in still further misled by the looseness, awkwardness, obscurity, and prolixity of his style, by its colloquial negligence of phrase, by that wavering of expression, and imparlability of figurative illustration which have been noted by Sir William Hamilton, Maurice, and nearly every other student of his works. The equivocation of the terms employed by him escaped his recognition, while it perplexed his readers, and produced much the same effect upon his reasoning as was produced upon Hume's by a similar agency. With Locke there might be delusion; there was no sophistry; there was an open, manifest spirit, a candor and honesty of investigation which often spirited or ignored consistency in the determined apprehension of what was felt instinctively to be right. His book accordingly exercises a most wholesome influence even when the developments of his doctrine are most aberrant, and its perverted errors most perilous. The practical character of his own disposition, the predilection for the studies of observation, and the innocence and simplicity of his own nature, guarded him from the effects as well as from the perception of his errors, but at the same time made him even more seductive to others. They preserved his own piet, while his system became a tempulum impietatis.

This practical appetency of Locke's mind was so en
grossing as to leave him utterly without imagination or poetic sensibility. Poetry be disconsolented from want of taste, but professedly for the more ignoble reason that "no gold was found at the roots of Parnassus." The absence of imagination was a very serious defect. It was not true in his case that ome ignorant pro mirabil. On the contrary, the wondrous that he knew was "undeemed of in his philosophy." These intellectual peculiarities became very manifest in his religious and political treatises—sometimes inducing point, perspicuity, and popularity; sometimes generating prosaic assumptions for want of penetrating vision. Theologically occasioned the denial of the immortality of the soul in the Reasonableness of Christianity—the ascertainment of all value to labor originated expounded in his economical speculations—the allegation of a social contract and of a state of nature—pure and unadulterated hypotheses—in his treatises On Government, and other less prominent vagaries. These points merit careful consideration, but they can be only noted here. We should not, however, omit to mention that Locke's amiable and tolerant disposition, the associations of his life, the tenor of his philosophy, his love for the extension of civil, political, and religious liberty at home and abroad, and entitle him to reverential regard as one of the chief benefactors of humanity.

Literature.—The literature illustrative of Locke's philosophy is endless. It includes the greater part of the philosophical treatises written since the close of the 17th century. It must suffice, therefore, to mention here only the works of most direct importance, and most readily accessible. Of such is the following list composed.


Locke, Nathaniel Clarke, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born June 1, 1816, at Salem, N. J., graduated from Middlebury College, Vt., in 1839; from Union Theological Seminary, New York, in 1844; was immediately licensed by the New York Presbytery, and soon after entered upon the duties of his charge at Eastville, Northampton County, Va.; accepted a call to the Central Church, Brooklyn, in 1847; three years later took charge of the Church at Hempstead, L. I., N. Y., and there labored until 1850, when failing health compelled him to seek for a dismission. Dr. Locke was a member of the General Assembly of 1860, which met in Rochester, N. Y. A number of his discourses were published, and he was also a large contributor to religious press. He died July 21, 1862. He was gifted with a well-trained and well-stored mind, and was eminently genial and social as a pastor and friend, and earnest and eloquent as a preacher. See Wilson, Presbyterian Historical Almanac, 1863, p. 188. (J. L. S.)

Locke, William, a divine and educator, was born at Woburn, Mass., Nov. 28, 1782, and was educated at Harvard University (class of 1756). He was ordained minister of the Gospel at
these words denote merely the different states through which the locust passes after leaving the egg, viz. the larva, the pupa, and the perfect insect—all which much resemble each other, except that the larva has no wings, and that the pupa possesses only the rudiments of those members which are fully developed only in the adult locust (Bubalius). But this supposition is manifestly wrong with regard to several of these terms, because, in Lev. xi, 22, the word וְכָלָּם, “after his kind,” or species, is added after each of them (compare ver. 14, 15, 16). It is most probable, therefore, that all the rest are also the names of species. But the problem is to ascertain the particular species intended, and here we are at a loss.


In every passage where arabs occurs, reference is made to its terribily destructive powers. It is the locust of the Egyptian plagues described in Exod. x, where, as indeed everywhere else, it occurs in the singular number only, though it is there associated with verbs both in the singular and plural (ver. 5, 6), as are the corresponding words in the Sept. and Vulgate. This is a want of uniformity, which will be rendered probable that four species were employed in the plague on Egypt, of which this is named first (Ps. lxviii, 40, 46; cv, 34). These may all have been brought into Egypt from Ethiopia (which has ever been the cradle of all kinds of locusts), by which is called in Exodus “the east wind,” since Bochart proves that the word which properly signifies “east” often means “south” also. The word arabs may be used in Lev. xi, 22 as the collective name for the locust, and be put first there as denoting also the most numerous species; but in Joel 1, 4, and Ps. lxviii, 46, it is distinguished from the other names of locusts, and is mentioned second, as if of a different species; just, perhaps, as we use the word fly, sometimes as a collective name, and at others for a particular species of insect, when speaking of the horse, the turnip, the fly, etc. When the Hebrew word is used in reference to a particular species, it has been supposed, for reasons which will be given, to denote the Gryllus gregarius or migratorius. Moses, therefore, in Exodus, refers Pharaoh to the visitation of the locusts, as well known in Egypt; but the plague would seem to have consisted in bringing them into that country in unexampled numbers, consisting of various species never previously seen there (comp. Exod. x, 5, 6, 15).

It is one of the flying creeping creatures that were allowed as food by the law of Moses (Lev. xi, 21). In this passage it is clearly the representative of some species of winged salutatorial orthoptera, which must have possessed a number of features sufficient to distinguish the insect from the three other names which belong to the same division of orthoptera, and are mentioned in the same context. The opinion of Michaelis (Suppl. 667, 510), that the four words mentioned in Lev. xi, 22 denote the same insect in four different ages or stages of its growth, is quite untenable, for, whatever particular species are intended by these words, it is quite clear from verse 21 that they must all be winged orthoptera. The Septuagint word βραχύς there clearly shows that
in a room, while aware that from fifty to one hundred different species annually visit our apartments. The Scriptures use popular language; hence "the multitude," the devourers, or the darker men, may have been the familiar appellations for families of locusts. The common Greek words for locusts and grasshoppers, etc., are of themselves equally indefinite, yet they also served for the names of species, as ἀκρός, the locust generally, from the tops of vegetables, on which the locust feeds; but it is also used as the proper name of a particular species, as the grasshopper ōρατος ἐφύθη, then winged, is applied sometimes to the grasshopper; τροφημιούσα, from τροφή, to chew, sometimes to the caterpillar. Yet the Greeks had also distinct names restricted to particular species, as ἄρός, κορυφία, επιμέλεια, etc. The Hebrew names may also have served similar purposes.

(2) Gen (23, 1xxiii, 4; Sept. ἄρυθρος, Vulgate omits, Engl. "locusts"), or Gss (213, Amos vii, 1, ἄρυθρος ἐφύθη; Aquila, ἄροδον [voratrices], locustus, "grasshoppers, 3, 3, 17, ἄρηλαβος, locustus, "grasshoppers"). Here the lexicographers, finding no Hebrew root, resort to the Arabic, دَحَّلِ, to creep out (of the ground), as the locusts do in spring. But this applies to the yearlings, not the species of locusts, and the expressions from Aristotle and Pliny occur unfortunately in general descriptions of the locust. Castell gives another Arab root, جنح, to cut or tear, but this is open to a similar objection. Parkhurst proposes 23, anything gibbous, curved, or arched, and gravely adds, "The locust in the caterpillar state, so called from its shape in general, or from its continually hatching out its back in motion." The Sept. word in Nahum, ἄρηλαβος, has already been shown to mean a perfect insect and species. Aristotle speaks of its parturition and eggs (Hist. Anim. v, 29; so also Plutarch, De Isid. et Orig.), It seems, however, not unlikely that it means a wingless species, and Podisma of the Ægyptiaca of the grasshoppers, which are of this kind, he includes under the genus Tettix. He says, this defines the ἄρηλαβος as a small locust, and Pliny mentions it as the smallest of locusts, without wings (Histo. Nat. xxix, 5). Accordingly, the Sept. omits only leaping to it. In Nahum we have the construction ἄρηλαβος, locust of the locusts, which the lexicons explain as a vast multitude of locusts. Archbishop Newcome suggests that the phrase is either a double reading where the scribes had a doubt which was the true reading, or a mistaken repetition not expunged. He adds, that we may suppose 23, the contracted plural for 22 (Improved Version of the Minor Prophets, Pontefr. 1809, p. 188). Henderson understands the reduplication to express "the largest and most formidable of that kind of insect" (Comment, on the Minor Prophets, ad loc). Some writers, led by this passage, have believed that the 20 represents the larva state of some of the large locusts; the habit of halting at night, however, and encamping under the hedges, as described by the prophet, in all probability belongs to the winged locust as well as to the larva; see Exod. x, 13: "The Lord brought an east wind upon the land all that day and all that night; and when it was morning, the east wind brought the locusts." Mr. Barrow (I, 257-8), speaking of some species of South African locusts, says that when the larva, which are still more voracious than the parent insect, are on the march, it is impossible to make them turn out of the way, which is usually that of the wind. At sunset the troop halts and divides into separate groups, each occupying in bee-like clusters the neighboring eminences for the night. It is quite possible that the 20 may represent the larva or nymphal state of the insect; nor is the passage from Nahum, "When the sun arieth they flee away," any objection to this supposition, for the last stages of the larva differ but slightly from the nympha, both which states may therefore be comprehended under one name; the 20 of Nah.
iii. 17 may easily have been the nympha (which in all the A. metabolus continue to feed as in their larva condition) encamping at night under the hedges, and, obtaining their wings as the sun arose, are then represented as a flash of light by the rays of the rising sun (Nath. iii. 17). It certainly is improbable that the Jews should have had no name for the locust in its larva or nymphal state, for they must have been quite familiar with the sight of such devourers of every green thing, the larve being even more destructive than the imago; perhaps some one of the salvages, all the names of species, admit to the names of so many species, denote the insect in one or other of these conditions. See Grasb.
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tena, under the scarabaei (Hist. Nat. vi. 8). The Jews inter- crickets that does so. Tychsen suggests the G. striolus of Linn. The song of the Gryllus tarsipes is sweet and loud. On similar principles we might conjecture, although with perhaps somewhat less certainty, a derivation from the Chald. ῥῆξ, to pray, and thence infer the Manda religious, or Priester, Deu, so called from its singular atti- tude, and which is found in Palestine (Kitto's Physical History, p. 418). The words in the Sept. and Vulg. properly mean the mildew or corn, etc., and are there applied metaphorically to the ravages of locusts. This mildew was anciently believed by the heathens to be a divine chastisement; hence their religious ceremony called Rubigilia (Pliny, Nat. Nat. xxvi. 29). The word is evident, and is here perhaps a synonyme for some one of the other names for locust. Michae[11] (Supplem. 1894) believes the word is identical with chasi, which he says denotes perhaps the mole- cricket, Gryllus talpiformis, from the stridulous sound it produces. Tychsen (p. 73, 80) identifies it with the Gryllus stridulus, Linnæus (= Epidota stridula, Aud. Serv.). The notion conveyed by the Hebrew word will, however, apply to almost any kind of locust, and, in- deed, to many kinds of insects; a similar word, translacina, was applied by the Ethiopians to a fly which the Arabs called zand, apparently identical with the tache fly of Dr. Livingstone and other African travellers. In the pas- sage in Deuteronomy, if an insect be meant at all, it may be assigned to some destructive species of grass- hopper or locust.

(11.) The Greek term for the locust is ἀπίχ, which occurs in Rev. ix, 8, 7, with undoubted allusion to the Oriental devastating insect, which is represented as ascen- ding from the smoke of the infernal pit, as a type of the judgments of God upon the enemies of Christianity. They are also mentioned as forming part of the food of John the Baptist (Matt. iii. 4; Mark i. 6), where it is is, as some have supposed, any plant that is intended, but the insect, which is still universally eaten by the poorer classes in the East, both in a cooked and raw state (Hackett's Illustra. of Script. p. 97).

II. Locusts belong to that order of insects known by the term Orthoptera (or straight-winged). This order is divided into two large groups or divisions, viz. Car- soria and Solitarioria. The first, as the name imports, includes only those families of Orthoptera which have legs formed for creeping, and which are considered unclean by the Jewish law. Under the second are com- prised those whose two posterior legs, by their peculiar structure, enable them to move on the ground by leaping.

This group contains, according to Serville's arrange- ment, three families, the Gryllidae, Locustariæ, and the Acridiæ, distinguished one from the other by some peculiar modifications of structure. The common house cricket (Gryllus domesticus, Linn.) may be taken as an illustration of the Gryllidae; the green grasshopper (Locusta viridissima, Fabr.), which the French call Sauterelle verte, will represent the family Locustariæ; and the Acridiæ may be typified by the common migratory locust (Epicota migratoria, Aud. Serv.), which

is an occasional visitor to Europe (see the Gentlemen's Magazine July, 1748, p. 381, 414; also The Times, Oct. 4, 1845). Of the Gryllidae, G. cerisyi has been found in Egypt, and G. domenicus, on the authority of Dr. Kitto, in Palestine but no other species have occurred in the countries. Of the Locustariæ, Phanomopera falcata, Serv. (G. falco, Scopoli), has also, according to Kitto, been found in Palestine, Bradyporus dubius in Asia Minor, Turkey, etc., Sago Nistaha near Smyr-
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which is a species commonly sold for food in the markets of Bagdad (Serv. Orthop. 657). A. semifasciatus, A. peregrinum, one of the most destructive of the species, and A. morbium, occur either in Egypt or Arabia. Calliptamus seropis and Chorogogus lybraeus are found in Egypt, and in the cultivated lands about Cairo; Ere mobius carinato, in the rocky places around Sinai. Exciakes, E. pulchripes, E. edipsis octofasciata, and E. migratoria (= G. migrat. Linn.), complete the list of the Suborder Orthoptera of the Bible lands. Of one species M. Olivier (Voyage dans l'Empire Othoman, ii, 424) thus writes: "With the burning south winds (of Syria) there come from the interior of Arabia and from the most southern parts of Persia clouds of locusts (Aedusoa peregrinum), whose ravages to these coun- tries are as grievous and nearly as sudden as those of the heaviest hail in Europe. We witnessed them twice. It is difficult to express the effect produced on us by the sight of the whole atmosphere filled on all sides and to a great height by an innumerable quantity of these insects, whose flight was slow and uniform, and whose noise resembled that of rain: the sky was darkened, and the light of the sun considerably weakened. In a moment the terraces of the houses, the streets, and all the fields were covered by these insects, and in two days they had nearly devoured all the leaves of the plants. Happily they lived but a short time, and seemed to have migrated only to reproduce themselves and die; in fact, nearly all those we saw the next day had paired, and the day following the fields were covered with their dead bodies." This species is found in Arabia, Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Persia. The ordinary Syrian locust greatly resembles the common grasshopper, but is larger and more destructive. It is usually about two inches and a half in length, and is chiefly of a green color, with dark spots. It is provided with a pair of antennae or "feelers" about an inch in length, projecting from the head. The mandibles or jaws are black, and the wing-coverets are of a bright brown, spotted with black. It has an elevated ridge or crest upon the thorax, or that portion of the body to which the legs and wings are at- tached. The legs and thighs of these insects are so powerful that they can leap to a height of two hundred times the length of their bodies; when so raised they spread their wings, and fly so close together as to appear like one compact moving mass.

Locusts, like many other of the general provisions of nature, may occasion incidental and partial evil, but, upon the whole, they are an immense benefit to those portions of the world which they inhabit; and so con- nected is the chain of being that we may safely believe that the advantage is far confined to those regions. "They clear the way for the renovation of vegetable productions which are in danger of being destroyed by the exuberance of some particular species, and are thus fulfilling the law of the Creator, that of all which he has made should nothing be lost. A region which has been choked up by shrubs, and perennial plants, and hard, half-withered, impalatable grasses, after having been laid bare by these scourges, soon appears in a far more beautiful dress, with new herbs, superb lilies, fresh annual grasses, and young and juicy shrubs of perennial kinds, affording delicious herbage for the wild cattle and game" (Sparman's Voyages, i, 367). Meanwhile their excessive multiplication is repressed by numerous causes. Contrary to the order of nature with all other insects, the males are far more numerous than the females. It is believed that if they were equal in number they would in ten years annihilate the vegetable system. Besides all the creatures that feed upon them, rains are very destructive to their eggs, to the larvae, pupae, and perfect insect. When perfect they always fly with the winds, and are therefore constantly carried out to sea, and often ignorantly descend upon it as if upon land. (See below, III.) Myriads are thus lost in the ocean every year, and become the food of fish. On land they afford in all their several states sustenance to countless tribes of birds, beasts, reptiles, etc.; and if their offices as the scavengers of nature, commissioned to remove all superuous productions from the face of the earth, sometimes incidentally and as the operation of a general law, interferes with the labors of man, as do storms, tempests, etc., they have, from all antiquity to the present hour, afforded him an excellent supply till the land acquires the benefit of their visitations, by yielding him in the mean time an agreeable, wholesome, and nutritive aliment.

There are different ways of preparing locusts for food: sometimes they are ground and pounded, and then mixed with flour and water and made into cakes, or they are salted and then eaten; sometimes cooked; boiled or roasted; stewed, or fried in butter. Dr. Kitto (Pict. Bible, note on Lev. xi, 21), who tasted locusts, says they are more like shrimps than anything else; and an English clergyman, some years ago, cooked some of the green grasshoppers, Locusta orcadianon, boiling them in water half an hour, throwing away the head, wings, and legs, and then sprinkling them with pepper and
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salt, and adding latter; he found them excellent. How strange, then, say, "how idle," to quote the words of Kirby and Spence (Endem. i, 305), was the controversy concerning the locusts which formed part of the sustenance of John the Baptist, ... and how apt even learned men are to perplex a plain question from ignorance of the customs of other countries! They are even an extensive article of commerce (Sparmann's Voyage, i, 567, etc.).

III. The general references to locusts in the Scriptures are well collected by Jahn (Bibl. Arch. vol. viii, 1889, iii, 76), and Dr. Harris speaks of their having a leader whose motions they invariably followed (The History of the Bible, London, 1825). See this notion refuted by Kirby and Spence (ii, 16), and even by Moufett (Theat. Insct. p. 122, Lond. 1694). It is also worthy of remark that no Hebrew root has ever been offered favoring this idea. Our translation (Nah. iii, 17) represents locusts, "great grasshoppers," as "camping in the hedges in the cold day, but when the sun ariseth as fleeing away." Here the locust, gōb, is undoubtedly spoken of as a perfect insect, able to fly, and as it is well known that at evening the locusts descend from their flights and form camps for the night, may not the cold day mean the cold portion of the day, i.e. the night, so remarkable for its coldness in the East, the word הַמְּלֵא being used here, as it often is, in a comprehensive sense, like the Gr. ἡμέρα and Lat. dies? Geesiatus suggests that הַמְּלֵא, "hedges," should here be understood like the Gr. αἰγαῖα, shrubs, brushwood, etc. (See above, i, 2.) With regard to the description in Joel (chap. ii), it is considered by many learned writers as a figurative representation of the ravages of an invading host of human beings, as in Rev. ix, 2, 12, rather than a literal account, since such a devastation would hardly, they think, have escaped notice in the books of Kings and Chronicles. Some have abandoned all attempt at a literal interpretation of Lev. xi, 22, and understand by the four species of locusts there mentioned, Shalmanezer, Nebuchadnezzar, Antiochus, and the Roman. Theodoret explains them as the four Assyrian kings, Tiglath-pileser, Shalmanezer, Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar; and Abarbanel, of the four kingdoms inimical to the Jews, viz. the Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans (Pococke's Works, i, 214, etc., Lond. 1740; Rosenmuller, Scholia in Joel c. i). From the Scriptures it appears that Egypt, Palestine, and the adjacent countries were frequently laid waste by vast bodies of migrating locusts, which are especially represented as a scourge of God's providence for the punishment of national sins; and the brief notices of the inspired writers as to the habits of the insects, their numbers, and the devastation they cause, are amply borne out by the more laborious details of modern travelers in the East, who have often seen the hordes, and sometimes obscured the sun (Exod. x, 3; Jer. xlv, 23; Judges vi, 5; vii, 12; Joel ii, 10; Nah. iii, 15; compare Livy, xii, 2; Ellen, N. A. iii, 12; Pliny, N. H. xi, 29; Shaw, Travels, p. 187 [fol. 2d ed.]; Ludolf, Hist.)

Salted locusts on rods borne in procession. (On sculpture from Roses, in the British Museum.)

That they were eaten in a preserved state by the ancient Assyrians is evident from the monuments (Layard, Bab. and Assy. p. 289).

The locust-bird referred to by travelers, and which the Arabs call smurrur, is no doubt, from Dr. Kitto's description, the "rose-colored starling," Pastor roseus. The Rev. H. B. Tristram saw one specimen in the orange-graves at Jaffa in the spring of 1858.

The smurrur, or locust-eating bird.

But makes no allusion to its devouring locusts. Dr. Kitto in one place (p. 410) says the locust-bird is about the size of a starling; in another place (p. 420) he compares it in size to a swallow. The bird is about eight inches and a half in length. Larveel (British Birds, ii, 51, 2d ed.) says "it is held sacred at Aleppo because it feeds on the locust;" and Col. Sykes bears testimony to the immense flocks in which they fly. He says (Catalogue of the Birds of Dakhma) "they darken the air by their numbers ... forty or fifty have been killed at a shot." But he says "they prove a calamity to the husbandman, as they are as destructive as locusts, and not much less numerous." The great flights of locusts occur only every fourth or fifth season. Those locusts which come in the first instance only fly on trees, and do not destroy grain: it is the young, before they are able to fly, which are chiefly injurious to the crops. Nor do all the species feed upon vegetables; one, comprehending many varieties, the truxalis, according to some authorities, feeds upon insects. Laterelle says the house-cricket will do so. "Locusts," remarks a very sensible tourist, "seem to devour not so much from a ravenous appetite as from a rage for destroying." Destruction, therefore, and not food, is the chief impulse of their devastations, and in this consists their utility: they are, in fact, omnivorous. The most poisonous plants are indifferent to them; they will prey even upon the crowfoot, whose causticity burns the very hides of beasts. They simply consume everything without predilection, vegetable matter, linen, woolen, silk, leather, etc.; and Pliny does not exaggerate when he says "forbes quote them even on the doors of houses," and even the doors of houses (xi, 29), for they have been known to consume the very varnish of furniture. They reduce everything indiscriminately to shreds, which become manure. It might serve to mitigate popular misapprehensions on the subject to consider what would be the consequence if locusts had been carnivorous like wasps. All terrestrial beings, in such a case, not excluding man himself, would have become their victims. There are, no doubt, many things respecting them yet unknown to us which would still further justify the belief that this, like "every other "work of God, is good"—benevolent upon the whole (see Dillon's Travels in Spain, p. 256, etc., London, 1789, 4to).
Mendenaen, Jodocus vus, a noted Dutch theologian, was born at Delft in 1628. He studied under Van Rossum at Leyden, and under Leuwenaeus, Franeker, and became preacher at Zoorzem in 1644; at Sluis, in Flanders, in 1650, and at Utrecht in 1652—in all of which places he used every exertion to revive the spirit of practical piety among his countrymen, whom great prosperity had rendered worldly-minded and indifferent. When, in 1672, the country was threatened by the invasion of the French under Louis XIV, he proclaimed it a judgment of the Lord, and called on them to repent. He found many followers. In 1665 he ceased to administer the Lord's Supper, from conscientious scruples. Laying great stress on purity of life and of heart, he feared lest he might administer it to some unworthy to receive this sacred ordinance. The number of his adherents gradually increased, and they spread over the whole Netherlands, but they never separated from the Reformed Church like the Labadists. The effect of Lo- mendenaen's labors may be traced in the history of Spener's labors afterwards in Germany. He died pastor of Utrecht in 1677. He wrote Verfallenes Christentum (published after his death by J. Hofmann), Reformationspiegel (to be found also in Arnold's Kirchen u. Kircherhistorie), and a number of hymns, etc.—Hertzog, Reali.

Endeck, p. 450. (J. N. P.)

Lodge (properly some form of the verb "lodge, bin, or sin, to stay over night, a-dorme, etc., etc.) See Ins. In Isa. i., 8, the "lodge in a garden" (יוֹלָד, melamä), a lodging-place, rendered "cottage" in Isa. xxiv., 20 signifies a shed or lodge for the watchmen in a garden; it also refers to a sort of hanging bed or hammock, which travellers in hot climates, or the watchmen of gardens or vineyards, hang on high trees to sleep in at night, probably from the fear of wild beasts (Isa. xxiv., 20). The lodge here referred to was a little temporary hut consisting of a low framework of poles, covered with boughs, straw, turf, or similar materials, for a shelter from the heat of the day and the cold of the night, for the watchmen that kept the garden, or vineyard, during the short season while the fruit was ripening (Job xxxviii., 18), and speedily removed when it had served that purpose. It is usually erected on a slight artificial mound of earth, with just space sufficient for one person, who, in this confined solitude, remains con- stantly watching the ripening crop, as the jackals during the vintage often destroy whole vineyards, and likewise commit great ravages in the gardens of cucum- bers and melons. This protection is also necessary to prevent the depredations of thieves. To see one of these miserable sheds standing alone in the midst of a field or on the margin of it, occupied by its solitary watcher, often a decrepit or aged person, presents a striking image of dreariness and loneliness (Hackett's Illustr. of Scripture, p. 163). See Cottage.

Lodge, Nathanael, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Graves County, Va., August 20, 1768; was converted in 1804, entered the Conference at Baltimore in 1810, and died Nov. 27, 1815. He was a very zealous and useful minister, and many souls were converted through his preaching. He was greatly lamented by his people, as on the day on which he was suddenly cut down.—Minutes of Conferences, i., 378.

Lodge, Robert, a member of the Society of Friends, was born at Masham, Yorkshire, about 1665. He was a religious youth, and became a Friend about 1660. He preached and suffered for the Quaker cause in Ireland. On July 15, 1690, he died, assuring his

**Loebur**, one of the three Norse divinities (Odin and Haner), who, walking at the sea-shore, created the first pair of men. See *Loc.

**Loëfler, Friedrich Simon**, a German Protestant theologian, a member of the celebrated philosopher Leibnitz, was born at Leipzig Aug. 9, 1669, and was educated at the university of his native place. In 1689 he became magister of philosophy and bachelor of divinity. In 1695 he was appointed professor at Probstheida, and served there until 1743, when, at the age of 48, he was made emeritus preacher. He died in 1748. He wrote *Specimen exegese, s. de operarum in vitæ*: *Dist. de litteris Bellerophonita*: etc.

**Loëfler, Josias Friedrich Christian**, a noted German Protestant theologian, was born at Stassfeld January 18, 1752. Having lost his father in 1765, he was educated in the orphan asylum and at the University of Halle. In 1774 he went to Berlin, where he made the acquaintance of Teller, and in 1777 became minister of one of the churches of that city. He now made himself known as a writer by translating Souvénain's renowned work on the Platonism of the fathers. In 1778 he was appointed chaplain in the Prussian regiment, but returned at the end of a year to Berlin, where he resumed his office, devoting also part of his time to educational pursuits. In 1783 he became professor of theology at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and minister of the principal church of that city. Here his rationalistic views made him many enemies. In 1787 he was appointed general superintendent at Gota, but entered on this office only in the following year. The University of Copenhagen conferred on him the degree of D.D. in 1792. He died February 4, 1816. Loëfler published three volumes of separate communications, and acts, and was after 1808 the editor of the continuation of Teller's *Magazin für Prediger*. See Döring, *Die deutscbe, Kanzelredner des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts*, p. 223; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, viii, 451.

**Loft** (oriously, upper chamber, e.g. of a private house (1 Kings xvii, 19; Acts xx, 9). Such rooms were either over the gate (2 Sam. xix, 1) or built on the flat roof (2 Kings xxiii, 12), and were especially used for prayer, conference, or public meetings. See CHAMBER; HOUSE; ROOF.

**Loftus, Dudley Field**, an Irish lawyer, noted as a learned Orientalist, was born at Rathfarnham, near Dublin, in 1618. He rose to the position of master in Chancery and a judge of the Prerogative Court. He translated the Ethiopic New Testament into Latin for Walton's Polyglot; also published translations from the Syriac into Latin and English. He died in 1695. See Wood, *Athen. Oxon.*; Harris's edition of *Ware's Ireland*; *Lodge's Peerage of Ireland*.

**Loftus, William Kenneth**, an English archeologist, was born at Rye in 1820. He was a zealous traveller and discoverer, and explored the sites of several ancient cities on the Euphrates and Tigris. In 1857 he published a work entitled *Travel and Researches in Chaldeas and Susiana*; also an account of *Some Excavations at Warka*, the Erech of Ninurta, and *Zikakia, the Palace of Esther*, in 1849-52. He died in 1858. To the biblical student Loftus's work is of special importance. See Thomas's *Dict. Bibl. and Mythol.*.

**Log** (στοιχεῖον, a deep carry, basin; Sept. σορύλαν, Vulg. sectarius), the smallest liquid measure (e.g. of oil) among the Hebrews (Lev. xiv, 10, 12, 15, 21, 24), containing, according to the rabbinis (see Carphon, *Apocrypha*, p. 262), a twelfth part of a "hill", or six eggs, i.e. nearly a pint. See MEASURE.

**Logan, David Swift**, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Pittsburgh, Pa., in 1834. His literary education was commenced in the academy of Beaver, and was continued in Jefferson College (class of 1854). In 1857 he became the Western Theological Seminary, and, after completing the regular theological course, was licensed by the Presbytery of Alleghany City, and afterwards ordained as an evangelist by the Presbytery of Steubenville, and for two years preached in the churches of New Philadelphia and Uhrichville, Ohio. He next labored in the Presbyterian Church of Tiffin, Ohio, until ill health obliged his return to his home in Bridgewater, Pa., where he died, Sept. 15, 1864. Mr. Logan was endowed with a well-balanced nature; no single faculty was cultivated at the expense of the rest. He had method, a happy, sound, thought, sound, a profuse, earnest preacher and a faithful pastor. See Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, 1865, p. 97. (J. L. S.)

**Logan, John**, a noted Scottish divine, was born at Fala, in the county of Edinburgh, in 1748. Though the son of a farmer, he was early destined to the clerical profession, and was educated in the University of Edinburgh. Upon graduation he became tutor to Sir John Sinclair. In 1773 he was licensed as a preacher in the Established Church of Scotland, and was shortly after appointed minister at Leith, where he remained until 1785, when he removed to London, retaining by agreement a part of his clerical income, for the purpose of devoting himself altogether to literary labors. He improved his reputation as a sacred poet. Logan, if not a learned divinity or a very profound thinker, was a man of much eloquence, and a highly popular preacher. But his poetic endowments, strongly lyrical in their tendency, were the highest he possessed; and, unfortunately, he was tempted to apply these in a path where he was ill calculated to shine, and the adoption of which proved fatal not only to his professional usefulness, but to his happiness. In 1780 he printed and caused to be acted in Edinburgh a tragedy called *Flammace*, which had been rehearsed at Covent Garden, but refused a license by the lord chamberlain. This publication brought on the anger of his Presbyterian associates; and these and other annoyances, aggravated by a hereditary tendency to hypochondria, drove him to intoxication for relief. He died in London Dec. 28, 1788. His friends, Drs. J. R. Hutton, and Hardy, published a volume of his sermons in 1790, and a second in 1791. These sermons long enjoyed very great popularity, and have been several times reprinted. They are among the most eloquent that the Scottish Church has produced. A third edition of his poems, with a new preface, and a life, appeared in 1790; but the poems are included in Dr. Anderson's collection. Some of his hymns are annexed to the psalmody of the Scotch Church.

**Logic**, this term, derived from the Greek λόγος, λογος, has been the subject of numerous definitions. By different authors and schools it has been defined as the art of convincing, the art of thinking, the art of discovering truth, the right use of reason, the science and art of reasoning, the science of deductive thinking, the science of the laws of thought as thought, and the science of the laws of discursive thought. These specimen definitions indicate in some degree the diverse conceptions of the subject which have prevailed at different periods and in different circles. Aristotle, whom Sir William Hamilton extravagantly calls the author and finisher of the general science under consideration, had no single name for it. He treated of its principal parts as *analytikè, apodeiktikè, and tropi*, in the latter included the doctrines of Plato and the ethical doctrine of the Sophists. Notwithstanding the honor credited to Aristotle, he himself says that Zeno the Eleatic was the inventor of dialectics.

Thus we are taken back to the early Greek philosophers and their formal discussions of what is now universally denominated Logic. They, in successive generations, developed with more or less clearness its prin-
The 18th century is counted as the second period of scholasticism, during which the leading dialecticians were Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus. During this period scholasticism reached its climax. The 14th and 15th periods of scholasticism witnessed its sensible decline under the protracted but bitter wranglings of the Thomists (Realists) and Scotists (Nominalists).

Notwithstanding an attempt by the Medici of Florence to revitalize the Platonic philosophy in opposition to that of Aristotle, the latter prevailed in the Universities of Europe, and the corruptions of it which had been countenanced by scholasticism began to pass away under the influence of more intelligent discussion. In the 16th century, after the invention of printing, the logical and systematical works of the Stagirite were issued in a purer text and more accurate versions, and largely engaged public criticism.

The authority of Aristotle had been so long supreme in the continental universities, and the union between what passed for his philosophy and the errors of the Church of Rome had been so long established, that it was only natural for Luther and Melancthon, at the beginning of the Reformation, to inveigh strongly against the Aristotelian logic and metaphysics. At time passed over, however, it became apparent that the work of the reformers could not be done through a change in that of the same Aristotelian logic. Melancthon was not slow to perceive this, and subsequently became an acknowledged follower of Aristotle as to dialectics, and even influenced Luther to retract some of his severer utterances. He introduced into the University of Wittenberg, to which Protestant Germany looked up, a scheme of dialectics and physics founded upon the Aristotelian theory. He also imitated the Stagirite philosopher by teaching logic with constant reference to rhetoric. The advocacy and influence of Melancthon secured the prestige of Aristotelian studies in Protestant schools of Germany for more than a century.

About the middle of the 16th century a formidable opposition to the authority of Aristotle sprang up at the University of Paris, under the leadership of Peter Ramus, a scholar of great natural acuteness, and of an irrepressible spirit. He published his Institutiones Dialecticae in 1548. His system, founded with much ingenuity on the writings of Plato, notwithstanding violent opposition, prevailed so far as to greatly weaken the influence of the Aristotelian philosophy. The king of France, weary of the innovation, made complaint against Ramus to Parliament. The king himself interfered, and appointed a public trial of the rival systems of logic. As might have been expected, a majority of the judges favored the established system. Ramus was consequently ordered to desist from teaching, and an order passed for the suppression of his book. That order was subsequently removed, and Ramus again became popular as a teacher. He treated logic as merely the art of arguing, and was very severe on the dry and tedious formalities of the schoolmen. His system embraccd inferences and proofs, and thus blended with rhetoric. In 1551, through the influence of the cardinal of Lorraine, Ramus became royal professor of rhetoric and philosophy, in which capacity he made many proselytes. Having adhered to the Huguenot party, he was killed in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. But he had already translated into German, where his system found no little favor. In Italy it secured a few disciples, but many more in France, England, and Scotland. Andrew Melville introduced the logic of Ramus at Glasgow, and it ultimately became known in all the Scottish universities. The logical writings of the remainder of the 16th century, and somewhat later, were filled with the Ramist and anti-Ramist controversy, which, though of little permanent importance, doubtless prepared the way for a better comprehension of the true principles and processes of logic in later periods.

V. — 16th
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In the 17th century the writings of lord Bacon formed another epoch in the history of logic. See BACON, Logic, according to lord Bacon, comprised the sciences of invention, judging, retaining, and delivering the conceptions of the mind. We invent or discover new arts and arguments. We judge by induction or syllogism, and we make inferences by analogies and similes. The first book of the Norm Organum developed his celebrated and peculiar division of fallacies, viz. idola trubi, idola specia, idola fori, and idola theatr. The second book sought to apply the principles of induction to the interpretation of nature. Although, from a defective knowledge of natural phenomena incident to his time, the author's illustrations were far from perfect, and although many logicians have disputed the correctness of his principles, it cannot be questioned that the Baconian logic and method of study exerted a powerful influence upon his own and after times in stimulating thought and discovery. The remaining authors of the 17th century whose writings influenced the study and methods of logic were Des Cartes, Arnauld, author of L'Art de Penser, and Locke, of England. Probably the most influential treatise on the direct subject was Arnauld's Analysis which consisted of the Port-Royal Logic. It attacked the Aristotelian system, and, being written in a modern language, had the advantage over the heavy Latinity of previous books. In this respect it became an example to subsequent writers, who, from the beginning of the 18th century, were numerous if not influential. It was written in all the logic as was its study of logic failed to command general attention. It had few attractions for the popular mind, and its special devotees were seldom able to place it in successful competition with philosophy, natural science, and general literature. Although prescribed in every system of academic study, and at once the agency and topic of ceaseless wrangling among the worshipers, yet its influence upon human life and public opinion was infinitesimally small.

The limits of this article do not admit of a detailed notice of all the logicians and logical systems of modern times, but only of allusion to a few of the most influential. In Germany, more than in any other countries, the study of logic has within the last hundred years assumed new phases and developed new doctrines, more especially in connection with the various systems of idealistic philosophy. Of that philosophy Immanuel Kant [see KANT] may be considered the inaugurateur, and his first philosophical production commenced with the study of logic. As early as 1762 he published a treatise on the "False Subtlety of the Four Syllogistic Figures," in which he denied the syllogism, as only as that it contained the others ratiocinia hybridia. From this point he went on developing his system, till in 1781 he published his Kritik of Pure Reason, to which in 1790 he added his Kritik of the Judgment. Kant claimed to have subjected the human mind to a new analysis, from which he determined the three comprehensive functions of sense, understanding, and reason. His general scheme is summed up as follows:

I. Doctrine of the transcendental elements of knowledge.
   A. Transcendental aesthetics.
   B. Transcendental logic.
   a. Transcendental analytices.
   b. Transcendental dialectics.
   II. The transcendental method.

Not to mention the numerous defenders and modifiers of the Kantian system, we pass to G. W. F. Hegel [see HEGEL], the publication of whose Wissenschaft der Logik in 1812 marks another epoch in German metaphysics. Hegel employed the term logic in a very extended sense. Not confining it to abstract forms of thought and the laws of ideas, he considered it the science of the self-sufficient and self-determining idea—the science of truth and reality. From his fundamental principle that thought and substance are identical, it followed that what is true of one is true also of the other, and that the laws of logic are ontological. His system claimed to develop the idea of the absolute by antagonism through all its successive stadia. With him the primary element of logic consisted in the oneness of the subjective and objective. Innisitc knowledge only regards the object without considering itself. But consciousness, besides the former, contains a perception of itself, of the stages of perception, consciousness, self-consciousness, and reason. Pure logic, according to Hegel, is divided into, 1. The logic of being; 2. The logic of qualified nature; 3. The logic of the idea.

In 1829, Richard Whately, afterwards archbishop of Dublin, published an article in the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana, which, having been expanded and printed as his Elements of Logic, was soon after extensively adopted as a text-book both in England and America. This publication has justly been considered as constituting an era in the study of logic in Britain and America. The principles of Kant's Kritik of Pure Reason were not extensively introduced into Great Britain until after 1856, when Sir William Hamilton began his lectures in the University of Edinburgh. See HAMILTON. Although Hamilton took opposite ground to Whately in his references to the Port-Royal Logic, he was a adherent to the Analystic of Aristotle. Thus the reawakened taste for logical studies during the present century arose from a restoration, by different methods, of the old logic which had come down from the early ages, and survived all the opposition and ridicule which it met. All of the systems under consideration, that none of the systems put forth by Ramus, Descartes, Locke, or Condillac, and their several modifiers, has been able to stand the test of time like that of the old philosophers and schoolmen. This fact may be accepted as proving that the system indicates substantially the process which takes place in all minds in the act of reasoning. Notwithstanding this small demonstration, and a few other points of general concurrence, the science of logic, which has been the subject of human study for more than two thousand years, remains still incomplete. Many of its principles and processes are yet in continued and active dispute. Since Whately and Hamilton, Mr. John Stuart Mill has written an elaborate work in which he depreciates the syllogism and magnifies induction. But his theories in reference to both bear the stamp of Comte's empirical positivism.

The chief logical discussion of the present day revolves around the "New Analytic of Logical Forms," or the quantification of the predicate introduced by Sir William Hamilton. This new analytic, which is chiefly valuable for its enlargement of the hitherto narrow sphere of syllogism, and for its translation of the metaphysics of Kant, being grounded upon certain principles of the Kritik of Pure Reason. Its theory, although illustrated by an ingenious system of notation, was left in a somewhat crude state by Hamilton, but has been gradually elaborated by Mansel and Thompson, of England, and Bowen and Mahan, of America. While these writers appear to think that they have attained the end of all logical perfection, Dr. McCoth, of Princeton, charges their whole system with fundamental error in presupposing "that there are forms in the mind which it imposes on objects as it contemplates them." To explode this error is the avowed object of Dr. McCoth's recent treatise, in which, while he falls back for confirmation upon the old logic, he claims to unfold laws which were not noticed by the old logicians. The characteristic of his work is a more elaborate and systematic form than has taken place since the publication of the Port-Royal Logic. Thus logic seems destined to pass down to coming centuries as it has descended from the past, a subject of endless debate, but one from which each successive generation derives its advantage in the very process of debate. See Hallam's Literature of Europe; Blakley's Historical Sketch of Logic; Kant's Kritik; Hegel's Wissenschaft der Logik; Whately's Elements of Logic; Sir
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(1) In the apocryphal books of Sirach (chap. i and xxiv) and Baruch (iii, and iv, i–4), this view of Wisdom is developed yet more clearly and fully. The book of Wisdom (vers. 1–180) presents Wisdom as the highest good, the essence of right knowledge and virtue, and as given by God to the sages who pray for it (chap. vii and viii); see especially vii, 22 sq., where Wisdom has divine dignity and honors, as a holy spirit of light, proceeding from God, and penetrating all things. But this book seems rather to have hidden, invisible; and we have viewed it as another name for the whole divine nature as a person distinct from God. And nowhere does it connect this Wisdom with the idea of Messiah. It shows, however, the influence of both Greek and Oriental philosophy on Jewish theology, and marks a transition from the Old-Test. view to that of Philo, etc. See WISDOM, BOOK OF.

(4) In Egypt, from the time of Ptolomy I (B.C. 300), there were Jews in great numbers, their head-quarters being at Alexandria (Philo estimates them at a million in his time). A.D. 50), and there they gradually came under the influence of the Hellenic civilization. There, in the age, a strange mixture of Greek and Oriental customs and doctrines. See ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOLS. Aristobulus, about 150 B.C., seems to have endeavored to unite the ancient doctrines of Wisdom and the Word of God with a form of Greek philosophy. This effort, the leading feature of which was the attempt to harmonize the two elements, is reflected in Philo, a contemporary of Christ, who strives to make Judaism, combined with and interpreted by the Platonic philosophy, do the work of the idea of Messiah, affording by the power of thought a complete substitute for the Torah. This attempt to harmonize the two elements, while it is led in him to a sort of anticipation of certain parts of Christian doctrine, explains how he himself vacillates between opposite and irreconcilable views. See PLATONISM.

(5) Philo represents the absolute God as hidden and unknown, but surrounded by his powers as a king by his servants, and, through these, as present and ruling in the world. (These powers, ἐνεργείαι, are, in Platonic language, ideas; in Jewish, angels.) These are different and innumerable; the original principles of things; the immaterial world, the type of which the material is an image. The two chief of these in dignity are the Θεός, God, the creative power, and the Κύριος, Lord, or governing power of the Scriptures. But all these powers are essentially one, as God is one; and their unity, both as they exist in God and as they emanate from him, is called the Logos. Hence the Logos is the mediator between the two powers; as the reason of God, lying in him—the divine thought; and as the outspoke word, proceeding from him, and manifest in the world. The former is, in reality, one with God's hidden being; the latter comprehends all the workings and revelations of God in the world, affords from itself the ideas and energies by which the world was framed and is upheld, and fills all things with divine light and life, rules them in wisdom, love, and righteousness. It is the beginning of creation; not unoriginate, like God, nor made, like the world; but the eldest son of the eternal Father (the world being the younger); God's image; the creator of the world; the mediator between God and it; the highest angel; the second God; the high-priest and reconciler.

(6) Etschke concludes that, such being the development of the doctrine of the Logos when John wrote, although there is no evidence that he borrowed his views from Philo, yet it is impossible to doubt the direct historical connection of his doctrine with the Alexandrian. Meyer thinks that if we suppose John's doctrine entirely unconnected with the Jewish and Greek philosophy, we destroy its historic meaning, and its intelligibility for its readers. It must be admitted that the term Logos seems to be chosen as already associated in
many minds with a class of ideas in some degree akin to the writer's, and as furnishing a common point of thought and interest with those speculative idealists who constantly used it while presenting them with new truths.

(7.) But any connection amounting to doctrinal dependence of John upon Philo is utterly contrary to the tenor of Philo's own teaching; for he even loses the crowning feature of Hebrew religion, the moral energy expressed in its view of Jehovah's holiness, and with it the moral necessity of the divine teacher and Saviour. He becomes entangled in the physical notions of the heathen, forgets the wide distinction between God and the world, and even denies the independent, absolute being of God, declaring that, were the universe to end, God would die of loneliness and inactivity. The very universality of the conception, its immediate working on all things, would have excluded to Philo the belief that the whole Logos, not a mere part or effusion of his power, became incarnate in Christ. "Heaven and earth cannot contain me," cries his Logos, "how much less a human being." On the whole, it is extremely doubtful whether Philo ever meant formally to represent the Logos as a person distinct from God. All the titles he gives it may be explained by supposing it to mean the ideal world, on which the actual is modelled. At most, we can say that he goes beyond a mere poetic personification of the idea, and marks a distinction of persons in the Godhead. See Philo.

(8.) John's connection with the doctrines of the later Jews, though less noticed, is at least as important as that with Philo. In the apocryphal books, as we have seen, the idea of the Logos was overshadowed by that of the divine Wisdom; but it reappears, prominently and definitely, in the Targums, especially that of Onkelos. These were written, indeed, after John's Gospel (Onkelos, the earliest, wrote not later than the 2d century A.D.), but their distinguishing doctrines certainly rest upon ancient tradition. They represent, and even mechanically inculcate, a doctrine of God, the Memra, דיבר, or Dibur, דיבור, as the personal self-revealed God, and one with the Shekinah, שיקין, which was to be manifested in Messiah. But it would be absurd to claim that John borrowed his idea of Messiah from the Jews, who in him looked for, not a spiritual revelation of God in clearer light, to save men from sin by suffering and love, but a national deliverer, to gather their worldly and carnal desires of power, not even for the divine Word become flesh, and dwelling among men, but for an appearance, a vision, a mere display, or, at most, an unreal, doctet human.

(9.) The contrast between John's Logos and Philo's appears in several further particulars. The Logos here is an abstract, as the Word was. It did not begin to be when Christ came, but was originally, before the creation, "with God, and was God." He made all things (ver. 3). Philo held to the original independent existence of matter, the stuff, ὁνόμα, of the world, before it was framed. John's Logos is light, which shines in moral darkness, though rejected by it. Philo has no such height of mournful insight as this. Logos became man in the person of Christ, the Son of God, Philo conceives of no incarnation. Thus John's lofty doctrine of the Messiah is not in any way derived from Jewish or Gnostic speculations, but rests purely on the Old-Testament doctrine, and chiefly on what he learned from Christ himself. His testimony to this forms the historical part of his Gospel. See MEMRA.

3. THEOLOGICAL BEARING OF THE TERM.—The word "Logos" is therefore evidently employed by the evangelist John to represent the redemptive doctrine of our Redeemer, with special reference to his revelation of the character and will of the Father. It appears to be used as an abstract for the concrete, just as we find the same writer employing light for enlighten, life for life-giver, etc.; so that it properly signifies the speaker or interpreter, than which nothing can more exactly accord with the statement made (John i, 18), 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father, hath declared him,' i.e. communicated to us the true knowledge of his mind and character. That the term is merely expressive of a divine attribute, a position which has been long and variously maintained by Socinians, though abandoned as untenable by some of their best authorities, is in total repugnance to all the circumstances of the context, which distinctively and expressly require personal subsistence in the subject which it describes. He whom John styles the Logos has the creation of all things ascribed to him; is set forth as possessing the country and people of the Jews; as the only-begotten (Son) of the Father; as assuming the human nature, and displaying in it the attributes of grace and truth, etc. Such things could never, with the least degree of propriety, be said of any mere attribute or quality. Nor is the hypothesis of a personification to be reconciled with the universally admitted fact that the style of John is the most simply historical, and the furthest removed from that species of composition to which such a figure of speech properly belongs. To the Logos the apostle attributes eternal existence, distinct personality, and strict and proper Deity—characters which he also ascribes to him in his first epistle besides the possession and exercise of perfections which absolutely exclude the idea of derived or creaturely being. See CHRISTOLOGY.

4. LITERATURE.—The following are the principal monographs on this subject: Sanidius, De Aión (in his Interpretationes, Amsterdam, 1670); Saubert, De rerum Aión (Altdorf, 1687); Carpzov, De Deo Aiónia Philonis (Helmstäd, 1749); Bryant, Philo's Aión (1797); Upham, On the Logos (Boston, 1828); Bucher, Johann. Lehre vom Logos (Schaafft, 1856). For others, see Darmesteter, Wörterbuch, d. v.; Darlington, Cyclopaedia, col. 1059; Lange's Commentary (Am. ed., Intro. to John's Gospel). Comp. also the Metaph. Review, July and October 1851; Jan. 1858; Christian Examiner, W. 5; A. M. Preb. Review, Jan. 1840; July, 1864; Stud. u. Kr. 1880, iii, 672; 1883, ii, 855; 1886, ii, 299. See John, Gospel of.

Logothèa (loγoτhèa, q. d. chancellor) is the title given in the Greek Church to the member of the ecclesiastical courts holding the imperial seal to be appended to their acts. See GREECE, CHURCH OF.

Logos is, in the mythology of the Caribbeans, the name of the first man, who descended from his celestial abode to the soft, shapeless mass of which the earth was formed by his creative power. He first imparted to it shape and motion; the sun rendered it dry and hard. Logos, after his death, reascended to heaven. See Vollmer, Mythology, sect. 6. v. E. v. A. B.]

Lohdlius, CARL FRIEDRICH, a German theologian, was born at Grünberg, near Waldheim, Dec. 13, 1748, and was educated at the University of Leipzig, where, in 1774, he obtained the degree of A.M. and the privilege of lecturing on theology. He became soon after morning preacher at the university. In 1780 he accepted a call to Grimsa as dean, and in 1792 to Dresden. He died there August 4, 1809. Of his scholarly productions we only mention Delineator imago divinitatis de condicione animis post mortem ev, quo Christus et Apostoli rizerunt, sive col. i et ii (Lipsian, 1790, 4to). See During, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschland, s. v. Letters Zealously devoted to the cause of his Master, he studied the ways and means of promoting the Christian religion among the masses of the German people, and in 1849 founded to this end a society for Inner Missions (q. v.), and in 1864, following the example of the immortal Fliedner (q. v.), of Kaiserswerth, established a Deacon-
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Die Sagen v. Loki in Haupt, Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterth. vol. vii.; Thorpe, North. Mythol. vol. i (see Index); and the excellent article in Thomas, Biogr. and Mythol. Dict. (Phil., 1872), s. v.

Lokmán is represented in the Koran and by later Arab tradition as a celebrated philosopher, contemporary with Moses and Solomon, with whom he is said to have frequently conversed. He was, we are told, an Arabian of the ancient tribe of Ad, or, according to another account, the king or chief of that tribe; and, when his tribe perished by the Sei el-Arim, he was preserved on account of his piety and piety. Other accounts, drawn mostly from Persian authorities, say that Lokmán was an Abyssinian slave, and noted for his personal deformity and ugliness, as for his wit and a peculiar talent for composing moral fictions and short apologetics. He was considered to be the author of the well-known collection of fables, in Arabic, which still exist under his name. There is some reason to suppose that Lokmán and Eosop were the same individual, and this view is of late gaining ground. See the excellent articles in the English Cyclop. s. v.; Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.; and Hammer-Purgstall, Literaturgesch. der Araber, i, 51 sq.

Lollards or Lollhards, originally the name of a monastic society which arose at Antwerp about 1300, and the movement of which was centered about the care of the sick and dying with pestilential disorders (see Cellites), was afterwards applied to those who, during the closing part of the 14th and a large part of the succeeding century, were credited with adhering to the religious views maintained by Wiclif (q. v.).

Origin of the Name.—Great diversity of existence exists among scholars on the origin of the name Lollard. Some have supposed that there existed a person of a name in Germany, who, differing in many points from the Church of Rome, made converts to his peculiar doctrines, and was the originator of the movement (see Thomas, Biogr. Dict. art. Lollard, Walter), and for this heretical step was burned alive at Cologne in 1822. It is more than probable, however, that this leader received his name from the sect than gave a name to it, just as in the Prognostic of Johannes Lyttenbeger (a work very popular in Germany towards the close of the 15th century) great weight is attached to the predictions of one Reynard Lollard (Reynhardus Lollhardus), who was, no doubt, so called from the sect to which he belonged. Others believe that it was applied to the Cellites because of their pretense of being digressors at funerals—the Low-German word follem or follem signifying to sing softly or slowly. Another derivation of the word is that which makes it an epithet of reproach. In papal bulls and other documents it is used as synonymous with the term, the tares commingled with the wheat of the Church. In this sense we meet with it (A.D. 1382) even before Wickliffe's death. Still another suggestion comes from a correspondent of "Notes and Queries" (March 27, 1862), who, quoting from a passage of Hede's history, cites a statement to the effect that bishop Florentius de Weelickoven "caused the bones of a certain Matthew Lollert to be burned, and his ashes to be dispersed," etc. The correspondent remarks that from a note on this passage, where reference is made to Prateolus and Walsingham, it is evident that Hede is speaking of the founder of the sect of the Lollards. This same Lollart is the subject of another passage where it is stated that the name of the English sect was derived from a Dutch heretic, buried at Utrecht, and well known in the neighboring region. With much more reason the original of the word Lollard has been traced of late to the Latin word lollardus, by a comparison of the late English Lollard with the old English follem, used by Chaucer and Langeard. Says Whitaker (in his edition of Peters Florence, p. 154 sq.) "Any reader of early English knows that Lollard is the late English spelling of the Latin lollardus. But what is lollard? It is a Latin spelling of the old English follem, used by Chaucer and
Lollards. The real meaning of loller is one who lolls about, a vagabond; and it was equally applied, at first, to the Lollards, next to the beggars. [- Beg-h nuis (q. v.)]. But, before long, loller was purposely confused with the Latin lobillum, by a kind of pun. The derivation of loller from to loll rests on no slight authority. It is most distinctly discussed and explained, and its etymology declared by no less a person than Landau himself, who lived at the time it came into use.

English Lollards. Whatever be the derivation of the word Lollard, certain it is that by this name alone the followers of John Wycliffe (q. v.) were always designated, who, in the early stage of the great religious movements of the bold English churchman (about A.D.1360), consisted of the “Poor Priests” (q. v.), a class called together by Wycliffe to carry the glad tidings of the Gospel into the remotest hamlets, and to counteract the influence of the beggins friars (see Beohards), who were then striding over the country, preaching instead of the Word the legends of the saints and the history of the Trojan War (compare D'Aubigné, Hist. of the Ref. ormination, v. 91 sq.). For some time the mendicant orders, which had first entered England in the early part of the 13th century, had been the objects of attack, both by the people and the clergy, for their rapacious and shameless conduct. Indeed, so much was the country disturbed by the violence and vices of swarms of these sanctimonious vagabonds that the ancient records often speak of their arrest. Wycliffe's opposition to such a class of persons could not but have assured him the general respect and commendation of the people. Not so, however, when, to counteract the influence of the mendicants, he instituted the “Poor Priests,” who, not content with mere polemics, preached the great mystery of grace. His name became as great a terror to the people that the clergy were threatened to be left without any attendants at their churches, preference being shown to the poor priests, preaching in the fields, in some church-yard, or in the market-places. It was not, however, until after Wycliffe's appointment to the University of Oxford that any of the doctrines which the Lollards as a sect afterwards maintained, and which caused his prosecution by the papists, were advocated and propagated. It is true, even as early as 1357, Wycliffe had published a work against the covetousness of Rome (The Last Age of the Church), and in 1365 he vindicated Edward III's resistance to the claim of Urban V of the arrears of the tribute granted to the papacy by king John (see Urban V: England); but it was not until (in 1372) he had taken the degree of D.D., and entered upon his work at Oxford University by able and instructive discourses, that he began to gain the favor of the papacy, that he drew upon himself the enmity of the English Prelates, and, in consequence, came to stand forth as the advocate of reform and the leader of a movement for this purpose. Nor did the success of his course slacken in the least after his withdrawal from the university and his residence at the small parish of Lutterworth. Everywhere those persons who had come under his influence or been converted by his writings were busily engaged in disseminating the doctrines which he taught. His followers were to be found among all classes of the population. Some, like the duke of Lancaster, lord Percy, and Clifford, may have been attached to Wycliffe's views mainly by their political sympathies, but the great mass of his adherents were such upon religious grounds. The examinations of those who, during the generation that followed his death (1384), were excommunicated, and who were called the common doctrinal position which they almost uniformly maintained. It was substantially identical with that taken by Wycliffe in his writings. The supreme authority of the Scriptures in religious matters, the extreme simplicity, and the general nature of his doctrine of pilgrimages, auricular confession, etc., the impiety of image-worship, the identification of the papal hierarchy with Antichrist, the entire sufficiency of Christ as a Saviour, without the need of priestly offices in the mass, and any elaborate ceremonial—such were the points upon which they were pronounced heretical, and, as such, persecuted and condemned.

Up to 1382, through the events of the time, the great schism of the papacy, the indignation excited in England by papal decrees, the scandal of many among the prelates and clergy, Wycliffe, as well as his followers, had been left comparatively unmolested, and he himself even escaped altogether. But not so, however, his followers, who were, near the time of his death, rapidly augmenting all over England. The tem- porary obscurity of Wycliffe's name and the spread of Wickliffe's opinions, though there may be some exaggeration in the remark of the former to the effect that "nearly every other man in England was a Lollard," in 1382, however, more decided action was taken on the part of the ecclesiastics, and resulted in the convoking of a council by archbishop Courtney. By it ten of Wycliffe's articles were condemned as heretical, and twenty-four as erroneous. The archbishop issued his mandate, forbidding any man, of what state or condition soever, "to hold, teach, preach, or defend the aforesaid heresies, or any other contrary opinions," which were to be preached or favored, publicly or privately. Each bishop and priest was exhorted to become an "inquisitor of heretical pravity," and the neglect of the mandate was threatened with the severest censures of ex-communication. This measure took effect, for it was observed, where the archbishop, Robert Rygge, was inclined to fa- vor Wycliffe's opinions, and the proctors, John Hunt- man and Walter Diah, were in sympathy with him. A sermon by Philip Reppynson, which they had allowed, and in which Wycliffe's views were defended, subjected them to the excommunication of the archbishop, and with some difficulty escaped on sub- mission. The chancellor was required to put Wycliffe's adherents to a purgation or cause them to abjure, publishing before the university the condemnation of his conclusions. His reply was that he durst not do it for fear of the "What," exclaimed the archbishop, "is Oxford such a nestler and favorer of heresies that the catholic truth cannot be published?" At the same time, by the archbishop's authority, Nicholas Hereford, Philip Reppynson, John Ashton, and Lawrence Bedemen, whose names were associated with Wycliffe's views, de- nied the privilege of preaching before the university, and suspended from every scholastic act. The chancel- lor himself was addressed as "somewhat inclined and still inclining to the aforesaid conclusions so condemned," and, under pain of the greater excommunication, he was enjoined to spare the people the trouble of the chancel- lor or defend the obnoxious doctrines. The injunction of the archbishop was enforced by the command of the royal council. In the early months of 1389 the king had favored the persecution of heretics. On the petition of the arch- bishop, he had allowed him and his suffragans to arrest and imprison, either in their own prisons, or any other if they please, all and every such person and person as shall either privily or openly preach or main- tain the condemned conclusions. The persons thus ar- rested might, moreover, be detained "till such time as they shall repent them and amend them of such errone- ous and heretical pravities." The officers and subjects of the king were also required to obey and humbly at- tend the archbishop and his suffragans in the execution of their process. But the king declined to intercede. Even the council of Peers, the last, insti- tuted the common doctrinal position which they almost uniformly maintained. It was substantially identical with that taken by Wycliffe in his writings. The supreme authority of the Scriptures in religious matters, they of the scripture, and the nature of his doctrine of pilgrimages, auricular confession, etc., the impiety of image-worship, the identification of the papal hierarchy with Antichrist, the entire sufficiency of Christ as a Saviour, without the need of priestly offices in the mass, and any elaborate ceremonial—such were the points upon which they were pronounced heretical, and, as such, persecuted and condemned.

Ashton's trial in London, the citizens broke open the doors of the con- clave, for suspicion of sacrilege, and the pope was not elsewhere. But popular sympathy was weak to resist the organized efforts of a powerful hierarchy, largely oc-
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carrying the most responsible posts of government, and
die boldly (Hannay's Rep. Gorn.) to forge or intero-
lated by any man, except the control
Some of the accused, like Huyppongton and Here-
ford, recanted, and became the most virulent persecu-
tors of their former sympathizers. Others, according
to Walden, who mentions William Swinderby, Walter
Brute, William Thorpe, and others, whose names figure
in Foxe's "Martyrs," deserted the realm. If Swinderby was
one of the refugees, he soon returned. It is doubtful
whether he or his associates went farther than to Wales
or Scotland. In 1589 he was arraigned before the bish-
op of Lincoln, and charged with heresy. Forced to re-
cant, he was compelled to renounce the base of the dioc-
es where he had previously been. He was again arrested as a "truly execrable offender of the new sect vulgarly called Lollards." The issue, so far as
as episcopal authority was concerned, could not remain
doubtful. Swinderby was found guilty, pronounced a
heretic, and to be shunned by all. From this sentence
he appealed to the king and council.

We have no subsequent record of Swinderby. Foxe
supposes him to have been burned in 1599. In 1599,
Walter Brute, another Lollard, a layman, was arrested,
and, after a tedious trial, was forced to recant. In 1595
the accused man was again summoned before a court,
and an apprehension that Parliament would take some action
in behalf of the persecuted Lollards. A bull of Boni-
face IX was issued, inciting the bishop of Hereford
against the obnoxious sect, and urging him to stimu-
late the orthodox zeal of the king. The king was at
the head of the persecution when the bull itself was
published, and in the presence of the bishops. He could
not have known what had transpired was sent him, and his
immediate return, with a view to repress the boldness
of the Lollards, was sternly urged. Nor was the
king backward in responding to the petitions of the
archbishop and the exhortations of the pope. Reciting
his former commission to the bishops and their suffer-
gings, giving them authority to arrest and imprison, he
extended this authority, by which the bishop of Hereford
was allowed to arrest William Swinderby and Stephen
Bell, who had fled to the borders of Wales; while sev-
eral of the leading members of Parliament were directed
to have it proclaimed, wherever they thought meet,
that no man of any condition within the said diocese
should, under pain of forfeiture of all he had, "make
or levy any conventicles, assemblies, or confederacies by
any color," and that, if any one should transgress this
rule, his own house should be burned, and his slaves still surrendered to the order of the king and council.

During this time, while special attention was drawn
to the danger apprehended from Parliament, the Loll-
ards were spreading their doctrines in other parts of the
realm, and they had made such progress that several of their leaders, eight of whom are mentioned by Foxe by name, were denounced to the archbishop on his visitation as hereti-
cles. They were summoned the next day to appear
before him and answer to the charge. But they "hid
themselves away and appeared not." They were there-
fore publicly denounced as excommunicate in several of
the parish churches. Nor was this all. The whole
town of Leicester, and all the churches in the same,
were interdicted so long as any of the excommunicated
should remain within the same. and "till all the Loll-
ards of the town should return and amend from such
heresies and errors, obtaining at the said archbishop's
hands the benefit of absolution."

The compact between the leading representatives of
the ecclesiastical and civil power which marked the ac-
commodation of Henry VIII was soon reflected in para-
mount legislation. To prevent the spread of the
Lollards, and to suppress their meetings, which were
described as confederacies to stir up sedition and insur-
rection (Crabb's History of English Law, p. 384), it was
proclaimed to all persons, sententiously convicted, to refer
their opinions, such persons were to be left to the
severiac arm. In such cases evidence was to be given
to the diocesan or his commissary, and the sheriff, mayor,
or bailiff were, after sentence pronounced, to re-
trieve them to the diocesan and cause them to be burnt.
The law did not remain a dead letter. It was not long before a victim was found. The ecclesiastics were only too zealous for an example that might strike terror among the people, and espe-
cially the Londoners, who were "not right believers in
God, nor in the traditions of their forefathers; such de-
lers of the Lollards, depravers of religious men, with-
holders of tythes," etc. The victim selected was "one
William Sautre, a good man and a faithful priest, in-
flamed with zeal for true religion," who in the Parlia-
ment of 1548 was deputed to inquire that he might be heard for the commodity of the whole realm. The spies of the bishops were excited, and he was summoned before the ecclesiastical court. His views were in substance those of the Lollards. He was at first induced to recant, but
after his previous trial before the bishop of Norwich was
known, as well as his submission and subsequent re-
lapse, there was no disposition to show him mercy.
By the king's order, "in some public and open place within
the liberties of the city of London," he was "committed
to the fire." So bold a measure, not frequent in Eng-
lish history, naturally terrified the Lollards. They kept
the bishop's spies, and the king's" spies, and the sheriffs,
the king's spies, and the sheriffs,
up to the eyes of the thousand before they could no longer look with confidence or the hope of relief. The son of Wickliffe's patron had be-
come the tool of the bishops. His usurped power was
sustained by their alliance. As the hopes of relief from
the King were dashed, the burden of the persecution
at a critical period of his career. He refused to make promises made at his accession began to die out, his pop-
ularity waned. Complaints were heard from various
quarters. The old parliaments of Richard II began to
murmur, and, to retain his throne in security, Henry
IV was compelled to throw himself more and more into
the arms of the Church, and concede everything which
the prelates might demand. The "cruel constitution"
of archbishop Arundel was the fitting ecclesiastical coun-
terpart of the civil statute that legalized the burning
of the Lollards. It forbade any one to preach, "whether
within the Church or without, in English," except by
ecclesiastical sanction. Schoolmasters and teachers were
to intermingle with their instructions nothing contrary
to the determination of the Church. No book or trea-
sise of Wickliffe was to be read in schools, halls, hospi-
tals, or other places whatsoever. No man hereafter, by
his own authority, should be able to have his books pub-
lished by the University of Oxford, was, at least once ev-
every month, to inquire diligently in the college with
which he was connected whether any scholar or inhab-
itant thereof had proposed or defended anything con-
tary to the determinations of the Church, and the fail-
ure of duty in this respect was to be punished by depriva-
tion, expulsion, and the greater excommunication.

But all the precautions of the bishops and the se-
verity of persecuting laws were ineffectual to suppress
the hated opinions. Fox narrates the examination of
William Thorpe (1407) and the burning of John Badly
(1409). The monks should return and amend from such
heresies as were" known. This petition, however, did not secure the royal approval. The influence and support of the Church would doubt-
less have been lost to the king if he had yielded to the
wishes of the Commons. Other measures which they
proposed, designed to set limits to ecclesiastical usurpa-
tion, while they gave unequivocal assent to the un-
changed spirit of the nation, met with little more success
In 1413 Henry IV was succeeded by his son, Henry V. The change, however, did not open any brighter prospect to the persecuted Lollards. The beginning of this reign was signalized by a new triumph of the Church. The king surrendered his friend, Sir John Oldcastle, lord Cobham, to the machinations of his persecutors. He was arrested, imprisoned, arraigned before the archbishop and his assessors, pronounced a heretic, and excommunicated. His offence was regarded as of the most aggravated character. He was not only himself heretically inclined, but he had employed his wealth and influence to support Lollard preachers, and transcribe and disseize heretical books. So powerful and bold was the organized conspiracy of the priesthood against him that the king did not venture to interfere in his case. The archbishop was charged by the chancellor to the sheriffs of cities and towns, were required, on entering office, to take an oath that they would use their whole power and diligence to destroy all heresies and errors, commonly called Lollardies, and assist the other magistrates and consuls as were required by them. It was moreover enacted that whoever were they that should read the Scriptures in the mother tongue (which was then called Wickliffe's learning) should forfeit land, cattle, body, life, and goods from their heirs forever, and so be condemned for heretics to God, enemies to the crown, and most acute traitors to the land. No sanctuary or privileged ground within the realm, though permitted to thieves and murderers, should shelter them. In case of relapse after pardon they should be hanged as traitors against the king, and then burned as heretics against God. The terror inspired by such executions and enactments drove many into exile. They fled, says Fox, "into Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, and into the wilds of Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, working there many marvels against their false kingdom too long to be enumerated," the most notable of whom were members of the sect who had most to apprehend, and who were the first to flee. Those who remained behind belonged very largely to the middle or the lower class. From time to time we meet with the name of some more eminent offender, and, from the precautions taken by their persecutors, we may form some idea of the continued energy as well as existence of the Lollards. Lechler, in the Zeitschrift für Hist. Theol. (1858, vol. iv.), has traced the evidences of their presence and influence in England down to the date of the Lutheran Reformation. The precious legacy of the Lollard faith was transmitted, along with MS. translations of the Scriptures and Lollard books, from generation to generation; and among the English martyrs, just before as well as after the commencement of the Reformation, there were several who might most appropriately be denominated Lollards. The prevalence of these views as late as the middle of the 16th century is attested by the elaborate effort which Reginald Peacock, successively bishop of St. Asaph and of Chichester, made to refute them. His earlier years had been spent in London, in the work of inquiring into the Lollard sect; his latter had become familiar with the work of the Lollards, and the arguments by which they were maintained. With great ingenuity, and with a commendable patience, he undertook their refutation, giving to this method the decided preference over chains, prison, and the stake. Convicted at length himself of holding heretical opinions, and removed from the episcopal office, he spent the last three years of his life in prison, and by some, although unwillingly, was regarded as a Lollard. On some points his views, indeed, approximated to those of the hated sect, but his writings derive their historical value from the exhibits of which they make of the doctrines maintained by the Lollards, or "Bible-men," as he sometimes calls them, and the evidence which they afford of their extensive acceptance. Here we see that for nearly two full generations the same doctrinal views which had been, or supposed to be, repressed by the immediate followers of Wickliffe were still retained by their successors, and during the two generations which followed they underwent no material change. Thus, when the English Reformation of the 16th century commenced, it derived a new impulse from the same source, i.e., the early English Lollards, and the Lollard party absorbed itself. Nor is it a mere fancy which has led writers like Lechler to assert an important and vital connection between the Lollardism of the 15th and the Puritanism of the 16th century. (E. H. G.)

The Scottish Lollards, who were not in any means confined to the southern portion of the British Islands. It penetrated also into Scotland, and in the real home of the Colclers (q. v.)—the land where a simple and primitive form of Christianity had been established, while among her southern neighbors Rome presented a vast and accumulated mass of superstition—threw nothing but well-known pumm received the countenance of those whose position and influence were well calculated to aid in its dissemination among a people that had freely imbued the spirit of religious reformation so prevalent among the inhabitants of the 14th century. After the death of King Richard II, at the time of the passage of the statute of præsumulis (A.D. 1389). More particularly rapid was the spread of the reformatory spirit in Scotland in the western districts, those of Kyle, Carrick, and Cunningham, and hence the surname for the Scotch Lollards, Lollards of Kyle, as they were frequently called. The clergy, aware of the danger that threatened their state of profanity and ease, at last, in the beginning of the 16th century, made open war upon these seditious antagonists. The first to suffer from the persecution which they inaugurated was a certain John Resby, an English priest who had fled northwards from persecution, and in the land of refuge also was fast making converts to his cause. The leading authority and influence in the land was at this time the see of St. Andrews (compare Dean Stanley's Lectures on the Eccles. History of Scotland, Maitland Society, 1846). The preacher, Robert, Duke of Albany, was known to be opposed to the Lollards; and though King James I was by no means blind to prevailing abuses in the Church, an act of Parliament was passed during his reign, in 1425, by which bishops were required to make inquisition in their dioceses for heretics, in order that they might undergo confinn punishment. This act was soon to be put in force. In 1433 another victim for the stake was secured in the person of Paul Craw or Crowar, a physician of Prague, who had sought refuge from persecution in Scotland. As he made no secret of his Lollard sentiments, he was arrested by order of Lord Lindsay, and the Lollard party was quite a long period. With the closing years of the century, however, to judge from the energy of the papists, it must have been apparent again in a more prominent manner, and from this period dates one of the severest of religious perse-
Lombardus. See Longobardi.

Lombardy is the name given to that part of Northern Italy which formed the "nucleus" of the kingdom of the Longobardi (q. v.). Incorporated in 774 into the Carolingian possessions, it became an independent kingdom again in 848, though it was not entirely severed from the Frankish monarchy until 888. It now consisted of the whole of Italy north of the Peninsula, with the exception of Savoy and Venice. In 961 it was annexed to the German empire, and its territory there-after gradually lessened by the formation of several small but independent duchies and republics. Throughout the Middle Ages the Lombards were compelled to"league together with their neighbors to retain their independence from the German emperors. The assumptions of Frederick Barbarossa they successfully defeated in 1176, and so also those of Frederick II. But by internal dissensions they were gradually weakened; and in 1540 Spain finally took possession of Lombardy, and held it until about 1700, when it fell to Austria, and was designated "Austrian Lombardy." In 1796 it became part of the Cisalpine republic, but in 1815 it was restored to Austria, and annexed politically to the newly-augmented Austrian territory under the name of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom. This union was dissolved in 1859 in the Italian War, Lombardy, with the exception of the Venetian territory (finally also given to Italy in 1866), falling to the new kingdom of Italy. The region called Lombardy, the country having been parcelled out into the provinces of Bergamo, Brescia, Como, Cremona, Milan, Pavia, and Sondrio. Its total area was 9086 English square miles, with a population in 1865, of 2,490,924 souls, mostly Roman Catholics. See ITALY.

Lombaro, Jacob, a noted Jewish writer and rabbi of Spanish descent, flourished in Venice, Italy, in the first half of the 17th century. He published in 1639 a beautiful edition of the Old Test. In Hebrew, with valuable comments, and a Spanish translation of the most difficult passages, entitled mão בשכם (a Handful of Quiet). He also wrote a polemic against Christianity. See Lombaro, Jacob Judzenth, u. s. Seckel, iii, 227; Fisher, Biblioth. Judaica, ii, 354.

Loménie de Brienne, Étienne Charles de, a very celebrated French prelate, was born at Paris in

which he attempted to conciliate the apparent contradictions, somewhat in the manner in which Grattan attempted it in his Discourses. He may be considered as the first author who collected their reasons, and formed a complete system, and, whatever the faults of his work, it is the foundation of scholastic theology, and shows much care and system. It became the text-book in the schools of philosophy, obtained for him the title of "Master of Sentences" (Magister Sententiarum), and placed him at the head of the scholastic divines. The work was first published at Venice (1477, fol.) in four parts, each divided into different headings. After his death, one of the propositions contained in it ("Christus, secundum quod est homo, non est aliquid") was condemned by pope Alexander III. Thomas Aquinas and others have written commentaries on the book. He also wrote Commentaire sur les Papes (Paris, 1641, fol.—Commentaire sur les Étapes de St. Paul (1687, fol.). His complete works were published at Nuremberg in 1478, and at Basle in 1486. An able editor was found in Alema, who published Petrus Lombardi's works at Louvain in 1546. The best edition of the Sentences is by Antoine Ghenart (Louvain, 1554). See Herzog, Real-Encyclopedia, s. v. Neander, Hist. of Christian Dogmas (Bohn's edit.), vol. ii (see Index): Hefele, Concilien, 45, 839, 786; Reuter, Alexander III, vol. ii, 13, 33; Durand, Nouv. Biblioth. des clerges, Ecclésiastiques, xvi, 45 sq.; Wetter und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, vi, 588 sq. (J. H. W.)

Lombard. See LONGOBARDI.
1727. He denounced his proroginature and the rigour of military glory for the easy honors of the Church, and became a great and powerful opponent of the Protentasts. Promoted in 1708 to the archbishopric of Toulouse, he aspired, it would seem, to the part of a Mazarin or a Richelieu in the state, without possessing either the ability or the unscrupulous daring necessary to it. Upon the death of Louis XV in 1774, he took particular pains to strike against the Protentasts, but it was not until 1787 that he gained prominence in state affairs. In this year, after figures in a commission for the reform of the clergy, and coquetting with the philosophy of D'Alembert and the encyclopedists, he became a member of the Assembly of Notables, and, having headed the party by whom the administration of Calonne was overthrown, he succeeded that unfortunate minister, adopted his plans, and proved himself just as incapable of executing them. An excited contest arose between the king and Parliament, and resulted in the dismissal of the latter by force of arms. In 1788 he was made prime minister, and was also promoted to the rich archbishopric of Sena. In 1791 he was offered a cardinal's hat, but, knowing the opposition of the people against the clergy, he declined this distinction. In July, 1792, the people were compelled by the dissatisfaction of the people to proceed to the Convocation of the state general for the month of May following; and on the 24th of August he retired to private life. He resided for a time at Nice, but the cardinal's hat which Pius VI bestowed on him several years before now graced the fountain of life. He was one of those who took the oath as a constitutional bishop, on account of which he was deprived of the cardinal's hat. He was nevertheless arrested February 15, 1794, and died of apoplexy the same night. See Heroes, Philosophers, and Courtiers of the Time of Louis XV (London, 1805, 2 vols. 12mo); Lacrou's Le Règime religieux du XVIIe siècle; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Génér., xxxi, 532 sq. (J. H. W.)

Loimus, in Hindi mythology, is the first created being, formed by Brahmane when he commenced to exist. He immediately concluded to devote himself only to the contemplation of divine things and, in order to be undisturbed, buried himself in the ground. This pleased the gods so much that they loaded him with favors, increased and fixed his power and piety, and assured him a duration of life surpassing even that of Brahmane (q.v.). Loimus, being a long time bereft of hair, and covered with hair all over, draws out a hair after the lapse of each cycle Brahe has gone through, and dies only after the last hair is drawn. See Vollmer, Mythol. Wörterb. a. v.

Lübn, Johann Michael, a German Protestant jurist and theologian, was born at Frankfurt-on-the-Main. He studied jurisprudence at Marburg, became soon known as an essayist on questions of morals, philosophy, and theology, which he treated with great ease and brilliancy, although occasionally inaccurate in his statements, and was finally appointed president of the Council of Lingen and Tüxleben. He died in 1776. He is especially known for his efforts to bring about a union of the different Christian churches, or, at least, of the evangelical denominations. He sought to unite them all into one, to carry out indifferentism towards denominations to the full extent in view. In this view, he wrote, under the name of Gottlob von Frieden, Evangelischer Friedenstempel nach d. Art d. ersten Kirche (1724):—Von Vereinigung d. Protestanten (1748):—Die einzige wahre Religion (1730). These works brought him into a long controversy with Hoffmann, Weichmann, Brenner, etc., and his attempts at establishing a union proved fruitless.—Hertzog, Rerum-knobilopoeia, viii, 452; Pierer, Universal-Lexicon, x. 463. (J. N. P.)

London Missionary Society. See Missionary Societies.

Long, Jacques Le. See Le Long.

Long, Roger, D.D., an English divine, noted as an astronomer, was born in Norfolkshire in 1690, and was educated at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge University, and became M.A. in 1728. He was honored with the chair of astronomy by his alma mater in 1749, and shortly after secured the rectory of Bradwell. He died December 16, 1767. Since his Memoir (1729 sq.), he published and is best known as the author of A Treatise on Astronomy (2 vols. 4to; vol. i, 1742; vol. ii, 1764). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and American Authors, ii, a. v.; Thomas, Biogr. and Mythol. Dict. a. v.

Long, Thomas, an English Nonconformist, was born in Exeter, 1621. He was educated at Exeter College, and about 1660 became prebendary of Exeter cathedral, from which he was ejected in 1688 for refusing to take the oath to William and Mary. He died in 1700. Mr. Long published a Vindication of the Primitive Christians in Point of Obedience to their Prince (1683); Aメーカー to Locke's Letter on Toleration (1689); and Vox Cleri on Alterations in the Liturgy (1689): and a Review of Dr. Walker's Account of the Author of Eikon Basilissi. See Wood, Athen. Oxon.; Thomas, Dictionary of Biography and Mythology, a. v.

Long Brothers, The Four. Among the leading men of the Arthurian tales, the four "Long Brothers" cannot be overlooked: Diocres, Ammonius, Eusebius, and Euthymius, who were as distinguished by their influence as they were eminent in stature. The secret of their power was in their inflexible honesty, combined with hearty and unfinching faith in the system of their choice. See Eucharist.

Longevity. The Biblical narrative plainly ascribes to many individuals in the earlier history of the race lives far longer than what is held to be the present extreme limit, and we must therefore carefully consider the evidence upon which the general correctness of the numbers rests, and any independent evidence as to the length of life at this time. The statements in the Bible regarding longevity may be separated into two classes—those given in genealogical lists, and those interspersed with the relation of events.

1. To the former class visually belong all the statements relating to the longevity of the patriarchs before Abraham. These, as given by Moses in the Hebrew text, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Gen. iii:27</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>Gen. viii:4</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoch</td>
<td>Gen. v:22</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>Gen. vii:2</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indelibility has not failed, in various ages, to attack revealing on the score of the supposed absurdity of assigning to any class of men this lengthened term of existence. In reference to this, Josephus (Ant. i. 3, 3) remarks: "Let no one, upon comparing the lives of the ancients with our lives, and with the few years which we now live, think that what we say of them is false, or that the number of our lives at present is an argument that neither did they attain to so long a duration of life." When we consider the compensating process which is going on, the marvel is that the human frame should not last longer than it does. Some, however, have supposed that the years above named are lunar, consisting of about 7273 years; but the opinion, with a view to reduce the lives of the antelthiuvians to our standard, is replete with difficulties. At this rate, the whole time from the creation of man to the flood would not be more than about 140 years; and Methuselah himself would not have attained to the age which many even of the early inhabitants of the world must have had when mere infants! Moses must therefore have meant solar, not lunar years—averaging as long as ours, although the ancients generally reckoned twelve
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months, of thirty days each, to the year. "Nor is there," observes St. Augustine (De Civ. Dei, xvi, 12), "any care to be given unto those who think that one of the seven years of the life of man make up a year of these times, being so short; and therefore, say they, 900 years of theirs are 90 of ours—their 10 is our 1, and their 100 our 10. Thus think they that Adam was but 20 years old when he begat Seth, and he but 20 when he begat Enos, whom the Scriptures call (the Sept. ver.) 203 years. For, as these men hold, the Scripture divided one year into ten parts, calling each part a year; and each part had a sixfold quarter, because in six days God made the world. Now 6 times 6 is 36, which, multiplied by 10, makes 360—i.e. twelve lunar months. The first of this depth, or of this year, states that some, professing Christianity, had fallen into the same mistake, viz. that Moses meant lunars, and not solar years. Ecclesiastical history does not inform us of this fact, except it be to it that Lactantius refers (i, 12) when he speaks of one Varro: "The life of man, though temporary, was yet extended to 1000 years; of this Varro is so ignorant that, though known to all from the sacred writings, he would argue that the 1000 years of Moses were, according to the Egyptian mode of calculation, only 1000 months!"

This shows how the inscrutable purpose of Inscriti differs deeply we learn from Pliny (Hist. Nat. vii), and also from Scaliger (De Emend. Temporum, i); still this does not alter the case as stated above (see Heidegger, De Annio Patriarcha-, in his Hist. Patr. Amst. 1688, Zür. 1729).

But it is asked, if Moses meant solar years, how came it to pass that the patriarchs did not begin to beget children at an earlier period than they are reported to have done? Seth was 105 years old, on the lowest calculation, when he begat Enos, and Methuselah 187 when Lamech was born! St. Augustine (i, 15) explains this difficulty in a twofold manner by supposing, 1. Either that the age of Seth was later than the age of the lives of the antediluvians were longer than ours, or, 2. That Moses does not record the first-born sons but as the order of the genealogy required, his object being to trace the succession from Adam, through Seth, to Abraham.

While the Jews have never questioned the longevity assigned by Moses to the patriarchs, they have yet disputed, in many instances, as to whether it was common to all men who lived up to the period when human life was contracted. Maimonides (More Nebokhim, ii, 47) takes this view. With this opinion Abarbanel, on Gen. 17:1 and 3, says, "The season of four months so far at 600 years is about 240, and now it may be that this number might then have been far more densely populated than it is now. Supposing, moreover, that the earth was no more productive antecedently than it was subsequently to the flood, and that the antediluvian fathers were ignorant of any mechanical care which might have saved human labor now, we can easily understand how difficult they must have found it to secure for themselves the common necessary of life, and this the more so if animal food was not allowed them. The prolonged life, then, of the generations before the flood would seem to have been rather an evil than a blessing, leading as it did to the too rapid peopling of the earth. We can readily conceive how this might conduct to that awful state of things expressed in the words, "And the whole earth was filled with violence." In the absence of any well-regulated system of government, we can imagine what evil might result from the uncontrolled mobs of strong men who might oppress the weak, the crafty would outwit the unsuspecting, and, not having the fear of God before their eyes, destruction and misery would be in their ways. Still we must admire the providence of God in the long duration of life, and also in the most calamitous of all the calamities, the flood. After the creation, when the world was to be peopled by one man and one woman, the age of the greatest part of those on record was 900 and upwards. But after the flood, when there were three couples to repopulate the earth, none of the patriarchs except Shem reached the age of 500, and only the first three of hi-
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line, viz. Araphaxad, Salah, and Eber, came near that age, which was in the first century after the flood. In the latter part of the present age (the age of 240); and in the third century (about the latter end of which Abraham was born), none, except Terah, arrived at 200, by which time the world was so well people that they had built cities, and were formed into distinct nations under their respective kings (see Gen. xxi. see also Luther and Petavius on the increase of mankind in the first three centuries after the flood).

2. The statements as to the length of the lives of Abraham and his nearer descendants, and some of his later, are so closely interwoven with the historical narrar., and not always thoroughly to its general truth and its cannot be separated. Abraham's age at the birth of Isaac is a great fact in his history, equally attested in the Old Testament and in the New. Again, the longevity ascribed to Jacob is confirmed by the question of Pharaoh and the patriarch's remarkable answer, in which he makes his then age of 130 years less than the years of his ancestors (Gen. xlviii. 9), a minute point of agreement with the other chronological statements to be especially noted. At a later time, the age of Moses is attested by various statements in the Pentateuch, and in the New Testament, on St. Stephen's testimony, it is not to be observed that the mention of his having retained his strength to the end of his 120 years (Deut. xxxiv. 7) is, perhaps, indicative of an unusual longevity. In the earlier part of the period following we notice similar instances in the case of Joshua, and, in general, in that of Othniel. Nor does the Bible contain any instances to the contrary against this evidence, except it be the common explanation of Ps. xc (esp. ver. 10), combined with its ascription to Moses (see title).

That the common age of man has been the same in all times since the world was generally populated is manifest from profane as well as sacred history. Plato lived to the age of 81, and was accounted an old man; and those whom Pliny reckons up (vii. 48) as rare examples of long life may for the most part be equalled in modern times. It must be observed, however, that all the supposed famous modern instances of very great longevity, as those of Perr, Jackson, and the old countess of Desmond, have utterly broken down on examination, and that the registers of countries where records of such statistics have been kept prove no greater extremity than about 110 years. We may fortunately appeal to all the extant hieratic papyri in the Bibliotheque at Paris bearing a moral discourse by one Ptahot-hotep, apparently eldest son of Aas (B.C. cir. 1910-1860), the fifth king of the fifteenth dynasty, which was of shepherds. See Egypt, Viz. the Egyptians, Ptahot-hotep. He speaks of himself: "I have become an elder on the earth (or in the land); I have traversed a hundred and ten years of life by the gift of the king and the approval of the elders, fulfilling my duty towards the king in the place of favor (or blessing)" (Facsimile d'un Papyrus Egyptien, par L. Prisse d'Avennes, pl. xix, lines 7, 8). The natural inferences from this passage are, that Ptahot-hotep wrote in the full possession of his mental faculties at the age of 110 years, and that his father was still reigning at the time, and therefore had attained the age of about 130 years, or more. The reigns assigned by Manetho to the shepherd-kings of this dynasty do not seem indicative of a greater age than that of the Egyptian sovereigns (Cory, Ancient Fragments, 2d ed., p. 114, 1856).

See Chronology.

LONGINUS, DIONYSIUS CASSIUS, a noted Greek philosopher, of Phrygian descent, was born probably in Syria, and flourished in the 3d century of our era. He was educated at Alexandria under Ammonios and Origen, and became an earnest disciple of Platonism. To expound this system and to teach rhetoric, he opened a school at Alexandria, and soon acquired a great reputation. His knowledge was immense, and to him was first applied the phrase, often repeated since, "a living library" and "a walking museum." His taste and critical acuteness also were no less wonderful. He was probably the first who attempted in an age when Platonism was giving place to the semi-Oriental mysticism and dreams of Neo-Platonism, Longinus stands out conspicuously as a genuine disciple of the great master. Clear, calm, rational, yet lofty, he despised the fantastic speculations of Plotinus (q. v.). In the latter years of his life he accepted the invitation of Zenobia to undertake the education of her children at Palmyra; but, becoming also her prime political adviser, he was beheaded as a traitor, by command of the emperor Aurelian, A.D. 273. Longinus was a heathen, but generally referred his general and other extant (in part only) is a treatise, Περὶ Βιολογίαν (On the Sublime). There are many editions of it; those by Morus (Leips. 1679), Toupier (Oxford, 1778; 2d edition, 1789; 3d edit., 1806), Weishe (Leipzig, 1809), and Egger (Paris, 1872) being among the best. Translations have been made of it into French by Boileau, into German by Schlesner, and into English by W. Smith. See Ruheken, Dissertation de Vita et Scriptis Longini (1776); Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. s. v.; Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.

LONGLEY, CHARLES THOMAS, D.D., the last private of all England, was born in Westmeathshire in 1794, and was educated at Westminster and Christ Church, Oxford, where he distinguished himself as a first-class scholar in classics. After graduating, he remained for some time connected with the university as a college examiner, and was a professor of the Bible and perpetual rector of Cowley in 1823, and rector of West Tytherley in 1827, and head master of Harrow School in 1829. In 1836 he was appointed bishop of Ripon, and in 1856 was translated to Durham, in 1860 to the archbishopric of York, and in 1862 to that of Canterbury. Over this see, by virtue of which he was private of the Church of England, and first of all the Anglican bishops of the world, he presided until his death, October 27, 1868. "Archibishop Longley belonged ecclesiastically to the old school of 'moderate' Establishment divines, but in the last three years of his administration his amiable temper, co-operating with his instinctive hyper-conservatism, led him to temperize with the reckless and audacious policy of bishop Wilberforce and the High-Anglicans, and he became a most inadequate standard-bearer for the English Church in her supreme hour. Incapable of the indulgent pacifism of an Egyptian, he felt that the function of his primacy was marked by a series of disastrous vacillations and blunders. He first gave his countenance to the bishop of Capetown in his revolutionary action in South Africa, and then withdrew that countenance. In the great anti-episcopal movement to introduce his anti-episcopal resolutions, and then he shrewdly withdrew his approval when they came up for action." The most important event during his administration was the so-called "Pan-Anglican" Synod, a meeting of all the bishops of the Church of England, which was brought into being in the churches in communities with her, convened in 1867, a measure instigated, it is said, by bishop Wilberforce (q. v.), to stop the tide of ritualism, and to bring about, if possible, a union with the Greek Church (see Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 1867, p. 42 sq.). In this synod the archbishop of Canterbury proved singularly untrustworthy. Himself inclined towards ritualism, he moderately rebuked the Ritualists in public, while privately he favored their promotion, and was instrumental in their appointment to colonial bishoprics. He was decided a High-Churchman, and, though his influence was great, his spirit was not notorious, he showed, in his dispassionate, how unfitted are mere moderation, and a desire simply for compromise and peace, to guide the Church in times when her foundations are assailed. We will only add that archbishop Longley died, and they who had lived, and sensible feeling, he fell a little too much into formula. He referred to words of Hooker's some three or four
days before his death as containing the faith in which he ' wished to die'—words expressive of his sense of guilt. It was believed that he bled himself from that guilt. See London Spectator, 1858, Oct. 31, p. 1272; N. Y. Tribune, Oct. 29, 1868. (J. H. W.)

**Longobardi (otherwise called Lombards), a Teutonic people of the Suevic race, who maintained a dominion in Italy from A.D. 566 to 774.**

The Lombardic people were derived from the Latin Longobardi or Longobarders, a form in use since the 12th century, and generally supposed to have been given in reference to the long beards of this people; although some derive it rather from a word porta or barbe, which signifies battle or battle-axe.

The first historical notices present them as a people small in number, having their original seat on the west side of the Lower Elbe, in a territory extending some sixty miles southward from Hamburg. They advanced into Moravia and Hungary, the abode of the Rugi, before 560, and conquered the Heruli, and were invited by Justinian to the neighborhood of the Danube in the year 526. They afterwards crossed into Pannonia, where, though at first in alliance with the Goths, they subsequently (A.D. 566 or 567) subdued the people, yielding in turn to the Avars, and in 569 crossed the Danube in the reign of Justin I, and ravaged Thuringia, thither by Narses, as it is said, out of revenge against the province and the emperor. This was fourteen years after the overthrow of the Gothic kingdom, and the exhausted state of the country left Northern Italy an easy prey to the conquerors, and called on differences with both the Roman and Greek churches went far to prevent the acceptance of their rule, and the establishment at that time of a united government in Italy, for the want of which the country has so many centuries suffered. The Lombards succeeded no better in securing entire dominion. They, however, extended their power, establishing the duchies of Frioul, Spoleto, and Benevento, until only the districts of Rome and Naples, the southern extremity of the peninsula, Venice, and the east coast from the Po to Ancona, with Ravenna as the city of the exarchs, remained under the power of the Greek emperor. The conduct of the Lombards as conquerors has been severely characterized on the authority of early writers of the Romish Church. Gregory the Great, in his epistles and dialogues, draws a frightful picture of their oppressions, as does Paulus Diaconus in his Chronicle. The heinous cruelty of the five dukes, who were the only rulers in the interregnum after the death of Cleph, till, by the threatening approach of the Franks, they were compelled to elect a king in the person of Autharius. Now for the first time (584-600) an orderly constitution was established. Paulus Diaconus speaks with great praise of the new state of things. "Wonderful was the state of the Lombard kingdom: violence and treachery were alike unknown; no one was oppressed, no one plundered another; thefts and robberies were unheard of; the traveller went wherever he would in perfect security" (Paul. Diaec. iii. 16).

A general idea of their political constitution may be found in the edict of king Rothari (586-592), a kind of Bill of Rights, which was promulgated Nov. 22, 643, and is memorable as having become the foundation of constitutional law in the Germanic kingdoms of the Middle Ages. This law was revised and enlarged by subsequent Lombard kings, but subsisted in force for several centuries after the Lombard kingdom had passed away. The edict recognizes, as among all German nations, three classes—the free, the semi-free, and slave or serf. It proclaimed the equality of the sexes, and secured the national unity, civil officers being regarded as rendering military service. The king was elective, and among the dukes he represented the nation. He was commander of the army, head of all police power, chief judge, and general war. There were countiers of various ranks, who spoke with great power and dignity. Under these were many local, judicial, police, and military authorities. The cities chosen by the dukes severally as their residences were centres of government. There would seem to be but little room for the old Roman municipal constitutions. Concerning the relation of the Lombard rule to the continuance of the Roman law and the rights of the conquered people there are differences of opinion. Under the Goths the former laws and customs remained largely unaltered; but it has been maintained (as by Leo) that under the Lombards the personal liberty, right of property, and municipal constitutions of the conquered people were abolished. The subject was much discussed by the Italians in the last century; and in this century the historians Savigny, Leo, Bandi di Vesme, Fossati, Treves, Bemmann-Holzner, etc., have professed conflicting or somewhat varied views. The Lombard laws themselves give but little precise information on this point. The Romans at least lost all united nationality. Roman law seems to have been first distinctively brought into use under Luitprand. The feeling of enmity which, for a long time at least, existed between the people and their conquerors, was increased by religious differences, and on this account the new power was specially obnoxious to the authorities of the Roman Church. A state of war generally prevailed between the two powers. The Church appeals are under these circumstances the most plaintive complaints of Lombard impiety and oppressions—at least during the earlier period of their dominion—in the wasting of churches and monasteries, and the treatment of ecclesiastics. The Lombard clergy themselves, however, never did seem to be the objects of especial vengeance in these deeds. Gregory the Great discerns in the times signs of the approaching judgment. "What is happening in other parts of the world," he says, "we know not; but in this the end of all things not merely announces itself as approaching, but shows itself as actually begun" (Diotl. iii.). Such representations of the spirit and course of the conquerors must be taken with considerable qualification. Still more untrustworthy are the accounts given, especially by Gregory, of numerous miraculous interferences in behalf of the true faith.

The Lombards were Ariani. Unlike the Franks, who became by religious sympathy the natural defenders of the pope, they, with the Goths, Vandals, Burgundians, and Suevians, had been converted to Christiopathy, about the end of the 5th century, by Arián missionaries. Such was the case with the German tribes generally. The power of the Lombard kingdom over them many, some of whom entered Italy, who were still heathens, and worshipped their gods Odin and Freia south of the Alps. There were probably also some Catholic Pannonians and Noricans who, with their bishops, had joined the heresy. Theodolinda of Bavaria also exerted a like influence upon her husband and their children, and under his reign the Catholic faith made considerable progress. On the death of Autharius (590), Theodolinda married Agilulf, and under his government also she continued to labor for the advancement of the Catholic Church, hoping somewhat to refine the manners of her own people. Theodolinda persuaded Agilulf to restore a portion of their property and dignities to the Catholic clergy, and to have his own son baptized according to the Catholic rites—an example which was followed by multitudes. Her brother Gunwald, duke of Asti, she influenced to build the magnificent basilica of Saint John at Asti, near Milan, in which in subsequent times was kept the Lombard crown, called the Iron Crown; indeed, she improved any and every opportunity to advance the interests of the Catholics, and thus hastened the successful establishment of their religion among the Lombards. Gregory the Great (690-694), founder of the papacy, maintained frequent correspondence with the queen in
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a friendly relation, similar to that existing between Gregory VII and the countess Matilda. On the occasion of the baptism of her children she received a present from Gregory. Earlier he had sent her four Books of Dialogues, "because he knew that she was true to the faith in Christ, and strong in good works" (Paul. Disc. iv, 5).

If the Roman Church had met with material losses by the Lombard invasion, it now gained much for the power of the papacy in the more complete dependence with which all parts of Italy began to look to Rome for a common defence of their faith. Rome became a certain centre of national life; through the dukes of the nobility, power was now in the hands of the bishops, and what the Roman Empire had lost by arms the Roman Church was to regain by peaceful means. After Gregory's death Agileulf received the monk Columban with great favor, and allowed him to settle where he would. At Milan he wrote against Ariusism. He founded the powerful monastery of Bobbio, which was subsequently very influential in the conversion of the Lombards. Grundeberg, daughter of Theodorlinda, married successively the kings Ariowald and Rothariis. Under the latter there was a Catholic and Arius bishop in Aosta (658-661), the successor of Duke Gunduald, was the first Catholic king. Dullinger says of him, "Rex Horibertus, pius et catholicus, Arrianorum abolevit heresem et Christianam fidelem fecit crescere." The Lombards became now enthusiastic churchmen; many monasteries and churches were founded and richly endowed. There was always, however, a certain degree of independence manifest among them. At the Lateran Council of 649, summoned by Martin I, Milan and Aquileia were not represented. A certain patriarchal and metropolitan prerogative was allowed the popes, with the reservation of the right of residence in Rome. In the latter half of the 7th century internal contests for the Lombard crown secured a greater degree of attachment to the Church, while the disputes of Rome with Constantinople brought the Lombards to the defence of the former. In the 8th century the powerful king Lothair (713-85), who raised the Lombard kingdom to its highest prosperity, sought anxiously to complete the conquest of all Italy, and before 800 it may be said that the national unity of Italy was complete. Each subject was called a Lombard. See LUIZPALD. The Church was subject to the state. Though its clergy and bishops obtained increasing power, it was not of a political character as in France. The bishops were subject to the king, and the inferior clergy to the subordinate judges. The bishops were chosen by the people. The clerics were subject to magisterial power. But the prospect looked bright for the people and the church when they subjected to the rule of the barbaric Lombards, they now entered upon that Machiavelian policy which they long incessantly pursued, of laboring to prevent a union of all Italy under one government, in order to secure for themselves a greater power in the midst of contending parties. This, with the disputes which arose concerning the succession to the Lombard throne, led to the downfall of the Lombard kingdom within no long time after it had reached its utmost greatness. Gregory III, in his distress, fixed his gaze on the youthful greatness of a transalpine nation, the Franks, to afford him the necessary assistance in the struggle now ensuing. The movement against the Lombards was initiated at the election of Zachary, by discarding the customary form of obtaining the consent of the exarchate's authority, at this time vested in the Lombard king; and Stephen II of Pepin, after he had been taken from the patriciate, i.e. the governorship of Rome, to make war upon Aistulf, the successor of Liutprand. Naturally enough, Pepin's military successes were all turned to the advantage of the pope in securing to him the exarchate of Aquitaine. New causes of hostility between the Frank and Lombard monarchs arose when Charlemagne sent back to her father his wife, the daughter of the Lombard king Desiderius (754-774). In the autumn of 778 Charlemagne invaded Italy, and in May of the following year Pavia was conquered, and the Lombard kingdom was overthrown. In 808 a treaty between Charlemagne, the western, and Nicephorus, the eastern emperor, confirmed the right of the former to the Lombard territory, with Rome, the Exarchate, Ravenna, Istria, and part of Dalmatia, while the remaining islands of Venice and the maritime towns of Dalmatia, with Naples, Sicily, and part of Calabria.

See Turc, Die Longobarden und ihr Volkerrecht (Rost. 1855); Fiegler, Das Konigreich der Longobarden in Italien (Leipzig. 1851); Abel, Der Untergang des Longobardenkönigreichs (Bonn. 1855); Heichel, Italien (Leipzig. 1829), vol. I; Hautefeuille, Hist. des Communes Lombardes depuis leur origine jusqu'à la fin du xvi siècle (Paris, 1857), vol. i; Heichel, Roman See in the Middle Ages, p. 50 sq.; Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 472; ii, 59 sq.

See Lombardy.

Longobardi, Nicholas, a Jesuit missionary, was born in Switzerland in 1655. He went to China as missionary in 1656, and died in 1655 at Pekin. He wrote De Conciofio jurequ Domino Tractusatis. See Leibritz's notes to a recent edition. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Longere, Louis de Four, abbé de, an eminent, learned French ecclesiastic, born at Charleville Jan. 6, 1632, and son of a Norman nobleman. When but four years old he was generally known as a learned prodigy. At fourteen he understood several Oriental languages, and undertook to get a complete knowledge of the holy Scriptures by making diligent study of the fathers and of the Jewish and Christian commentators. The Sorbonne, which he sometimes visited, only gave him a distaste for scholastic theology; he preferred to reconstruct positive theology from the original, after the manner of P. Petrus, where he found more exactness and stability. In 1674 he was provided with the abbotship of St. Jean-du-Jard, near Meli, and in 1684 with that of Sept-Fontaines, in the diocese of Rheims. After receiving orders he entered the Seminary of St. Maguire, and shut himself up there in complete solitude for fifteen years. When he re-entered the world he opened his house to learned men, and kept up with them a regular correspondence, and manifested a great eagerness to instruct those who consulted him. Longere consecrated his whole life to labor; he knew no other rest except that of change of occupation. No part of the domain of learning was strange to him, but he much preferred history. His constitution and memory were excellent; his conversation he was lively, critical, historical, humorous, and cynical. He took no part in religious controversy. He died in 1782. Among his works of interest to us are Tractat d'un auteur de la connection Romaine touchant la transsubstantiation, où il se fait voir que les principes de non Ephes ce dogme ne peut être un article de foi (London, 1686); — Discours touchant les Antiquités des Chaldèes et des Egyptiènes (in the Lettres choisies of Richard Simon) — Dissertation sur le passage de Flavius Joseph de Jour de Jésus-Christ (in the Bibl. ancienne et moderne de Le Cerf, vols. 297-100); Discours sur la vie du cardinal Weisstein contraires à ceux qui ont écrit contre sa réputation (in the Memoire de Littératur, of P. Desmotel). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.; Thomas, Dict. de Biog. et Mythol. s. v.; General Biographical Dictionary, s. v.

Longueval, Jacques, a learned French Jesuit, was born in the suburbs of Pernone March 11, 1618. The age of nineteen he entered the Society of Jesus, and afterwards taught rhetoric and theology in different colleges of his order. On account of a violent work published upon the religious quarrels of the period, he was first exiled, but later received permission to reside at the house of the provincial Jesuits in Lille, where he died January 11, 1785. Among his published works are Traité du Schisme (Brussels, 1718) [a Refutation of this work was published in the same year by Megange]. — Dissertation
LORD

Lonsdale, John, D.D., a distinguished English prelate, was born at Newmillerdeg, near Wakefield, Jan. 17, 1788, and was the son of the Rev. John Lonsdale, vicar of Darfield and incumbent of Chapeltorp. Young Lonsdale entered Eton College at the age of 11, and completed his studies finally at King's College, Cambridge, where he got nearly all the prizes, and took the B.A. in 1811. He then studied law for a time, but changing for theology, he was ordained priest in 1815. Shortly after he was made examining chaplain to archbishop Sutton and paid assistant at the same place.

In 1821 he was appointed to the office of Christian advocate to Cambridge University, and in the following year domestic chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury. From 1831 to 1843 he was prebendary of St. Paul's; from 1839 to 1843, principal of King's College, London. In 1844 he was made master of Southwell Minster; he was also archdeacon of Middlesex during 1842 and 1843, and was for some time chaplain at Lincoln's Inn. In 1844, finally, he was appointed, by Sir Robert Peel, bishop of Lichfield. He died at Erdeshall Castle, Staffordshire, Oct. 19, 1867. Bishop Lonsdale was greatly celebrated in the English pulpit; while yet in the infancy of his ministry, two courses of his university sermons, as well as several occasional discourses, were asked for and received by the public (London, 1820, 1821). In 1849 he published, with archbishop Hale, a volume of *Annotations on the Gospel* (see Hale). He is spoken of as "a man of remarkable humility, averse to controversy, and never willing to enter into a public discussion of great questions in theology, from the belief that others were better qualified than he to handle them; but, withal, he was unflinching in his adherence to what he believed to be right." He was greatly beloved, not only by his own Church, but by the Diocesans also. See Appleton's *A. M. Cyclop.* 1867, p. 451; *A. M. Ch. Rec.* 1868, p. 675.

Looking-glass. See Minor.

LOOP (only in the plural τιάπλοα, tialath, windsings; Sept. ἄξετα, Vulg. ansula), an attachment or knotted "eye," probably of cord, corresponding to the knobs or "taches" (ταχῆς) in the edges of the curtains of the tabernacle for joining them into a continuous circle, fifty to a curtain, and formed of blue material (Exod. xxv, 4, 5, 10, 11; xxxvi, 11, 12, 17). See TABERNACLE.

Loos (Collinias), Cornelius, a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Gonda, Holland, in 1546, and was educated at Louvain. He entered the priesthood, and was made doctor of theology at Mentz, where, in a sojourn of several years, he composed most of his works. He afterwards became archbishop of Trever; but, on account of his opinions upon magic, published in a book styled De vera et falsa magia (1592), he was forced to remove from his diocese, though he retracted his heretical views. He went to Brussels, and there exercised the humble functions of vicar of the parish. He was soon accused of falling back into his old opinions, was arrested and imprisoned. He was about to be accused a third time, when he died at Brussels, Feb. 8, 1593. Loos was very zealous against Protestants. Among his works the following are of theological and general interest: *Defensio adversus Chr. Franciscus*; and several sentences are still quoted against inquisitors (Mayence, 1581) — *Thesaurus aenam sanctarum precationum* (ibidem, 1581) — *Illustrissimum Germ
exhibits a plural termination without the affix is that of Gesenius (Thesaur. a. v. 177.), and seems just, though rather disapproved by professor Lee (Lex. in 7777.) The latter adds that "our English Bibles generally translate אָדָם by LORD, in capitals; when preceded by יִתְנֶה, they translate it God: when יִתְנֶה, flesh, follows, however, by LORD, as in Isa. iii, 1, The Lord, the Lord of Hosts: The context alone, then, is not a sufficient reason for this respect" (Kitto). "In some instances it is difficult, on account of the passum accent, to say whether אָדָם is the title of the Deity, or merely one of respect addressed to men. These have been noticed by the Maso- rites, who distinguish the former in their notes as 'holy'; and the latter as 'profane'." (See Gen. xviii, 3; xix, 2, 18; and compare the Masoretic notes on Gen. xx, 18; Isa. ix, 4)." See Adonal.

3. Κυρίος, the general Greek term for supreme mastery, whether royal or private; and thus, in classical Greek, distinguished from βασιλεύς, which is exclusively applied to God. The "Greek Κυρίος, indeed, is used in much the same way and in the same sense as Lord. It is from κυρίος, authority, and signifies 'master' or 'possessor'. In the Septuagint, this, like Lord in our version, is invariably used for 'Jehovah' and 'Adonai'; while the Greek βασιλεύς, or King, or God in our translation, is generally reserved to represent the Hebrew 'Elohim'. Κυρίος in the original of the Greek Testament, and Lord in our version of it, are used in much the same manner as in the Septuagint; and so, also, is the corresponding title, Domes, in the Latin versions. As the Hebrew name Jehovah is one never used without reference, in any but the Almighty, it is to be regretted that the Septuagint, imitated by our own and other versions, has represented it by a word which is also used for the Hebrew 'Adonai', which is applied not only to God, but, like our Lord, to every other person of rank and dignity, in the translation of the New Testament, and to the Hebrew Master, in our versions. The title, however, has never been used with the same propriety, as it is apt to be applied to persons of no distinction, or to men of rank and dignity.

4. דֶּרֶךְ, דֶּרֶךְ, master in the sense of domination, applied to only heathen deities, or else to human relations, as husband, etc., and especially to a person skilled or chief in a trade or profession (like the vulgar boss). To this corresponds the Greek διακονεῖ, whence our Deacon.

The only real and important words in the original, thus rendered in the common Bible (usually without a capital initial, are: יִתְנֶה, gehir., prop. denoting physical strength or martial prowess; יִתְנֶה, sar, a title of nobility; יִתְנֶה, sheihah, a military officer (see Cap¬tains); and יִתְנֶה, se’ren, a Philistine term; also the Child. יִתְנֶה, maris, an official title (hence the Syriac mar, or bishop); and יִתְנֶה, rab, a general name = prefect, with its reduplicate יִתְנֶה, rabrens, and its Greek equivalent ἱππότιμος, "Rabboni." Lordly occurs in the A. V. only in the expression יִתְנֶה דֶּרֶךְ, se’phel additum, in the title, nobles, I. e. a large vessel fit to be used for persons of quality (Judg. v, 25). See Disit.

Lord, Benjamin, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in 1800 at Saybrook, Conn., graduated at Yale College in 1821; was then tutor in 1819, was licensed to preach pastor Nov. 20, 1717, in Norwich, and there preached until his death, March 31, 1844. He was made a member of Yale College corporation in 1740, and remained such till 1773. Dr. Lord published True Christianity explained and defended, wherein are some Observations respecting Conversion (1737) :— Two Sermons on the Necessity of Regeneration (1738) :—Believers in Christ only the true Children of God, and born of him alone, a sermon (1747) :—God glorified in the Works of Providence and Grace: a remarkable Instance of it in the various and signal Deliverances that evidently appear to be wrought for Mercy Wheeler, lately restored from extreme Impotence and Confusion (1748); and several occasional sermons.—Sprague, Ainslie, 2, 297.

Lord, Daniel Minor, a Presbyterian minister, was born April 9, 1800, at Lyme, Conn., and was educated at Amherst College and at the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., and in April, 1834, was licensed to preach by the Second Presbytery of Long Island, and subsequently ordained at Southampton. In 1835 the Presbyterian dismissed him to the Suffolk South Association. Soon after he became pastor of the Boston Mariners' Church. In August, 1836, he became the first pastor of the Shelter Island Church, where he remained until his death, Aug. 26, 1861. Mr. Lord published The History of Pitcairn's Island; also Various Articles on The Moral Claims of Savages stated and enforced, and for several years was editor and almost sole writer and publisher of a review, in which he ably, logically, and clearly discussed numerous theological questions. See Wilson, Pref. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 805. (J. L. S.)

Lord, Eleazer, an American theological writer, was born in 1738. With an excellent preparatory education, improved by close study to such a degree that in 1821 Dartmouth College, and in 1827 Williams, conferred on him the honorary degree of A.M., he devoted a portion of his time during an active business life as a merchant, president of an insurance company, and for some years of the Erie Railway Company, to the study of theological science. In 1866 he received from the University of Pennsylvania, the degree of D.D. Blind¬ness saddened his latter years, but his treasured learning comforted him. He died at Piermont, N. Y., June 8, 1871.

Lord, Isaiiah, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Pharsalia, Chenango County, N. Y., July 16, 1844, was converted at the age of sixteen, and, joining the Methodist Episcopal Church in May, 1860, was licensed to preach. In 1854, while employed as a teacher, his gentle bearing and godly admonitions led many to the cross and salvation. In 1855 he joined the Oneida Conference, and labored in the following places with accept¬ ability and success: Summit Hill, Hartford, Brooklyn, Smyrna, Union Valley, Amber, Freeville, East Homer, and Georgetown, where he died Aug. 21, 1870. "He was a man of stern integrity and sterling worth, fully com¬ mitted to all the great moral enterprises of the day. . . . His mission was lovingly and fearlessly executed. His piety was profound and real, and his death was but the begin¬ ning of everlasting life."—Conf. Minutes, 1871.

Lord, James Cooper, a philanthropic New York merchant and iron manufacturer of our day, deserves a place here for his great efforts to advance the interests of his fellow-men. He founded in 1860 "The First Ward Industrial School," a latter, a free public library, and erected two churches for the benefit of his workingmen and their neighbors. He died Feb. 9, 1869.

Lord, Jeremiah S., D.D., a Reformed (Dutch) minister of note, was born at Brooklyn, N. Y., about 1817, and was educated at Union College, class of 1866.
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He entered the ministry in 1848 at Montville, N. J., where he labored until 1847, when he assumed the charge of the Reformed Church of Griggstown, N. Jersey. In the year following, however, he accepted a call from the First Reformed Church in Flemington, N. J., where he labored until his death, April 2, 1889. "Few ministers of our denomination," says the *Intelligencer* (April 8, 1889), "were more highly esteemed by their brethren, or enjoyed in a higher measure the confidence and affection of their people, than did this most excellent brother. The love he bore in his works, and gave him many souls as seals to his ministry. . . . His preaching was characterized by great earnestness and solemnity. The love of Christ in the gift of himself was the central theme of his discourses. His style was clear, compact, and persuasive. His was indeed a most useful life, and his example of faithfulness, earnest zeal, and self-sacrificing devotion to the duties of his high and holy calling is a rich legacy to all his surviving brethren in the ministry."

LORD, John King, a Congregational minister, was born March 22, 1819, at Amherst, N. H. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1843, entered the ministry in 1841, and was ordained pastor in Hartland, Vt., November, 1841, where he remained three years. October 21, 1848, he was installed pastor in Cincinnati, Ohio, where he died, July 13, 1849. A volume of his sermons was published in 1850.—*Sprague, Am., ii*, 781.

LORD, Nathan, D.D., LL.D., an eminent American divine and educator, was born at South Berwick, Me., Nov. 28, 1792; was educated at Bowdoin College (class of 1810), and studied theology at Andover Theological Seminary, where he graduated in 1816. After quitting the college he acted as assistant in Phillips Exeter Academy. Now a theologian, he at once entered the active work of the ministry as pastor of the Congregationalists at Amherst, N. H., the only church he ever served. He remained with his people until 1829, when he was called to the responsible position of president of Dartmouth College, where he remained until his death, Sept. 9, 1870. Possessed of the highest attainments of scholarship, great executive ability, a winning address, an equanimity of temper, remarkable "firmness of character and devotion to principle, and unwearied application to labor, Dr. Lord made Dartmouth College one of the most popular of our higher educational institutions: 1824 students were graduated from its halls during his presidency. As a theologian he was, like Edwards and Bel- lamy, of the school advocating a strictly literal interpretation of prophecy, but he has left us few remains in print. He occasionally contributed to our theological quarterlies, and published several sermons and essays.

The following review notice: *Letters*, David Dana, D.D., on Prof. Park's Theology of New England (New Eng., 1852); *On the Millennium* (1854); and Letters to Ministers of the Gospel of all Denominations on Slavery (1854–5), in which he defended the institution of slavery as sanctioned by the Bible, thereby greatly provoking opposition and criticism from Northern divines. See Drake, *Dict., Amer. Biog., s. v.*; *New Amer. Cyclop.* s. v.; also the *Annual* for 1870.

LORD, Nathan Le., a Baptist missionary and physician, was born in Norwich, Conn., in December, 1821, was educated at the Western Reserve College (class of 1847), and, after completing a theological course, was employed for a time as agent and financial secretary of the college. Having decided to devote himself to the missionary work, he was ordained in October, 1852, and sailed with his wife for Ceylon. After six years of faithful labor, the failure of his health compelled him to return to this country, where he remained nearly four years, during a portion of which time he performed with great acceptence the duties of a district secretary of the Board of Missions in the southern districts of the West. He also attended several courses of medical lectures, receiving the degree of M.D. at Cleveland, Ohio. In 1868 he sailed with his wife and children for the Madura Mission of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, but the climate of India proving unfavorable to his health, he returned in June, 1867. He died Jan. 24, 1868.

Lord's Day. The expression so rendered in the Authorized English Version (*in τῷ Κυρίῳ ὕμπαρ* occurs only once in the New Testament, viz. in Rev. i, 10, and is there unaccompanied by any other words tending to explain its meaning. It is, however, well known that the same phrase was, in after ages of the Christian Church, used to signify the first day of the week, on which the resurrection of Christ was commemorated. Hence it has been inferred that the same name was given to that day during the time of the apostles, and was in the present instance used by St. John in this sense, as referring to an institution well known, and therefore requiring no explanation. This interpretation, however, has of late been somewhat questioned. It will be proper here, therefore, to discuss this point, as well as the early notices of this Christian observance, leaving the general subject to be treated under SABBATH. The broader topic of the hebdomadal division of time will be discussed under the head of WOR.
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tors of this view seem to have put out of sight the fol-
lowing considerations. In the preceding sentence St.
John had mentioned the place in which he was writing —
Ephesus—where the day of the Lord, which he had tal-
er. It is but natural that he should further particular-
ize the circumstances under which his mysterious work
was composed, by stating the exact day on which the
revelations were communicated to him, and the employ-
ment, spiritual musings, in which he was then engaged.
To suppose a mixture of the metaphorical and the the-

eral would be strangely out of keeping. Though it be
conceded that the day of judgment is in the New Test.
spoken of as η τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμίκην, the employment of
the adjectival form constitutes a remarkable difference,
which speaks of a continuous and maintained effort of
(Comp. 1 Cor. i, 8, 14; v. 5: 1 Thess. v, 2; 2 Thess. ii, 1;
Luke xvii, 24; 2 Pet. iii, 10). There is also a critical
objection to this interpretation, for ἀνεσκέιν ἐν ἡμίκῃ
is not δίδῳ οὐγερ (Comp. Rev. iv, 2). This third theory,
then, which is sanctioned by the name of Augusti, must
be abandoned.

4. As a less definite modification of this last view we
may mention, finally, that others have regarded the
phrase in question as meaning simply “the day of the
Lord,” the substantive being merely exchanged for the
article, as in 20: 13; 1 Cor. xvi, 7; “the Lord’s Supper,”
which would make it merely synonymous with the
generally expected temporal appearance of Christ on earth: η ἡμίκη τοῦ Κυρίου, “the day of the
Lord” (1 Thess. v, 2). Such a use of the adjective
became extremely common in the following ages, as we
have repeatedly in the fathers the corresponding ex-
pressions Dominica crucis, “the Lord’s cross”; Domin-
icae nativitatis, “the Lord’s nativity” (Tertullian, De Idol.
p. 5); κυριακῶν κυριακῶν (Eusebius, Histor. Eccles. iii, 9).
According to their view, the passage would mean, “In
the spirit I was present at the day of the Lord,” the
word “day” being used for any event marked forth
(possibly in allusion to Joel ii, 81), as in John viii, 56: 
“Abraham rejoiced to see my day.” The peculiar use of
the word ἡμίκη as referring to a period of ascenden-
cy, appears remarkably in 1 Cor. iv, 8, where de σπορι-
ῳ ἡμίκης ἡμίκης is rendered “man’s judgment.” Never-
theless, this interpretation, besides the objection of its
vagueness as a date, is clogged with all the difficulties
that attach to the preceding one.

All other conjectures upon this point may be permitted
without comment, but themselves, but the following cause is too

In Scripture the day of the week is called η μαυ σάββατου, in post-scriptural writers
it is called η Κυριακῆ ἡμίκης as well; therefore
the book of Revelation is not to be ascribed to an
apostle, or, in other words, is not part of Scripture. The
logical effort and the effort of its holiness.
It says, in effect, because post-scriptural writers have
these two designations for the first day of the week,
therefore scriptural writers must be confined to one of
them. It were surely more reasonable to suppose that
the adoption by post-scriptural writers of a phrase so
pre-eminently Christian as η Κυριακῆ ἡμίκης to denote
the first day of the week, and a day so especially mark-
ed, can be traceable to nothing else than an apostle’s use
of that phrase in the same meaning.

11. Early Notices of this Christian Observance.—Sup-
posing, then, that η Κυριακῆ ἡμίκης of St. John is the
Lord’s day, as now applied to the first day of the mod-
ern week, we have to inquire here, what do St. John gather
from holy Scripture concerning that institution? How
is it spoken of by early writers up to the time of Con-
stantine? What change, if any, was brought upon it
by the celebrated edict of that emperor, which has
already declared to have been its originator?

1. Scripture says very little concerning it, but that
little seems to indicate that the divinely-inspired apoes-
tes, by their practice and by their precepts, marked the
first day of the week as a day for meeting together
to break bread, for communicating and receiving instruc-
tion, for laying up offerings in store for charitable pur-
poses, for occupation in holy thought and prayer. The
first day of the week so devoted seems also to have been
sanctified by the example of the apostles of the day, which
would have been especially likely to be chosen for such purposes by
those who “prayed Jesus and the resurrection.”
The Lord rose on the first day of the week (τὴν μαυ σάββατου), and appeared, on the very day of his rising,
to his followers on five distinct occasions—to Mary Mag-
dalenae, to the other women, to the two disciples on the
road to Emmaus, to St. Peter separately, to ten apostles
collected together. After eight days (μοῦ ἡμίκη ἐκεῖνον),
that is, according to the ordinary reckoning, on the first
day of the next week, he appeared to the eleven (John
xx, 26), and the two disciples (20: 19). Something like
something like a settled form, St. Luke records the fol-
lowing circumstances: St. Paul and his companions ar-
ived there, and “abode seven days, and upon the first
day of the week, when the disciples came together
to break bread, Paul preached unto them.”
From the state-
ment that “Paul continued his speech till midnight,”
it has been inferred by some that the assembly commenced
after sunset on the Sabbath, at which hour the first day
of the week had commenced, according to the Jewish
reckoning (John’s ἤκοι Αρκαλ., § 390), which would hard-
ly agree with the idea of a commemoration of the res-
urrection of the Lord on the first day of the week. But it
is to be observed that none of the writers of the New
Testament have supposed to have a reference to the tenets of the Jewish
converts, who considered it unlawful to touch money
on the Sabbath (Vitringa, De Synagog., transl. by Ber-
nard, p. 75-167). In consideration for them, therefore,
the apostle directs the collection to be made on the fol-
lowing day, on which secular business was lawful; or,
as Coccineus observes, they regarded the day “non ut festum, sed ut irpaouiov” (not as a feast, but as a work-
ing day; Vitringa, p. 77). Again, the phrase μαυ τῶν
σαββάτων is generally understood to be, according to
the Jewish mode of naming the days of the week, the
common expression for the first day. Yet it has been
differently construed by some, who render it “upon one of the days of the week” (Tractes for the Times, ii, 1, 16).
In Heb. x, 25, the correspondents of the writer are de-
sired “not to forsake the assembling of themselves to-
gether, as the manner of some is, but in every place, one
other,” an injunction which seems to imply that a reg-
ular day for such assembling existed, and was well
known; for otherwise no rebuke would lie. Lastly,
in the passage given above, St. John describes himself as
being in the Spirit on the Lord’s day.

Taken separately, perhaps, and even all together, these
passages seem scarcely adequate to prove that the dedication of the first day of the week to the purposes above mentioned was a matter of apostolic institution, or even of apostolic practice. But, it may be observed, that it is, at any rate, an extraordinary coincidence, that almost as soon as we emerge from Scripture we find the same day mentioned in a similar manner, and directly associated with the Lord's resurrection; and it is an extraordinary fact that we never find its dedication questioned, or at least forsworn as apostolic by any apostle or shepherd of the church, with the Papacy, baptism, with ordination, or at least spoken of in the same way. As to direct support from holy Scripture, it is noticeable that those other ordinances which are usually considered scriptural, and in support of which Scripture is usually cited, are dependent, so far as more quotation is concerned, upon fewer texts than the Lord's day is. Stating the case at the very lowest, the Lord's day has at least "probable institutions in Scripture" (Bp. Sanderson), and so is superior to any other holy day, whether of hebrew or greek origin, in memory of the crucifixion, or of annual celebration, as Easter day in memory of the resurrection itself. These other days may be, and are, defensible on other grounds, but they do not possess anything like a scriptural authority for their observance. If we are inclined still to press for mention of the Lord's day, opposed to other days, as the institution of the church, for such we suppose it to be, in the writings of the apostles, we must recollect how little is said of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and how vast a difference is naturally to be expected to exist between a sketch of the manners and habits of their age, which the authors of the holy Scriptures did not write, and the hints as to life and conduct, and regulation of known practices, which they did write.

On quitting the canonical writings we turn naturally to Clement of Rome. He does not, however, differentiate "the Lord's day" but in 1 Cor. 1:26 he says, "νῦν ταύτα τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἐλευθερίας, and he speaks of συμφέρουσας καραίαι καὶ ὑπάρχουσαι, at which the Christian προσωποί and λεγέντες should be made.

Ignatius, the disciple of St. John (ad. Magn. c. 9), contrasts Judaism and Christianity, and, as an exemplification of the contrast, opposes a special day in memory according to the Lord's life (κατὰ τὴν Κυριακὴν τῇ Ζωῇ τοῦ Κυρίου).

The epistle ascribed to St. Barnabas, which, though certainly not written by that apostle, was in existence in the first century (c. 19), contains the following words: "We celebrate the eighth day with joy, on which, too, Jesus rose from the dead." A pagan document now comes into view. It is the well-known letter of Pliny to Trajan, written (about A.D. 100) while he presided over Pontus and Bithynia. "The Christians (says he) affirm the whole of their guilt or error to be that they were accustomed to meet together on a stated day (stato die), before it was light, and to sing hymns to Christ as a god, and to bind themselves by a sacramentum, not for any wicked purpose, but never to commit fraud, theft, or adultery; never to break their word, or to refuse, when called upon to deliver up any trust; after which it was their custom to separate, and to assemble again to take a meal, but a general one, and without guilty purpose" (Epist. x. 97).

A thoroughly Christian authority, Justin Martyr, who flourished A.D. 140, stands next on the list. He writes thus: "On the day called Sunday (τής Σαββάτου λατρευόμενη αὔριον) is an assembly of all who live either in the cities or in the rural districts, and the memorials of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read. Then he goes on to relate the celebration of the religious duties which are entered upon at this assembly. They consist of prayer, of the celebration of the holy Eucharist, and of collection of alms. He afterwards assigns the reasons which Christians had for meeting on Sunday. These are, "because it is the First Day, on which God dispelled the darkness (τοῖς ἐκώροις) and the original state of things (τὴν ἔλαφον), and formed the world, and because Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead upon it" (Apod. i. 67). In another work ( Dial. c. Tryph. ) he makes circumcision furnish a type of Sunday. "The circumcision of a Jew was done on the eighth day was a type of the true circumcision by which we are circumcised from error and wickedness through our Lord Jesus Christ, who rose from the dead on the first day of the week (τῷ μὲν σαββάτῳ); therefore it remains as chief and chief of days." As for σαββάτον, he uses that with exclusive reference to the Jewish law. He carefully distinguishes Saturday (ἡ κυριακή), the day after which our Lord was crucified, from Sunday (ἡ μὲν σαββάτῳ ἐξείλθε ἐκ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἡμᾶς), upon which he rose from the dead. If any surprise is felt at Justin's employment of the heathen designations for the seventh and first days of the week, it may be accounted for thus. Before the death of Hadrian, A.D. 138, the hebrew national division (which Dion Cassius, writing in the 8th century, derives, together with its nomenclature, from Egypt) had, in matters of common life, almost universally superseded in Greece, and even in Italy, the national divisions of the lunar month. Justin Martyr, writing to and for heathen, as well as to and for Jews, employs it, therefore, with a certainty of being understood.

The strangest of all is the pagan Tacitus. He, however, delighted to consider himself a sort of Christian, has the following words in his book on "Fate," or on "the Laws of the Countries," which he addressed to the emperor M. Aurelius Antoninus: "What, then, shall we say respecting the new race of ourselves who are Christians, whom in every country and in every region the Messiah established at his coming; for, lo! wherever we be, all of us are called by the one name of the Messiah, Christians; and upon one day, which is the first of the week, we assemble ourselves together, and on the appointed and holy day (Tacitus, Hist. 5. 8)."

Two very short notices stand next on our list, but they are important from their casual and unstudied character. Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, A.D. 170, in a letter to the Church of Rome, a fragment of which is preserved by Eusebius (Eccles. Hist. iv. 23), says, τὴν τεῖχος διάνοιαν ἐκ τῆς Κυριακῆς τούτης ἐπιστολήν. And Melito, bishop of Sardis, his contemporary, is stated to have composed, among other works, a treatise on the Lord's day (ἐν τῇ τῆς Κυριακῆς λόγῳ).

The next writer who may be quoted is Ireneus, bishop of Lyons, A.D. 178. He asserts that the Sabbath is abolished; but his evidence to the existence of the Lord's day is clear and distinct (De Orat. 28; De Idol. 14). It is spoken of in one of the best-known of his Fragments (see Beaven's Ireneus, p. 205). But a record in Eusebius (v. 29, 2) of the part which he took in the Quarta-Decimy controversy shows that in his time it was an institution beyond dispute. The point in question was this: Should Easter be celebrated in connection with the Jewish Passover, on whatever day of the week that might happen to fall, with the churches of Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia, or on the Lord's day, with the rest of the Christian world? The churches of Gaul, then under the superintendence of Ireneus, agreed upon a synodical epistle to Victor, bishop of Rome, in which occurred words somewhat to this effect: "The mystery of the Lord's resurrection may not be celebrated on any other day than the Lord's day, and on this alone should we observe the breaking off of the Paschal fast." This confirms what was said above, that while, even towards the end of the 2nd century, traditions varied, the word celebrated for Christ's resurrection, the weekly celebration of it was universal, which no diversity existed, or was even hinted at.

Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 194, comes next. One does not expect anything very definite from a writer of so mystical a tendency, but he has some things quite to our purpose. In his Strom. (iv. 9) he speaks of τῆς διπο-
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χίλιον ἡμέραν, τὴν τῷ ὅστις ἀνίκητος ἔγινε, τὴν δὲ καὶ πρὸν ὁ ἄνω φωτός γίνεται, ε.τ.λ., words which bishop Kaye interprets as contrasting the seventh day of the Law with the eighth day of the same incarnated and more important event. "When Clement says that the (Gnostic, or transcendential Christian), does not pray in any fixed place, or on any stated days, but through-out his whole life, he gives us to understand that Christians in general did meet together in fixed places and at appointed times for prayer." But we are not left to mere inference on this important point, for Clement speaks of the Lord's day as a well-known and customary festival (Strom. vii.), and in one place gives a mystical interpretation of the name (Strom. v.).

Tertullian, whose date is assignable to the close of the second century, may, in spite of his conversion to Montanism, be quoted as a witness to facts. He terms the first day of the week sometimes Sunday (Dies Solis), sometimes Dies Dominicus. He speaks of it as a day of joy ("Dies Solis lestia fulgentem," Apol. c. 18), and asserts that it is wrong to fast upon it, or to pray standing during its continuance ("Die Dominico jejunium nefas dicimus, vel de geniculata adorare," De Cor. c. 8). Even business is to be put off, lest we give place to the devil ("Differentes etiam negotia, ne quem Diabolam locum demus," De Orat. c. 18).

The evidence that the Lord's day had its superiority to the Sabbath indicated by manna having been given on it to the Israelites, while it was withheld on the Sabbath. It is one of the marks of the perfect Christian to keep the Lord's day.

L. D. 210) speaks of the heathen interlocutor, in his dialogue called Octavius, as asserting that the Christians come together to a festival "on a solemn day" (solemn diei).

Cyprian and his colleagues, in a synodal letter (A.D. 258), make the Jewish circumcision on the eighth day peculiarly the "law of life of the Christian, to which Christ's resurrection introduces him, and point to the Lord's day, which is at once the eighth and the first.

Commodian (c. A.D. 290) mentions the Lord's day. Victorinus (A.D. 290) contrasts it, in a very remarkable passage, with the Paraclete and the Sabbath.

Lastly, Peter, bishop of Alexandria (A.D. 300), says of it, "We keep the Lord's day as a day of joy, because of him who rose thereon."

The results of our examination of the principal writers of the two centuries after the death of St. John may be the more striking, if we consider that the Lord's day (a name which has now come out more prominently, and is connected more explicitly with our Lord's resurrection than before) existed during these two centuries as a part and parcel of apostolical, and so of scriptural Christianity. It was never defended, for it was never impugned, or, at least, only impugned as other things received from the apostles were. It was never confounded with the Sabbath, but carefully distinguished from it (though we have not quoted nearly all the passages by which this point might be proved). It was not an institution of severe sabbathial character, but a day of joy (μεταχωρία) and cheerfulness (μουσική), rather encouraging than forbidding relaxation. Religiously regarded, it was a day of solemn meeting for the holy Eucharist, for united prayer, for instruction, for almsgiving; and though, being an institution under the law of liberty, was not supposed to have been enjoined, it was commonly enjoined, Tertullian seems to indicate that the character of the day was opposed to worldly business. Finally, whatever analogy may be supposed to exist between the Lord's day and the Sabbath, in no passages have they been brought down to us in such a commandment as to give the obligation to observe the Lord's day. Ecclesiastical writers reiterate again and again, in the strictest sense of the words, "Let no man, therefore, judge you in respect of an holiday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days" (Col. ii, 16). Nor, again, is it referred to any sabbatical foundation anterior to the promulgation of the Mosaic economy. On the contrary, those before the Mosaic era are constantly presumed to have had neither knowledge nor observance of the Sabbath. As the text asserts, the fourth day, it is, in spite of the attempt to show that the Lord's day is merely an ecclesiastical institution, dependent on the post-apostolic Church for its origin, and by consequence capable of being done away, should a time ever arrive when it appears to be no longer needed.

If these facts be allowed to speak for themselves, they indicate that the Lord's day is a purely Christian institution, sanctioned by apostolic practice, mentioned in apostolic writings, and so possessed of whatever divine authority all apostolic ordinances and doctrines (which were not obviously temporary, or were not abrogated by the new, or better order) can be supposed to possess.

3. But, on whatever grounds of "the Lord's day" may be supposed to rest, it is a great and indisputable fact that four years before the (Eccumenical Council of Nicaea, it was recognised by Constantine, in his celebrated edict, as "the venerable day of the Sun." The terms of the document are these: "Imperatore Constantiniano Aug. Heliopolit." "Ommnes judices urbanaeque plebes et ecclares officia veneranda Dio Solis crescentiae. Rutur tamen postea in imperio librum licentiae inseratur librique frequenter event ut non aliquis alio die frumentum suile sui vinum scrobulus mandetur. non omne munus nepotem quae seu civitatis celestis provisione concessa."—Det. Non. Mart. Cruspo II et Constantino II Cons. Some have endeavored to explain away this document by alleging, 1st. That "Solis Dies" is not the Christian Seventh Day, but the first day of the week. 2d. That, before his conversion, Constantine had professed himself to be especially under the guardianship of the Sun, and that, at the very best, he intended to make a religious compromise between existing religions, thereby weakening the Christian faith. 3d. That Constantine's edict was purely a calendarial one, and intended to reduce the number of public holidays, "Dies Nefasti" or "Feriati," which had, so long ago as the date of the "Actiones Verrucinae," become serious impediments to the transaction of business; and that this was to be effected by choosing a day which, while it would be accepted by the paganism then in fashion, would, of course, be agreeable to the Christians. 4thly. That Constantine then instituted Sunday for the first time as a legal day of rest. All these statements are absolutely refuted, both by the quotations made above from writers of the 2d and 3d centuries, and by the terms of the edict itself. It is evident that Constantine, accepting as facts the existence of the "Solis Dies," and the reverence paid to it by some one or other, does nothing more than make that reverence practically universal. It is "venerabilis" already. It is probable that this most natural interpretation would never have been disturbed had not Sozomen asserted, without warrant from either the Justinian or the Theodorian Code, that Constantine did for the sixth day of the week what the codes assert that he did for the first (Eccles. Hist., i, 8; comp. Eusebius, Vit. Const., iv, 18). The three other statements concern themselves rather with what Constantine means than with what he did. But with such considerations we have little or nothing to do, if we suppose the edict was only selected an ambiguous appellation. He may have been only half a Christian, wavering between allegiance to Christ and allegiance to Mithras. He may have affected a religious syncretism. He may have wished his people to adopt such syncretism. But in the fourth century a great change occurred, and he may have hesitated to avow too openly his inward leanings to Christianity. He may have considered that community of religious days might lead by-and-by to community of religious thought and feeling. He may have had in view the rectification of the calendar. But all this is nothing to the purpose. It is a fact, that in
The year A.D. 321, in a public edict, which was to apply to Christians as well as to pagans, he put especial honor upon a day already honored by the former—judiciously calling it by a name which Christians had long employed without scruple, and to which, as it was in ordinary use, the pagans could scarcely object. What he did for it was to insist that worldly business, whether by the friendly consent of the administrators of private citizens, should be intermitted during its continuance. An exception, indeed, was made in favor of the rural districts, awkwardly from the necessity of the case, covertly, perhaps, to prevent those districts where paganism (as the word pagus would intimate) still prevailed extensively from feeling its loss from a sudden and stringent change. It need only be added here that the readiness with which Christians acquiesced in the interdiction of business on the Lord's day affords no small presumption that they had long considered it to be a day of rest, and that, so far as circumstances admitted, they had made it so long before.

Were any other testimony wanting to the existence of Sunday as a day of Christian worship at this period, it might be supplied by the Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325. The fathers there and then assembled make no doubt of the Lord's Day and the public services connected with it, but do not define it. They assume it as an existing fact, and only notice it incidentally in order to regulate an indifferent matter—the posture of Christian worshippers upon it (Conc. Nic. canon 20).

Cyriacus (A.P. 360) concludes one of his Homilies by dismissing his audience to their respective ordinary occupations. The Council of Laodicea (A.D. 364), however, enjoined Christians to rest (συγκακλησις) on the Lord's day. To the same effect is an injunction in the forsyery called the Apostolical Constitutions (vii. 24), and various other enactments from A.D. 600 to A.D. 1100, though by no means extending to the prohibition of all secular occupations.


Lord's Prayer, the common title of the only form given by Jesus Christ to his disciples. Matthew imports it as part of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v, 1-12); not in the form we now confine by it, but the general topic of that part of the discourse is prayer. Luke, however, explicitly assigns the occasion for its delivery as being at the request of the disciples (Luke xi, 2-4); and we cannot reasonably suppose either that they had forgotten it, if previously given, or that our own Lord never made such an exercise as is here described, but had not referred to it as already pre-arranged. The following analysis exhibits its comprehensive structure:

![Diagram of Lord's Prayer structure]

The closing doxology is omitted by Luke, and is probably spurious in Matthew, as it is not found there in any of the early MSS. The prayer is doubtless based upon expressions and sentiments already familiar to the Jews; indeed, parallel phrases to nearly all its contents have been discovered in the Talmud (see Schöttgen and Lightfoot, s. v.). This, however, does not detract from its beauty and force, but is only another indication of its origin, which is to be considered as a whole. The earliest reference found to it, as a liturgical formula in actual use, is in the so-called Apostolical Constitutions (q. v.), which give the form entire, and enjoin its stated use (vii. 44), but solely by baptized persons, a rule which was afterwards altered by higher authorities. The Christian fathers, especially Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen, are loud in its praise, and several of them wrote special expositions or homilies upon it. Cyril of Jerusalem is the first writer who expressly mentions the use of the Lord's Prayer at the consecration of the altar (Ep. 28, § 5). St. Augustine has also alluded to its use on this solemn occasion (Hom. lxxxiiii). The Ordo Romani prefixes a preface to the Lord's Prayer, the date of which is uncertain. It contains a brief exposition of the prayer. All the Roman breviaries insist upon beginning divine service with the Lord's Prayer. The Church, it would appear, regularly proved that this custom was introduced as late as the 18th century by the Cistercian monks, and that it passed from the monastery to the Church. The ancient homiletical writings do not afford any trace of the use of the Lord's Prayer before sermons (see Riddle, Manual of Christian Antiquities). Its absurd repetition as a Pater Noster (q. v.) by the Romanists has perhaps led to an undue avoidance of it by some Protestants. In all liturgies (q. v.) of course it occupies a prominent place, and it is usual in many denominations to recite it in the presence of the minister; and in public services, as in the Mass: although Jerome (Ep. Peleg. iii, 3) and Gregory (Ep. vili, xlix) affirm that it was used by apostolical example in the consecration of the Eucharist. The literature of the subject is very copious (see the Chrest. Remembrancer, Jan. 1862). Early monographs are cited by Vollheding, Index Programmatum, p. 38, ed. 1811. Among special recent comments on it we may mention those of Bocker (Lond. 1835), Anderson (ib. 1840), Manton (ib. 1841), Rowseal (ib. 1841), Duncan (ib. 1845), Kennaway (ib. 1845), Pritchard (ib. 1850), Edwards (ib. 1860), and Denton (ib. 1864; N. Y. 1865). See Prayer.

Lord's Supper, the common English name of an ordinance instituted by our Saviour in commemoration of his death and sufferings, being one of the two sacraments universally observed by the Christian Church.

I. Name. It is called "the Lord's Supper" (εὐχαριστία τοῦ Κυρίου) in 1 Cor. x. 25. Matthew, however, has "memorials of the Lord's Supper" in 1 Cor. x. 23, but here it is a general name, for what is often called the "memorials of the Lord's Supper" in the early church are only those which happen at the Communion (συνοικνομία, a festival in common), a term borrowed from 1 Cor. x. 16, and Eucharist (Εὐχαριστία and ἐκχορία), "a giving of thanks," because of the hymns and psalms which accompanied it. Among the many other Greek and Latin names applied to the Lord's Supper, but for which we have no exact equivalent, we mention Ζωνέλιον, "a collection" (for celebrating the Lord's Supper), Λυτριγία (Liturgy, q. v.), Μεσσίας (Sacrament, q. v.), Μεσία (Mass, q. v.), etc. See Eucharist.

II. Biblical Notice. — Original Account. — The institution of this sacrament is recorded by Matthew (xxvi, 26-29), Mark (xiv, 22-25), Luke (xxii, 19 sq.), and by the apostle Paul (1 Cor. xii, 24-25), whose words differ very little from those of his companion, Luke; and the only difference between Matthew and Mark is, that the latter omits the words "for the remission of sins." There is so general an agreement among them all that it will only be necessary to recite the words of one of them: "Now, when the even was come, he sat down with the twelve" to eat the Passover which had been prepared by his direction, "and as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is my..."
blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins” (Matt. xxvi, 20, 25-28). Its institution “in remembrance of Christ” is recorded only by Luke and Paul. John does not mention the institution at all, but the discourse of Jesus in chap. vi, 51-59 is referred by many interpreters to the Lord’s Supper. Paul was familiar with it, as C. N. T. shows, and they cannot partake of the Lord’s table and at the same time eat of the pagan sacrifices, because (verse 19) “the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils, and not to God;” and in another part of his first epistle (xi, 27-29), that “whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord; but let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup; for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord’s body.” Other passages of the New Testament are referred by many exegetical writers to the Lord’s Supper, but they establish no new point concerning the Biblical doctrine. They will be examined, however, in detail in this connection, leaving the ecclesiastical relations of the subject for the title Communion.

2. Paschal Analogies.—This is an important inquiry in the history of the institution of the Lord’s Supper. When Jesus and his disciples met together to eat the Passover (Matt. xxvi, 19; Mark xiv, 16; Luke xxi, 18), the manner in which the paschal feast was kept by the Jews of that period differed in many details from that originally prescribed by the rules of Exod. xii. The multitude that came up to Jerusalem met, as they could find accommodation, family by family, or in groups of friends, with one of their number as the celebrant, or “proclaimer” of the feast. The ceremonies of the feast took place in the following order (Lightfoot, Temple Servit, xiii; Meyer, Comm., in Matt. xxvi, 26). (1) The members of the company that were joined for this purpose met in the evening and reclined on couches, this position being then as much a matter of rule as standing had been originally (comp. Matt. xxvi, 20, διστορε; Luke xxi, 14; and John xiii, 23, 25). (2) The head of the household, or celebrant, began by a form of blessing “for the day and for the wine,” pronounced over a cup of which he and the others then drank. The wine was, according to rabbinic traditions, to be mixed with water; for not any mysterious reason, but because that was regarded as the best manner of drinking the best wine (comp. Matt. xxv, 30). (2) All who were present then washed their hands; they also having a special benediction. (3) The table was then set out with the paschal lamb, unleavened bread, bitter herbs, and the dish known as Charoseth (חרושת), a sauce made of dates, figs, raisins, and vinegar, and designed to commemorate the mortar of their bondage in Egypt (Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. col. 881). (4) The celebrant first, and then the others, dipped a portion of the bitter herbs into the Charoseth and ate them. (5) The dishes were then removed, and a cup of wine again brought. Then followed an interval which was allowed theoretically for the questions that might be asked by children or prosectyes, who were astonished at such a strange form of mourning of a feast, and the cup was passed round and drunk at the close of it. (6) The dishes being brought on again, the celebrant repeated the commemorative words which opened what was strictly the paschal supper, and pronounced a solemn thanksgiving, followed by Psa. cxiii and cxiv. (7) Then came a second washing of the hands, with a short form of blessing as before, and the celebrant broke one of the two loaves or cakes of unleavened bread, and gave thanks over it. All then took portions of the bread and dipped them, together with the bitter herbs, into the Charoseth, and so ate it as they ate the flesh of the paschal lamb, with bread, etc., as they liked: and, after another blessing, a third cup, known especially as the “cup of blessing,” was handed round. (9) This was succeeded by a fourth cup, and the recital of Psa. cxvii, followed by a prayer, and this was accordingly known as the cup of the Hallel, or of the Song. (10) There might be, in conclusion, a fifth cup, provided that the “great Hallel” (possibly Psa. cxv-cxvii) was sung over it. See Passover.

Comparing the ritual thus gathered from rabbinic writers with the early Christian usage, and considering the common principle that it represents substantially the common practice of our Lord’s time, and (8) that the meal of which he and his disciples partook was really the Passover itself, conducted according to the same rules, we are able to point, though not with absolute certainty, to the points of departure which the latter event presented for the novelty of the new. To (1) or (3), or even to (8), we may refer the first words and the first distribution of the cup (Luke xxi, 17, 18); to (2) or (7), the dipping of the sop (ψιλός) of John xiii, 26; to (7), or to an interval during (after) the distribution of the bread (Matt. xxvi, 26; Mark xiv, 22; Luke xxii, 19; 1 Cor. xi, 23, 24); to (9) or (10) (“after supper,” Luke xxi, 20), the thanksgiving, and distribution of the cup, and the hymn with which the whole was ended. It will be noticed that, according to this order of succession, the question whether the cup of the Last Supper was of a later age, as some writers have thought, or of a later age, as some writers have thought, or of a later age, as some writers have thought, or of a later age, as some writers have thought, or of a later age, as some writers have thought, or of a later age, as some writers have thought, or of a later age, as some writers have thought, or of a later age, as some writers have thought, or of a later age, as some writers have thought, or of a later age, as some writers have thought, or of a later age, as some writers have thought, of which those which has thus been transferred to the Christian Church and perpetuated in it. Old things were passing away, and all things becoming new. They had looked on the bread and the wine as memorials of the deliverance from Egypt. They were now told to partake of them in remembrance of their Master and Lord. The festival had been annual. No rule was given as to the time and frequency of the new feast that thus superseded the old, but the command, “Do this as oft as ye drink it” (1 Cor. x, 25), suggested the more continuous recollection of that which was to be their memorial of one whom they would wish never to forget. The words, “This is my body,” gave to the unleavened bread a new character. They had been prepared for language that would otherwise have been so startling by the teaching of John (vi, 52-58), and they were thus taught to see in the bread that was broken the witness of the closest possible union and incorporation with their Lord. The cup, which was “the new testament” (Νέαν συμμαρτύρειν) in his blood,” would remind them, in like manner, of the wonderful presence of which that new covenant had been spoken (Jer. xxxi, 31-34), of which the crowning glory was in the promise, “I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.” His blood shed, as he told them, “for them and for many,” for that remission of sins which he had been proclaiming throughout his whole ministry, was to be to the new covenant what the blood of sprinkling had been to that of Moses (Exod. xxxiv, 8). It is possible that there may have been yet another thought connected with these symbolic acts. The funeral customs of the Jews involved, at or after the time when was passed the mourning bread (comp. Jer. xvi, 7, “shall neither they break bread for them in mourning,” in marginal reading of A. V.; Ewald and Hitzig, ad loc.; Ezek. xxiv, 17; Hosea ix, 14; Tob. iv, 17), and of wine, known when thus given, as “the cup of consolation.” May not the bread and the wine of the Lord’s Supper have been a repetition of that character, preparing the minds of Christ’s disciples for his departure by treating it as already accomplished? They were to think of his body as already anointed for the burial (Matt. xxvi, 12; Mark xiv, 8; John xii, 7), of his body as already given up in death, of his body as already shed. The passion itself was also, little as they might dream of it, a funeral feast. The bread and the wine were to be pledges of consolation for their sorrow, analogous to the verbal promises.
of John xiv. 1, 27: xvi. 20. The word διαθήκη might even have the twofold meaning which is connected with it in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

May we not conjecture, without leaving the region of history for that of controversy, that the thoughts, desires, emotions of that hour of divine sorrow and communion would be such as to lead the disciples to crave earnestly for the promise which they had understood they should seek that renewal in the way which their Master had pointed out to them? From this time, accordingly, the words "to break bread" appear to have had for the disciples a new significance. It may not have assumed the form of a cup and of a historic or liturgical act; but when they met to break bread, it was with new thoughts and hopes, and with the memories of that evening fresh on them. It would be natural that the Twelve should transmit the command to others who had not been present, and seek to lead them to the same obedience and the same blessings. The narrative of the two disciples to whom their Lord made himself known "in breaking of bread" at Emmaus (Luke xxii. 30-35) would strengthen the belief that this was the way to an abiding fellowship with him.

3. The literal use. — It is always interesting to note, as has been pointed out by the writer of the Acts of the life of the first disciples at Jerusalem, a prominent place is given to this act, and to the phrase which indicated it. Writing, we must remember, with the definite associations that had gathered round the words during the thirty years that followed, we are apt to hear and to think of the members of the Church as continuing steadfast in or to the teaching of the apostles, in fellowship with them and with each other, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers (Acts ii. 42). A few verses further on, their daily life is described in terms ringing itself undesigned (1) of that of public devotion, which still belonged to them as Jews ("continuing daily with one accord in the Temple"); (2) of that of their distinctive acts of fellowship; "breaking bread from house to house (or 'privately,' Meyer), they did eat their meat in gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people.") Taken in connection with the account given in the preceding verses of the love which made them live as having all things common, we can scarcely doubt that this implies that the chief actual meal of each day was one in which they met as brothers, and which, beyond the very act of sharing the same food, was the eminently commemorative acts of the breaking of the bread and the drinking of the cup. It will be convenient to anticipate the language and the thoughts of a somewhat later date, and to say that apparently they thus united ever afterwards in the act of the Lord's Supper. The element of the eucharist (from the Greek eucharistia) is passing by degrees into the special signification of 'communion.' The apostle refers to his own office as breaking the bread and blessing the cup (1 Cor. x. 16). The table on which the bread was placed was the Lord's table, and that title was to the Jew, not, as later controversies have made it, the antithesis of altar (3ωριανος), but as nearly as possible a synonyme (Mal. i. 7, 12; Ezek. xii. 22). But the practice of the Agape, as well as the observance of the commemorative feast, had been transferred to Corinth, and this called for a special notice. Evil had sprung up which had to be checked at once. The meeting of friends for a social meal, to which all contributed, was a sufficiently familiar practice in the common life of Greeks of this period, and these club-feasts were associated with plans of mutual relief or charity to the poor (comp. Smith's Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Antiq. x. v. Erinó), The Agape of the new society would seem to them to be such a feast, and hence came a disorder that altogether frustrated the object of the Church in instituting it. Richer members came, bringing their supper with them, or appropriating what belonged to the common stock and consumed it without waiting till others were assembled and the presiding elder had taken his place. The poor were put to shame, and dejected of their share in the...
feast. Each was thinking of his own supper, not of that to which we now find attached the distinguishing title of "the Lord's Supper." When the time for that came, one was hungry enough to be looking to it with physical, not spiritual craving; another, so overpowered with wine as to be incapable of receiving it with any reverence. It is quite conceivable that a life of excess and excitement, of overworked emotion and unrestrained indulgence, such as this epistle brings before us, may have been a contributory cause to the physical as well as to the moral health of those who were affected by it, and so the sickness and the deaths of which Paul speaks (1 Cor. xi, 30), as the consequences of this disorder, may have been so, not by supernatural infliction, but by the working of those general laws of the divine government which we are accustomed to consider as the consequences of the sin. In any case, what the Corinthians needed was to be taught to come to the Lord's table with greater reverence, to distinguish ἐνεργεῖα (energeia) the Lord's body from their common food. Unless they did so, they would bring to the table πεπλωμένος in the morning, which was yet dark" (Tertullian, ad Uxor. ii, c. 4).

The recurrence of the same liturgical words in Acts xxvii, 35 makes it probable, though not certain, that the food of which Paul thus partook was intended to have, for himself and his Christian companions, the character of a consecration, analogous to that of the heathen soldiers and sailors, may be noticed, are said to have followed his example, not to have partaken of the bread which he had broken. If we adopt this explanation, we have in this narrative another example of a celebration in the early hours between midnight and daybreak. It was done at the time, i.e. as we have met with in the meeting at Troas.

All the distinct references to the Lord's Supper which occur within the limits of the N. T. have, it is believed, been noticed. To find, as a recent writer has done (Christian Remembrancer, April, 1860), that there is no allusion to it in the Liturgy of the Eastern Church in the Pauline Epistles involves (ingeniously as the hypothesis is supported) assumptions too many and bold to justify our acceptance of it. Extending the inquiry, however, to the times as well as to the writings of the N. T., we find reason to believe that we can trace in the early history of the Church some fragments of that which belonged to it from the beginning. The agreement of the four great families of liturgies implies the substratum of a common order. To that order may well belong the Hebraic: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, which hath given rest unto his people Israel, according to the word of his servant David." The sacrifice "To thee"; the "Triumphant Corda" (ἰματία τοίχων τοῖς τίμησις), the Tri- sagogia, the Kyrie Eleison. We are justified in looking at these as having been portions of a liturgy that was really primitive; guarded from change with the tenacity with which the Christians of the 2d century clung to the traditions (the παραδόσεις of 2 Thess. ii, 15; iii, 6) of the first, forming part of the great deposit (παραδόσεις) of faith and worship which they had received from the apostles and have transmitted to later ages (comp. Bingham, Eccles. Antiq. bk. xv, ch. vii; Augusti, Christ. Arch. b. viii; Stanley on 1 Cor. x. x)."

III. Ecclesiastical Representations. — The Christian Church attached from the first great and mysterious importance to the Lord's Supper. In accordance with the original institution, all Christians used wine and bread, with the exception of the Hydroparastics (Aquar- rii), who used water instead of wine, and the Anergy- rite, who are said to have used cheese along with bread. The wine was generally mixed with water (εὐρώσα), and an allegorical signification was given to the mixture of these two elements. In the writings of the fathers (the fifth), at the same time, we meet with some passages which speak distinctly of symbols, and, at the same time, with others which indicate belief in a real participation of the body and blood of Christ. Ignatius, Justin, and Irenæus laid great stress on the mysterious connection subsisting between the Logos and
the elements. Tertullian and Cyprian are representatives of the symbolical aspect, though both occasionally call the cup the body or the blood of Christ. The symbolical interpretation prevails in particular among the Alexandrine school. Clement called it a mystic symbol which produces an effect only upon the mind, and Origen decidedly opposed those who took the external sign for the thing itself. The idea of a sacrifice, though not yet of a daily or periodic sacrifice, appears in the writings of Justin and Irenæus. Cyprian says that the sacrifice is made by the priest, who acts instead of Christ, and imitates what Christ did. It is not quite certain, but probable, that the Eustonites celebrated the Lord’s Supper as a commemorative feast; the mystical meals of some Gnostics, on the contrary, bear but little resemblance to the Lord’s Supper. The development of liturgies in and after the third century, and the introduction of many mystical ceremonies, showed that the fathers generally regarded the Lord’s Supper, with Chrysostom, as a “dreadful sacrifice.” They clearly speak of a real union of the communicants with Christ; some, also, of a real change from the visible elements into the body and blood of Christ, though most of their expressions can be understood both of consubstantial and corporeal union. Augustine drew a clear distinction between the sign and the thing signified, while Augustine sought to unite its more profound mystical significance with the symbolical. Gelasius, bishop of Rome, very decidedly denied “the ceasing of the substance and nature of bread and wine.” The notion of a daily repetition of the sacrifice is distinctly set forth in the writings of Gregory the Great. A violent controversy concerning the Lord’s Supper arose in the 9th century. Paschasius Radbertus, a monk of Corvey, clearly propounded the doctrine of transubstantiation in his Liber de corpore et sanguine Domini, addressed to the emperor Charles the Bald, between 880 and 882. He was opposed by Ratramnus in his treatise De corpore et sanguine Domini, which was written at the request of the emperor, who drew a distinction between the sign and the thing represented by it, between the internal and the external. The most eminent theologians of the age, as Rabanus Maurus and Scotus Erigena, took an active part in the controversy. Gerbert (afterwards pope Sylvester II) endeavored to illustrate the doctrine of transubstantiation by the aid of geometrical diagrams. Toward the middle of the 11th century the doctrine of the real presence was sanctioned by the Second Lateran council (1136), canon of Tours (q. v.), who principally condemned the doctrine of an entire change in such a manner as to make the bread cease to be bread. Several synods in succession, between 1066 and 1079, condemned his views, but he was not entirely refuted. He adopted the words of Bede and imposed upon Berengar an oath that he believed “corpus et sanguinem Domini non solu sacramentum sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum trassist, frangi et dividere dimituis atteri.” Among the scholastics, Lanfranc developed the distinction between the subject and the accidents. The doctrine of transsubstantiation, first used by Hildebert of Tours, though similar phrases, as transnostio, had previously been employed (by Hugo of St. Victor and others). Most of the earlier scholastics, and, in particular, the followers of Lanfranc, defended both the change of the bread into the body of Christ and that of the “accidentia sine subiecto,” both of which were inserted in the Decretum Gratiani (about 1150), and declared an article of faith by the fourth Council of Lateran. Later, the Scholastics discussed a great many subtle questions, such as: Do animals partake of the body of Christ when they happen to swallow a consecrated host? By the institution of the Corpus-Christi day by pope Urban IV (1264), the doctrine of transubstantiation received a liturgical expression. However, a considerable time before, it had become a custom in the Latin Church the faithful to consume the host in the form of the host. Alexander Hales, Bonaventure, and Thomas Aquinas expressly demanded that only the priests should partake of the cup. The Hussites demanded the admission of the leity also to a partaking of the cup, on the basis of the Council of Constance was one of the causes of the Hussite War. The doctrine that Christ existed wholly in either of the elements (for which doctrine the theologians used the expression communio) was expressly confirmed by the Council of Basle. The number of those who during the Middle Ages expressed their dissent from the doctrine of transubstantiation is limited.

The doctrine of impanation, or a coexistence of Christ's body with the bread, was first advanced by John of Paris, who was followed by William Ockham and Durandus de Saint-Porocondo. Both transubstantiation, or the consummation of the sacrifice were combated by Wickliffe, who, with Berengar of Tours, believed it a change from the inferior to the superior. His views were probably shared by Jerome of Prague, while Hus seems to have believed in transubstantiation. The Reformers of the 16th century agreed in rejecting transubstantiation as unscriptural, but they differed among themselves in several points. Carlstadt believed that the words of institution were to be understood εκεῖνος, i.e. that Christ, while speaking to them, had pointed at his own body. Zwingli took the word "Ιστος" in the sense of "to be food," and viewed the Lord's Supper merely as an act of commemoration, not as a visible sign of the body and blood of Christ. Zécolampadius differed from Zwingli only grammatically, retaining the literal meaning of "ἐστι," but taking the predicate, "my body," (τὸ σῶμα μοῦ), in a figurative sense, of Christ in the bread; Luther believed it impossible to put any of these connotations on the letter of the Scripture, and adhered to the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in, with, and under the bread and wine (consubstantiation). Together with this view he professed a belief in the body of Christ. Calvin rejected the doctrine of the real presence; but, after the precedence of Bucer, Myronius, and others, spoke of a real, though spiritual participation of the body of Christ which exists in heaven. This participation, however, he restricted to the believer, while Luther agreed with the Roman Church in maintaining that also infidels partake of Christ's body, though to their own hurt. Attempts at mediating between the views of Luther and Calvin were early made, and there were crypto-Calvinists in the Lutheran, and crypto-Lutherans in the Calvinistic churches. But the Lutheran view received a decisive blow in 1610, when the Augsburg Confession was adopted, which shut out any further influence of Calvinism. The decline of Lutheran orthodoxy in general caused also the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper to grow into disuse, and the Protestant theologians generally adhered with Luther in the doctrine of the real presence. There are many differences in the latter, at length, prevailed. (See the Brit. and For. Rev. Oct. 1860; Müller, De Lutheri et Calviniani sentinentia de Sacro Canto, Hali. 1853.) It was, in particular, adopted by the Armenian churches, as also by the Socinians. In the Church of England there was from the beginning a real-presence and a spirit of communion, and by the controversy between them frequently became very hot. The real-presence party generally agreed with the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, but some of its writers advanced views more resembling those of the Roman Church. In the 19th century the High-Church parties of the German Lutheran Church, and of the Episcopal Church of England, Scotland, and America, revived and emphasized again the doctrine of the real presence. The reality theology of the United Evangelical Church of Germany in the 19th century fell back on the doctrine of Calvin, and emphasized the real and objective communication of the whole God-man Christ to the believer, and the real body and blood in the German Reformed Church of America. Very different from the doctrine of all the larger Christian denomin-
institutions were the views which some mystic writers of the ancient and medieval Church intimated, and which were fully developed in the 16th century by Paracelsus, and afterwards adopted by the Society of Friends. They regardcommunion as something essentially internal and mystical, and deny the Lord’s Supper to be an ordinance which Christ the Last Supper had perpetrated. — Lutheran., Historia controversy Sacramenticus (Tig. 1673); Hoe- pelianus, Hist. Sacramentaria (Tig. 1692); Planck, Geschichted. Entstehung, etc., des protest. Lebegriffes, ii, 204 sq.; 471 sq.; iii, (I), 576 sq.; iv, 6 sq.; v, (I) 89 sq., 211 and 213; The Transfiguration. 

IV. Forms of Celebration. — 1. The Elements. — (a) At the institution of the Lord’s Supper Christ used unleavened bread. The primitive Christians carried with them the bread and wine for the Lord’s Supper, and took the bread which was used at common meals, which was unleavened bread. When this custom ceased, togeth-

er with the Agapé, the Greeks retained the leavened bread, while in the Latin Church the unleavened bread became common since the 8th century. Out of this difference a dogmatic controversy in the 11th century arose, the Greek Church reproaching the Latin Church with the omission of the leavened bread, and making it heresy. At the Council of Florence, in 1439, which attempted to unite both churches, it was agreed that either might be used; but the Greeks soon rejected, with the council also, the tole ration of the unleavened bread, and still maintain the ancient custom. 

We see, from 1 Cor. xi, 24, that in the apostolic Church the bread was broken. This custom was dis-

continued in the Roman Church when, in the 12th and 18th centuries, the host or holy wafer was cut in a pe-
culiar way, so as to represent upon it a crucified Saviour. Luther retained the wafer, but the Reformed churches reintroduced the use of common bread and the breaking of it. The same was the case with the Socinians and the United Evangelical Church of Germany. In the Episcopal Church of England, and the churches derived from it, cuts pieces of common wheaten bread are given into the hands of the communicants. See J. G. Hermann, Hist. concertationum de pomo ovo (Lips. 1787); Marburgin, Das Brod im Abendmahl (Berlin, 1817).

(b) The second element used by Christ was wine. It is not certain of what color the wine was, nor whether it was pure or mixed with water, and both points were always regarded as indifferent by the Christian Church. The use of mixed wine is said to have been introduced by pope Alexander I; it was expressly enacted in the 12th century by Clement III, and divers allegorical signs are given to the mingling of these two elements. Also the Greek Church mingled the wine with water, while the Armenian and the Protestant churches use pure wine.

The question as to whether the wine originally used in the Lord’s Supper was fermented or not, would seem to be a futile one in view of the fact, 1. that the unfer-

mented juice of the grape can hardly, with propriety, be called wine at all; 2. that fermented wine is of almost universal use in the East; and, 3. that it has invariably been employed for this purpose in the Church of all ages. For the end of the 7th and in the 4th of the Eastern modern well-meaning reformers, the idea that our Lord used any other would hardly have gained the least currency. See Wink.

In accordance with the original institution, both ele-

ments were used separately during the first centuries, but it became the custom that the persons present, bread merely dipped in wine. The Manicheans, who abstained wholly from wine, were strongly opposed by teachers of all other parties, and pope Gelasius I, of the 5th, called their practice grande sacrilegiosa. In the 10th century it became frequent in the West to use only consecrated bread dipped in wine, it was not before the end of the 18th century that, in accordance with the doctrine, then developed by the Scholastics, that Christ was wholly present in both bread and wine, and that the partaking of the bread was sufficient, the Church began to withhold the wine from the laity alto-

gether. The Waldenses, Wickliffe, Huss, and Savonarola, protested against this withdrawal of the cup, and all the Protestant denominations agreed in restoring the use of both elements. The Greek Church has always used the wine under both species, and Scholia des Keiches im Abendmahl (Leogra, 1780); Schmidt, De fustis calicis eucharisticis (Heilsmiit, 1708).

2. Consecration and Distribution of the Elements. — To “consecrate” meant in the ancient Church only to set apart from common and devote to a sacred use. But, by degrees, a magical effect was attributed to consec-

ration, as was already done by Augustine, and when the doctrine of transubstantiation became prevalent in the Roman Church, it was supposed that the pronunciation of the words “This is my body” changed the ele-

ments into the body and blood of Christ. The formulae which were used at the consecration were at first free, but afterwards fixed by written liturgies. All liturgies contain the words of institution and a prayer; the lit-

urgy of the Greek Church, moreover, a prayer to the Holy Holy and Holy bread and wine into the hearts and blood of Christ. In the ancient Church both ele-

ments were distributed by the deacons, afterwards only the wine; at a later period of the Church, again, both elements. According to the Protestant theologians, the administration belongs properly to the ministers of the Church; but many theol. have maintained that where no regular teachers can be ob-

tained, this sacrament may be administered by other Christians to whom this duty is committed by the Church.

3. Time and Place. — In the apostolic Church, as we have seen, the Lord’s Supper was regularly celebrated in the public assemblies, hence in private dwellings, at common tables, during the persecutions in hidden places, at the sepulchres of the martyrs, and, later, in the church-

es at special tables or altars. In imitation of its first cer-

ebration by Christ, it was at first celebrated at night; later, it became almost universally connected with the morning service. In the primitive Church, Christians partook of it almost daily; and when this was made im-

possible by the persecutions, at least several times a week, or certainly on Sundays. In the 10th century, many of the theological questions of the laxity of Christians in the participation of the Lord’s Supper, and afterwards several synods had to prescribe that all Christians ought to partake of it at least a certain number of times. The fourth Synod of Lateran, in 1415, restricted it to once a year. The Catholic Church, in an effort to secure a uni-

form participation, without, however, making any defi-
nite prescriptions as to the number of times. Many of the Protestant states punished those who withdrew altogether from it with exile, excommunication, and the refusal of a Christian burial.

4. Persons by whom, and the Manner in which the Lord’s Supper is received. — In the primitive Church all baptized persons were admitted to the Lord’s Supper; afterwards the catechumens and the lopes were excluded from it. Communion of infants is found in an early pe-

riod, and is marked in the acts of the Council of Trent, Hist. eucharist. infant. (Ber. 1742). To those who were prevented from being present at the public service the consecrated elements were carried by deacons. Thus it was especially carried to the dying as a Viaticum, and until the 5th or 6th century it was even placed in the mouth of the dead, or in their coffin (see Schmidt, De eucharistia mortuorum, Jena, 1645).

The apostles received the Lord’s Supper reclining, according to Eastern custom. Since the 4th century the communicants used to stand, afterwards to kneel, then the men with uncovered head, the women covered with a long white cloth. Since the 4th century a certain order was introduced in approaching the communion table, so that first the higher and lower clergy, and afterwards the laity came.
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The self-communion of the laity is prohibited by all Christian denominations. The self-communion of officiating clergymen is generally strenuously resisted in the Roman Church, but also permitted and customary in the Episcopalian Church, among the Moravians, and with other denominations.

5. Ceremonies in Celebration.—In the Roman Church the communicants, after having confessed and received absolution, approach the altar, and stand at some distance from the altar, and receive kneeling a host from the priest, who passes round, taking the host out of a chalice which he holds in his left hand, repeating, for each communicant the words "Corpus Domini nostrui Jesu Christi custodiat animam tuam in vitam saevis et in aeternam. Amen." In the Episcopal Church the service is nearly the same as that of the ancient Church.

In the Lutheran Church the communion is preceded by a preparatory service, confession (q. v.). After the sermon the clergyman consecrates the host and the wine at the altar. Amid the singing of the congregation, the communicants, first the men, then the women, step, either singly or two at a time, to the altar, where the clergymen place the host in their mouth, and reach to them the cup, using the following or a similar formula: "Take, eat, this is the body of our Lord, and drink, this is the blood of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, and remember always His death till He come again. Amen. Take, drink, this is the blood," etc. The service is concluded with a prayer of thanks, and with the blessing. During the service frequently candles burn on the altar.

In the Reformed, Freezbyterian, Congregational, Armistic, etc., churches, the service begins communiating with a formula containing the passage 1 Cor. xii. The communicants step, in most places singly, to the communion table, and the broken bread and the cup are given into their own hands. In some places they remain sitting in the pews, where the elders carry to them bread and wine; in others, twelve at a time sit around a table. Private communion of the sick is an exception.

In the Episcopal Church of England the service of the Lord's Supper is immediately preceded by a general confession of sins, which is followed by a prayer of consecration and the words of institution. The communicants first commune themselves, then the communicants, who approach without observing any distinction, and kneel down at the communion table, receiving the bread (which is cut) and the cup into their hands. The service is conducted by the sacerdotal Episcopalian Church, and substantially in the Methodist churches.

The Socinians, on the day before they celebrate the Lord's Supper, a preparation ("discipline") with closed doors, when the preacher exhorts the Church members, rebukes their faults, reconciles enemies, and sometimes excludes them for gross or grave offenses. The Church. On the following day, at public service, the altar tables are spread and furnished with bread and wine. The communicants sit down round the table, and take with their hands the bread, which is broken by the preacher, and the cup.

The service of the Moravians makes that of the primitive Church. It is celebrated every fourth Sunday at the evening service, and was formerly connected with the Agape (love feasts), washing of feet, and the kissing of peace.


Lorenz, Johann Michael, a German theologian, was born at Torgau, July 16, 1692, and died at the university of that city. In 1713 he obtained the degree of A.M.; in 1714 he was appointed preacher in his native place; in 1722, professor ordinary of divinity at his alma mater. In addition to this, he was appointed in 1724 visitor of Williams College; in 1726, morning preacher, and regent of the school of St. Thomas; in 1734, pastor of the Thomas Church; in 1741, vice-president of the ecclesiastical conference. The doctorate in divinity he obtained in 1722. He died Aug. 16, 1752. By more than fifty Latin dissertations on dogmatic and exegetic theology Lorenz gained a high honorable name in theological literature. We only mention Dissertatio de unitate Spirituali, ad 1 Joh. ii, 27 (Argentorat, 1728, 4to). See Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutscbrlands, vol. ii, s. v.

Lorenzo or Lorenzetto, Ambrogio and Pietro, two celebrated Italian painters of the 14th century, were born at Siena about 1300. They were brothers, as we learn from an inscription which was attached to their pictures of the "Presentation" and of the "Marriage of the Virgin," destroyed in 1720. The principal of their works, the beautiful Madonna in the Museum at Siena, and represented the fatal adventures of some missionary monks, has been destroyed. In the first compartment a youth was represented putting on the monastic costume, in another, the same youth was represented with several of his brother monks about to set out for Asia, and in the third, several of the monks, in crowds, are already at their place of destinat-
tion, and are being chastised in the sultan's presence, and are surrounded and mocked by a crowd of scoffing infideles; the sultan judged them to be hanged; in a fourth the young monk is already hanged to a tree; yet he notwithstanding continues to preach the Gospel to the astonished multitude, upon which the sultan orders their hanging to be stopped; the next morning is their ceremonious execution by the sword, and the scaffold is surrounded by a great crowd on foot and on horseback; after the execution follows a great storm, which is represented in all the detail of wind, hail, lightning, and earthquake, from all of which the crowd are praying to be delivered; the next day they are buried in the Campo Santo at Pisa. In 1355 Pietro was invited to Arezzo to paint the cathedral, in which he painted in fresco twelve stories from the life of the Virgin, with figures as large as life and larger, but they have long since perished; they were, however, in good preservation during the time of Vasari, and completely are stored them. He speaks of parts of them as superior in style and vigor to anything that had been done up to that time.—English Cyclop. s. v. See also Vasari, Vite dei Pittori, etc.; Della Valle, Lettere Scelte; Lanzi, Storia Pictoria, etc.; and especially Rumohr, Italianische Forschungen, in which the two Lorenzetti are treated of at considerable length.

Loretto, properly Loreto (Lauretum), an Italian city of some 8000 inhabitants, several miles south of Ancona, is renowned simply as a place of pilgrimage. It is the site of the celebrated sanctuary of the Virgin Mary called the Santa Casa, or Holy House. The church of Santa Casa was built in 1461-1518. The first mention of this sancta casa is to be found in Flavius Blondus's († 1468) Italia illustrata, where he says of it, "Celeberrimus sanctus Italia saeculum beate Virginiae in Laureto." He mentions the many rich presents which were made to the shrine as a proof that "at this place the prayers for the intercession of the mother of God are granted," but he says nothing of the origin of the place. Pope Paul II († 1471) granted indulgences to those who visit this shrine, and the building was followed by his successors. Baptist Mantuanus, in his Redemptoris mundi matrix ecclesia Lausivana historia (Antwerp, 1576), relates, quoting a history found at the shrine itself (and probably written about 1450-80), that the house of the Virgin Mary, in which Christ was brought up, was known and was said to have been discovered by St. Helena, was, after the total downfall of the country, and the destruction of its Christian churches by the Turks in May, 1291, brought by the angels to Loreto and a half later years later to Italy, in the neighborhood of Recanati, and was thence finally transferred to its present site. This story is contradicted by the Church historians of the 14th century themselves, who say that in their day Mary's house at Nazareth was still visited by pilgrims. The houses of Recanati resembled each other very much, and the selection of the original habituation of the Virgin proved very difficult, as private interests became mixed up with it. But now as to the church of the Santa Casa itself. It stands near the centre of the town, in a piazza which possesses other architectural attractions, the chief of which are the governor's palace, built from the designs of Bramante, and a fine bronze statue of pope Sixtus V. The great central door of the church is surmounted by a splendid bronze statue of the Madonna; and in the interior are three magnificent bronze doors filled with bas-reliefs, representing the principal events of scriptural and ecclesiastical history. The celebrated Holy House stands within. It is a small brick house, with one door and one window, originally of rude material and construction, but now, from the devotion of successive generations, the most renowned and best-known of all the Marian shrines. It is entirely cased with white marble, exquisitely sculptured, after Bramante's design, by Sansovino, Bandinelli, Giovanni Bolognese, and other eminent artists. The subjects of the bas-reliefs are all taken from the history of the Virgin Mary in relation to the mystery of incarnation, as the Annunciation, the Visitation, the Nativity, the Magi, the exception of three on the eastern side, which are mainly devoted to the legend of the Holy House itself and of its translation. The rest of the interior of the church is rich with bas-reliefs, mosaics, frescoes, paintings, and carvings in bocca, one of the finest works is the font, which is a master-piece of art. The Holy House having been at all times an object of devout veneration, its treasury of votive offerings is one of the richest in the Western world. It suffered severely in the French occupation of 1786, but it has since received numerous and most valuable restorations. With the innumerable and silver lamps kept burning at the shrine is endowed to the amount of several thousand dollars to secure their being always kept burning. The remainder of the wax candles and oil (of which some 14,000 pounds are burned annually) is sold as possessing miraculous virtues, and companies the use or even the handling of household vessels belonging to the shrine. As many as 40,000 masses have been said there in one year, which also adds greatly to the income. Popes Julius II, Sixtus V, and Innocent XII attached indulgences to the pilgrimages and prayers offered here, but nevertheless the number of pilgrims, which was said in 1600 to have reached 200,000 per annum, fell in the last century to 40,000, and in our own day remains at this number. The frescoes of the church are among the finest to be found in the world. The name it took from Laurenza, a lady on whose estate the Santa Casa remained for a while.

The history of this shrine has been critically examined by P. P. Bergerius, and in 1619 by Prof. Verneger, of Strasbourg. Its principal champions were Jesuits; among them we would mention Turrianus, Caniani, and Barone. In 1637 there was published a history of the Santa Casa in six volumes, and in some places, as at Prague, near Augsburg, etc., and, in turn, became shrines.—Herzog, Real-Encyklop. viii, 469.

Loria (or Loria) Isaac (by the Jews ליאו), the initials of ליאו (ליאו), a noted rabbi and great exponent of the Cabala (q. v.), was born at Jerusalem in 1354, of a German-Jewish family. His father having died when he was a child, he was cared for by a rich uncle, and was dedicated to the study of the Talmud at Cairo. When twenty-four years of age he was considered one of the greatest Talmudists of that place. Unfortunately, however, Loria became an ardent adherent of the mystical writings of the Jews, and especially enraptured with the Sphak (q. v.), one of the Cabalistic works. The heretical views did not bring the upright and confused system of the Sphak into order, unity, and congruity; he also made many valuable additions. A most remarkable feature of his views are the numerous divisions of his psychology, with its two sexes. Still, all these theories were, with him, only premises to lead to the so-called or practical branch in the Cabala, which he called the "world of perfection" (Olam ha-Tikkun). He also held peculiar views on the fall of man. By reason of Adam's original sin, he held, the higher and the inferior souls, the good and the evil, came into confusion, and became intermixed with each other, and a separation of souls was thus a necessity. In addition to this he teaches the Superfattoio. He pretended to have a full knowledge concerning the origin, relation, and rami-
fication of souls; further, to possess the power and faculty to compel the spirits of the upper world to take their abode in the bodies of living men, in order to reveal to them what is going on in the upper world; further, to be able to read on every man's brow in which relation his soul stands to the higher worlds. In Cairo nobody interested himself in his mystic, and he therefore emigrated in 1590 to Safet, the capital of Thesalonica, where the Cabalists were esteemed as high as the Bible. His superior knowledge, faculties, and gifts gradually secured him the favor of the Cabalists, and Loria was soon surrounded by troops of young and old Cabalists, who came to listen to his new revelations. He subse-
sequently became a cabalistic community, and lived to-
ger apart from the non-Cabalists, and according to his prescriptions. After Loria's death (August, 1572), Vital Calabrese became his successor and gathered his productions, while another of his disciples, the Italian Israel Saruk, propagated his teachings in Europe. In-
deed, it may be said that the influence of this Cabalistic extended more or less over all the Jews of the globe, and many of them to this very day follow this great Jewish mystic in assigning to the Sohar equal value as to the Bible. It must be confessed, however, that by his ascription to the Sohar he also called forth a whole race of Jewish communities everywhere, and a reaction in the phar-
sisic, lifeless prayers, while even upon the Christian the-
osophy, mysticism, and exegetical studies his influence was considerable. See Gritz, Gesch. der Juden, ix, 487 sq.; x, 120; Jost, Gesch. d. Juden, iii, 100, 145; Fürst, Bibl. Jud., ii, 197 sq.

Loria, Salomo, a noted rabbi, was born at Posen in 1510. Gifted with great talents, he devoted himself to a thorough research of Jewish literature. On ac-
count of his onslaughts on Jewish tradition he became involved in manifold controversies with his colleagues, and was persecuted; but, though personally disliked on account of his inclination to polemics, and not spared even the private characteristics of living authorities, his just merits concerning the Talmud were recognised af-
after all, and his commentaries on six volumes of the Tal-
mu are held in high reputation among the Talmudic Jews to this very day. He died in 1553. See Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden, ix, 487 sq.; Fürst, Bibl. Jud., ii, 290 sq.

Lorin (or), JEAN, a Jewish commentator on the Scripture, distinguished in his day as an exegetical scholar, was born at Avignon in 1609; taught theology at Paris, Rome, and Milan, and died March 26, 1634, at Dôle. For a list of his works, see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxvi, 662.

Lotterbein, CHARLES DE GUISE, Cardinal of: See Gritz, Charles.

Lorsch, GEROB WILLIAM, a German theologian, was born at Dillingen, in the duchy of Nassau, Feb. 29, 1759. In 1768 he entered the University of Hildesheim; in 1771 he removed to that of Göttingen, and became there an enthusiastic student of the Oriental languages under Michaelis. After having finished the academic course, he spent four years in private study in his fa-
ther's house, preparing himself for the ministry. In 1778 he became rector at Siegen; in 1786, at the gram-
mar-school of his native place, and obtained, at the same time, the dignity of professor; in 1791, rector at the grammar-school of Herzberg, and, at the same time, professor of Oriental languages at the academy there, and in the following year was appointed to lecture at the university of that place on history and exegesis. In 1798 he became the third professor ordinary of di-
vinity; in 1794, the second counsel of the Conventual. Having become famous, by reason of his literary contributions, as an eminent Orientalist, he was, in 1812, called to the University of Jena as professor of Oriental literature. The theological faculty of Marburg bestowed on him the degree of doctor of di-
vinity. He died March 30, 1816. He belongs to the few and rare scholars of the ancient languages who combined acuteness with extensive learning. De Sacy places him among the first German Orientalists, first to publish an Archiv für orientalische Literatur (Mar-

Lorsch, CONVENT of (otherwise Laureham, Lau-
reichen, monasterium Laureosseni, Laurissene, Lauris-
na), situated four miles from Heidelberg, was established about A.D. 764 by countess Wibillswinda (widow of count Rupert, who, by order of Pepin, conduct pope Steph-
en back to Rome) and her son Canem. Its first aho-
bis is said to have been a near relative of the founders, 
Chrodeng of Metz. The first establishment was on an island of the Weschnitz, dedicated to St. Peter; a sec-
ond was soon erected on a hill in the neighborhood. CHARLEMAGNE greatly interested himself in this monas-
tery, and added to it as endowment Heppenheim (in January, 778) and Oppenheim (in September, 774), and personally attended the consecration. Louis the Pious, Lothaire, Louis the German, and Louis III all confirmed successively the donations of Charlemagne. But one of the greatest sources of prosperity for the convent was its having received from Rome the relics of St. Nazarius, which brought it numerous presents and donations, and soon made it one of the most prosperous convents at the time. Lorsch also enjoys great literary fame. Its monks by distinguishing themselves by their literary pursuits, to which the Annaleis Laurensenses bear witness. The early part of these annals (708-768) is evidently derived from those of the convent of Mur-
bach, which were very popular; but after that time they are clearly original, and continue down to 908. Aside from the less important Annals Laurensenses minores, we must mention the Annals Laurensenses, formerly called plebei or Losiertam, which are the most important annals of the time. Ranke has lately discovered in them the official work of a Carolingian court historian, and they are used by those who to the present day interpret the annals bearing his name. Until the 11th century the convent enjoyed great prosperity. Then its reverses commenced, and, after various struggles, it fell in the 12th century, till "a planta pedis usque ad verticem non fult in eo sanitas." The moral condition of the Lorenz monastery had greatly deteriorated even since the 11th century, and it became necessary to inaugurate a re-
form. This task was intrusted to archbishop Sifrid II of Mentz, A.D. 1229. His successor, Sifrido III, however, was really the man who completed this task by subjecting the monks to the Cistercian rule, "ut ordo," says Gregory of Hildesheim, "in unius ordinis per se, et pulchrum et virtutum augeatur." By him also were successively installed into Lorsch some Preamon-
trian canons of the conven of All Saints (diocese of Strasbourg), and the pope approved it as a new organi-
zation Jan. 8, 1248. In the second half of the 14th century Lorsch was subjected to the rule of the electoral admin-
istration. Vainly did the Premonstrants appeal to pope Alexander VII: the convent retained only the original foundation at Mentz and its dependencies. Not until after the completion of the treaty of Westphalia (1648) was a part of its other possessions restored to it. In 1651 the Palatinate renewed its claims to the lands of the convent, and questioned the propriety of the inde-
pendence of Lorsch as a separate duchy, with representation in the Diet. The quarrel lasted nearly through the whole of the 18th century, but was determined in 1808, when the convent became the possession of the house of Hesse-Darmstadt. See Retzbach, Geschicche der Deutschen, i, 584 sq.; K. Dahl, Beschreib. d. Fürstentums Lorsch (Darmstadt, 1812, 4to); Codex privatis olm Laurensenam, etc., ed. Academ. elector. scient. Theodor-Palatina, vol. iii (Mannh., 1766, 4to); Heuzey, Real-Encykl., viii, 490.

Lort, MICHAEL, D.D., an English theologian, was born in 1725; entered Trinity College, Cambridge, 1745; be-

became professor of Greek at Cambridge in 1759; rec-
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Lo-ruhmah (Heb. Lo-Ruhamáh, לְוֹ רֻחָמָה, not pitied, as it is explained in both contexts, Hosea, i, 6, Sept. Ov. Ḥeiṣálmay, Vulg. Abaque misericordia, and as it is rendered in the Author, vers. Hosea, i, 23, 'not obtained mercy,' the name divinely appointed for the first daughter of the prophet Hosea. Later on his wife Gomer, the whore of the city, is so called, by Hosea's father, Jotham, the type of Jehovah's temporary rejection of his people by the Babylonian captivity in consequence of their idolatry (Hosea, i, 6; ii, 23; comp. ii. 1). B.C. cir. 725. See Hosea.

Losada, Christopher, a martyr to the cause of Protestantism in Spain in the 16th century, was, at the time of his conversion under the preaching of Dr. Egidius [see Gil-Juan], an eminent physician and learned philosopher. He was chosen pastor of a Protestant Church in Seville, which met ordinarily in the house of Isabella de Baenas, 'a lady not less distinguished for her piety than for her rank and opulence.' Among the subscriptions of his correspondence were Don Juan Ponce de Leon and Domingo de Guzman, and others equally well celebrated. Arrested by the Inquisition in consequence of his zeal in diffusing Protestant principles among his countrymen, neither the prison nor the rack could make him renounce his convictions, and he was consequently condemned to the stake. He suffered death at an "auto-da-fe," solemnized at Seville Sept. 24, 1556, in the square of St. Francis, and attended by four bishops, the members of the royal court of justice, the chapter of the cathedral, and a great assemblage of nobility and gentry, the causes of the death penalty on twenty-one apostates from the Roman belief. The most distinguished individual aside from Dr. Losada was one of his members, Don Juan Ponce de Leon, whom we have mentioned above. They both bore their trial with admirable Christian patience, committing their souls to a faithful Creator. See Fox, Book of Martyrs, p. 186; M'Crie, Reformation in Spain, p. 217, 300, 807. (J. H. W.)

Löschner, Johann Kaspar, a German theologian, was born at Werden May 8, 1686, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg. He flourished successively as professor of exegesis at the universities of Hildesheimen, Erfurt, and Zwicbach (1668), pastor at Erfurt (1676), superintendent at Zwickau (1679), and then as senior preacher in the west Prussian city of Danzig. In 1667 he was made doctor and professor of theology at his alma mater, and he remained there until his death, July 11, 1718. He wrote many theological dissertations, of but little value in our day.

Löschner, Valentin Ernst, a distinguished German theologian, was born at Sondershausen in 1763. He studied at the universities of Wittenberg (where his father, Caspar Löschner, was a professor) and Jena, and then went on a peripatetic career. After traveling through the Netherlands and Denmark, and the cities Hamburg and Rostock, in the last-named place he connected himself with the anti-Vietist party, but after his return he devoted himself to historical studies, and the publication of his works on theology and exegesis, morals, etc. In 1698 he was appointed superintendent by the duke of Weissenfels, and, some time after, began, in connection with some friends, the publication of the first theological periodical in Germany, the Unschuldige Nachrichten von allem u. neuem theolog. Sachen (20 vols. to 1720) founded by Henry Busch and continued until 1781. This became the organ of the orthodox party in Saxony, as opposed to the Pietists and indifferentists prevailing at the time. His sphere of influence was afterwards enlarged, first as superintendent of Delitzsch, and, later (1792), as professor in the University of Witteberg. In 1704 he was appointed superintendent of Dresden and member of the supreme consistorial court. In this position his activity was soon manifested in the improved facilities for religious and secular instruction. Besides establishing several parishes and churches, he laid the foundation of a seminary for ministers; at the same time he zealously instructed candidates for the ministry, preached both on Sundays and week-days, besides carrying on an extensive correspondence with the princes, states, and pastors who held fast to the orthodox faith, and opposing the innovators of doctrine and indifferentism. He died Feb. 12, 1741. Löschner left a collection of his letters forming five volumes folio, which are preserved in the library in Hamburgh. His principal works are Historia mortuorum (part 1, 1707; pt. iii, 1725); — Die Reformationsente, — Timgoths Verisme (1718). See Herz Real-Encycl. a. s.; Tholuck, Der Geist des løtherischen Theologen Wittegen (1852); M. v. Engelhardt, Valentin Ernst Löschner nach s. Leben u. Wirken (Dorpat, 1853; 2d edit., Stuttgart, 1860); Harst's Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. 1846 and 19th Cent. i, 109 sq., 116 sq., 130.

Loshtiel, George Horatio, a bishop of the Moravian Church, was born at New London, Ct., as a teacher, but ordinated as a deacon in 1822, and as an elder in 1825. He was born Nov. 7, 1740, at Angermünde, in Courland, where his father had charge of a Lutheran parish. In early life he joined the Moravians, and studied both theology and medicine at their college at Barby, in Germany. After practicing medicine for some time, he devoted himself wholly to the ministry, in Holland, Germany, and Livonia. In 1802 he was consecrated a bishop, and came to the United States in order to fill the office of president of the provincial board which governs the Moravian churches in this country. Failing health and other circumstances constrained him to retire from this position in 1810. Two years later he was elected into the general board of the Church at Berthelsdorf, in Saxony; but the war with Great Britain and the state of his health prevented him from leaving America. He died Feb. 28, 1814, at Bethlehem, Pa. His two principal works are Geschichte d. Mission der Evang. Brüder unter den Indianern in N. A. (1789), translated into English by La Trobe, and published in London (1794), a standard on the Moravian missions among the Indians, with a full account of their manners and customs, based upon the reports of the missionaries, and Ensay de Haar auf dem Wege zur Erleuchtung (Religious Meditations for Every Day in the Year), a book which passed through eight editions (the last in 1848), and is still read with great profit by thousands of Christians in Germany. See De Schweinitz, Life and Times of David Zeisberger (Philadelphia, 1871, 8vo), p. 892 sqq. (E. de S.)

Lössner, Christopher Friedrich, a German theologian, noted in the department of exegesis, was born at Leipzig in 1784, and was educated at the university of that place. He afterwards held a professorship in his alma mater. He died there in 1808. His chief work is Observations ad Novum Testamentum, et Philoem Alexandrinum (Leipzig, 1777, 8vo). In this work the force and meaning of words are particularly illustrated, together with points of antiquity, and the readings of Philo's text. Mönig has thrown much light upon these subjects, and the writings of Philo is admirably elucidated by Lössner. (Horne). Another valuable production of his is Observaciones in religiosas versiones Proverborum Salomonis Græce Aquila, Symmachii et Theodotii. 

Loss (prop. some form of the verb לְשׁון, leshôn, but likewise a frequent rendering of several other Heb. and Gr. terms which usually imply an idea of dexterity). According to Moses Hess, whoever first brought up this verb, there could have been found any lost article (לְשׁון) was required to take it to his home, and then endeavor to discover the proper owner (Deut. xxii, 1-8). This would, of course, particularly apply to stray animals, and Josephus gives some special details with respect to money so found
LOSS
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(see Irvine, 8, 29; compare the Mishna, Shekal. viii, 2). In case of the abstraction of property while in the possession of the finder, the latter had not only to make it good, but also to add one fifth of its value, and even to make a sin-offering likewise (Lev. vi, 3 sq.).

The Mishna makes many casuistic distinctions on this subject (Shab. 11, 1), especially with regard to property (Ve'edot, i. e. expiratia) the disinterested property.

See DAMAGE.

LOOS, LEOVIN HOMRI, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Augusta, N. Y., July 1, 1808, and was educated at Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. (class of 1828). In 1829 he was licensed and ordained by Onedia Presbytery, and installed pastor of the Church in Camden, Orange County, N. Y. Afterward served in Elyria, Ohio; in Rockford and Chicago, Ill.; and in Joliet and Marshalltown, Iowa. He was a syndical missionary three years to the synod of Peoria, Ill.; also prominent in bringing into existence institutions of learning, as Beloit College and Rockford Female Seminary, Ill. He died July 10, 1865. Mr. Loss was an eminently successful preacher, erecting many churches, and especially prominent in the Sabbath-school cause. He always had the fullest confidence of the men of the world; they recognised his worth as a man and a Christian. See Wilson, Prep. Hist. Amer. 1866, p. 217. (J. L. S.)

LÖSCH, CASPAR FRIEDRICH, a German theologian, was born at Erfurt Jan. 5, 1753, and was educated at the university of that place, which he entered in 1770. Dissatisfied with the innovations which Bharat undertook in theology, he removed in 1778 to the University of Jena, and again, not quite satisfied with the rationalistic innovations of the day, he was obliged to acquire the greater part of his learning by private study, in 1774 he became school-teacher at his native place; in 1781 dean of Andreas Church, and in 1785 dean to the Prediger Church of the same place. He died March 50, 1817. Lossius was a man of great learning; the literature of the Reformation was almost his daily study. Having seen the danger which threatened his country, both religiously and morally, from the rationalistic innovations, and from the consequences of the French Revolution, he dedicated most of his works to the cause of the fathers of the Reformation. Some of his productions passed through several editions in a short time. Some were even translated into French, and rescued thousands from moral degradation and spiritual destruction. A complete list of his works is given by Döring, Geschichte Theol. Deutschl. vol. ii, s. v.

Lost Tribes. See Captivity; Israel.

Lot (properly בֵּית meaning בַּיִת, goral, eliphig, literally a pebble, used anciently for balloting; other terms occasionally thus rendered are בַּיִת, a portion, Deut. xxxiii, 9; 1 Chron. xvii, 18; Psalm cvi, 11, referring to an inheritance; and לָוֹד, לָוָד, by lot, Luke i, 9; John xii, 24, strictly a small stone, as used in casting lots (Lev. xi, 8; Num. xxxiii, 54; Josh. xiv, 1; Ezek. xxix, 6; Josh. i, 7), hence also a method used to determine chances or preferences, or decide to make a decision. The decision by lot was often resorted to among the Hebrews, but always with the strictest reference to the interposition of God. As to the precise manner of casting lots, we have no certain information; but several modes were probably in use. In Prov. xvi, 33 we read that "the lot, i.e. a pebble, is cast into the lap," properly into the bosom of an urn or vase. It does not appear that the lap or bosom of a garment worn by a person was ever used to receive lots.

The ancient nation of Israel was very general (see Dake, Orac. ed. c. 14; Potter, Greek and Hebr. 1, 780; Adams, Rom. Ant. 1, 540 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Class. Ant. a. v. Sors) and highly esteemed (Xenoph. Cyrop. i, 6, 46), as is natural in simple stages of society (Tact. Germ. 19), recommending itself as a sort of appeal to the Almighty secure from all influence of passion or bias, and a sort of divination employed even by the gods themselves (Homer, Iliad, xxii, 309; Cicero, De Div. i, 34; ii, 41). The word sortes is thus used for an oracular response (Cicero, De Divina, ii, 56). So there was a mode of divination among the ancients by means of arrows poisoned but and one without mark, πάντομοι (Herr. iv, 12; Ezek. xxii, 21; Mauritius, De Sortitio, c. 14, § 4; see also Esth. iii, 7; ix, 24-32; Mishna, Taanith, ii, 10). See DIVINATION. Among heathen instances the following additional may be cited: 1. Choice of a champion, or of priority in combat (II. Ill. vii, 171; Herod. vii, 171; ib. ii, 15); 2. Decision of fate in battle (I. xx, 209); 3. Appointment of magistrates, jurymen, or other functionaries (Aristot. Pol. iv, 16; Schol. On Aristot. Phys. 277; Herod. vii, 190; Xenoph. Cyrop. iv, 5, 56; Demosth. c. Aristog. i, 778, 1; comp. Smith, Dict. of Class. Ant. a. v. Diosc.)

4. Priests (Koch. in Tim. p. 188, Bkck.). 5. A German practice of deciding by marks on twigs, mentioned by Tacitus (Germ. 10); 6. Division of conquered or colonized land (Thucydides, iii, 50; Plutarch, Pericles, 94; Bück, Public Econ. of Ath. ii, 170).

The Israelites sometimes had recourse to lots as a method of assembling the divine will (Prov. xxvi, 5), and generally in cases of doubt for which God reserved no other remedy (Esth. iii, 7; compare Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 801), especially the following: (a) In matters of partition or distribution, e. g., the location of the several tribes in Palestine (Num. xxvi, 56 sq.; xxxiii, 54; xxxiv, 18; xxxv, 21; Josh. xvii, 5 sq.; xxx, 6 sq.; xix, 5), the assignment of the Levitical cities (Josh. xxii, 4 sq.), and, after the return from the exile, the settlement in the homesteads at the capital (Neh. xii, 1; compare 1 Macc. iii, 36). Prisoners of war were also disposed of by lot (Joel iii, 5; Nah. iii, 10; Obad. 11; compare Matt. xxvii, 35; John xiv, 24; compare Xenoph. Cyrop. iv, 5, 55). (b) In criminal investigations where doubt existed as to the real culprit (Josh. vii, 14; 1 Sam. xiv, 42). A notion prevailed among the Jews that this detection was performed by observing the shining of the stones in the high-priest's breastplate (Mauritius, c. 21, § 4). The instance of the mariners casting lots to ascertain by the surrendering of what the opponent the sea could be appealed (Jonah i, 7), is analogous; but it is not clear, from Prov. xviii, 18, that lots were resorted to for the determination of civil disputes. (c) In the election to an important office or an undertaking for which several persons might be supposed to have claims (1 Sam. x, 19; Acts i, 26; comp. Herod. iii, 128; Justin. xiii, 4; Cicero, Ferr. i, 2, 51; Aristot. Pol. i, 14, 16) as well as in the assignment of official duties among associates having a common right ( Neh. x, 54), as of the priests in the Temple. Among the sixteen of the family of Eleazar and the eight of that of Ithamar (1 Chron. xxvii, 3, 5, 19; Luke i, 9), also of the Levites for similar purposes (1 Chron. xxiii, 28; xxiv, 20-31; xxv, 6; xxxv, 17; Mishna, Tumid. 1, 2; iii, 1; iv, 2; Joma, i, 5, 6; Shabbat, xxxii, 2; Lightfoot, Hor. Hebbr. in Luke i, 8, 9, vol. ii, p. 489). (2) In military enterprises (Judg. xx, 10; compare Val. Max. i, 5, 3). In the sacred ritual of the Hebrews we find the use of lots but once prescribed, namely, in the selection of the scapegoat (Lev. xvi, 8 sq.). The two inscribed tablets of boxwood, afterwards of gold, were put into an urn, which was shaken, and the lots drawn out (Joma, iii, 9, 4, 1). See Aaron, David, Dav. ov. Eventually came into frequent usage (comp. the Mishna, Shabbat, xxxii, 2). In later times they even degenerated into a game of hazard, of which human life was the stake (Josephus, Wars, iii, 7). Dice appear to have usually been employed for the lot (רַעַשׁ כְּלָו, to throw the die), Josh. xvi, 8; so מַעַסִּים, to cast, Josh. xviii, 6; Êdymon, to give, Acts i, 26; 42, Êdymon, to fall, John i, 7; Ezek. xxiv, 7; Acts i, 20), and were sometimes drawn from a vessel (יַעַשׁ כְּלָו, the lot come forth), Num. xxxii, 19.
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54:1 so ⼒y, to "come up," Lev. vii, 9; comp. the Mishna,
Joma, iv. 1). A different kind of lot is elsewhere indi-
cated in the Mishna (Joma, ii, 1; comp. Lightfoot, Hor.
Hebr., p. 714). A sacred species of lot was by means of
the URIM and THUMMIM (q. v.) of the high-priest
(Numb. xxvii, 21: 1 Sam. xxviii, 6), which appears to
have had some connection with the divination by means
of the sacred vessel EPHOD (1 Sam. xxiii, 6, 9). Stones
were occasionally employed in prophetic or emblematic
lots (Numb. xvii, 6 sq.; Zech. xi, 10, 14). See also
Purim. Election by lot appears to have prevailed in the
Christian Church as late as the 7th century (Bing-
ham, Eccles. Antiq. iv, 1, 1, vol. i, p. 428; Bruns, Conc. ii,
66). Here also we may notice the use of words heard,
or passages chosen at random from Scripture. Sortes
Biblici, like the Sortes Virgiliane, prevailed among
Jews, as they have also among Christians, though de-
nounced by several councils (Johnson, "Life of Cowley,
Works, ix, 8; Bingham, Ecc. Antiq. xvi, 6, 5; id., vi, 33
sq.; Bruns, Conc. ii, 145-154, 166; Mauritianus, c.15; Hof-
mann, Lex. s. v. Sortes).

On the subject generally, see Mauritianus, De Sortisone
op. vet. Hebraeos (Basle, 1692); Chrysander, De Sortibus
(Halle, 1740); Benzel, De Sortesone vet. in his dissertation,
297-318; Winckler, Gedanken über d. Spuren gothis.
Provenöns Leoes (Hildesheim, 1750); Paläshophil.

Abbaandl. v. Gebrauche d. Looeoes in d. heil. Schr. in Ben-
er's Hall. Samml. i, 2, 79 sq.; Junius, De Sorte, remejon-
dubia causa causarum divinendi (Lips. 1746); Enenberg, De Sort-
evella (Uepl. 1758); Hanovius, Die elecione per sortem
(Gedan. 1748; in German by Tumbold, Hambl. 1751).

Bosner, Formulz Kunst, etc. (Hildesh. 1746).

The term "lot" is also used for that which falls to one
by lot, especially a portion or inheritance (Josh. xv; 1
Judg. 3; Psa. cxxxv, 8; Is. xxvii, 14; lvi, 6; Acts, xii,
21). Lot is also used metaphorically for portion, or des-
tiny, as assigned to men from God (Psa. xvi, 5): "And
arise to thy lot in the end of days" in the Messiah's
kingdom (Dan. xii, 18; comp. Rev. xx, 6). See Her-
itage.

LOT. See Myrrh.

LOT (Heb. חָכָה, ḫâkhâr, a covering, as in Isa. xxvii, 7; Sept.
and N. T. Act., Josephus Ant. oc. 256). Occurs Gen. xi, 31;
xii, 4, 5; xiii, 1-14; xiv, 12, 16; xix, 15, 18, 22, 22,
30, 36; Deut. ii, 9, 19; Isa. lxxiii, 8; Luke xvii, x,
29, 29, 32; 2 Pet. ii, 7), the son of Nahor and nephew
of Abraham (Gen. xi, 27). His sisters were Milcah, the
wife of Nahor, and Iscach, by some identified with Sarah.

In the genealogy of the covenant people, we find the
word itself occurs in the following several instances:

Geth. 1. In the title of the patriarchs, as we see in the
family relations:

TERAH

Yagar to Abram to Saral

Nahor to Milchah

Latin

Ishmael. Isaac

Bethuel

Leah. Rachel

Laban.

Daughter

Daughter

Eaan. Jacob.

Rebekah.

Leah. Rachel.

Mobah.

Ben-Ammi.

Lot to wife

Milcah to Nahor. Iscach.

By the early death of his father (Gen. xi, 29), he
was left in charge of his grandfather Terah, with whom he
migrated to Haran, B.C. 2089 (Gen. xi, 31), and the lat-
ter dying there, he had already come into possession of
his property when he accompanied Abraham into the
land of Canaan, B.C. 2086 (Gen. xii, 5), and thence into
Egypt, B.C. 2087 (Gen. xii, 10), and back again, by
the way of the Philistines, B.C. 2086 (Gen. xx, 1), to the
southern part of Canaan again, B.C. 2085 (Gen. xiii, 1).
Their united substance, consisting chiefly in cattle, was
not too large to prevent them living together in one encampment.
Eventually, however, their pos-
sessions were so greatly increased that they were obliged
to separate, and Abraham, with rare generosity, conceded
the choice of pasture-grounds to his nephew. Lot avail-
ed himself of this liberality of his uncle, as he deemed
most for his own advantage, by fixing his abode at
Sodom, that his flocks might pasture in and around that
fertile and well-watered neighborhood (Gen. xiii, 5-18).
He had soon very great reason to regret this choice; for,
although his flocks fed well, his soul was starved in that
waste place, the inhabitants of which were sinners before
the Lord exceedingly. There he vexed his righteous
soul from day to day with the filthy conversation of the
wicked (2 Pet. ii, 7).

Not many years after his separation from Abraham
(B.C. 2085), he had carried away a number of persons by
Chedor-
lamor, along with the other inhabitants of Sodom, and
was rescued and brought back by Abraham (Gen. xiv.),
as related under other heads. See ABRAHAM; CHEDOR-
lamor. This exploit procured for Abraham much ce-
brity in Canaan; and it ought to have procured for
Lot respect and gratitude from the people of Sodom,
who had been delivered from hard slavery and restored
to their homes on account. But this does not ap-
pear to have been the result.

At length (B.C. 2064) the guilt of the "cities of the plain"
brought down the signal judgments of heaven
(Gen. xix, 1-29). Lot is still living in Sodom (Gen.
xix), a well-known resident, with wife, sons, and daugh-
ters—married and marriageable. The rabbinical tra-
dition is that he was actually "judge" of Sodom, and
sat in the gate in that capacity. (See quotations in
Otho, Lex. Rabbin, s. v. Lot and Sodomah.) But in the
midst of the licentious corruption of Sodom—the
eating and drinking, the buying and selling, the plant-
ing and building (Luke xvii, 28), and of the darker evils
exposed in the ancient narrative—he still preserves
some of the delightful characteristics of his wandering
life, his fervent and chivalrous hospitality (xix, 2, 8),
the unleavened bread of the tent of the wilderness (ver. 8),
the water for the feet of the wayfarers (ver. 2), afford-
ing his guests a reception identical with that with
which they had experienced that very morning in Abraham's
tent on the heights of Hebron (comp. xvii, 8, 6). It
is this hospitality which receives the commendation of
the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in words that
have passed into a familiar proverb, "Be not forgetful
to entertain strangers, for thereby some have entertained
angels unawares" (Heb. xiii, 2). On the other hand, it
is his deliverance from the guilty and condemned city—
the one just man in that mob of sensual, lawless wretch-
es—which points the allusion of St. Peter, to "the godly
delivered out of temptations, the unjust reserved unto
the day of judgment to be punished, an example to
those that afterwards should live ungodly" (2 Pet. ii, 6-9).

The avenging angels, after having been entertained by
Abraham, repaired to Sodom, where they were received
and entertained by Lot, who was sitting in the gate of
the town when they arrived. While they were at sup-
der the sumptuous banquet, a number of angels were de-
manded that the strangers should be upfolded to them,
for the unnatural purposes which have given a name of
infamy to Sodom in all generations. Lot resisted this
demand, and was loaded with abuse by the vile fellows
outside on that account. They had nearly forced the
door, when the angels, thus awfully by their own expe-
rince convinced of the righteousness of the doom they
came to execute, smote them with instant blindness, by
which their attempts were rendered abortive, and they
were constrained to disperse. Towards morning the an-
gels apprised Lot of the doom which hung over the
place, and urged him to hasten thence with his family.
He was afraid to extend the b)00k to the salvation
of the families of his daughters who had married
in Sodom; but the warning was received by those fam-
ilies with incredulity and insulL and he therefore left
Sodom accompanied only by his wife and two daugh-
ters. As they went, being hastened by the angels, the
wife, anxious for those who had been left behind, or re-
luctant to remove from the place which had long been
her home, and where much valuable property was nec-
cessarily left behind, lingered behind the rest, and was
suddenly involved in the destruction by which—sham-
med and stifled as she stood by sable incrustations—
she became "a pillar of salt" (Gen. xix. 1, 20). This
narrative has often been regarded as one of the "difficult-
ies" of the Bible. But it surely need not be so. Even
under the above extreme view of the suddenness of the
event, the circumstances appear to be all sufficiently ac-
counted for. In the sacred record the words are simply
these: "His wife looked back from behind him, and be-
came a pillar of salt;" words which neither in them-
soever in their position in the narrative afford any
serious difficulty, even without the supposition of a mir-
acle. It is not taken with the same one of the fleeting
forms which the perishable rock of the south end of the
Dead Sea is constantly assuming in its process of de-
The first allusion of this kind is perhaps that in
Wis. x, 7, where "a standing pillar of salt, the monu-
ment (pietatis) of an unbelieving soul," is mentioned
with the "waste land that smotheth," and the "plants
bearing fruit that never come to ripeness," as remaining
to that day, a testimony to the wickedness of Sodom.
This notion was regarded by the Roman Catholics as script-
urally authentic that might not be dispelled. See the
quotations from the fathers and others in Hofmann's
Lexicon (s. v. Lot); and in Mislain, Lieux Saints (iii. 224).
Josephus also (Ant. i. 11, 4) says that he had seen it,
and that it was then remaining. So, too, do Clemens
Romanus (Adv. Haer. i. 11) and Ireneaus (iv. 51, 64). So
does Benjamin of Tudela (there is a reference to a usual
usualliter (ed. Asher, i. 72). Rabbi Petachia,
the other hand, looked for it, "but did not see it; it
no longer exists" (ed. Benisch, p. 61). The same state-
ment is to be found in travellers of every age, certainly
of our own times (see Maundrell, March 30). The or-
igin of these traditions relative to this pillar has lately
been satisfactorily explained by the discovery by the
American party under Liest Lynch of an actual column
standing still on the south-western shore of the Dead
Sea, at a place retained with that of the name of Sodom
in the form of Usdom, of which he gives a pictorial
sketch, describing it as a round pillar, about forty feet
high, on a lofty pedestal, standing detached from the
general mass of the mountain, of solid salt, slightly
decreasingsizeupwards, and capped with carbonate of
lime; but, although himself a Catholic, he admits, with
scientific caution, that it is merely the result of the ac-
ction of the winter rains upon the rock-salt hills, which
the cap of limestone has here protected, leaving the sur-
rrounding parts to wash away, till a column has thus
gradually been carved out. (Nurritur fit Bj regionem, p.
307, 308.) Prof. Palmer also visited this singular object,
called by the Arabs Bint Shelit Lot, or "Lot's [daughter]
wife." He describes and gives a view of it as "a tall

isolated needle of rock, which really does bear a curious
resemblance to an Arab woman with a child upon her
shoulder. The Arab legend of Lot's wife differs from
the Bible account only in the addition of a few frivolous
details. They say that there were seven cities of the
plain, and that they were all miraculously overwhelmed
by the Dead Sea as a punishment for their crimes. The
prophecy Lot and his family alone escaped the general
destruction. He was divided among to take all that
he had and fee estate, a strict injunction being given
that they should not look behind them. Lot's wife,
who had on previous occasions ridiculed her husband's
prophetic office, disobeyed the command, and, turning
to gaze upon the scene of the disaster, was changed into
this pillar of rock." (Desert of the Exodus. [Harper's], p.
396 sq.) The expression of our Lord, "Remember Lot's
wife" (Luke xvii, 28), appears from the context to be
solely intended as an illustration of the danger of going
back or delaying in the day of God's judgments. From
this text, indeed, it would appear as if Lot's wife had
gone back or had tarried so long behind in the desire
of saving some of their property. Then, as it would
seem, she was struck dead, and became a stiffened corpse,
fixed for the time to the soil by saline or bituminous
incrustations. The particle of similitude must here, as in
many other passages of Scripture, be understood, "like
a pillar of salt." See Nagel, Der culpa uzoriz Lotis (Alb-
dorf, 1755); Distel, Die salute zeoriz Lotihi (Ald. 1721);
Waller, Dias. de statua sol. uzoriz Lotis (Lapis, 1674);
Wolle, De facto et fato uzoriz Lotis (Lips. 1780); Schwoll-
mann, Comn. qua de uzoriz L. in statuas sol. convers у
(dubitatur (Hamburg, 1749); Milon, Sandesch. u. Salts-
säule in die L.'s Wir bevernndet worden (Hamb. 1677);
Clerici Dias. de statua salina, in his Comment, in Gen.;
Tieroff, De statua salis (Gen. 1667); Müller, Darm (Helms-
stadt, 1764); Oedmann, Stuwml. iii. 145; Bauer, Hebrew
Geschichte, i. 181; Maii Obserr. at. i. 108 sq.; H. v. d.
Harzt, Ephem. philol. p. 67 sq.; Jenisch, Exoriz, zweier
wichtig. Schriften (Hamb. 1761); Michaelis and Ro-
semüller on Gen. xii. 26; Geniesius, Thesaur. Hist. p. 72.
Lot and his daughters meanwhile had hastened on to
Zoar (q. v.), the smallest of the five cities of the plain,
which had been spared on purpose to afford him a refu-
uge; but, being fearful, after what had passed, to
remain among a people so corrupted, he soon retired to a
cavern in the neighboring mountains, and there abode
(Gen. xii, 21). After some stay in this place, the
daughters of Lot became apprehensive lest the family
of their father should be lost for want of descendants,
which than no greater calamity was known or appro-
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hended in those times; and in the belief that, after what had passed in Sodom, there was no hope of their obtaining suitable husbands, they, by a contrivance which has in it the taint of Sodom, in which they were brought up, made their father drunk with wine, and in that state seduced him into an act which, as they well knew, was a hopeless business, because he had been most abhorrent to him. They thus became the mothers, and he the father, of two sons, named Moab and Ammon, from whom sprung the Moabites and Ammonites, so often mentioned in the Hebrew history (Gen. xxii. 31-88). With respect to Lot's daughters, whom it is impossible to say anything intentionally in them. He admits that the incest was a horrid crime, except under the unavoidable necessity which apparently rendered it the only means of preserving the human race; and this justifying necessity he holds to have existed in their minds, as they appear to have believed that all the inhabitants of the land had been destroyed except their father and themselves. But it is incredible that they could have entertained any such belief. The city of Zoar had been spared, and they had been there. The wine also with which they made their father drunk must have been procured from men, as we cannot suppose they had brought it with them from Sodom. The fact would therefore seem to be that, after the fate of their sisters, who had married men of Sodom and perished with them, they became alive to the danger and improavity of marriage; and, as the only remains of the nation of the land, and of the importance of preserving the family connection. The force of this consideration was afterwards seen in Abraham's sending to the seat of his family in Mesopotamia for a wife to Isaac. But Lot's daughters could not go there to seek husbands; and the only branch of their own family within many hundred miles was that of Abra-
ham, whose only son, Ishmael, was then a child. This, therefore, must have appeared to them the only practicable mode in which the house of their father could be preserved. Their making their father drunk, and their solicitous concealment of what they did from him, show that they despised of persuading him to an act which, under any circumstances, and with every possible extenuation, must have been very distressing to so good a man. That he was a good man is evinced by his de-
leverance from among the guilty, and is affirmed by an apostle (2 Pet. ii. 7); his preservation alluded to by our Saviour (Luke xvii. 18, etc.); and in Deut. ii. 9, 19, and Psa. lxxxiii, 9, his name is honorably used to des-
ignate the Moabites and Ammonites, his descendants. This account of the origin of the nations of Moab and Ammonites is certainly true. It has been treated as a Hebrew legend which owed its origin to the bitter hatred existing from the earliest to the latest times between the "children of Lot" and the children of Israel. The hor-
rible nature of the transaction—not the result of impulse or passion, but a plan calculated and carried out, and that not once, but twice, would prompt the wish that the legendary theory were true. But even the most destructive critics (as, for instance, Tuch) allow that the narrative is a continuation without a break of that which proceeds it, while they fail to point out any marked change in the language in the transition; and it cannot be questioned that the writer records it as a historical fact. Even if the legendary theory were ad-
missible, there is no doubt of the fact that Amnon and Moab sprang from Lot. It is affirmed in the statements of Deut. ii. 9 and 19, as well as in the later document of Psa. lxxxiii. 8, which Ezekiel in the prophetic word when Nehemiah and his newly-returned colony were suffering from the attacks and obstructions of Tobiah the Am-
onite and Sanballat the Horonite (Ewald, Dichter, Psa. lxxxiii). The circumstances are the last which the Scripture re-
cords of the history of Lot, and the time and place of his death are unknown. A traditional respect has been shown to his memory (also that of his wife, who is called Edith, המגש [one of his daughters being called
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LOTUS. See Lilly.

LOUDON, CONVYORT OF. See Granville. Louis (or Louis) of Granada, a Spanish ascetic, theologian, and writer, was born at Granada in 1504. In 1524 he joined the Dominicans, in the convent of
LOUIS I
523

LOUIS I

Santa Cruz of Granada. In 1529 he was, on account of his great reputation, transferred to the convent of St. Gregory at Valledeld, where he attracted much attention by his preaching. He was afterwards recalled to Granada, to reform the convent of Scala Celli, in the Sierra de Cordova. In the solitude of this convent he composed a number of religious works. He next went to Cordova as preacher, and became acquainted with John of Avila (q.v.), who acquired great influence over him. After spending eight years in Cordova, Louis went to Badajoz, where he founded a convent, of which he was the first abbot. Cardinal Henry, infant of Spain and archbishop of Eborac, desiring to avail himself of Louis' charity, invited him to his native city. The crown of Portugal vainly offered to make him bishop of Viseu, and afterwards metropolitan of Braga; he accepted no office whatever, except that of provincial of his order in Portugal, which he held for some years. He finally retired into the convent of Santa Domingo of Lisbon, and devoted the remainder of his life to pastoral duties and to writing religious works. He died Dec. 81, 1588. His works, a large number of which were translated into French, Italian, and German, are very numerous; among them the most important are: Memoria de la vida Christiense (Lisbon, 1586, 2 vols. 8vo); Sacrificia, 1584, fol.; — Simbolo de la Fe (Salamanca, 1892, 2 vols. 8vo, printed and translated); — Guida de Pescadores (Salamanca, 1570, 8vo); — Diccionario de la doctrina Christiana (Lisbon, 1864, Madrid 1586, 4to); — Institucio y regla de bien vivir para los que empecepor a servir a Dios (Barcelona, 1602, 2 vols. 8vo); — Louis (feel the necessity of the imperial possessions. Bernard's ambition soared higher. He was not content with Italy; he desired the mastery over the whole of the imperial lands, and ungratefully conspired against his uncle. He was unsuccessful; however, was seduced by the imperial troops, and condemned to death. Louis was very much inclined to marry and have posterity, but state interests compelled him to inflict the severe punishment of depriving his nephew of eyesight, which was the cause shortly after, no doubt, of his death. This conspiracy, as well as sundry other occurrences, made the despotism of the emperor more absolute, and, finally deciding in favor of the principle of primogeniture, his son Lothaire was appointed successor. Besides Lothaire, Louis had two sons, Pepin and Louis. To the former of these two he gave Aquitania; to the latter Bavaria, Bohemia, and Carinthia. Unfortunately, however, for the peace of the family, Louis lost his faithful companion, the mother of these children, shortly after this partition of his possessions, and, marrying a second wife, became the father of a fourth son, Charles, whose mother, Judith, conspired in his behalf for a portion of the imperial crown. This resulted in 830 in a revolt of Lothaire against his father, on the plea of the bad conduct of the step-mother. At a diet, however, which was held at Aix-la-Chapelle, the father and son were reconciled. Not so happily ended a second revolt in 833, when Louis, forsaken by his followers, was condemned to death. He was obliged to make a treaty by which he committed himself up to the age of 30 to marry him as prisoner to Soissons, sent the empress Judith to Torgo, and confined her infant son Charles, afterwards Charles the Bald, the object of the jealousy of his half-brothers, in a monastery. A meeting of bishops was held at Cuesnet, at which the archbishop of Rheims presided, and the unfortunate Louis being arraigned before it, was found guilty of the murder of his nephew Bernard, and of sundry other offences. He was deposed, condemned to do public penance in sackcloth, and was kept in confinement. This misusage of the emperor enraged the youngest of the sons of Bavaria (840–576), an enigmatic prince, of lofty stature and noble figure, with a fiery eye and a penetrating mind, and, after securing the assistance of his other brother, Pepin, in the following year, he obliged Lothaire to deliver up their father, who, after having been formally absolved by the bishop, regained his throne. Not made wiser by past experience, Louis, listening to the selfish counsel of his wife, Judith, now assigned to his fourth son, Charles, the kingdom of Neustria, or Eastern France, including Paris, and, after Pepin's death, Aquitania also. Charles was a man of courage. The emperor Louis marched against him, and quelled the rebellion in a diet at Worms to judge his rebellious son. Mean-
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father in his train, he halted at Complagne, and summoned a council of his prelates to accomplish the work from which he dared not proceed. With unbounded willingness they undertook the onerous task, declaring their competency through the power to bind and to loose conferred upon their order as the vicars of Christ and the turnkeys of heaven. They held the wretched young prisoner, who was held for ransom (415), in a dungeon, and榜&neander (Ch. Hist. iii. 851), "gave many opportunities for the Church to interfere in the political strifes," and for it the Church had been anxiously but patiently in waiting. With the coronation of Charlemagne the pope of Rome, and his bishops, had to the East toward the West, and thus, by his action, had not only conferred a most doubtful title on Charlemagne, but secured, at the same time a political ascendency of the papacy. Under Charlemagne, however, the thunders of the Church were controlled by the emperor; but in Louis the Plout was found a willing slave, and with rapid strides the Romish Church marched onward to establish its superiority over the Empire. See PAPACY.

What Louis would do for the Church was clearly seen in his submissive acts—the master of Europe in 822 a penitent before the prelates assembled at the Council of Attigny. Here the triumphs of the spiritual power, under the spices of a rapid progress toward domination, were plainly foreshadowed. The hierarchy failed not to discover the hour of Louis' weakness, and day by day new laws were proposed and enacted, the ecclesiastical fabric undermined, the power of the secular authority enfeebled and abrogated. Prominent among the ecclesiastics who influenced the king to favor the Church and her institutions was Walz, abbot of Corbie. What Walz (q.v.) advised was worthy of adoption, and he had no sooner made his proposals than they became law. Thus the growing power of the Church over the kingdom, the decay of royal power, and the separation of Church and State, were accelerated by the policy which the king, and the bishops concerning themselves only about the affairs which belonged to their respective callings." Unfortunately, however, the concessions which the king was daily making to the clergy gave to them a spirit of much of the business strictly belonging to the secular authority, and "the scope and the danger of the authority thus successively conferred upon the Church were most impressively manifested when Louis was deposed by his sons (in 833), . . . and Lothaire determined to remove the restoration of his father to the throne. . . . The people had been invited by Louis himself, eleven years before, at Attigny, to see the bishops sit in judgment on their monarch; and the decretales (q. v.) of Siricus and Leo I, forbidding secular employment and the bearing of arms by any one who had undertaken ecclesiastical functions, were forgotten but that they might be revived. Accordingly, when Lothaire returned to France, dragging his captive
Louis VI, of France, called "Le Jeune," son of Louis le Gros, was born in 1119, and succeeded his father in 1137. By nature of a cruel disposition, he had been especially harsh towards disobedient subjects, and, under the pretense that he must aid the Church to atone for a sin, he was admitted to be a German abbott of Clairvaux, to go on a crusade. Accordingly, the king set out, at the head of a large army, in 1147. Sieger and Raoul, count of Vermandois, Louis's brother-in-law, were left regents of the kingdom. This second crusade proved unsuccessful: the Christians were defeated near Damascus, and Louis, after several narrow escapes, returned to France in 1149. The repudiation of his first wife, Eleanor of Aquitaine, and his marriage with Constance of Castile, brought on a war with Henry II of England, who had taken Eleanor for his wife. The war was, however, unimportant in its consequences. In Henry's controversy with Thomas à Becket, Louis VII greatly furthered the cause of Becket (comp. Roberton, Becket [London, 1859, sm. 8vo], p. 211 sq., 295). He died at Paris in September, 1180. See Reichel, Roman See in the Middle Ages, p. 327 sq.; Millman, History of Latin Christianity, bk. viii, ch. vi and ch. viii. (N. H. W.)

Louis IX (of St. Louis) of France (1226-1270), was born in Poissy April 23, 1215, and succeeded his father, Louis VIII, when but twelve years of age, his mother, Blanche de Castile, acting as regent. During the minority of the king there was a constant struggle between the crown and the feudal lords, headed by Thibaut, count of Champagne, and the count of Brittany. Amid these troubles queen Blanche displayed great firmness and ability, and Louis, as soon as he was old enough, by the assistance of those who had remained faithful to the crown, made war against Henry III, king of England, who had supported the French prelates, and beat the English in 1242 at Taillebourg, at Saintes, and at Blaye, but finally made a truce of five years with the English sovereigns, at the same time par- doning also his rebellious nobles. During an illness Louis had made a vow to visit the Holy Land, and in June, 1248, after having appointed his mother to go for him out for the East with an army of 40,000 men, to conquer the Holy Sepulchre. He landed first in Egypt and took Damietta, but was made prisoner at the battle of Mansoura, and compelled to pay a heavy ransom. He then sailed, with his remaining army, and landed at Acre, 600 strong, to Acre, and carried on the war in Palestine, but without success. After the death of his mother (Nov., 1252), he made preparations for his return to France. At home in 1254, he now applied himself with great diligence to the interests of his realm. It was Louis IX of France that first gave life to Gallicism by his "Pragmatic Sanction," which he enacted in 1268. See GALLICAN CHURCH. He also published several useful statutes, known as the Etatements de St. Louis; established a police in Paris, under the orders of a prévôt; organized the various truces into companies called contraintes; founded the theological college of La Sorbonne, so called after his confessor; created a French navy, and made an advantageous treaty with the king of Aragon, by which the respective limits and jurisdictions of the two states were defined. The chief and almost the only fault of Louis, which was, however, of his age, was his religious intolerance; he issued oppressive ordinances against the Jews, had a horror of heretics, and used to say "that a layman ought not to dispute with the unbelievers, but strike them with a good sword in the body." By an edict of 1263, he excluded from his Christian subjects the third of the debts they owed to Jews, and this "for the good of his soul." This same spirit of fanaticism led him (in July, 1270) to undertake, against the wishes of his best friends, another crusade—a crusade the most ignoble, and not the least calamitous of all the crusades (q. v.). He was sent for Africa, laid siege to Tunis, and, while there, died in his camp of the plague, Aug. 25, 1270. Pope Boniface VIII canonized him in 1297. See Histoire de St. Louis (edited by Ducange, with notes, Paris, 1686, folio, English trans.); Petitot, Catholicisme des Nations relatifs à l'histoire de France (Paris, 1824); Dissertations et reflexions sur l'histoire de St. Louis; Le Nain de Tillemont, Vie de St. Louis (ed. J. de Gallaye, Paris, 1846, 4 vols.); H. L. Scholten, Geschichte Ludwigs IX (Münster, 1860-1855, 2 vols.); E. L. Anchard, Gesch. des Frankreichs, 1, 466 sq.; K. Rösen, Die pragm. Sanctionen, welche unter d. Namen Ludwigs IX. v. Frankreich auf uns gekommen ist (Munich, 1858); Neander, Church Hist., iv, 205 sq.; Reichel, Roman See in the Middle Ages, p. 618 sq.; and the works already cited in the article GALLI- CAN CHURCH. See also FAPEST.

Louis XIV of France, grandson of Henry IV, and third son of Louis XIII, was born in February 1638, the regency of his mother, Anne of Austria, controlled by cardinal Mazarin (q. v.), continued during the minority of the sovereign. So far, indeed, as the policy of Mazarin was concerned, it prevailed until his death in 1661,
when Louis first really assumed for himself the reins of government, and indicated the principles of his administration. During the minority of its youthful sovereign the country had been distracted by civil wars, those of the Fronde, partly through Spanish influences, partly through an unsatisfied and fractious element of the French nobility. Perplexing difficulties, moreover, and even actual conflicts of the regent and her minister with the Parliament and States General, had more than once arisen, usually terminating, however, in the triumph of the former. Louis himself, in his eighteen years, disposing of these bodies, and forbidding any future exercise of some of its most important functions. The internal difficulties, so far as due to the hostile policy of the Spanish court, were disposed of by the marriage of Louis with the infanta Maria Theresa in 1660, through the skilful management of Mazarrin. The effect of these troubles, however, was to shape, to some degree, the policy of Louis, and to enable him to carry it out successfully. That policy was to avoid all conflict of authority by centring all power in the person of the sovereign. The administration, extending over a period of great significance in the secular history and history of Europe, concerns us here in view of its principles and results religiously and ecclesiastically; for, while it may be said that one of the grand objects of this administration was to supersede Austria as the paramount power of Europe, it is not so much in the means, as in the end, in connection with the destruction and diminution of Protestantism, not only in France, but elsewhere. To enable us to consider his policy as it affected the religious condition of France and Europe, the cause of his civil and military administration must, however, be first examined.

Louis's civil policy—the consolidation of all power in the hands of the sovereign, detaching the crown from its alliance with all the legislative, judicial, and municipal institutions—he himself has best interpreted for us. By the rights which can befall any one of our rank, is his language to the dauphin, is to be reduced to that subject in which the monarch is obliged to receive the law from his people. . . . It is the will of God that every subject should yield to his sovereign implicit obedience. . . . I am the state! These assertions of supreme prerogative are put forth, indeed, in a connection with a recognition of accountability to the divine Source from which such powers are derived; but below him there was no accountability, no limitation to the action of his royal vicereign. Consistently with this throne and with the interests of his imperial administration, the first and most effective instrument for the carrying out of such policy was a thorough military organization. This was perfected to a degree hitherto unknown, among its new features the most effective to the end proposed being the emanation of all commissions, promotions, and distinctions from the king; doing away altogether with the possibility of the existence of such a balance of power as had previously been maintained, and rendering impossible all limitation of prerogative. The States General—the great central legislative representation of the clergy, nobles, and commons—was reduced almost to a provincial state, having a more limited function of the same nature, shared the same fate. The Parlement, from registering, protecting, and partly legislative bodies, became simply judicial tribunals to execute, under the forms of law, the decrees of a royal master. That in the thorough working out of this system Louis exhibited rare administrative ability cannot be denied. That he possessed the peculiar capacity of selecting efficient subordinates is no less manifest. That, moreover, under his rule there was a great evolution of administrative machinery, and literary capacity, is equally undisputed. Not so salutary or favorable were the results, however. Louis's policy eventually broke down the resources of the country; and it set in operation certain tendencies, which only worked themselves out in the crash of the French Revolution.

But this concentration of all power in the person of the sovereign had in view the carrying out of an external as well as an internal policy. "Self-aggrandizement," to use his own words, is "at once the noblest and most agreeable occupation of kings," and this he did not always pursue under the restraints of truth and right. "In dispensing with the strict observance of treaties, we do not," said he, "violate them; for the language of such instruments is not understood literally; it is conventional phraseology, just as we use complicated expressions in society." These two sentences are the text, of which the internal policy of Louis may be regarded as constituting the commentary. His reign, counting from the death of Mazarin, was characterized by four great wars, occupying altogether forty-two years, or seven ninths of its continuance. The first of these was his attack upon Spanish Flanders, and this in violation of the treaty of the Pyrenees, made at his marriage, by which all claim of inheritance, in right of his wife, to Spanish territory was solemnly renounced. Out of this contest, at first opposed, but afterwards (1670) by England, conducted for a long time varying in success, but, in the end, to the advantage of France, Louis, by the treaty of Nimeguen, 1678, came forth with the possession of a large addition of territory, a part of which was the duchy of Lorraine, and to which he afterwards added Strasburg, then a free German city—possessions of the sovereignty of Emperor Leopold which he stored to Germany by the war of 1670. Next, to provoke a war of nine or ten years' duration was his claim for his sister, the duchess of Orleans, to a portion of the Palatinate, enforced by an invasion of the territory in question. To repel this movement the emperor Leopold was for a time embarrassed, his people impoverished, and many of them suffering from actual starvation. But by far the greatest contest was provoked by Louis's claim for his family to the succession of the crown of Spain, for which there were three competitors—Louis, the emperor Leopold, and the elector of Bavaria. Through the interest of the pope and of the Spanish nobility, Louis had succeeded in procuring the succession for his grandson, the duke of Anjou. To this Holland, under threat of invasion, had been forced to accede; and William of England, unable to secure the interests of his administration, was forced to take the first and most effective instrument for the carrying out of such policy was a thorough military organization. This was perfected to a degree hitherto unknown, among its new features the most effective to the end proposed being the emanation of all commissions, promotions, and distinctions from the king; doing away altogether with the possibility of the existence of such a balance of power as had previously been maintained, and rendering impossible all limitation of prerogative. The States General—the great central legislative representation of the clergy, nobles, and commons—was reduced almost to a provincial state, having a more limited function of the same nature, shared the same fate. The Parlement, from registering, protecting, and partly legislative bodies, became simply judicial tribunals to execute, under the forms of law, the decrees of a royal master. That in the thorough working out of this system Louis exhibited rare administrative ability cannot be denied. That he possessed the peculiar capacity of selecting efficient subordinates is no less manifest. That, moreover, under his rule there was a great evolution of administrative machinery, and literary capacity, is equally undisputed. Not so salutary or favorable were the results, however. Louis's policy eventually broke down the resources of the country; and it set in operation certain tendencies, which only worked themselves out in the crash of the French Revolution.
trol all temporalities, and to fleece all classes of the benedict clergy without dividing the wool with the pope, was considered a great sin during the pontificate of Louis. His effort was to free the national Church from the control of the papacy; through his appointments, to make it subservient to his general policy. His treatment of the pope, especially in connection with the question of the privilege of the French ambassadors at Rome, was harsh and overbearing; and although compensated, in 1691, to yield in certain assertions of prerogative, it but slightly affected the exercise of his ecclesiastical supremacy. His bishops were, many of them, learned, able, and eloquent. There was a higher standard, both of literary talent and of the well-understood theory, than in regim preceding. Their writings constitute this period, in some respects, one of the most brilliant in the history of the Church of France. But these writings contain no vigorous protest against the vices and cruelties of their royal master, and many of them are implicated in the support of his most flagrant cruelties and acts of oppression. It was perfectly understood that no other course would be tolerated. His own account to Massillon of the effect produced upon him by his court preachers will enable us to understand the character of their presence in every equal capacity, than in the regim preceding. Their writings constitute this period, one of the most striking illustrations of this despotic policy in ecclesiastical and religious matters. In this context between Jesuitism and a purer form of Romanism, the pope, and, through the pope and the Jesuits, Louis, became a part. See J. Arnaud.

It is, however, in the course pursued towards his Protestant subjects that the policy of Louis may be recognized; that the ecclesiastical and religious history of his reign has an interest altogether unique and peculiar, namely, the position of the Huguenots and Dissenters, holding, under the law, certain legal privileges—among others, the exercise of freedom, not only of religious opinion, but of worship. The old-fashioned orthodox practice of extermination by fire and sword had been already tried, more than once, without success. At the close of the Thirty Years' War, France was at peace, and was more favorable to the Huguenots than any preceding arrangement; and, although containing in it some objectionable features, became to the Protestants the charter of their existence. They and the Catholics, under different codes of civil and religious laws, were alike under the law of the land—enjoyed its sanction, lived under its protection. Louis, whose great doctrine was uniformity and submission in all things, therefore proposed for himself the task, not of violating this great compact with his Protestant subjects, but of doing away with the necessity of its existence by bringing them all within the national Church. Urged forward in this attempt by his mistress, Madame de Maintenon, wholly under the control of the Jesuits, and by the latter themselves, on the plea that by such a course he would merit the forgiveness of heaven for the evil sins of his youth, especially his illicit connection with Madame de Montespan, two great agencies were immediately set in operation to the attainment of this result—those of bribery and intimidation. Conversions were sought by purchase, or by appeals to the interests or ambition of the parties concerned. The object was made for the purchase of such conversions by a fund collected of one third of the profits of all ecclesiastical benefices, and placed in the hands of a Huguenot renegade, to be used for this purpose. The matter went so far that there was a regular pool of priests in this service of denominations. Measures of this kind were not unaccompanied with success; grades, and large successions were published as the result of this mode of operation. To cut off the temptation of release, so as to insure the price of a second conversion, an edict was issued condemning all relapsed persons to banishment for life and confiscation of their property. With these efforts, moreover, which only reached the weak and worthless, was combined the other element of harassment and intimidation. Commissions of Romanish clergy were instituted, sometimes upon their own motion, sometimes upon popular complaints, and with the view of the king, in order to banish them. The object of these inquiries, in some cases, was to collect evidence and thus to increase the number of cases where the Holy Inquisition had to proceed. Detractors and the agents of the king, such as the bishops, were instructed to investigate the legal titles of churches of the Huguenots, which for the purpose had been called in question. One infelicitous in the position of the Protestants, even under the Edict of Nantes, was that which was connected with what may be called the Church territorial system. They were territorially the dependents of Romanish bishops, in the parishes limits of Romanish priests, in some indefinite manner regarded as in their pastoral charge, and these annoying questions of Church property could thus be easily started. The result, in many cases, was that titles were wrested away from the churches in my chapel, and I have been very well pleased with them; when I hear you, I am displeased with myself." But the unfavorable testimony of this one faithful witness, of at least one other not less faithful, Feneon, could not counteract the sluttery of so many others. The difficulty with the Jansenists constitutes, perhaps, one of the most striking illustrations of this despotic policy in ecclesiastical and religious matters. In this context between Jesuitism and a purer form of Romanism, the pope, and, through the pope and the Jesuits, Louis, became a part. See J. Arnaud.

As, however, these proved insufficient to the attainment of the desired end, and the law still guaranteed the legal existence of the as yet unconquered Protestants, more vigorous steps were taken prior to the final one in the direction of annoyance and severity. Without, therefore, revoking the existing law, it was subverted by new edicts of the most vexatious and harassing character. Many of these may be found detailed under the article HUGUENOTS.

There was, however, another form of operation in this effort of exterminating Protestantism by conversion. Human wickedness, in this effort, found out the way to commit a new crime. This new crime, unique and preeminent in the achievements of malicious ingenuity, had to be described by a new name, and the world thus heard for the first time of the Dragoman. Without, therefore, revoking the existing law, it was subverted by new edicts of the most vexatious and harassing character. Many of these may be found detailed under the article HUGUENOTS. The process was that of quartering soldiers—Romanists, of course, the bigotry of the Romanist being combined with the brutality of the soldier—in the families and houses of Protestants. The commanders were instructed to quarter as many Protestant families as possible in them there until the families were brought over to the Catholic faith, and then to transfer them to others of the same character and for the same object. As the army employed for this purpose was a large one, so whole districts at once were subjected to this intolerable annoyance and oppression. Multitudes, of course, yielded; and where they subsequently recanted their act of weakness, they became subject to banishment and confiscation. The suffering involved may be more easily imagined than described. The "dragoons," says one who passed through it, "fixed their cross to their musketeers, so as the more readily to compel their hosts to kiss them; and if the kiss was not given, they drove the crosses against their stomachs and faces. They had as little mercy for the children as for the adults, beating them with these crosses or with the flats of their swords, so violently as not seldom to maim them. The wretches also subjected the women to their barbarities: they whipped them, they disfigured them, they dragged them by the hair through the mud or along the stones. Sometimes they would seize the laborers on the highways, or who were returning home at night, and drive them to the Romanish churches, pricking them like oxen with their own goads to quicken their pace."
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If, in any case, these outrages were resisted, and there was anything like a Protestant gathering, the result was a massacre. The mere collection of such population, to indicate that they were not all carried over to the national Church, was thus treated. Upon the assumption, therefore, that these agencies, after having operated for four years, and accomplished the pretended pious purpose; that Protestantism, to any calculable degree, had ceased to exist, in 1685 the Edict of Nantes, as no longer of any use or necessity, was abrogated. To proclaim the falsehood and cruelty of this pretense, and the proceedings based upon it, they were followed by enactments of a character most mischievous. (In the Revolutions of Louis XIV, v, 86 sq.; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. Eng. (Ch. of Restoration, see Index in vol. ii); Hase, Ch. Hist. (see Index); Ranke, Hist. Popery, ii, 272 sq., 293; Student's France (Harper's), p. 410 sq.; Vehme, Mem. of the Council of Austria, ii, 16 sq.; Quart. Rev. (London), 1810 (July); Brit. and For.-letter, 1849, p. 471; see also another passage in the articles France and Huguenots (C. W.).

Louvard, see Lick.

Louvard, Francisc, a French Jansenistic theologian of the Benedictine order, was born in Champagne in 1661. In 1679, he was transferred to the convenut of St. Denis, near Paris, to devote himself to the study of the text of St. Gregory Nazianzen. In 1713 pope Clement XI published the memorable bull "Unigeniti a nobis concessa," in which he condemned a heretic, if such a one emigrated in 1665 as a Protestant, he was condemned to the galleys. If he did not, he was regarded as a Catholic, and at any subsequent period could be proceeded against for his Protestantism as a relapsed Catholic.

Within five months after his ordinance against Prot- estants just mentioned the career of Louis terminated. To use the language of another, "He was an infirm and aged man. He had survived his children and his grandchildren. He had been overwhelmed by the victories of Eugene and Marlborough. He was oppressed with debt. He was hated by the people who had idol- ized him, and was compelled to listen to the indig- nant invectives which the whole civilized world poured forth against his blind and inhuman persecutions. He died declaring to his spiritual advisers that, being him- self ignorant of ecclesiastical questions, he had relied upon their guidance and as their agent in all that he had done against either the Jansenists or the Protestant heretics, and on those his spiritual advisers he devolved the responsibility to the Supreme Judge." There can be no question that in many cases the persecuting policy of Louis was quickened by the influence of Madame de Maintenon and her ecclesiastical advisers; that in many cases his subordinate agents pursued courses of outrage and cruelty exceeding his intentions; that such men as Bossuet, Arnauld, Flechier, and the whole Gallican Church, in approving this policy, were actuated by it in its guilt and in its consequences; but, after all, it was essentially his policy. It was the carrying out in ecclesiastical the autocratic principle enunciated with reference to civil matters. The concentration of all power in the hands of the sovereign required that he should be not only the State, but the Church.

Louis dying Sept. 1, 1715, was succeeded by his great- grandson, Louis XV. His son the dauphin and his eldest grandson died at an earlier period. Some of his children, the fruit of adulterous connection with Madame de Montespan, were legally adopted during his lifetime, but the act was annulled after his death. In regard to other children from similar connections no such action was taken. After the death of his first wife he privately married Madame de Maintenon. The works of Louis are contained in six volumes. They are occupied with instructions for his sons, and with correspondence bearing upon the history of his times. His reign may be regarded as one of the most brilliant in the annals of French literature. In the department of theological and controversial literature this was peculiarly the case, while in that of public eloquence there was an array of talent and genius beyond parallel.

Literature.—Voltaire, Néce de Louis XIV; Pellisson, Histoire de Louis XIV; Dangeau, Journ. de la cour de Louis XIV; Lettres de Madame de Maintenon; Laeroy, Hist. de France sous le Régne de Louis XIV; Capellini, Louis XIV son Gouvernement, etc. (1857, v. 8vo). James, Life and Times of Louis XIV (Bohn's ed., Lond. 1851, 2 vols. 12mo); Smedley, Hist. Ref. in France (N.Y. 1845, 5 vols. 18mo), Barnes's Felice, Hist. Protestant. in France, 1845, 12mo (see also the latest, Kitchener's, v, 86 sq.; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. Eng. (Ch. of Restoration, see Index in vol. ii); Hase, Ch. Hist. (see Index); Ranke, Hist. Popery, ii, 272 sq., 293; Student's France (Harper's), p. 410 sq.; Vehme, Mem. of the Council of Austria, ii, 16 sq.; Quart. Rev. (London), 1810 (July); Brit. and For.-letter, 1849, p. 471; see also another passage in the articles France and Huguenots (C. W.).
version, as this consequence of sin leads man to recognize the restoration of this disturbed relation to God as the one thing needful and indispensable. The love of God consequently proceeds in both cases on the assumption of the worth of man in the eye of God, and is a proof of it. Hence the anger of God, as manifested by these punishments, is but another form of his love. It is a reaction of rejected love, which manifests itself only in imparting suffering and pain on the one who rejects it, proving thereby that its rejection is not a matter of indifference to it. This love may not appear at first sight, but it is clearly revealed in God's conduct towards all mankind, as well towards the heathen as towards the chosen people, of God and the heart of man. In one way (Acts xiv, 17) he allows them to fall into all manner of evil (Rom. i, 21 sq.) in order to bring them to a sense of their misery and helplessness as well as of their guilt. But at the bottom of this anger there is still love, and this is clearly shown in the fact that he manifested himself to them in their conscience, and also took care of them (Acts xiv, 17; xvii, 25 sq.). But, if this love is thus evinced towards the heathen, it is still more clearly manifested towards the chosen people, the fact of their choice being itself a manifestation of that love which is the unchanging inconstancy of God, the blessings and punishments, the anger and the mercy, of which they were the objects. Holiness and mercy are the chief characteristics of the divine love as manifested towards Israel; the one raising them above their weaknesses, their evils, and their sins, the other understanding these failings and seeking to deliver and restore them. But in both also is manifested the constancy of that love, its faithfulness; and the exactitude with which it adheres to the covenant it had itself made evinces its righteousness by saving those who fear God and obey him. Holiness and mercy are, for the moral, religious consciousness, harmonized in the expiatory sacrifice, in a figurative, typical manner in the O. T., and in a real, absolute manner in the N. T. The divine right in regard to fallen humanity is maintained, the death penalty is paid, but in such a manner that the chief of all, the divine Son of man, who is also Son of God, suffers it for all, of his own free will, and out of love to man, in accordance with the wishes of his Father. Thus the curse of sin and death is removed from humanity, and the possibility of a new existence of righteousness and felicity restored. The New Testament is therefore the full revelation of the spirit and object of the divine love. The incarnation of the Son of God is the revelation of God himself, and leads to his self-impartation by the Holy Spirit. Hence the eternal love discloses itself as being, in its inner nature, the love of the Father for the Father, the love of the Son for the Father by the Holy Ghost, which proceeds from both, and is the fulness of the love that unites them, whence we can say that God is love; as also, in its manifestation, it is the divine love towards fallen creatures, which is the will to restore their perfect communion with God by means of the all-sufficient expiatory sacrifice of the God-man, and the communication of the Holy Spirit, by which both the Father and the Son come to dwell in the hearts of men, thus forming a people of God's own, as was postulated, but not yet realized in the O. T. The love of God in man, therefore, is the destiny of being loved by the Father (1 John v, 0), resulting in a powerful impulse of love towards the God who has loved us first in Christ (1 John iv, 19), and an inward and strong affection towards all who are loved by God in Christ (1 John iv, 11); for the divine love, in its true essential being, love, even when it loves the wicked, is a loving of the loveless. This love takes the form of a duty (1 John iv, 11), but at the same time becomes a gradually strengthening inclination. And this is the completion or the ripening of the divine love in man (in τοῖς πάντις ἐνδιωκόμενοι), that it manifests itself in positive results for the advantage of others.

We find the beginning and examples of this love in...
der the old dispensation where mention is made of desire after God, joy in him, eagerness to serve him, zeal in doing everything to please and honor him. The inclination towards those who belong to God, the holy communion of love in God, that characteristic feature of the N. T., is also foreshadowed in the O. T. by the people of God, who are regarded as one in respect to him, and whose close communion with God is represented by the image of marriage. This image is still repeated in the N. T., nevertheless in such a manner that the union is represented as not yet accomplished; for, though Christ is designated as the bridegroom and the Church as the bride, the wedding is made to coincide with the establishment of the kingdom. Thus, when the apostle considered, the love of God and the furtherance of the love of God are still a figurative expression. God wants the whole heart of his people: one love, one sacrifice, exclusively directed towards him, so that none other should exist beside it, and that all inclinations of love towards any creature should be comprised in it, derived from it, and return to it. On this account his love is called jealous, and he is said to be a jealous God. This jealousy of God, however, this decided requiring of an exclusive submission on the part of his people, is, on the other hand, considered as having for their welfare, their honor, and their restoration. The close connection, indeed the unity of both, is evident. The effect of this jealousy of God is to kindle zeal in those who serve him, and consequently opposition against all that opposes, or is adverse to his cause. This is a manifestation of love towards God, which love is essentially a return of his own love, and consequently gratitude, accompanied by the highest appreciation, and an earnest desire for communion with him. It includes joy in all that serves God, absolute submission to him, and a desire to do everything for his glory. The joy is, in God, i.e. the love of those who feel themselves bound together by that common bond, is essentially of the same character; but, from the fact of its being directed towards creatures who are afflicted with many failings and infirmities, must also include—as distinguished from the love towards God—a willingness to forgive, which makes away with all hindrances to full communion, a continual friendliness under all circumstances, consequently patience and gentleness, zeal for their improvement, and sympathy for their failings and misfortunes. But as the love of the creative, creative, and sanctifying God, extending further than merely those who have attained to that communion with him, embraces all, so should also the love of those who love him. Yet in the divine love itself there is a distinction made, inasmuch as God’s love towards those who love him bears a much more tolerant character, his commandments are strengthening, sustaining pleasure in them (John xiv, 21, 23), while his love towards the others is benevolence and patience, which, according to their conduct, the disposition of their hearts, and their receptivity, is either not felt at all by them, or only produces pain, fear, or, again, hope, desire, etc., but not a feeling of compunction, alighting joy. So in the love of the children of God towards the human race we find the distinction between brotherly and universal love (Rom. xii, 10; Heb. xiii, 1; 1 Pet. i, 22; 2 Pet. i, 7). In both we find the characteristics of kindness and benevolence, sympathy, willingness to help, gentleness, and patience: but in the universal love there is wanting the feeling of delight, of an equal aim, a complete reciprocity, of conscious unity in the one highest good.

Love also derives a special determination from the personality, the spiritual and essential organization of the one who loves, and also his particular position. It manifests itself in friendship as a powerful attraction, a hearty sympathy of feelings, a strong desire for being together and enjoying a communion of thoughts and feelings. It is the mutual love in a tenacious personal attraction, a satisfaction in each other as the mutual complement of life, and a desire for absolute and lasting community of existence. Parental, filial, and brotherly love can be considered as a branch of this affection. Both, parental and brotherly love, are characteristic of the Christian morals when based on the love of God. As wedded love is an image of the relation between the Lord and his people, or the Church (Eph. v. 25 sq.), so, paternal, filial, and brotherly love are respectively images of the love of God towards those who love him, and towards him, and of their love towards each other. All these relations may want this higher consecration, and yet be well regulated; they have then a moral character. But they may also be disorderly: friendship can be sensual, selfish, and even degenerate into unnatural lust and impurity. Sexual love may become selfish, having no other object but the gratification of lust; parental love may change to self-love, producing over-indulgence, and fostering the vices of the children; brotherly love can degenerate into flattery and spoiling. Thus this feeling, which is in principle and in its best, the highest and noblest, can become the most common, the worst, and the most unworthy. Both kinds of love are mentioned in Scripture. The highest and purest tendency of the heart is in the Bible designated by the same name as the more natural, immoral, or disorderly kind, as a tendency of the heart away from God and Romans: 'Eroto, Amor, and Aaggellry, Venus, had both significations, the noble and the common; but Christianity has in Christ and in his Church the perfect illustration and example of true love, whose absolute type is in the same life of God himself. This divine love, as it exists in God, and through the divine Spirit in the heart of man, together with the connection of both, is represented to us in Scripture as infinitely deep and pure. We find it thus represented in the Old Testament (see Deut. xxxiii, 8; Is. xlix, 18 sq.; xlvii, 17 sq.; Jer. xxxii, 30; xxxiii, 37 sq.; Ezek. xxxiv, 11 sq.; Hose. iii, 2 sq.; Mic. vii, 18 sq.). Then in the whole mission of Christ, and in what he stated of his own love and of the Father's, see Matt. xx, 28; Luke xxv; John iv, 10, 14; vi, 37 sq.; vii, 37 sq.; ix, 4; x, 12 sq.; xii, 36; xiii, 1; xv, 15, 19; xvii; and, for the testimony of the apostles, Rom. v, 8 sq.; viii, 35 sq.; 1 Cor. xiii; Eph. i, 17 sq.; v, 1 sq.; 1 John iii, 4, etc. These statements are corroborated by the testimony of Christians in all ages, who have all been witness to this love, however much their views may have differed on the other points of the doctrine. The subject of the object have thrown great light on the nature and modes of manifestation of this love; see among them, Danb, Syst. d. chrest. Moral. ii, 1, p. 310; Marheineke, Syst. d. theol. Moral, p. 470; Rothc, Theol. Ethik, ii, 350.—Herzog, Real-Encyclop. viii, 889 sq. See Wesleyan, p. 94.

Love, Christopher, a Presbyterian divine, was born at Carlif, Wales, in 1618; entered the active work of the ministry in 1644, in London, after which he became a member of the Assembly of Divines. After the death of Charles I, to whom he had previously been opposed, he entered into a plot against Cromwell, for which cause he was executed in August, 1651. Mr. Love was the author of a number of sermons and theological tracts published in 1645–54. As a writer, he was plain, impressive, evangelical. See Wild, Trilogy of Christopher Love; Neale, Puritans, i, 528; ii, 123 sq.; Wood, Athen. Oxon.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, vol. ii, a. v.

Love, John M. D.D., an eminent Scotch divine, was born at Paisley, Scotland, in 1757. He was one of the founders of the London Missionary Society. He died in 1825. Dr. Love published in 1796 Adivization to the People of Otaheite, republished after his death; also 2 vols. of Sermons and Lectures in 1829; a vol. of Letters in 1836; 94 Sermons, preached 1784-5 to 1828. See Chambers and Thomson, Bioog. Dict. of Extinct Scotsmen, 1853, vol. v; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, vol. ii, a. v.

Love Family. See Familiest.
LOVE-FEAST

LOVE-feast. In the article Aparé (q. v.) the subject has been treated so far as it relates to an institution in the early Church. It remains for us here only to speak of the love-feast as observed in some Protestant churches, especially the Methodist connection. In a strictly primitive form, the love-feast is observed by the Moravian Brethren. They celebrate it on various occasions, generally in connexion with the annual festival or preparatory to the holy communion. Printedodes are often used, prepared expressly for the occasion. In the course of the service a simple meal of biscuit and coffee or tea is served, of which the congregation partakes. In some churches the question is decided with an address by the minister (E. de Schweinitz, Moravians Manual [Philad. 1859, 12mo], p. 161).

From the Moravians Wesley borrowed the practice for his own followers, assigning for its introduction into the Methodist economy the following reasons: "In order to increase in them [persons in bonds (q. v.)] a grateful sense of all his [God's] mercies, I desired that one evening in a quarter all the men in band, on a second all the women, would meet, and on a third both men and women together, that we might together 'eat bread with God,' and the sentiment Christians are not 'of the works of the flesh, but of the word of life'" (Wesley, Works, v., 1833). In the Wesleyan Church only members are attendants at love-feasts, and they are appointed by or with the consent of the superintendent (Minutes, 1806). Admission itself is gained only by a ticket; and as it frequently happened that members would lend their tickets to strangers, it was enacted in 1808 that "no person who is unwilling to join our society is allowed to attend a love-feast more than once, nor then without a note from the travelling preacher; .... and that any person who is proved to have lent a society ticket to another who is not in society, for the purpose of deceiving the door-keepers, shall be suspended for three months" (comp. Grindrod, Laws and Regulations of West. Methodists [Lond. 1842], p. 180). In the Methodist Episcopal Church the rule also exists that admission to love-feasts is to be had by tickets only (comp. Discipline, 1835, ch. ii., § 17 [2]), but the rule is rarely, if ever observed, and they are frequently attended by members of the congregation as well as by the members of the Church. By established usage, the presiding elder (and in his absence only the minister in charge) is entitled to preside over the love-feasts, and they are therefore held at the time of the Church conference. See Conference, Methodist. The manner in which they are now generally observed among Methodists is as follows: They are opened by the reading of the Scriptures followed by the singing of a hymn, and then by prayer. During and after the dealing out of the bread and water, the different members of the congregation dispose themselves in a manner that is to be regarded. See Ritualism. The manner in which they are now generally observed among Methodists is as follows: They are opened by the reading of the Scriptures, followed by the singing of a hymn, and then by prayer. During and after the dealing out of the bread and water, the different members of the congregation dispose themselves in a manner that is to be disregarded. See Latitudinarianism. The term was primarily applied to those who disapproved of the schism made by the Non-jurors, and who distinguished themselves by their moderation towards Dissenters. See Ritualism.

Lowe, ben-Besalel, a rabbi and Jewish teacher of note, was born probably in Posen about 1525. Of his early history but little is authenticated. We find him first occupying a position of influence and prominence at Prague, where he was known as "the learned Rabbi Lowe," toward the close of the 16th century (1575). Previous to his coming to Prague he had been
rabbis over a congregation in Moravia for some twenty years. In 1811 he was elected chief rabbi of the Jews in the Bohemian capital. In 1852 he became chief rabbi of Pozsony and Poland; he returned, however, in 1858 to Prague, and there died in 1869. He left nineteen different works, of which several are yet in manuscript in the library of the University of Oxford, England. Besides his technical astronomical knowledge, he made him one of the first authorities of his time, he also enjoyed a great reputation as mathematician and philosopher. He seems to have also possessed great knowledge of astronomy and astrology, the favorite studies of the age. He was befriended by the renowned Tycho Brahe, astro- nomer to the court of the emperor Frederick II; and the latter also, it is said, honored the rabbi, and at one time admitted him to a prolonged audience; indeed, it was a well-established fact that his extended knowledge and unblemished character secured for himself and the Jews of his time happier days, and, like a sunbeam in the midst of dark clouds, appears the abort period in which he officiated as rabbi in the sad history of the Jewish congregation of Prague. He was opposed to the unscientific manner in which the Talmud was studied, by hunting after imaginary contradictions and difficulties (Filium), and he called into existence the various societies for a more scientific study of the same. In connection with his son-in-law, Rabbi Chayim Wahle, he founded a seminary for Talmudic studies. The rabbi's knowledge of natural philosophy caused him frequently to make predictions, which gave birth to several agend, as the ignorant saw in them the supernatural power of the Cabalist. A Christian Bohemian historian claims for the rabbi the honor of inventing the camera-obscura. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, ix. 496 sq.; Sekelos, Some Jewish Rabbis (v.), in the Jewish Messenger (N.Y. 1871); First, Biblioth. Judaica, ii. 396 sq. (J. H. W.)

LOWE, JOEL, BEN-JEHUDAH LOM (also called Brul, או ברול, from the initials ב.י.ל. בֵּנְ-רֵי הָגְדָה לֹאֶב), a Jewish writer of note, born about 1740, was a distinguished disciple of Moses Mendelssohn, and afterwards, although a Jew, held a professorship in the William's school at Breslau. He died in that city, February 11, 1802. Besides many valuable contributions to Biblical exegesis and literature in the Berlin Magazine for the Advancement of Jewish Scholarship, entitled Measef or Sammelzer (Collector), of which he was at one time also editor, he published (1788) a translation of the Song of Songs, an elaborate Introduction, written conjointly with Wolfsohn, to Mendelssohn's German translation of this book (Berlin, 1788; republished in Prague, 1808; Lemberg, 1817); — (2) Annotations on Ecclesiastes, also conjointly with Wolfsohn, published with Mendelssohn's commentary on this book, and Friedländer's German translation (Berlin, 1788); — (3) Commentary on Jonah, with a German translation (Berl. 1788); — (4) Commentary on the Psalms, with an extensive introduction (آثار מח traf סלמי), containing an elaborate treatise on the musical instruments of the ancient Hebrews, as well as on Hebrew Poetry; published with Mendelssohn's German translation of this book (Berlin, 1785-91); — (5) German Translation and Heb. Commentary of the Commemorative and Festival Lessons from the Pentateuch and the Prophets [see Haphtarah] (Berlin, 1790-91); — (6) German Translation of the Pentateuch for beginners, preparatory to Mendelssohn's version (Breslau, 1818); — (7) Elementary Hebrew Grammar, entitled עִנְיָנִי הָבְרִית, according to logical principles, for the use of teachers (Berlin, 1794; republished in Prague, 1803). Of his articles published in quarterlies, the following are the most important: 1. Notes on Joshua and the Song of Songs, in Elchhorn's Allgemeine Bibliothek (Leips, 1789), ii. 183 sq.; — 2. Treatise on Personification of the Deity and the Sephiroth, ibid. (1800), v. 378 sq. — See Figures, Bibl. Hebr., ii. 268; Steinschneider, Catalogu Libr. Heb. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 1297 sq.; Kitto, Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature, s. v.; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, xl, 101 sq.

LOWE, CHARLES, D.D., a Unitarian Congregational minister of note, son of judge John Lowell, to whom Massachusetts is indebted for the clause in her Constitution which abolished slavery, was born in Boston Aug. 15, 1782, and was educated first at Andover Academy, and later at Harvard College, class of 1800. After graduation he went abroad, and travelled extensively in the Old World. At Edinburgh he entered the divinity school of the university, and spent there three semesters. On his return home he studied theology with Rev. Dr. Zeedekiah Sanger, of South Bridgewater, and Rev. David Tappan, professor of divinity at Cambridge, and was ordained pastor over the West Parish, Mel- ton, Jan. 1, 1806. In 1837 his feeble health demanded relief, and the Rev. Cyrus A. Bartol was ordained as his colleague. Dr. Lowell continued his pastoral connection until his death (at Cambridge, January 29, 1861), although he officiated but occasionally. He was remarkable for kindness, integrity, directness and simplicity of character, and was a most zealous and consistent opponent of slavery. As a preacher his popularity was eminent, and he was almost adored by his parishioners. Graceful as an orator, with a voice of unusual common sweetness, he preached with such sincerity that he seemed to his hearers to be almost divinely inspired. He published some twenty different discourses, a volume of Occasional Sermons (Boz. 1856, 12mo), and a volume of Practical Sermons (1856): Meditations for the Afflicted, Sick, and Dying; and Devotional Exercises for Communicants. He also contributed largely to the periodical literature of his day. Among his surviving children are Prof. Lowell, the poet; the Rev. Robert Lowell, author of "The New Priest in Concepcion Bay," a novel of Newfoundland life; and Mrs. Pappenheim, well-known writer on Hungarian history. See Ch.it, Expositor, 1870, xxxiii, 13; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s. v.; Drake, Dict. Am. Biog. s. v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, s. v.

LOWELL, JOHN, an American philanthropist, deserves our notice as the founder (in 1809) of "the Lowell Institute," at an expense of $250,000, to maintain forever in Boston, his native place, annual courses of free lectures on natural and revealed religion, the natural sciences, philology, belles-lettres, and art. Mr. Lowell was born May 11, 1799, and was entered student at Harvard in 1813; but was compelled already, in 1815, by poor health, to seek relief by residence in the East. He died at Bombay March 4, 1866. He was a superior scholar, and one of the best of the English libraries in America. See New American Cyclop. s. v.

LOWER PARTS OF THE EARTH (डेल्फी-क्रेन), properly valleya (Isa. xliv. 23); hence, by extension, Sheol, or the under-world, as the place of departed spirits (Psa. lxxiii, 9; Eph. iv, 9), and by meton. any hidden place, as the womb (Psa. xxxiv., 13). In the original of Ezek. xxvi. 30; xxxii. 18, 24, the words are transposed, and used in the second sense.

LÖWISOHN, SALOMON, a Jewish writer of note, and really the first Jew who chronicled the history of his people in the German tongue, was born at Moor, Hungary, in 1789, and was truly a self-made man. Amid the greatest difficulties he acquired an education, and particularly a thorough knowledge of the Hebrew. Possessed of great poetical talent, he wrote בִּסְדָּאֵל הַנֶּבֶץ (Vienna, 1818). The first work in which a Jew applied himself to the history of the chosen people of God, in a German version, was Löwischen's Vorlesungen über die neuesten Geschichten der Juden (Vienna, 1820, 8vo), which starts with their dispersion, and dwells at length on the Talmud and its authors. Unfortunately, however, the young man so well endowed with this work, so suspiciously begun, was brought to an early grave by disappointment.
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He died of broken heart, in his native place, in 1822. See Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, xi, 458 sq. ; Oriental. Literature, vol. i, 1855. For his notes, see p. 72 sqq. (J. H. W.)

Lowman, Abraham. A Presbyterian minister, was born in Indiana County, Pa., in 1833; made an early profession of faith, and joined the Associate Reformed Congregation at Jacksonville, Pa.; entered the Theological Seminary of the First Associate Reformed Synod (class of 1857); was licensed by the Presbytery of Wissahickon, and in 1858 received and accepted a call from the Associate Reformed congregation at Brookville, Pa., but while preparing to enter upon the active duties of this charge he suddenly died, Nov. 27, 1858. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Alm. 1860, p. 159.

Lowman, Moses. A learned English dissenting divine, was born in London in 1690, and was educated at Trinity College, and subsequently at Leyden and Utrecht. In 1710 he became minister of a Presbyterian congregation at Clapham, Surrey, where he labored until his death in 1752. He was eminently skilled in Jewish antiquities, and is the author of a learned work on the Civil Government of the Hebrews (London, 1740, 1745, 1816, 18vo); of a Paraphrase and Notes of Revelations (1737, 1745, 4to; 1791, 1807, 8vo), of which work Doddridge remarked that he had "received more satisfaction from it, in regard to many difficulties in that book, than he ever found elsewhere, or expected to have found at all."—A specimen from his Paraphrase on the 6th Psal. in proof that Jesus is the Messiah (London, 1738, 8vo), which Dr. Landal calls "a valuable book;" and Rationale of the Ritual of Hebrew Worship (1748, 1816, 8vo). See Proc. Dis. Mag., vol. i and ii; Allibone, Dict. of British and American Authors, s. v.

Lowrie, John Marshall, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in Pittsburg, Pa., July 16, 1817, and was educated for two years in Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., and afterwards at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. (class of 1840); and then at the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. (class of 1842). In April, 1842, he was licensed by New Brunswick Presbytery, and soon after accepted a call to the churches of Blairstown and Knowlton, in Warren County, N. J., where he ordained and installed by Newton Presbytery Oct. 18, 1843. In 1846 he accepted a call to Wellsville, Ohio; subsequently to Fort Wayne, Ind., where he labored faithfully until his death, Sept. 26, 1867. Dr. Lowrie contributed largely to the press, and wrote many precious gems in poetry and prose; he was a man of more than ordinary gifts, a clear, vigorous intellect, and sound judgment; he excelled in systematic arrangement, clear statement, clear argument, and forcible argument. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Alm. 1868, p. 115 sq.

Lowrie, Reuben, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Butler, Pa., Nov. 24, 1827, and was educated at the University of the New York City, where for one year he served as tutor; studied theology at Princeton, N. J.; afterwards became principal of a presbyterian academy in Luzerne County, Pa.; was licensed by the Luzerne Presbytery in 1851, at which time he engaged in the work of foreign missions among the Chocot Indians; in 1856 he was ordained, and April 22 sailed as missionary into the Sea Girt, China. Here he was fully to himself to the study of the Chinese language, translated the Shorter Catechism, and a Catechism on the Old Testament History, into this dialect; devoted much time to the compilation of a Dictionary of the Four Books, commenced by his brother; he had also written a Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew in Chinese when he died, April 26, 1860. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Alm. 1861, p. 96.

Lowrie, Walter Macon, a Presbyterian missionary to China, was born in Butler, Pa., in 1819 (?), graduated from Jefferson College in 1837, passed a theological course at Princeton, was ordained by the Second Presbytery of New York, and entered on his ministerial labors. While passing from Shanghai to Ningpo, Aug. 19, 1847, he was thrown overboard by pirates, and drowned at 7 a.m. from the 72 sq. (J. H. W.)

The date of his embarkation from America is not known, but he was in China some time prior to 1842. He was a young man of fine powers and large culture, and promised much for the Church and the world. His piety was of a lofty, self-denying stamp, which made it equal to all obstacles, and his career was opening grandly when thus suddenly called to his reward. He wrote Letters to Sabbath-school Children:—Land of Sinim, or Exposition of Isaiah xlix (Philadelphia, 1846, 18mo). A volume of his Sermons preached in China was also published (1818, 8vo). See Lowrie, Memoirs of Missionaries in New York Observer, Jan. 8, 1848; Memoirs of W. M. Lowrie (New York, Carter and Brothers, 1849); Princeton Review, xxii, 280.

Low Sunday, the first Sunday after Easter, so called because it was customary to repeat on this day some part of the solemnity which was used on Easter day, whence it took the name of Low Sunday, being celebrated as a feast, but of a lower degree than Easter day itself.

Lowth, Robert, D.D., a distinguished English prelate, and son of William Lowth (q. v.), was born at Burton Nov. 27, 1710. In 1737 he graduated master of arts at Oxford University, and in 1741 was elected professor of poetry in his alma mater. Entering the ecclesiastical order, he was presented with the rectory of Stevenage and Walsingham, in 1744. After a four-year's residence on the Continent, he was, on his return in 1750, appointed by bishop Hoadley archdeacon of Winchester, and three years after to the rectory of East Woodhay in Hampshire. It was in this year that Lowth published his valuable work De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum, Prolocutiones Academicae (Oxonia, 1753, 4to; 2d edit. with annot. by Michaelis, Göttingen, 1758; Oxon. 1763; Göttingen, 1768; Oxford, 1775, 1810; with notes by Rosenmüller, Leips, 1815; and last and best, Oxford, 1821, 8vo). An English translation of the first 18 lectures was prepared by Dr. Dodd for the Christian Magazine (1766-67), and of all by Dr. Gregory (Lond. 1767, 1816, 1885, 1839, 1847); a still more desirable English translation was prepared by Prof. Stowe (Andover, 1829, 8vo). "In these masterly and classical dissertations," says Ginsburg (in Kütto, Cyclog Bibl. lit. ii, s. v.), "Lowth not only evinced a deep knowledge of the Hebrew language, but showed that he actually exhibits the true spirit and characteristics of that poetry in which the prophets of the O. T. clothed the lovely oracles of God. It does not at all detract from Lowth's merits that both Abarbanel and Azariah de Rosai had pointed out the characteristics before him the same features of Hebrew poetry [see Rosai] upon which he expatiates, inasmuch as the enlarged views and the invincible arguments displayed in his handling of the subject are peculiarly his own; and his work is therefore justly regarded as marking a new epoch in the treatment of the Hebrew poetry. The greatest testimony to the extra-ordinary merits of these lectures is the thorough analysis which the celebrated [Jewish] philosopher Mendelssohn, to whom the Hebrew was almost vernacular, gives of them in the Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaftern und der freien Künste, vol. i, 1756." In 1751 Lowth received the degree of doctor in divinity from the University of Oxford by diploma. In 1755 he went to Ireland as chaplain to the marquis of Hartington, then appointed lord lieutenant, who nominated him bishop of Limerick, a preferment which he exchanged for a prebend of Downpatrick, the bishopric of Down being vacant. In 1766 Dr. Lowth was appointed bishop of St. David's, whence a few months later he was translated to the see of Oxford, and thence, in 1777, he succeeded Dr. Terrick in the diocese of London. In 1778, only one year after his appointment at London, he gave the public his last and greatest work, Isaiah: a Translation, with a preliminary Dissertation, and Notes (18th
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edit. 1849, 8vo). This elegant and beautiful version of the evangelical prophet, of which learned men in every part of Europe have been unanimous in their eulogiums, and which is alone sufficient to transmit his name to posterity, aimed "not only to give an exact and faithful representation of the words and sense of the prophet by adhering to the letter of the text" and treading as nearly as may be in his footsteps, but, moreover, to imitate the air and manner of the author, to express the form and fashion of the composition, and to give the English reader some notion of the peculiar turn and cast of the original." In the elaborate and valuable Preliminary Remarks, he states this, he enters more minutely than in his former production into the form and construction of the poetical compositions of the O.T., lays down principles of criticism for the improvement of all subsequent translations, and frankly alludes to De Rossi's view of Hebrew poetry, which is similar to his own. See Ross. This masterly work soon obtained a European fame, and was not only rapidly reprinted in England, but was translated into German by professor Koppe, who added some valuable notes to it (Gottingen, 1737-91, 4 vols. 8vo.). It must not, however, be supposed that the work did not meet with opposition, so far as the views of the author could lead to difference in opinion; and we incline with Dr. G. B. Cheever to the belief that Lowth's "only fault as a sacred critic was a degree of what architect Decker denomes "the spirit of Tassawuf," or rags for textual and conjectural emendations. The importance of this spirit in his work on Isaiah was the only obstacle that prevented its attaining the name and rank, as classic in sacred literature, which has been accorded to the Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews" (North American Review, xxxvi, 376.) compiled by Horne, Bibl. Bibl. 1820, 287). On the death of archbishop Cornwallis, the primate was offered to Dr. Lowth, a dignity which he declined on account of his advanced age and family afflictions. In 1788 he lost his eldest daughter, and in 1788 his second daughter suddenly expired while presiding at the tea-table; his eldest son was also suddenly cut off in the prime of life. Bishop Lowth himself died Nov. 8, 1787. The other and minor writings of bishop Lowth, consisting of (1) Tracts, belonging to his controversy with bishop Warburton (q. v.), to which a trifling difference of opinion on the book of Job gave rise; (2) Life of William of Wykeham (1758)—(3) Short Introduction to English Grammar (1762). The Sermons and other Remains of Bishop Lowth were published with an Introductory Memoir by the Rev. Peter Hall, A.M. (London, 1814), pp. 120; and his Letters and Writings of the late R. H. Lowth (Lond. and Goring, 1787, 8vo.), and Blackwood's Magazine, xxxix, 765, 902; Gentle Magazine, iv, viii, etc.; Kitto, Journal of Soci. Lit., 94, 295; v, 573; xii, 188; Eng. Cyclop. s. v.; Darling, Eccles. Biog. ii, 1873; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s. v.; and especially Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.

Lowth, Simon, D.D., an English non-jurist divine, was born in Northamptonshire about 1630. In 1679 we find him vicar of St. Cosmus, a position of which he was deprived in 1688. He died in 1720. Dr. Simon Lowth published Historical Collections concerning Ch. Affairs (Lond. 1694, 4to), besides several theological treatises (1672-1704). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.

Lowth, William, D.D., a distinguished English divine, father of bishop Robert Lowth, was born in London Sept. 11, 1661. He was educated at Merchant Taylors' School, whence he was elected to a scholarship at St. John's College, Oxford, in 1675, when not yet 14 years old; became M.A. in 1680, and B.D. in 1686. His Vindication of the Divine Authority of the Old and New Testament (Lond. 1682; 3d edit. with two sermons, Lond. 1821, 12mo.) in answer to Le Clerc's attacks on the inspiration of Scripture, brought him prominently into notice; and the first to favor him was bishop Mew, of Winchester, who had been president of St. John's College, and well knew Lowth's great attainments. He made him his chaplain, and presented him with a prebendal stall in his cathedral at Winchester in 1696, and with the living of Burton and Petersfield in 1699. Dr. Lowth died May 17, 1792. Though less celebrated as a writer than his son, he has added considerably to the character of a profounder scholar, and might, and no doubt would, have attained to as great distinction in the Church as his son had he lived as much in the public eye, and, instead of serving others in the preparation of their works, gone directly before the people himself. So great, indeed, was the recommendation of Lowth, that in all his bishopric, we can be just only after a careful inquiry of the amount and extent of the assistance he furnished to the works of his contemporaries, upon whom Dr. Lowth, having carefully read and annotated almost every Greek and Latin author, whether scholastic or scholastic, especially the latter, dispensed his stores with a most liberal hand. The edition of Clemens Alexandrinus, by Dr. (afterwards archbishop) Potter; that of Josephus, by Hudson; the Ecclesiastical Historians, by Reading (Cambridge); the Bibliotheca Biblica, were all enriched by his notices. His treatment of the Book of Psalms of Durham, during the preparation of his Defence of Christianity from the prophecies of the Old Testament, against the discourse of the "Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion," and in his vindication of the "Defence of Christianity," is considered, held a constant correspondence with him, and consulted him upon many difficulties that occurred in the course of that work. Many other English scholars were also indebted to Dr. William Lowth's labors for important aid. But the most valuable part of his character was that which least appeared in the eyes of the world. His piety, diligence, hospitality, and beneficence rendered his life highly exemplary, and greatly enforced his public exhortations. Besides the Vindication already mentioned above, Dr. Lowth wrote Directions for the profitable Reading of the Holy Scriptures, etc. (1708, 12mo; 7th edit. Lond. 1739, 12mo), an excellent little work, which has gone through many editions; and last, but chiefly, A Commentary on the prophetic Books of the Old Testament, originally published in separate portions (1714-1725), and afterwards collected in a folio volume as a continuation of bishop Patrick's commentary, and generally accompanying the commentary collected severally from Patrick, Whitby, Arnald, and Lowman (best editions of the whole commentary, Lond. 1822, 6 vols. royal 4to; Philad. 1860, 4 vols. imp. 8vo.). See also "Lowth," says Orme (Bibl. Bibl., "is one of the most judicious and accurate commentators; he propounds himself, adheres strictly to the meaning of the inspired writer, and is yet generally evangelical in his interpretations. There is not much appearance of criticism; but the original text and other critical aids were doubtless closely studied by the respectable author. It is often quoted by Scott, and . . . . is pronounced by bishop Cattson the best commentary in the English language." See Life of Dr. William Lowth, by his son, Biol. Brit.; Churchman's Magazine, 1809 (March and April), 781 sq.; Jones, Christian Biog. s. v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibl.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. vii, 74; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.; Kilto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. vol. ii, s. v.

LOYOLA, IGNATIUS OF, ST., or, with his full Spanish name, Don Inigo Lopez de Recale, the founder of the Jesuits, was born in 1491, in the province of Toleti, which was situated not far from Aspeyta, in the Spanish province of Guipuzcoa. He was the youngest of the eleven children of Don Bertand, Señor d'Aguex y de Loyola, and Martina Saez de Balce. His family pride itself on belonging to the ancient, pure nobility of the country, and to families distinguished (1481, 12mo.) which was the origin of the Jesuits. After receiving his first instruction in religion from his aunt, Doña Maria de Guevara, a fervid Catholic, he became a page at the court of Ferdinand the Catholic
Loyola had too great a desire for glory to be satisfied with court life, and, following the example of his brothers, who served in the army, he resolved to become a soldier.

During the first campaign in which he took part he distinguished himself at the siege of Najara, a small town situated on the frontier of Blacaya, the capture of which was partly attributed to his bravery. The siege was not completed when the princes of the order received permission to lay down their arms; but Loyola remained, and the attack was renewed. He was severely wounded in the leg by a cannon ball in both legs. The French, after taking the place, honored his courage, and had him transported on a litter to his native castle of Loyola, which is not far from Pampeluna. As the first operation had not been successful, the leg had to be broken again and to be reset anew. The extreme painfulness of this operation brought on a fever on the eve of the festival of the apostles Peter and Paul, which was thought would prove fatal; but on Tuesday of the following week he described his unexpected recovery to the miraculous aid of the prince of the apostles, who, as he states, appeared to him in a dream, touched him with his hand, and cured him from his fever. But, notwithstanding this belief in his conqueror of the soul, he had the determination not to let the outward world absorb him, to remain a worldly spirit. The recovery proved, however, not to be complete, and Ignatius, in order to get fully restored, had to submit to several other painful operations, in spite of all of which his right leg remained considerably shorter than the other. While his recovery was slowly proceeding, he dictated novels for pastime; but as no books of this class were to be found in the castle, he received in their stead a Life of Jesus Christ and of the Saints. He read this at first without the least interest in the subject, and only because no other book could be found; but gradually his fiery imagination learned how to derive food from this reading, and a determination sprang up to imitate the spiritual combats which he found described in this book, and to excel the saints in heroic deeds. For a time the reviving thirst of glory, and a strong attachment to a lady of the royal court, made him fairly unhappy; but Loyola learned to control these feelings, and soon his ardor for the spiritual combat had so well overcome them, and began the new career upon which he had resolved to enter with a pilgrimage to the convent of Montserrat, famous for the immense concourse of pilgrims from all parts of the world to a miraculous picture of the Virgin Mary. There he received the sign of the cross, and determined to visit his old friend the duke of Najara, and immediately after making the visit dismissed his two servants, and took along the road to Montserrat. There, during three successive days, he made a general confession of all the sins of his life, and took the vow of chastity. Before the picture of the Virgin Mary he held a vigil, hung up his sword and dagger on the altar, and then repaired to Manresa, a small town situated about three leagues from Montserrat, and containing a convent of the Dominican order and a hospital chiefly for pilgrims. Here he desired to live unattached; but the presence of the devil caused him insomnia and doubts concerning the evil spirits, and to be gladdened by visions of the Saviour and the holy Virgin. Gradually he began to settle in his mind, and resolved to labor for the conversion and sanctification of souls. He began to speak in public on religion, and made the first draft of the famous book of the Spiritual Exercises (Exercitia Spiritualia), in the composition of which he claims to have had divine aid. This book has contributed more than any other to the erection of the new papal theocracy which has recently been established, and to the revolution in papal infallibility. It consists of meditations, which are grouped in four divisions or weeks. The first week, after an introductory meditation on the destiny of man and of all created things, occupies itself with sin, its hideousness, and its terrible consequences. The second week has for its object the meditation on the mysteries of the life of Christ, who is represented as being in the highest sense of the word the king by the grace of God, whose call to the spiritual campaign all men have to obey, and in whose service every noble heart will feel itself inspired to noble deeds. In a life-picture of Christ it is shown how man must prove himself in the war for and with Christ. The meditation then turns to the mysteries of incarnation, to the childhood of Jesus, and his retired life in Nazareth. Here the contemplation of the life of Christ is interrupted by the meditation on the two last events: the death and resurrection of Christ. The whole is concluded with a meditation on the love of God. The book was for the first time printed in Rome in 1548, and on July 31 of the same year approved by pope Paul III, and urgently recommended to the faithful. In the hands of the Jesuits this book subsequently became one of the chief instruments which secured the thoroughly military discipline of their order, as well as of their devoted adherents.

After passing ten months in Manresa, Ignatius, in January, 1523, embarked at Barcelona for the Holy Land. He spent a few days in Rome, then went to Venice, where he embarked for Jerusalem on July 14, and arrived there on September 4. It was his wish to remain here, in order to labor for the conversion of the people of the East; but the provincial of the Franciscan monks, who had been authorized by the pope either to retain or to release the pilgrims, did not allow him to stay. Accordingly, he had to return to Europe, and arrived in Venice in January, 1524. In March he was again on Spanish soil, and having become convinced during his voyage of the importance of a literary education for the accomplishment of his plans, he entered, although 33 years old, a grammar-school at Barcelona, where he studied, in particular, the elements of Latin. Two years later he went, with three disciples whom he had gained at Barcelona, to the University of Alcala, which a short time before had been founded by cardinal Ximenes. Here he was, with his companions, imprisoned for six weeks, by order of the Inquisition, for giving religious instruction without special authorization. After being released, he went, at the advice of the archbishop of Toledo, to the University of Salamanca to continue his studies. But, when there, he had new difficulties with the Inquisition; he resolved to leave Spain, and, not accompanied by any of his disciples, went to the University of Paris, where he studied from February, 1528, to the end of March, 1558, and on March 14, 1558, obtained the title of master of arts. Here his plan was fully matured to establish a society of men who might aid him in carrying on his devotional ideas. The first who was gained for the plan was Pierre de Vertre (Petron Faber), who for some time had been his tutor in his phil-
Omphal. studies. The second was Francis Xavier, a young nobleman of Novara. Soon after they were joined by the Spaniards Jacob Lainez, Alphonse Salmeron, and Nicholas Alphonse Bobadilla, and the Portuguese Simon Rodriguez d’Azoa. For the first time they were called together by Ignatius in July, 1554. On August 15, on the festival of the assumption of the Virgin Mary, he took the title of the Order of the Spiritual perpetuity of the Name of Jesus, of the Church of the Apostles. He also residing near Paris, where, having received the communion from the hands of Lefévre, the only priest in their midst, they all, with a loud voice, took the solemn vow to make a voyage to Jerusalem, in order to labor for the conversion of the infidels of that Holy Land; to quit all they had in the world besides what they indispensably needed for the voyage; and in case they should find it impossible either to reach Palestine or remain there, to throw themselves at the feet of the pope, offer him their services, and go wherever he might send them. As several members of the company had not yet finished their theological studies, it was agreed that they should remain at the university until January 25, 1557. Ignatius in the meanwhile undertook to labor against the further progress of the Reformation in France; his ascetic practices soon bore fruit in his health. On the advice of his physician, he had to return to his native land, where he soon recovered. On Jan. 6, 1557, he was met at Venice by all his companions, who, after his departure from Paris, had been joined by Claude le Jay, Jean Codure, and Pasquier Brunet. Two months later all the members of the society were sent by Ignatius to Rome, he himself remaining at Venice, as he believed the influential cardinal Caraffa (subsequently pope Paul IV) to be unfriendly to him. The pope, Paul III, received the companions of Ignatius favorably, and gave them permission to be ordained priests by any bishop of the Catholic Church. As the war between Venice and the sultan made it impossible for Ignatius to go with his companions to Palestine, Ignatius, who had again united all the members of the society at Venice, resolved to go with Lefèvre and Lainez to Rome, in order to place the services of his society at the disposal of the pope. Before separating, Ignatius instructed all his companions, in case they were asked who they were, and to what society they belonged, to reply that they belonged to the Society of Jesus, as they had united for a combat against heresy and vice under the banner of Jesus Christ. On his journey to Rome, Ignatius claimed to have had another vision in the lonely, decayed sanctuary of Storia, about six miles from Rome, and to have received a direct promise of divine aid and protection. At Rome Ignatius succeeded in gaining the entire confidence of the pope. A charge of heresy and sorcery, which a personal enemy brought against him, was easily refuted, but it was found more difficult to overcome the opposition to his projected order from three cardinals, by whose advice the pope was chiefly guided. But, undaunted by this great obstacle, as he continued his fruitful and reverend to the Church of God, he was finally received and received a unanimous vote. He at first declined to accept; but when, at a second election, he was again found to be the unanimous choice of his brethren, and when his confessor, the Franciscan monk father Theodore, urged him not to resist the call of God, he yielded to the voice of the same; but the Hamburg magistracy neglected to institute the investigation usual in cases of sudden death. His theological works are numerous, and many
be found in Sandius, Bibil. Antitrin. (Freist. 1864), with the exception of the Historiae Reformatoriae Poloniæ, published in 1860 at Freist. In the course of his secular works, his Theatr um Comœticum has a worldwide celebrity. See Engl. Cyclop. a. v.; Krasański, Hist. Ref. in Poland, ii, chap. xiv; Fock, Der Socinianismus (Kiel, 1847).

Lu'bitim (Heb. Lubim, לבקה, from the Arab., signifying inhabitants of a thirty land, Nab. iii, 9; "Lubim," b2 chron. xi, 8; xvii, 8; also "Lubim," לבק, "Libyans," Dan. xi, 43; Sept. everywhere Aββmocε, the Libyans, always joined with the Egyptians and Ethiopians, being the principal of the countries, contributing, together with Damascus and Sakkout to Shishak's hay; Gen. xix, 13; Jer. viii, 9; and apparently as forming with Cushites the bulk of Zerzâb's army (xvi, 8); spoken of by Nahum (iii, 9) with Put or Phut, as helping No-Amon (Thebes), of which Cush and Egypt were the strength; and by Daniel (xi, 43) as paying court with the Cushites to a conqueror of Egypt or the Egyptians. These particular indications are African nations under tribute to Egypt, if not under Egyptian rule, contributing, in the 10th century B.C., valuable aid in mercenaries or auxiliaries to the Egyptian armies, and down to Nahum's time, and a period with Damascus and Sakkout to Shishak's hay. See Antiochus Epiphanes [see Antiochus IV], adding, either politically or commercially, to sustain the Egyptian power, or, in the last case, dependent on it. These indications do not fix the geographical position of the Lubim. The location of the Cushites and the Egyptians shows that the territory was near Egypt, either to the west or south. For more precise information we look to the Egyptian monuments, upon which we find representations of a people called Rebu or Learu [Rah and Lintu being the same in hieroglyphics], who cannot be doubted to correspond to the Libyans. These Rebu were a warlike people, with whom Memphith (the son and successor of Ramesses II) and Ramesses III, who both ruled in the 18th century B.C., waged successful wars. The latter king routed them with much slaughter. The sculptures of the great temple he raised at Thebes, now called that of Medinet Habû, gave us representations of the Rebu, showing that they were fair, and of what is called a Semitic type, like the Berbers and Kabyles. They are distinguished as northern, that is, as parallel to, or north of, Lower Egypt. Of their being African there can be no reasonable doubt, although they may assign to the Berber in the Mediterranean, commencing not far to the westward of Egypt. We do not find them to have been mercenaries of Egypt from the monuments, but we know that the kindred Mashawasha-u were employed by the Bubastite family, to which Shishak and probably Zerah also belong; and it is not unlikely that the warlike races intended by the Libim, used in a more generic sense than Rebu, in the Biblical mention of the armies of these kings (Brugsch, Geogr. Inschr. ii, 79 sq.). We have already shown that the Luubim are probably the Mizraite Lehabim; if so, their so-called Semitic physical characteristics, as represented on the Egyptian monuments, afford evidence of great importance for the inquirer into primeval history. The mention in Mancheo's Dynasties that, under Necherophes, or Nechrochis, the first philosopher, and head of the third dynasty (B.C. c. 2600), the Libyans revolted from the Egyptians, but returned to their allegiance through fear, on a wonderful increase of the moon, may refer to the Lubim, but may as well relate to some other African people, perhaps the Naphthuim, or Phut (Put). The historian Heliodorus, in his description of the world, thus led us to place the seat of the Lubim, or primitive Libyans, on the African coast to the westward of Egypt, perhaps extending far beyond Cyrenaica. From the earliest ages of which we have any record, a stream of colonization has flowed from the East along the coast of Africa, extending to the rainy zone, and the fertile plains of the Mediterranean, where the Libim have a common name of Libyans from the Lubim. They seem to have been first reduced by the Egyptians about B.C. 1250, and to have afterwards been driven inland by the Phoenicians and Greek colonists. Now, they still remain on the northern confines of the Great Desert, and even within it, and in the mountains, while their later Semitic rivals pasture their flocks in the rich plains. Many are as the Arab tribes of Africa, one great tribe, that of the Beni 'All, extends from Egypt to Morocco, illustrating the probable extent of the territory of the Libim and their cognates. It is possible that in Ezek. xxxvii, 14, the Libim should be understood for Cushites. Finally, there is no other instance of the use of this form: as, however, לבק and לבק are used for one people, apparently the Mizraite Lubim, most probably kindred to the Lubim, this objection is not conclusive. See Curs; Ludim. In Jer. xiv, 9, the A.V. renders Phut 'the Libyans;' and in Ezek. xxxvii, 5, 'Lubya.' See Libya.

Lubin, Augustin, a French monk, was born in Paris Jan. 29, 1564; was early admitted to the Order of Malines; Reformed Augustinians; and died at Bourges, and assistant general at Rome. He died at Paris March 7, 1656. Lubin had a special knowledge of all the benefits of France and the abbey of Italy. He published many learned works on ancient geography; among which the most distinguished are: L'Abbé Saccus Geographicus (Paris, 1670)—Martyrology Romanum, cum tabulis geographicas et notis historicis (Paris, 1660)—Tabulae geographicae pour les Vies des hommes illustres de Plutarque, dressées sur la tradition de l'Abbé Tolemon (Paris, 1761)—Clé de l'ordre de St. Desiré, etc. See Dupin, Auteurs ecclésiast. de l'église et secr. siècle; Journal des Savants, 1695, p. 220.

Lubin, Billard, one of the most learned Protetants of his time, was born at Westersted, in Oldenburg, March 24, 1556, of which place his father was minister. He was educated first at Leipzig, where he prosecuted his studies with great success, and for further improvement went thence to Cologne. After this he visited the several universities of Helmstedt, Strasburg, Jena, Marburg, and, last of all, Rostock, where he was made professor of poetry in 1580, and ten years later was advanced to the dignity of quillor, containing all the names of the abbey, of their founders, their situation, etc. (Paris, 1671); etc. See Dupin, Auteurs ecclésiast. du dix-septième siècle; Journal des Savants, 1695, p. 220.

Lubin, Giovanni Battista, an Italian prelate, was born at Venetia, and became a Franciscan, but was driven hence by poverty to the highest stations in the Church. He became referendary of the two signatures, and auditor of pope Innocent XI, who appointed him cardinal Sept. 1, 1681. Before entering the Church Luca had been a lawyer, and treaties on jurisprudence form the greater part of his works. He died at Rome Feb. 3, 1688. His Theàtrum Veritatis et Justinis (1697, 7 vols.)
treats of canon and civil law, and was very highly es
terated. Among his remaining works are the follow

Lucanus or Lucullus, a disciple of Marcius and the Gnostic, flourished in the latter part of the second century. He denied the reality of the body of Christ, as well as the immateriality and immortality of the soul. He regarded the souls of animals as of the same kind with those of men, and allowed the resurrection of the former. He is known to have been the author of numerous forgeries. Among his works, the History of the Virgin Mary, the Protevangelium, or History of James, the Gospel of Nicodemus. He seems to have been the same heretic who is sometimes called Lucius, Leucius, Lucius, Leutius, Leonius, Leutius, Seleucus, Charinus, Neocharinus, Neocharus, and Leonidas. — Faber, Ec/. Diss. De a. v. See Schaff, Ch. Hist. i. 245. See LucaS, St.

Lucarius, Cyriacus. See Cyril, Lucar.

Lucas (Anaxius, Vulg. Lucas), a friend and companion of Justin. He is mentioned in his impartial epitome (Philem. 24). A.D. 57. He is doublets the same as Luke, the beloved physician, who is associated with Demas in Col. iv. 14, and who remained faithful to the apostle when others forsook him (2 Tim. iv. 11), on his first examination before the emperor. For the grounds of his identification with the evangelist Luke, see the article Luke.

Lucas de Tuy (ot Tudens), a Spanish theologian and writer, was born at Leon, where he became cano of St. Isidore, and was afterwards appointed deacon of Tuy, in Galicia. In 1277 he made a journey to Jeru

salern, saw pope Gregory IX in Italy, and also the gen
eral council of Rhodes. In 1279 he was appointed bishop of Tuy in 1299, and died in 1320. He wrote a Chronicle of Spain, extending from 670 to 1236 (pub
lished by Schott in his Spec. Ill., Francia, 1663, fol., vol. iv), and a Vita et historia translationis S. Isidori, which is reproduced in the article on that saint in the Acta Sanctorum, April 4. The second part of this work, which does not at all relate to St. Isidore, is a passionate and superstitious attack on the Cathari (q. v.); valu
able, however, for its information concerning some cus
toms of that sect in the south of France and in Spain. This part of Lucas's work was published separately by the Mariana, under the inappropriate title of Libri tres de altera vita sibi et dilecti contra Albigenianos erros (Inglot. 1613, 4to; reprinted in the Biblioth. Patr. Mariana, xxxv, 188, and in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Collogani, xiii, 282). Lucas also rejected as heretical the view which afterwards obtained of the three persons of the Trinity being of different ages, and asserted, contrariety to the then prevailing notion, that Christ ought not to be represented as crucified with the feet crossed, but with the feet side by side, each pierced with a separate nail—Hering, Diet.-Encycl. iv, 555. (J.N.P.)

Lucas, Francis (Brukensia), one of the ablest of the Roman Catholic theologians of the 6th century, was born at Bruges in 549. He studied theology at Louvain, and became at once celebrated for his knowl
edge of the sacred languages and their cognate dialects. In 606 he was appointed archdeacon and dean of the cathedral of St. Omer, and there he remained until his death, Feb. 13, 616. As the fruits of his great scholar
ship he has left us mainly works of value in Biblical theology. The following deserve special mention: (1) the edition of the Biblia Regia (brought out by Plantin, the famous printer of Antwerp, under the auspices of Philip the Fair, in 1512), which Lucas supervised. But the work by which he is principally known is (2) his Commentarius de Quatuor Evangelia (Antw. 1606), which was completed by Suppleimentum Comment. in Luc. et

Lucius (Antw. 1612, 1616), a commentary of no ordinary mer it. " Entirely passing by, or alluding in the briefest manner to the mystical sense, and omitting all doctr

inal discussions, he explains clearly and concisely the literal meaning, illustrating it frequently from the Greek and Latin fathers, as well as from later writers of au
thority, though never burdening his pages with any confirmatory citations. His plan is a systematic one, and judiciously carried out. He chooses one sense, and that the one which the sacred writer appeared to have had in view, and briefly expounds and illustrates that, never distracting his readers with varying interpretations only mentioned. Lucas had not mean critical ability, and his knowledge of Greek, Hebrew, and Syrian was exact and trustworthy. A truly devotional spirit breathes through the whole." (3) Notitiae in Sacr. Bibl. (Antw. 1605-83), with a careful summary of the various readings, which were also appended to the edi
tion of the Vulgate that appeared from the press of Plantin with Emmanuel Sa's notes (Antw. 1624), under the title Fr. Luca, Roman, correct. in Bibl. Latina. loc. imagin.


Lucius, Richard, an English clergyman and mora
list, was born in 1646 in Radnorshire, Wales, entered Jesus College, Oxford, in 1664, and, after taking his degree, was for some time engaged in teaching. He finally entered the ministry, and became vicar of St. Stephen's, Coleman Street, London, in 1688. In 1696 he became prebend of Westminster. Blindness afflicted him in his later years. He died in June, 1715, at Lon

don. He published a number of occasional works (1669-1704; 3d ed. 1710, 2 vols.; 1712-16, 17, 3 vols.; and 2d ed. 1722, 8 vols.). Among his devotional tracts the following are highly recommended by such critics as Knox, dean Stanhope, bishop Jebb, Sir Rich
ard Steele, and Dr. Daniel Dodgson; because he was a

lucius. (1865, 2 vols.): —Practical Christianilty, or an Account of the Holiness which the Gospel enjoins, with the Motives to it, etc. (5th ed. 1700; last ed. 1888). See Wood, Ath. Oozon.; Allibone, Diet. of Authors, a v.

Lucas, Abraham, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Northville, Long Island, N. Y., March 13, 1791; studied at Union College, and at Edinburgh. He took a de
gree in theology with the Rev. Jonathan Hunting, of Southold, and Rev. Dr. Aaron Woolworth, of Bridgehampton, L. L., and also with Prof. Porter, of Andover, Mass. In 1812 he was licensed by the Long Island Presbytery, and in 1813 was ordained pastor of the church at Weshamption. He was chosen for three consecutive years to represent Pres
bytery in the General Assembly, and was a great many times elected moderator. He died Oct. 23, 1865. Mr. Lucas was a man of fine abilities, and superior as an ex
ecutive officer. He held a high place in the esteem and confidence of his ministerial brethren, and was always placed first on responsible commissions and committees. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Alm. 1867, p. 311.

Lucernarium (Lukerins), a name given to the evening service of the ancient Church, because ere it began it was usually dusk, and the place to be lighted up with lamps. See Bingham, Antiqu. Chris

rus Church, bk. xii., ch. ix., § 7. See Hoefner, Gen. Hist. ix., § 2.

Lucia, Sr., a Roman Catholic saint of the 8th or the beginning of the 4th century, is said to have been of a noble Sicilian family. Her legendary history is as fol

ows. Having gone on a pilgrimage with her mother to the grave of St. Agatha for the restoration of the last

er's health, she was to be resolved to become a nun. Her mother assured, but she was engaged to marry, angry at her resolution, denounced her as a Christian. She acknowledged the truth of the charge
when brought before the judges, and was condemned to ear a brothel; but when Pascasius gave the order to take her thence it was found impossible to move her from the spot, even though yokes of oxen were employed to draw her. Pascasius now attempted to burn her, and had boiling pitch and oil poured on her, but in vain; he then ran her through with a sword, when she prophesied the downfall of Diocletian, the death of Maximian, and the arrest and death of Pascasius. She died after partaking of the body of the Lord, and on the spot a church was afterwards erected. Her life is contained in Laurentius Servius's De probatis Sanctorum historia, Dec. 13, and in a number of martyrologies, but it has often been a subject of debate whether her death was during the reign of Diocletian or of Galerius. She is therefore not found in the Acta Sanctorum. She is commemorated on Dec. 13.—Hertzog, Real Encyclop. viii, 496; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen Lexikon, a. v.

Lucian (Ανεωνίας), a celebrated Greek rhetorician, the Voltaire of Greek literature, was born at Samosata, a city on the west bank of the Euphrates, in the Syrian province of Commagene. We possess no particulars regarding his life on which any reliance can be placed except a few scattered notices in his own writings. From these it appears that he was born about the later part of the 2nd century (A.D. 167). He lived under both the Antonines and died about the end of the 2nd century. His parents, who were in humble circumstances, placed him with his maternal uncle, a sculptor, in order to learn statuary; but he soon quitted this trade, and applied himself to the study of the law. However, he afterwards abandoned law and devoted himself to letters, but, not meeting with much success in this profession, he resolved to settle in Gaul as a teacher of rhetoric, where he soon obtained great celebrity and numerous scholars. He appears to have remained in Gaul till he was about forty, when he gave up the profession of rhetoric, after having acquired considerable wealth. During the remainder of his life we find him travelling about from place to place, and visiting successively Macedonia, Cappadocia, PaphLAGoria, and Bithynia. The greater part of his time, however, was passed in Athens, where he lived on terms of the greatest intimacy with Demosthenes, a philosopher of great celebrity, and where he probably wrote most of his works, which principally consist of attacks upon the religion and philosophy of his age. Towards the latter part of his life he held a lucrative public office in Egypt, which was bestowed upon him by Emperor Probus. Lucian tells us, "the government gave me ten to death by dogs for his attack on the Christian religion rests on no credible authority, and was probably invented by Suidas, who appears to have been the earliest to relate it. The writings of Lucian, in the form of dialogue, are in a remarkably pure and elegant Greek style, free from the false ornaments and artificial rhetoric which characterize most of the writings of his contemporaries. Modern critics have usually given him his full meed of praise for these excellences, and have also deservedly admired the keenness of his wit, his great talent as a writer, and the inimitable ease and flow of his dialogue; but they have seldom done him the justice he deserves. They have either represented him as merely a witty and amusing writer, but without any further merit, or else they have attacked him as an immoral and indelicate satirist, or as a contemptible person of mean qualities and manners. We are endeavor to expose all kinds of delusion, fanaticism, and imposture; the quackery and imposition of the priests, the folly and absurdity of the superstitious, and especially the solemn nonsense, the prating insouciance, and the immoral lives of the philosophical charlatans of his day (see his Deaceron). Lucian may, in fact, be regarded as the Aristophanes of his age, and, like the great comic poet, he had recourse to raillery and satire to accomplish the great objects he had in view. His study was human nature in all its phases, and he at all times in which he lived furnished ample materials for his observation. Many of his pictures, though drawn from the circumstances of his own days, are true for every age and country. As an instance of this, we mention the essay entitled On those who serve the Great for Hire. If he sometimes discloses the follies and vices of mankind too freely, and occasionally uses expressions which are revolting to our ideas of morality, it should be recollected that every author ought to be judged by his standard of religion and morality. The character of Lucian's mode of life was entirely practical; he was not disposed to believe anything without sufficient evidence of its truth, and nothing that was ridiculous or absurd escaped his raillery and sarcasm. The tales of the poets respecting the attributes and exploits of the gods, which were still firmly believed by the common people of his age, were especially the objects of his satire and ridicule in his dialogues and in many other of his works. That he should have attacked the Christians in common with the false systems of the pagan religions will not appear surprising to any one who considers the tenets that Lucian probably never took the trouble to inquire into the nature of the religion which he so constantly and universally despised in his time by the higher orders of society, who did, indeed, visit with ridicule all religious beliefs. Says Gibbon (Harper's "ed", i, 86), "We may be well assured that a writer conversant with the history and character of his country to public ridicule had they not already been the objects of secret contempt among the polished and enlightened orders of society." Volterraus, indeed, affirmed, without stating his authority, that Lucian apostatized from Christianity, and was accustomed to say he had gained nothing by it but the corruption of his name from Lucius to Lucianus. So also the scholiast on the Perigrinus calls him παραλογιαρχη, while the scholiasts on the Vera Historia and other pieces frequently apostrophize him in the blisteriest terms, and make the most facetious and absurd charges against him of ridiculing the Scriptures. These accusations of blasphemy, however, could be made only against an apostate, and such, it is now well established, Lucian was not. Born of pagan parents, he led the life of a pagan philosopher of the 2nd century, when, as Gibbon says, "A famous youth of extraordinary and grave manners, who, from ignorance of the Christian religion, has been led to venerate and misrepresent it. The charge might be urged with some color against Lucian if it could be shown that he was the author of the dialogue entitled Philopatris. A meering tone pervades the whole piece, which betrays so intimate a knowledge of Christianity that it could hardly have been written but by one who had been at some time within the pale of the Church. Some eminent critics, and among them Fabricius (Bibl. Gracca, v, S04 [ed. Harles]), have held Lucian accountable for this production, but it is now pretty generally admitted not from him, but from some lost work of the same author, Descriptio versus de Animae in De Atalante et Auctore Philopatride, in which it is shown that the piece could not have been Lucian's; and many considerations are brought forward which render it very probable that the work was composed in the reign of Julian the Apostate. Compare Neander, Church History, ii, 89, note 5.)

The works of Lucian may be divided into, I, RHEITORICAL.—Πείρα τον μυεας, Somnium seu Vita Luci-Ani: Προδοτος, Herodotus surre Actionis; Ζευς, ζευς ιτε Λιοκλής; Αρμονία, Harmonia; Σεβασμος ι Προδοτος, Ουπάτος, Ουπάτος ι Διάνσος, Bacchus; Προδοτος.
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Contemplation, is a very elegant dialogue, but of a graver turn than the preceding; it is a picture of the smallness of mankind when viewed in proportion to the universe. A philosophical essay on the nature of Contemplative thought. The Epistle to Dr. JOHN STUART, 1737, which by many was considered a masterpiece of the philosophical age. The Katalogus Tres Tyrannus, is, in fact, a dialogue of the dead. "Omnium hoc Athenis, Somnium seu Gallus, justly reckoned among the best of Lucian's. Die Caryophyllaceae, as Aesop in America, so called from Lucian's being admired by Rhetoric and Dialogue, is chiefly valuable for the information it contains of the author's life and literary pursuits. We may here also mention the Knoteon, Cronos-Solon, and the Empylius Knoyunc, which turn on the institution and custody of the Saturnalia. Among the dialogues which may be regarded as mere pieces of burlesque or satire, no polychemical tendency, may be reckoned Erastus, Eunomoi Dieiologos, Dialogi Meretrici, and Poetae et Educi, Navigium seu Vota. Among the dialogues which cannot be placed in any of the above three classes are the Eileis, Imagines, which some suppose to have been addressed to a concubine of Verus, and which Wieland conjectures to have been intended for the wife of Marcus Antoninus; Tyger Wov Bivcat, Pro Imaginibus, a defence of the preceding, with the flattery of which the lady who was the subject of it pretended to be pleased. True Taros, True Athenians, An Answer to the Ideas of the Egyptians, an attack upon the Greek gymnasia; Piri Erevsius, De Salvatone: this is hardly worthy of Lucian, but contains some curious particulars of the art of dancing among the ancients. Miliarus proo Eunio, Dionysus in Athens, with a long and curious history, is not doubted. VI. MISCELLANEOUS PIECES.—These bear in their form some analogy to the modern essay: Piro tov eikontos Prumastas, In Lyno, and Ad eaxi qui subs Seyrat Promeneutheus and E Verba; Piri Sow, De Sacrificiis, against the absurdities of the heathen worship, and especially of the Egyptian. Piri tov uvmv svon, De Areopag Conduictis; Apollon proo Tov wos, De Merc Com. Cond; Tyger eir eirh prapapirgma naiomatos, Pro Lyra in Salutando, a playful little piece, though containing some curious learning. Piri vpsos, De Lucu, in opposition to the received opinions of the infernal regions. Piro avgisthotev, Adereus Isolocot, is a bitter attack upon a rich man who thought to acquire a character for learning by collecting a large library. Piri tov mpv eirevna denvvov, Non temere credimus, a piece of the most decided nature. In 1679 Charles published the first edition of the collection, with some additions. In 1685 he published the second edition, with some of the dialogues: it was reprinted in 1686 and 1751. The best German translation of Lucian has been furnished by Wieland (Leips. 1786, 6 vols. 8vo). The notes accompanying it are also valuable; but the translator left out one piece which held an interest of a minor nature. Another good translation is by Park (Stoughton, 1828-1831, 15 vols. 12mo). See, besides the authorities already quoted, Jacob, Charactaristik Lucian's v. Samosata (1832); Tiemann, Versuch u. Lucian und seine Philosophie (1884); Struve, Specimenis an a Aetate et vita Luciani (1829-30); Fowkes, Lucianus u. d. Ghot; Tschirchimer, Fall des Heidenkultus, § 815 sqq.; Baur, Die drei ersten Jahrhunderte, p. 895 sqq., nondem, Greek Literature, ch. i, § 8 and 4; Ladner, Works, viii, ch. xix; Farrar, Crit. Hist. Free Thought, p. 44 sqq.; Lond. Qu. Rev. 1821; Fraser's Magazine, 1859; Journal Soc. Hist. Rev., ch. xix; especially Planck, in Studien u. Kritiken, 1851, and in an English version in the Biblioth. Sacra, 1885 (April and July); Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biogr. and Mythol, iii, 812, and the excellent article by Theodor Keim, in Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, vi, 504 sqq.

Lucian, St., presbyter of Antioch, and a martyr, is said by some to have been born at Samosata, in the Syrian province of Commagene, about the middle of the 2d century. His parents died while he was yet a boy, and, left to depend upon his own resources, the twelve-year-old lad removed to Edessa, where he remained and became a pupil of Macarius, an eminent Biblical schol-
Lucian was a prolific writer of religious, philosophical, and political satires, often using the guise of a commentator or a historian to critique his contemporaries. In his work, he frequently employed the persona of a travelling and itinerant sage, a type of character that was popular in the Hellenistic world. This allowed him to comment on the social and political issues of his time without being directly associated with any particular faction. Lucian was also known for his innovative use of the novel form, which he developed for the first time in his work "On the Precepts of the Gourmets" ("De Consuetudine Gourmetorum"). His works reflect a deep understanding of the cultures of his time and his ability to weave together elements of mythology, philosophy, and contemporary issues in a way that was both entertaining and thought-provoking. Lucian's writings have been influential in the development of humor and satire in literature and have continued to be a source of inspiration for modern authors. His legacy as a master of comic writing End.
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starsignifiesthesamekindorprince(Numb.xxvii. 17;comp.Bayle,loc.cit.v.29;xxviii.16).Delitzschadoptsthesameview(Commentad.loc.).

"Inanotherandhighersembler,however,thedesignation wasapplicabletohiminwhompromisefallintointotallycorresponded,anditissoappliedbyJesuswhenthespiritstyleshimself"TheMorningStar."(Rev.xxii.16).Inacertainsenseitisthelessofallthosewhodestroyledoregnedwithhim.(Rev.ii.29)."SeeStar.

Lucifer, bishop of Caecilis, in Sardinia, surnamed Caloricus, a noted character in ecclesiastical history, the founder of an independent sect known as Luciferians, flourished about the middle of the 4th century. At the Council of Milan, held in 344, he appeared as joint legate with Eusebius of Vercelli from pope Liberus, and here he displayed great opposition to the Arian beliefs. He refused to hold any communion with the clergy who had, during the reign of Constantius, con formed to the Arian doctrines, although it had been determined in a synod at Alexandria, in 362, to receive again into the Church all the Arian clergy who openly acknowledged their errors, and was, in consequence, imprisoned for a time, and finally banished. He took up his residence in Syria, but here also became involved in disputes, and greatly increased the disorders which agitated the Church at Antioch by his ordination of Paulinus as bishop in opposition to Meletius. Disapproved of by his former friends, he retired in disgust to his native island, and there founded an independent sect, whose distinguishing tenet was that of Arian bishop, and no bishop who had in any measure yielded to the Arians, even although he repented and confessed his errors, could enter the bosom of the Church without the participation of the protector of Rome (B.C. 387; all 190, 15, 10--24). The whole form of the letter—the mention of the consuls, the description of the consuls by the praenomen, the omission of the senate and of the date (comp. Wernsdorff, DeindeMoor. §caul.)—shows that it cannot be an accurate copy of the original document; but there is nothing in the substance of the letter which is open to just suspicion. Josephus adds this information in the letter of "Lucius" in his account of Simon, but gives one very similar in contents (Ant.xiv.8,5), as written on the motion of Lucius Valerius in the ninth (nineteenth) year of Hyrcanus II; and unless the two letters and the two missions which led to them were purposely assimilated, which is not wholly improbable, it must be supposed that he has been guilty of a strange oversight in removing the incident from its proper place.

The imperfect transcription of the name has led to some confusion. Luciukleida of a male name, is the three consequences:--

1. (Lucius) FuriusPhilus(therista,Clouta,FustiHoll. iii,114,givesP.FuriusPhilus,whowasnotconsultill B.C.186,andisthereforeatonceexcluded.(2.)Lucius CæciliusMetellusCalvus,whowasconsultillB.C.142, and immediately after to Judah and the Hebrews. See supposition it might seem not unlikely that the answer which Simon received to an application for proco
tion, which he made to Rome directly on his assumption of power (comp. 1 Macc. xiv. 17, 18) in the consularship of Metellus, has been combined with the answer to the later embassy of Numenius (1 Macc. xiv. 24; xv. 18). But the third identification with Lucius Calpurnius Piso, who was consul B.C. 159, is most probably correct. The date exactly corresponds, and, though the province of Lucius Calpurnius Piso is not easily determined beyond all question, the balance of evidence is decidedly against the common lists. The Fasti Capitolini are defective for this year, and only give a fragment of the name of Popillius, the fellow-consul of Calpurnius. Cassiodorus (Chron., as edited, p. 106 ed. Conp. Calpurnius, but the eye of the scribe (if the reading is correct) was probably misled by the names in the years immediately before. On the other hand, Valerius Maximus (i. 8) is wrongly quoted from the printed text as giving the same prenomen. The passage in which the name occurs is in reality no part of Valerius Maximus, but a piece of the abstract of Julius Parius inserted in the text. Of eleven MSS. of Valerius which have been examined, it occurs only in one (Mus. Brit. Burn. 209), and there the name is given Lucius Calpurnius, as it is given by Mal. In a collection of Fasti Capitolini (Soc. j. F. Vind. Comenius, 7). Significantly rightly (Fasti Capitolini, p. 207): "Cassiodorus prodit consuls Cn. Plonium...epictoma L. Calpurnium." The chance of an error of transcription in Julius Parius is obviously less than in the Fasti of Cassiodorus; and even if the evidence were equal, the author of the Fasti of Cassiodorus might rightly be urged as decisive in such a case.

Lucius of Adrianople (or Hadrianople), an Eastern prelate of note, flourished as bishop of Adrianople in the 4th century. Decisively orthodox in his opinions, the predominant and powerful Arians deposèd him from his see, and in 340 or 341 we meet him at Rome before pope Julius I pleading for his restoration. Although he was soon back with a deacon in the Roman pontiff to reseat the deposed orthodox bishop, the Oriental prelates refused to recognise the papal authority, and he did not recover his see until the emperor Constantius, constrained by the threats of his brother Constanta, then emperor of the West, restored Lucius (about 347). Upon the death of Constans (350), Lucius was again deposèd by the infuriated Arians, and banished. He died in exile. He is commemorated in the Roman Church February 11. See Athanasius, A po l o g y, de Pugia sua, c. 8; Arianor. ad Monach. c. 19; Socrates, Histor. eccles. c. 21, 26; Euseb. Hist. eccl., lib. ii, cap. 519; Smith, Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biog. and Myth, ii, 825.

Lucius of Alexandria, an Arian prelate, flourished about the middle of the 4th century. He was elected patriarch by the Arians, when, upon the death of the emperor Constantius (361) and the murder of the Arian patriarch, George of Cappadocia, Athanasius had recovered the patriarchate of Alexandria, and expelled the Arians from the churches. Even in the lifetime of Athanasius the two patriarchates wrangled much for authority, but the contest became fierce between Arian and Orthodox after the deathe of Athanasius (378). The latter had nominated his successor without any regard to Lucius, and it was only after the deposition and imprisonment of Peter, the nominee, who had in the mean while been ordained, that Lucius regained the patriarchate, to hold it only until Peter, who had made his escape to Rome, returned with letters confirming his ordination (A.D. 377 or 378). Lucius was, in all probability, never again restored. In 380 he is found in company with Demophilus, Arian patriarch of Constantinople, just as he was withdrawing from the city by order of expulsion. Nothing more is known of Lucius. According to Jerome, he wrote Sollemnes de Paschate (which is mentioned in a later list of his works). See also Hiero. Ep. Eccl. cit., liii, 4; iv, 21 sqq., 24, 37; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 471; Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, ix, 247; Labbe, Concilii, vol. vi, col. 818; Smith, Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biog., ii, 928.

Lucius (Labeo, for Latin Lucius, a common Roman name), surname the Cyrenian (i.e., Kypriakos, "of Cyrene"), thus distinguished by the name of his city—the capital of a Greek colony in Northern Africa, and remarkable for the number of its Jewish inhabitants—is first mentioned in the N.T. in company with Barnabas, Simeon called Niger, Manaen, and Saul, who were with Paul at Antioch (Acts xiii, 1). A.D. 44. These honored disciples having, while engaged in the office of common worship, received commandment from the Holy Ghost to set apart Barnabas and Saul for the special service of the Gentiles, Paul, proceeding from this, to be called to their hands upon them. This is the first recorded instance of a formal ordination to the office of evangelist, but it cannot be supposed that so solemn a commission would have been given to any but such as had themselves been ordained to the ministry of the Word, and we may therefore assume that Lucius and his companions were already of that number. Whether Lucius was one of the seventy disciples, as stated by Pseudo-Hippolytus, is quite a matter of conjecture, but it is highly probable that he formed one of the congregation to whom Peter preached in the house of the woman at Joppa (Acts, i. 12, 21), though there can hardly be a doubt that he was one of "the men of Cyrene" who, being "scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen," went to Antioch preaching the Lord Jesus (Acts xii, 19, 20).

In the Apostolical Constitutions, vii, 46, it is stated that Paul made Lucius bishop of Hierapolis, which is probably a mere inference from the supposition that the epistle to the Romans was written from that Corinthian port. Different traditions make Lucius the first bishop of Cyrene and of Laodicea, in Syria.—Smith, a.v.

It is commonly supposed that Lucius is the kinsman of Paul mentioned by that apostle as joining with him in his salutation to the Roman brethren (Rom. xvi, 21). A.D. 55. There is, however, no sufficient reason for regarding him as identical with Luke the Evangelist, though this opinion was apparently held by Origen (ad loc.), and is supported by Calmet, as well as by Wetstein, who adds in confirmation of it the fact reported by Herodotus (iii, 121), that the Cyrenienses had throughout Greece a great reputation as physicians. But it must be observed that the names are clearly distinct. The missionary companion of Paul was not Lucius, but Luke; the former is described by Paul as "a beloved physician," a name by which he was known in three different epistles (Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 11; Phil. 214), is never referred to as a relation. Again, it is hardly probable that Luke, who suppresses his own name as the companion of Paul, would have mentioned it among the names of the "seven bishops and prophets and teachers at Antioch." Olshausen, indeed, asserts confidently that the notion of Luke and Lucius being the same person has nothing whatever to support it (Clark's Theol. Lib. iv, 515). See Luke.

Lucius, king of England, said to have introduced Christianity into Britain in the second half of the 2d century. See England, Church of (I).

Lucius, Samuei, etc. See Lute.

Lucius I, pope, succeeded Cornelius as bishop of Rome, after the death of the latter, in Sept. 253. He was soon after banished from Rome, but returned, and is spoken of as a martyr as early as March, 258. There seems, however, to be no precise information as to the length of his pontificate. Nicetopaurus (H. Ev. vii. 7) states that he held the office six months; Eusebius (H. Ev. vii. 2) says eight; and the Liber Pontificalis about eight months, which must certainly be an error. The latter work ascribes to him the ordinances forbidding any but persons of the purest morals and the best conduct to officiate at the altar, and all priests from entering alone the residence of the pope, without directing that the pope and the bishops were always to be attended by two priests and three deacons, who should bear witness of their conduct. A pseudo-decretal letter
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is also ascribed to him. According to Cyprian, Lucius I must have suffered a short exile from Rome during his pontificate, for Cyprian wrote Letters of congratulation on the occasion of his return from exile (Ep. 61 ad Luc.). According to this author (Ep. 65), Lucius wrote several letters on the treatment of backsliders, but they are not known at present. See Bower, Hist. of the Popes, I, 61; Tillemont, Memoriae, iv, 118 sq.

Lucius II, pope, of Bologna, properly GERARD CUSINUS, or CUSINELLO, was elected pope on August 22, 1078, at the instance of St. John of Lateran. He was made cardinal priest of Santa Croce in Jerusalem by Honorius II, and vice-chancellor and librarian of the Church of Rome by Innocent II. He was finally elected pope after the death of Celestine II, and his election was confirmed by the Romans, under the guidance of Arnold of Braccio, rose against the papal authority, determined, by an Arnould spirit [see ARNOLO D'BRACCIO], to re-establish the old republic, and to this end appointed a patrician in the capitol to govern them, and chose Jordan, son of Peter Leo, as such, giving him all the revenues of the city, and restricting the pope to the tithes and voluntary offerings. "Cesar should have the things that are Cesar's, the priest the things that are the priest's, as Christ ordained when Peter paid the tribute-money" (cited from Cyprian, Hist. I, iv, 101). The pope attempted to seize this revenue by force, and at the head of a band of armed followers, went forth to attack the capitol, but was wounded by a stone, and died of this wound, Feb. 25, 1145. See Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Rom. Empire, vi, 428 sq.; Reidel, See of Rome in the Middle Ages, p. 226 sq.; Bower, History of the Popes, vi, 52 sq. See also TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.

Lucius III, properly Uraldo Alcucinigoli, belonged to a distinguished family of Lucca. He was made cardinal priest of St. Praxedes by Innocent II in 1146, and cardinal bishop of Ostia and Velletri by Adrian IV in 1153. Having distinguished himself in some negotiations with France, and allied the emperor Frederick, he became a prominent member of the "holy college," and was finally elected pope Sept. 2, 1181. Soon after his arrival at Rome, however, he got into difficulties with the Romans, and was finally obliged to flee the city. Christian, archbishop of Mentz and chancellor of the emperor, started to assist him with a large army, but died on the way. In 1183 Lewis returned to Rome, but his conduct and that of his followers having created fresh troubles, he soon left that city forever and retired to Verona, where he was nearer his imperial protector. The emperor himself arrived at Verona soon after, and the two princes held a consultation on the state of the Church. In this council the Romans were denounced as enemies of the Church, and the Waldenses also were put under the ban, and a crusade was advised to help the persecuted Christians in the East. While engaged in demanding assistance for the crusaders from the kings of England and France, Lucius fell sick and died, Nov. 24, 1183. His letters are in Maucci, Coll. Conciliarum, xxii. See Neander, Ch. Hist. iv, 609; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, vi, 159 sq.; Hist. of the Popes, ii, 202; Milman, Hist. of lat. Christ. iv, 459 sq.; Bukus, Med. Popes and Crusaders, ii, 155, 165, 168.

LUCKE, JOHANN PHILIPP, a German theologian, was born at Erbach, Sept. 28, 1728. In 1745 he entered the University of Jena. In 1750 he became preacher at Göttingen; two years later, town-pastor at Michelstadt; in 1757, assessor of the Consistory; two years after, professor of divinity, and four years later, appointed court preacher. He died Nov. 8, 1781. Well posted in all branches of theology, especially in Church history, familiar with the French, and furnished with the gift of eloquence, he was a most active and efficient worker for the preservation of the moral and religious principles of the Reformation. As a commentator, he was an opponent of the innovations of Bahrdt. The best of his works in these lines are his Erläuterungen des Briefes Pauli an die Gemeinen zu Galaten (Jena, 1758, 4to)—Erläuterungen des Briefes Pauli an die Römer (ibid, 1758, 4to). See Döring, Geschichte Theol. Deutschland's, vol. ii, 8, v.

LUCKE, GOTTFREID CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH, an eminent German theologian, was born at Egelin, near Magdeburg, August 23, 1781. He studied theology at the universities of Halle and Göttingen. In 1818 he became lecturer in the latter university, and in 1816 went to Berlin University, and there lectured on the exegesis of the N. T. Here he became intimate with De Wette and Schleiermacher, whose views greatly influenced the remainder of his career as a theologian. In 1818 he was, at the same time as Gieseler, appointed professor at the newly-founded University of Bonn, and in 1827 became professor of theology at Halle. He died in that city Feb. 14, 1855. He wrote Commentatio de Ecclesia Christianorum apostolicae (Göttingen, 1818, 4to):

—Über den neutestament. Kanon des Eusebius von Cäsarea (Berlin, 1816, 8vo)—Grundriß d. neutestam. Hermeneut. u. ihrer Geschichte (Berlin, 1817, 8vo)—Comment. de S. D. Schriften d. Evangelisten Johannes (Bonn, 1820—24, 8 vols. 8vo; 8d ed. 1845—56; transl. into English under the title Commentary on the Epistles of St. John, Edinb. 1837, 12mo)—Questions ad eundem Didymum (Göttingen, 1829, 4 parts, 4to). He also took part with De Wette and Schleiermacher in the publication of the Theologische Zeitschrift (Berlin, 1819—22, 8 vols. parts, 4to), and with Gieseler in that of the Zeitschrift für gebildete Christen (Elberfeld, 1823 and 1824, 4 parts 8vo). He also contributed some valuable articles to the Theol. Studien u. Kriften—Hefte, Nour. Blog. Genér. xxxi, 1561; Pierer, Universal-Lexicon, x, 569; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. viii, 525 sq.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. ii, 1879; Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. ii, 460.

Luckingbach, Abraham, a Moravian missionary among the Delaware tribe of the North American Indians, was born in Lehigh County, Pa., May 5, 1777; entered Nazareth Hall, by invitation, in 1815; was, by appointment, at the mission station of the Delaware Indian Hymn-book, and published in the Delaware language Select O.T. Scripture Narratives. See De Schweinitz, Life and Times of David Zeisberger, p. 659.

Luckey, Samuel D.D., a noted minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Rensselaer-ville, Albany County, N. Y., April 4, 1791; entered the ministry in 1816; removed to Canada in 1833; was appointed in 1816, inclusive, labored at Dutchess, Montgomery, Saratoga, and Pittstown, and in 1817—18 in the city of Troy. In 1819 he was at Rhinebeck; and in 1820—21 at Schenectady, where he received from Union College the degree of master of arts and of doctor of divinity. The next ten years of his life were spent at New Haven, Brooklyn, Albany, and as presiding elder on the New Haven District. In 1822 he became principal of the Genesee Wesleyan Seminary at Lima, N. Y., where he remained four years. At the General Conference of 1836 he was a delegate, and was elected to the editorship of the Christian Advocate and Journal at New York. At that time the office involved the senior editorship of the Book Room. After an honorable service of four years he returned to the itinerancy, first for a time at Duane Street, New York, and in 1842 was again transferred to the Genesee Conference. From this time to the day of his death (Oct. 11, 1860) he remained in Western New York, residing mostly in Rochester City, but filling the offices of presiding elder, pastor, and chaplain of the Monroe County Penitentiary, in which latter position he served for nine years, beholding great crowds of the poor and the fallen. Dr. Luckey had also the honor to be appointed in 1847 one of the regents of the State University. He wrote an excellent treatise on the Sacrament

V.—18.
of the Lord's Supper, a work on the Trinity (a respectable 12mo volume, which gained for him a wide repute for theological acumen and polemical tact), and a small volume of Ethic Hymns and Scriptural Lessons for Children. The hymns, which are original and not without merit, are rhetorical paraphrases of Scripture, mostly of the Psalms. The Lyceum was a school for the education of the younger power of intellect. For depth of penetration and soundness of judgment he had few superiors. His knowledge of the forms and principles of law, both civil and ecclesiastical, was quite extensive. He was a thorough Methodist and an admirer of the genius and historical development of his Church he was as familiar with as the alphabet. He long stood among the magnates of his people, and his history is woven in the history of his Church." See Conf. Minutes, 1670, p. 290 sq.

Lucopertrians is the name given to a sect offanatics and ascetics who believed in a double Trinity, rejected marriage, scorned all external forms of worship, and adopted absurdly allegorical interpretations of Scripture. They were believed to have had as their founder an ecclesiastic by the name of Lucopertrus, but the probability is that Lucopertrus is a nickname, and it is said to have been given to a person called Peter, who promised to die on the third day after he was birth, and who was called Wolf-Peter or Lucopertrus afterwards, because the devil on that day appeared to his followers in the shape of a wolf. See BOOMGAARD, MESSALIA.

Lucretius, Titus Carus, a noted Roman poet, deserves a place here as the exponent of Epicureanism. He wrote some time towards the opening of the 1st century, but of his life we know almost nothing with certainty, as he is mentioned merely in a cursory manner in contemporary literature. St. Jerome, in his translation of the Chronicle of Eusebius, gives the date of his birth as B.C. 38 (according to others, 89), but he does not specify the source from which his statement is derived. It is alleged, further, that he died by his own hand, in the 44th year of his age, having been driven frantic by a love-poison which had been administered to him; that he composed his works in the intervals of his madness, and that these works were revised by Cicero; but all these statements rest on very insufficient authority, and must be received with extreme caution. His peculiar opinions rendered him specially obnoxious to the early Christians, and it is possible that the latter may have been too easily led to attribute to him a fate which in his own nature and curious literary and intellectual termination, was deemed but a due reward for the bold and impious character of his teachings. The great work on which his fame rests is De Rerum Natura, a philosophical didactic poem in six books (edióto princeps, Brescia, abridged in the 1st edition by Wakefield [London, 1796, 3 vols. 4to.] and [Glasgow, 1812, 4 vols. 8vo.]), by Forbiger [Leips. 1829, 12mo.], and by Lachmann [Berlin, 1850, 2 vols.]. English translations in verse by Creek [London, 1714, 2 vols. 8vo.], Good [London, 1803-7, 2 vols. 4to.]; in prose by the Rev. J. S. Watson, M.A. [London, Bohn's Classical Library, 1851, post 8vo.]. In these measure an exposition of the physical, moral, and religious tenets of Epicurus. See Epicurean Philosophy. "Regarded merely as a literary composition, the work of Lucretius stands unrivalled among didactic poems. The clearness and fulness with which the most minute facts of physical science, and the most subtle philosophical speculations are unfolded and explained; the life and interest which are thrown into discussions, in themselves repulsive to the bulk of mankind; the beauty, richness, and variety of the episodes which are interwoven with the main thread of the poem, combined with the majestic verse in which the whole is clothed, render the De Rerum Natura, as a work of art, one of the most perfect which antiquity has bequeathed to us" (Chambers, Cyclopaedia, s. v.). See Smith, Dict. Class. Biog., s. v.

Lud (Heb. לוד, derivation unknown; Sept. Ἀθῆ, but in Ezek. Ἀθης; Auth. Vera. "Lydia," in Ezek. xxx. 5), the name apparently of two nations. See Ethnic.

1. The fourth son of Shem (B.C. post 5058), and founder of a tribe near the Assyrians and Aramaens (Gen. x. 22; 1 Chron. 1, 17). According to Josephus (Antiq. i. 6, 4), they were the Lydians; in which opinion agree Eusebius, Jerome, and other fathers. Later authorities (Bochart, Phaleg, and Geigenius) express a contrary opinion. On the contrary, Michaelis (Spegiol. ii. 114 sq.) reads θιλυσ, and understands the Indians (see also his Supplement, No. 1146, comp. Vater, Comment. i. 180). Lud would thus be represented by the Lydus of the mythical period (Herod. i. 7). "The Semitic character of the manners of the Litt. ... and by the Persians for the consolidation of the Persian kingdom during its latest period and after the Persian conquest, but before the predominance of Greek art in Asia Minor, favor this idea; but, on the other hand, the Egyptian monuments show us in the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries B.C. a powerful people called Tyrrows or Ludens, probably seated near Mesopotamia, and apparently north of Palestine, whom some, however, make the Assyrians. We may perhaps conjecture that the Lydians first established themselves near Palestine, and afterwards spread into Asia Minor; the occupiers of the inland seat of the race being over-ridden or removed by the Assyrians." With the latter supposition, compare the apocryphal statement in Judith ii. 23. See Lyd.

2. One of the Hamitic tribes descended from Mizram (Lud, Gen. x. 18), apparently a people of Africa (perhaps of Ethiopia), sprung from the Egyptians, and so accustomed to fight with bows and arrows (Ezek. xxvii. 10, 11, 12; Is. liv. 19, where they are associated with Cush and Phut; comp. the Ludim, Jer. xi. 9, and the Phud and Lud of Judith ii. 23). Some have referred the name to the people of Ludigia, on the western coast of Africa, south of Morocco (see Michaelis, Spegioi. ii. 114 sq.; also Suppl. No. 1147); and combined with this the mention of a river Lud in Tangitania (Pliny, v. 2). Others, as Bochart (Phaleg, iv. 56) and Geigenius (Comment. ad loc. Isa.), regard them as one of theEthiopians. Hitzig (Comment. ad loc. Is. and Jer.) thinks that the Libyans are intended (by an interchange of letters), but Nubia appears to be rather indicated by the scriptural notices. Still more improbable is the supposition of Forster (Op. ad Michael, p. 13 sq.), that the inhabitants of the oasis are intended, designated in Coptic by a term having some resemblance to Lud. The Arabic interpreters have Tunites; the Targum of Jonathan renders inhabitants of the nome of Neit. The opinion of Michaelis (Suppl. No. 1148), that by the Ludim the Libyans are meant, and the Lydians and Libyans, has lately been rejected by Geigenius (Thes. Heb. p. 746) with the remark that the Egyptians and Tyrians employed soldiers from Asia Minor in their armies (Herod. ii. 152, 154, 156; iii. 1). But the Egyptians, at least, had also mercenary troops from Africa, and the Asians referred to were only from Ionis and Caria. Rosellini (Monument. stor. iii. i. 281 sq.) speaks of a province of Ludim, but the locality is uncertain. See Ludim.

Ludmilla, Elisabeth von Schwarberg RE-DOLFRSTADT, a noted female hymnist of Germany, was born April 7, 1640, and died March 12, 1672. She wrote 215 hymns, many of which are the pearls of German sacred song and historic devie were published en masse under the title Die Stimme der Frauen (new ed. 1880). See her biography by Thiilo (1856).

Luddeke, Christoph Wilhlem, a German theologian, was born at Schonberg, Prussia, Mar. 8, 1737. In 1758 he went to the Levant as a preacher of the Danish mission, and afterwards became pastor of the Lutheran Church at Thessalonica. In 1768 he accepted a call to Magdeburg as pastor; in 1773 to Stockholm, as German preacher and inspector of the German Lyceum. He died June 18, 1803. He was an excellent scholar in many branches of theology, and done
much for mission and education, and by his contributions to the literature on the Orient contributed largely to Biblical geography. His Expositio brevis locorum Sacrae Scripturae ad Orientem esse referentium, etc., deserves special mention (Halle, 1777, 1802).—Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, vol. ii., s.v.

Lüderwald, Johann Balthasar, D.D., a German theologian, was born at Fahrland, Prussia, Sept. 27, 1722. He entered the University of Halle, and, having finished the academical course, became in 1742 tutor; in 1747, pastor at Glentorf, near Holmstäd, afterwards superintendent and first pastor at Forsfelde, where he died, Aug. 25, 1796. He is noted as a defender of the true doctrine of the inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures, and of the Protestant church. He published the Werke in 13 folio volumes.

Ludwibergi, (Ludwigeri, or Lutgardis), a celebrated thuramuchtasker of the 12th century, was born about 1182. At the early age of twelve she entered the Benedictine convent of St. Trudo, and soon gave evidence of mystical tendencies. She claimed to have visions in which she held familiar converse with the Virgin Mary, the angels, John the Baptist and the apostles, St. Catherine, and a number of other saints. Once she stated she had seen St. John the evangelist in the form of a shining eagle, who, opening her mouth with his beak, filled her with divine wisdom. But Christ himself was generally the object of her ecstatic visions. After taking the veil in 1200, she was in 1205 appointed abbess of the convent. In 1206, by advice of John de Liro and of St. Christine, she entered the convent of the Cistercians of Aquin, near Brussels. Here her visions became still more striking and numerous; in her meditations on the sufferings of Christ her body became covered with blood, etc. She was also said to have worked a great number of miracles. She died June 16, 1246. Her biography was written by the Dominican Thomas Cantpirantius. See Johan Stol, Legenden (Freib. 1856), vol. ii., l.c. Herzog, Real-Encyklop., viii. 511.

Lüdcke, Johann August, a German theologian, was born at Cotten Sept. 15, 1727, and was educated at the Universities of Halle and Frankfort-on-the-Oder. In 1759 he became tutor; in 1762, subrector of the German Reformed town-school of his native place; in 1776, pastor at Gneschach, where he remained until 1813. He died at Glogau, Jan. 28, 1821. For a list of his works see Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, vol. ii., s.v.

Lu'uddin (Heb. 'Uuddin; "fear of God").""Awâ'iziy; in Jer. Awâeësà; in A.V. "Ludins,") a Mizzrahitian or Egyptian people or tribe (Gen. x. 13; 1 Chron. i. 11; Jer. xvi. 9), probably the same with Lùd, No. 2. From their position at the head of the list of the Mizzraities, it is probable that the Ludim were settled to the west of Egypt more than forty years before any other race of the same stock. In Islamic narratives—"Tarshish, Pue, and Lud, that draw the bow (_xlabel, _xlabel, ) Tubal, and Javan, the isles afar off (lxvi. 19). Here the expression in the plural, "that draw the bow" (Vulg. tendere sagittam), may refer only to Lud, and therefore not connect it with one or both of the names preceding it, and its comparison with the other three passages, in all which Phut is mentioned immediately before or after Lud or the Ludim, goes to confirm the Sept. reading, Phut, _sûbûn_ for Pue, a word not occurring in any other passage, as the true one; and we also notice coincident the extraordinary change from _xlabel_ to _xlabel_. See Pue; _Menôch_. Jeremiah, in speaking of Phut and Shem's army, makes mention of "Cush and Phut that handle the buckler, and the Ludim that handle [and] bend the bow" (xlvii. 9). Here the Ludim are associated with African nations as mercenaries or auxiliaries of the king of Egypt, and it therefore seems probable, _prima facie_, that the Mizzraithian Ludim are intended. Ezekiel, in the description of Tyre, speaks thus of Lud: "Pue, Lud, and Phut were in thine army, thy men of war: buckler (_xlabel_ and helmet hung they up in thee; they set thine adorning" (xxvii. 10). In this place Lud might seem to mean the Semitic nation of Lud, especially noted in Asia Minor and Lydia; but the association with Phut renders it as likely that the nation or country is that of the African Ludim. In the prophecies against Gog a similar passage occurs. "Pue, Cush, and Phut (A.V. "Libya") with them [the army of Gog]; all of them [with buckler (_xlabel_) and helmet" (xviii. 8, 9). It seems from this that there were Pan-African mercenaries at this time, the prophet probably, if speaking of a remote future period, using their name and that of other well-known mercenaries in a general sense. The association of Pue, Cush, and Phut in the former passage therefore loses somewhat of its weight. In one of the prophecies against Egypt Lud is thus mentioned among the supports of that country: "And the sword shall come upon Mizrain, and great pain shall be in Cush, at the falling of the slain in Mizram, and they shall take away her multitude (_xlabel_ and her foundations shall be broken down. Cush, Phut, and Lud, and all the mingled people (_xlabel_ and Chub, and the children of the land of the covenant, shall fall by the sword with them" (xxx. 4, 5). Here Lud is associated with Cush and Phut, and forms an African nation. The Ereb, whom we have called "mingled people" rather than "strangers," appear to have been an Arab population of the Sinaitic peninsula, perhaps including Arab or half-Arab tribes of the Egyptian desert to the east of the Nile. Chub is a name nowhere else occurring in the text, which perhaps should be suspended for the country or nation of the Lubim. See Chur; Ludim. The "children of the land of the covenant," may be some league of tribes, as probably were the Nine Bows of the Egyptian inscriptions; or the expression may mean nations or tribes allied to Egypt, as though a general designation for the rest of its supporters besides those specified. It is noticeable that in this passage, although Lud is placed among the close allies or supporters of Egypt, it yet follows African nations, and is followed by a nation or tribe at least partly inhabiting Asia. This would possibly also partly inhabiting Africa. See Egypt.

There can be no doubt that but one nation is intended in these passages, and it seems that thus far the preponderance of evidence is in favor of the Mizzraithian Ludim. There are several instances in the Bible both of Egyptian and Greek mercenaries or auxiliary forces of the Egyptian army. Egyptian mercenaries or troops, besides of African, and perhaps of those bordering Egypt on the east. We have still to inquire how the evidence of the Egyptian monuments and of profane history may affect our supposition. From the former we learn that several foreign nations contributed allies or mercenaries to the Egyptian armies. Among them we identify the Reni with the Lubim, and the Shary-anatana with the Cherethim, who also served in David's army. The latter were probably from the coast of Pales tine, and, as such, may have been drawn into the service of the Egyptian army from an insular portion of the same people. The rest of these foreign troops seem to have been of African nations, but this is not certain. The evidence of the monuments reaches no lower than the time of the Belostite line. There is a single foreign contemporary inscription recorded on one of the colossi of the temple of Abu-Simbel in Nubia, noting the passage of Greek mercenaries of a Pammechites, probably the first (Wilkinson, Modern Egypt and Thebes, ii, 329). From the Greek writers, who give us information from the time of Pammechites I downwards, we learn that "数十 mediocris, 50,000 and the like," was the number of an important element in the Egyptian army in all times when the country was independent, from the reign of
that king until the final conquest by Ochus. These mercenaries were even settled in Egypt by Psammethichus. There does not seem to be any mention of them in the Bible; they are included by Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recollected that it is reasonable to connect the Shemitic Lud with the Lydians, and that at the time of the prophets by whom Lud and the Ludim are mentioned the Lydian kingdom generally or always included a more western part of Asia Minor, so that the Lud and Ludim might well apply to the Ionian and Carian mercenaries drawn from this territory. See LUD.

The manner in which these foreign troops in the Egyptian army are characterized is perfectly in accordance with the account of the mercenaries of the monarchical period of the Bible, which, although about six centuries earlier than the prophet's time, no doubt represent the same condition of military matters. The only people of Africa beyond Egypt portrayed on the monuments whom we can consider as most probably of the same stock as the Egyptians are the ReBU, who are the Libyim of the Bible, almost certainly the same as the Mizrahit Lehabin (q. v.); therefore we may take the ReBU as probably illustrating the Ludim, supposing the latter to be Mizraites, in which case they may indeed be included under the same name as the Libyim, if the appellative BeU be wider than that of the Ludim of the Bible, and also as illustrating Cush and Phut. The last two are spoken of as handling the buckler. The Egyptians are generally represented with small shields, frequently round; the ReBU with small round shields, for which the term here used, קַרְנָה, the small shield, and the expression "that handle," are perfectly appropriate. The Ludim should have been archers, and apparently armed with a long bow that was strong with the aid of the foot by treading (יוּחַּק וּכּוֹד), is noteworthy, since the Africans were always famous for their archery. The ReBU, and one other of the foreign nations that served in the Egyptian army—the monuments show the former only as enemies—were bowmen, being armed with a bow of moderate length; the other mercenaries—of whom we can only identify the Philistine Cherethim, though they probably include certain of the mercenaries or auxiliaries mentioned in the Bible—carrying swords and javelins, but not bows. These facts of agreement, founded on our examination of the monuments, are of no little weight, as showing the accuracy of the Bible. See SHIELD.

Ludke, Friedrich Germainus, a German theologian, was born at Stendal, Prussia, April 10, 1730. He began his academical course very young, and, upon its completion, became a sub-deacon of the Nicolai Church at Berlin, which office he held until his death, March 8, 1792. He was looked upon by his contemporaries as a man of an independent, decided, and philosophical mind, and ably defended the Christian truths. He was also an earnest advocate of tolerance, and wrote "About Toleranee and Freedom of Conscience."—Dörffer, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, vol. ii, s. v.

Ludlow, John, D.D., L.L.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Aquacacanonock, now Passaic, N. J., Dec. 13, 1793; graduated at Union College, Rensselaer, in 1813, and at the Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J., 1817. His first settlement was in the First Reformed (Dutch) Church of New Brunswick, 1817; in 1819 he was elected professor in the theological seminary at that place: in 1823 he became pastor of the First Reformed (Dutch) Church in Albany, where he sustained himself with great power as a preacher, pastor, and public man. In 1834 he was installed as the 62nd bishop of the synod of the Netherlands, and retained that position with distinguished ability until 1852, when he returned to New Brunswick as professor of ecclesiastical history and Church government in the theological seminary, and also as professor of political philosophy in Rutgers College. He died in 1857, in the full assurance of hope and of faith. In every respect Dr. Ludlow was "a mighty man, physically, mentally, spiritually; as a theologian, a preacher, and a leader of men. He was full of power. His intelligence was as his body, compact, and vigorous. His will and his emotional nature were equally strong. His spirit and labors in the pulpit, in the professor's chair, at the head of the university, and in public bodies, were always direct, well ordered, and indomitable. He adored every relation that he sustained, and was one of the very finest specimens of intellectual and moral nobility."—Sprague, Ammiad: Memorial Sermons by Drs. George W. Bethune, Isaac Ferris, and W. J. R. Taylor; Corwin, Manual of the Reformed Church; N. Y. Observer (1860); American College Presidents, etc. (Long, 1864). Ludlow, Peter, a Baptist minister, was born in Enfield, Conn., Aug. 8, 1797, of Presbyterian parentage. He was for a time a member of Princeton College, N. J.; then began the study of law, but his religious convictions became so deep that he decided to become a minister. The distinguished Summerfield aided him in his theological studies. He joined the Baptist Church, received license, and was ordained Sept. 2, 1823 pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Providence, R. I. His continued ill-health necessitated his acceptance of a call to the Baptist Church in Georgetown, S. C. He died in New York, in 1857. Sprague says of him: "His talents were of a high order, and he was not less distinguished for his evangelical views than for his attractive and effective eloquence." See Sprague, Ammiad: The American Pulpit, vi, 727 sq.

Ludolf, Jon, a noted Ethiope scholar, also a lawyer and statesman of distinguished merit, was born at Erfurt, in Thuringia, in 1694. After finishing his education, he spent several years in travelling, and subsequently filled important stations in his native city, and under the elector palatine at Frankfurt. He then devoted himself to the completion of his works, of which his Ethiope History, and his commentaries on it, his Amharic and Ethiopic Grammar, and Ethiopic Lexicon, are the most valuable, and have universally met with the highest esteem from the learned.

Ludolph de Saxonia was distinguished among the Dominican mystics of the 14th century. He entered the Order about A.D. 1300, and in further pursuance of his pious devotion became a Carmelitan at Strasburg. His Vita Jesu Christi has often been edited and translated into various languages. He flourished in Saxony, but the date both of his birth and death are unknown.

Lüders, John H., an American Roman Catholic priest of great ability and note, was born at Litten, in the Diocese of Newark, New Jersey, in 1827; entered St. Mary's Theological Seminary in Cincinnati, Ohio, and was consecrated priest in 1846, and bishop of Fort Wayne in 1856. He desires the commendation of all Christian people for his great zeal in behalf of educational facilities for the negro classes under his charge. He was especially active during his presidency over the diocese of Northern Indiana, where he built many churches and established schools. He died in Cleveland, Ohio, June 29, 1871.

Luf, Friedrich Matthias, a German theologian, was born at Kirch-Russelbach, Aug. 8, 1706. In 1728 he entered the University of Aldorf, where his uncle, G. G. Zelter, was then professor of theology and of the Oriental languages. In 1730, when Prof. Zelter resigned his professorship and became pastor at Poppersbusen, Luf accompanied him, and was made a curate in 1728. He became a chaplain at Flirth, where he unexpectedly died, May 24, 1740. His death caused great grief, since his knowledge and unwearied diligence gave promise of future usefulness and eminence. He rendered great service in issuing the Bible-works of Zelter. He committed all the German productions to print, but among his works valuable MSS.
were found, intended as preparations for quite extensive labor. See Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl. vol. ii. s. v.

LuGo, Juan de, a learned Spanish Jesuit and cardinal, was born at Madrid, Nov. 25, 1588, and for twenty years was theological professor at Rome; was made cardinal in 1648, and died Aug. 20, 1660. In his office as cardinal he was distinguished for his plain manner of life, and the sympathy of the poor, and the Jesu- natei Dominica (Lyons, 1633, fol.): —De Sacramentis in genere (1658, fol.): —Responsorum Moralis lib. vi (1651, fol), etc. All his works were collected in seven large folios (Venice, 1751). Pallavicini boasted of having been his pupil. Liguori names him as a theologian of the school of Thomas Aquinas.

Lugo's brother Francisco was also a Jesuit, and a sort of several theological works. They are of minor value, however. See Hofer, Nouv. Biog. Génér. xxxii, 212.

Lüthiith (Heb. Luchîth, לְעֵיחה; always with the art. prefixed, prob. tabellad, see below); Sept. Aowía; but in Jer. [לְעֵיחָה] Aowía v. r. Aowía, a Moabith place (but whether a town or not is uncertain, as it is one of the names of the "ascent of Luhith"), always apparently situated on an eminence between Zoar and Horma- nain, on the track of the invading Babyliotians (Isa. xvi, 5; Jer. xxlii, 5). According to Eusebius, it lay between Aroplis and Zoar. M. de Saucley thinks it may have been situated on the hill Nukheh, about half way up on the south side of the ravine leading north-easterly from the northern opening of the penin- sula of the Dead Sea (Narrative, i, 386, 267, and map). The position is probably not far from correct (although not between Az and Zoar), but no such name appears on Robinson's or Zimmermann's map: it does, however, on Vans de Velde's.

Lahith, "as a Hebrew word, signifies 'made of boards or posts' (Gesenius, Thesaurus, p. 748); but why assume that a Moabish spot should have a Hebrew name? By the Syriac interpreters it is rendered 'paved with flag- stones' (Eichhorn, Alg. Bibliothek, i, 845, 872). In the Targums (Pseudojon. and Jerus. on Numb. xxi, 16, and Jonathan on Isa. xvi, 1) Lechaith is given as the equiva- lent of Ar-Moab. This may contain an allusion to Luchith, or it may point to the use of a term meaning 'as for our own convenience, namely, the Moabites and St. John with the Lamb, in the Ambrosian Library at Milan; the Elthrough Madame, painted in 1521, the Drunkeness of Noah, and other works in the gallery of the Brera at Milan; the frescoes of the Monastero Maggiore, or San Maurizio, in the same city, from which, however, the ultramarine and gold have been scraped off; several at Sarzana, among them his chef-d'œuvre, Christ disputing with the Doctors; and other extensive and equally good works in the Franciscan convent Dégli Angeli at Lugano, on the lake of that name. The date of his death is not exactly known, but he was alive in 1500.

He had a brother, Ambrogio, who imitated his style, and several sons who also were painters. See English Cyclop. s. v.; Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.

Luitprand, or Liudprand, king of Lombardy (A.D. 712-744), was born towards the close of the 7th century. In 702 his father, Ansprand, a powerful Lombard lord, and an adherent of king Liutprand, having been defeated by the usurper Aribert II, retired to the Bavarian court. He was joined there by Luitprand, but the other members of his family, having fallen into the hands of Aribert, were put to death. In 712 Luitprand and his father succumbed to the same fate, owing Aribert having been a learned dying shortly after, Luitprand succeeded to the throne. His first care was to restore peace to his kingdom, suffering from internal dissensions. He enacted a series of laws in the years 712, 717, 720, 721, 725, 724, which, with the Edict of the Lombard law as it remained in force in Northern Italy until the 14th, and in the kingdom of Naples until the 16th century. Peace and prosperity once restored to his people, Luitprand eagerly sought for an opportunity for the ascertainment of his dominions. He had his eye especially on Rome and the exarchate, and when the quarrel broke out between the pope and the emperor of Constantinople concerning image worship, Luitprand suddenly announced himself and his Lombards devout worshippers of images, and, under pretence of taking the pope's part, he undertook the reestablishment of Ravenna and several cities. But pope Gregory II, eager at once to strengthen the power of Lombardy, and the prospect that hereafter the papacy might be dependent on the rule of a people looked upon as vile barbarians [see Lombards], preferred to seek aid in other quarters not only for himself, but also for the exarch, about as little as to be numbered. He therefore enjoined upon the duke of Venetia to aid the exarch in retaking the provinces seized by Luitprand. Gregory at the same time persuaded the inhabitants of the dukies of Spoleto and Benevento to throw off the Lombard yoke. Luitprand, however, marched the pope in cunning, for he no sooner learned the position of the pontiff than he turned to the side of the exarch, and, after having aided him in subduing his insurgent provinces, marched himself against Rome, with the intention of taking his revenue on the pope. The latter, however, succeeded in pacifying Luitprand, and the Lombard returned into his kingdom. In 736, being dangerously ill, he surrendered for a while his power to his nephew Hildebrand, whom the Lombards had elected his successor, but when he recovered his health he found himself obliged to divide his authority between Hildebrand and with Hildebrand, as the latter was the more naturally formed against him by pope Gregory III, and the dukes of Spoleto and Benevento and the exarch of Ravenna, and, to punish the incumbency of the apostolic see, he appeared before the gates of Rome. The pope, in his distress, called in the Charles Martel for assistance. Gregory's appeal is truly touching: "His tears are falling night and day for the destitute state of the Church. The Lombard king and his son are ravaging the last remains of the property of the Church, which no longer suffices for the daily service; they have invaded the territory of Rome, and seized all his farms. His only hope is in the timely succor of the Frankish king." Valuable pres- ents accompanied this appeal—among them the mystic keys of the sepulchre of St. Peter, and fillets of his chains, which no Christian could resist—also a proffer of the title of Emperor and Consul of the Romans, which the deliverer of the Eternal City was to become even the patron of the Romish Church. Of course Martel an- swered favorably to such an invitation. Unfortunately, however, for the Romish cause, he died shortly after. But, even before Martel could have taken the field against Luitprand, the latter had been induced to withdraw his troops from Rome. A state of hostility, how- ever, continued between the Lombards and the Romans until the death of Gregory III. The next pontiff (Zachary) finally succeeded, by a personal visit to Luitprand, in securing a treaty with the Lombards, on the terms that the latter restored to the Church all the possessions taken from it during the war. Luitprand thereafter seems to have been favorably inclined towards Zachary and the Church. He died in January, 744. See Paul Diacre.
LUTPRAND, or LUTPRAND, a distinguished Italian historian, who accompanied the Franks to Pavia; or, (as Bleek supposed, from the address of the papal legation, to have accompanied the Franks to Ravenna) to Pavia. Col. A.D. 920, of a noble family very high in favor at the court of king Hughes. Lutprand received a very good education, and was at an early age appointed deacon of the cathedral of Pavia. He soon after became chancellor of king Berengar, by whom he was, about 946, sent on a mission to Byzantium, but by the year 960, he fell under the displeasure of the king and queen Willa, and retired to the court of Otho I of Germany. He remained there eleven years, learned the language of the country, and became acquainted with all the most distinguished chancellors. In 958 he began, at the request of the bishop of Elyra, to write a history of his own age, and he continued this task until 962, when he returned to Otho in Italy. He was now at once appointed bishop of Cremona, and was in 963 sent by Otho to pope John XII, ostensibly for the purpose of assuring the pope that it was good policy to incite the Roman aristocracy against the emperor. Shortly after, when the pope was accused before the Synod of Rome, Lutprand spoke against him in the name of the emperor. Two years afterwards Otho sent him again to Rome, to be present with the bishop of Spala, to direct the pontifical election, a duty which he excelled in, to the emperor's entire satisfaction. In 968 Lutprand went to Constantinople to negotiate a marriage between princess Theophania and the son of Otho, but he failed in it. In 971 he was sent, with some others, to renew negotiations for the same object, Nicholas being dead; but he died himself soon after, in the early part of 972. His works, which are of great value for the history of those times, are Antapodosis, begun at Frankfort-on-the-Maine in 958, concluded in Italy in 962, a historical work, in which he seeks to revenge himself for the wrongs he had suffered, especially from Berengar and Willa; Libri de rebus gestis Ottomae Magni imperatoris, an account of events from 950 to 964, which is the more valuable from the fact that Lutprand was an eyewitness and often an actor in all the occurrences he relates.—Relatio de legatione Constantino-poli- tana, 968, very important for the information it contains on events and customs, and the best written of Lutprand's works. The Antapodosis and Historia Ottomis, of which the original MS., partly in Lutprand's own handwriting, is preserved in the library of Munich, were published at Antwerp (1640, fol.), and in 1749, a modern critical work which still belongs to the great classics of ages, as those of Reuber and Du Chesne, and in the Scriptores of Muratori, vol. ii. The best edition of Lutprand's works is contained in Pertz, Monumenta, vol. iii, who has also published them separately. A German translation of the Antapodosis was published by the baron of Osten-Sacken (Berlin, 1838.), with an Introduction by Wattenbach. See Kipke, De Vita et Scriptis Luptrandi (Berlin, 1842, 8vo); Pertz, Monum. iii, 394; Wattenbach, Deutsche Handschriften im Mittelelter (24 ed. Berlin, 1866); p. 207 of the Catalogue of manuscripts in the British Museum, and of the publications of the British Academy. See also Jena, Hist. i, 740; 742 sq.; Dümmges, Otto I, p. 199 sqq.; Nieburg, SS. Byz. vol. xi.; Martini, Ur. d. Geschichtschreibers Luptrand, in Denkschriften d. Kön. Akad. d. Wissensch. of Munich, 1809, 1810; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxiii, 219; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. viii, 442; Baxmann, Politik der Päpste, vol. ii (see Index).

Lukan, the evangelist, and author of the Acts of the Apostles. Although himself not an apostle, he has admirably supplemented their labors, he has thus laid the literary world under lasting honor. I. His Name. This, in the Greek form, Λούκας, is abbreviated from Λουκάνας, the Greek equivalent of the Latin Lucanus, or Λουκάς, Lucullus (comp. Silvanus; Aedes for Aenamass; Zenas for Zenodorus; Winer, Gr. Text. p. 115). The contraction of οὗτος into ὁ is said to be characteristic of the names of slaves (see Lebeck, De Substantiva, in ὁ εὐαγγελιστής, in Wolf, Ancit. iii, 49), and it has been inferred from this that Luke was of Greek extraction (which may also be gathered from the implied contrast between his characters, mentioned Col. iv, 12, and the ὁ εὐαγγελιστής, ver. 11), and a libertus, or freedman. This latter idea has found confirmation in his profession of a physician (Col. iv, 14), the practice of medicine among the Romans having been in great measure confined to persons of servile rank (Midd. De Medicorum apud Roman. degent. Conditione; col. iv, 6). However, there were many exceptions (see Smith, Dict. of Classical Antig. s. v. Medicus, and it is altogether an insufficient basis on which to erect a theory as to the evangelist's social rank. So much, however, we probably may safely infer from his profession, that he was a man of superior education and mental culture to the generality of the apostles, the fishermen and tax-gatherers of the Sea of Galilee.

II. Scripture History. All that can be with certainty known of Luke is gathered from the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul. This does not, however, make his sanctity. He was not born a Jew, for he is not reckoned among them "of the circumcision" by Paul (comp. Col. iv, 11 with ver. 14). This be not thought conclusive, nothing can be argued from the Greek idiom in his style, for Luke can be a Hellenistic Jew, nor from the Gentile tendency of his Gospel, for this it would share with the inspired writings of Paul, a Pharisaei brought up at the feet of Gamaliel. The date of his conversion is uncertain. He was not, indeed, "an eyewitness and minister of the word of God from the beginning" (Luke i, 2), or he would have rested his claim as an evangelist upon that ground. His name does not once occur in the Acts, and we can only infer his presence or absence from the sudden changes from the third to the first person, and vice versa, of which phenomenon, notwithstanding all that has been argued against it, this, which has been accepted since the time of Ireneus (Contr. Hær. iii, 14), is the only satisfactory explanation. Rejecting the reading εὐαγγελιστής ὁ ἱησοῦς, Acts xi, 28 (which only rests on D. and Augustine, De Serm. Dom. ii, 17), which would bring Luke into connection with Paul at a much earlier period, as well as the identification of the evangelist with Lucius of Cyrene (Acts xiii, 1; Rom. xvi, 21), which was current in Origen's time (adv. Rom. xxvi, 39; see Lardner, Credibility, vi, 124; Marsh, Michaelis, c. 294), and would make him a kinsman of Paul, we first assume that Paul is companying with Luke, traveling with him to Macedonia (Acts xvi, 10, 11). A.D. 48. Of his previous history, and the time and manner of his conversion, we know nothing, but Ewalt's supposition (Gr. d. V. Farr. vi, 35, 448) is not at all improbable, that he was a physician residing in Troas, converted by Paul, and attaching himself to the apostle with all the ardor of a young convert. He may also, as Ewalt thinks, have been one of the first uncircumcised Christians. His conversion had taken place before, since he silently assumes his place among the great apostle's followers without anything being said of it. Luke has not the same knowledge and ministry of Christ. He may have found his way to Troas to preach the Gospel, sent possibly by Paul himself. There are some who maintain that Luke had already joined Paul at Antioch (Acts xi, 27-30; see Journal of Sacred Literature, October, 1861, p. 170, and Conybeare and Howson's Life of Paul, ed. London, 1861). He accompanied Paul as far as Philippi, but did not share in the imprisonment of his master and his companion Silas, nor, as the third person is resumed (Acts xvii, 1), did he, it would seem, take any further part in the apostle's missionary journey. The first person appears again on Paul's third visit to Philippi. A.D. 54 (Acts xx, 5, 6), from which it has been gathered that Luke had spent the whole intervening time—a period of seven or eight years—in Philippi or its neighborhood. If any credit is to be given to the ancient opin
ion that Luke is referred to in 2 Cor. viii. 18 as "the brother whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches" (a view adopted by the Church of England in the collect for Luke's day), as well as the early tradition embodied in the subscription to that epistle, that it was sent from Philippa "by Titius and Lucas," we shall have evidence of the evangelist's missionary zeal during this long space of time. If this be so, or if it be limited to the "three months" of Paul's sojourn at Philippa (Acts xx, 8) Luke was sent from that place to Corinth on this errand, the word "gospel" being, of course, to be understood, not, as Jerome and others erroneously interpret it, of Luke's written gospel, but of his missionary activity. The mistaken interpretation of the word "gospel" in this place has thus led some to assign the composition of the Gospel of Luke to this period, a view which derives some support from the Arabic version published by Erpenius, in which its writing is placed "in a city of Macedonia twenty-two years after the Ascension," A.D. 51. From their reunion at Philippa, Luke remained in constant attendance on Paul during his journey to Jerusalem (Acts xx, 6-xxi, 18), and, disappearing from the narrative during the apostle's imprisonment at Jerusalem and Caesarea, reappears at Caesarea, plain, and most unexpectedly. If this be so, as he has written the Hebrew, at the close of the Second Epistle to Timothy (iv, 11) gives us the latest glimpse of the "beloved physician," and our authentic information regarding him beautifully closes with a testimony from the apostle's pen to his faithfulness amidst general defection, A.D. 64.

III. Traditionary Notice. The above sums up all we really know about Luke; but, as is often the case, in proportion to the scantiness of authentic information is the copiousness of tradition, increasing in definiteness, be it remarked, as it advances. His Gentile descent being taken for granted, his birthplace was appropriately enough placed at Antioch in "the centre of the Gentile Church, and the birthplace of the Christian name" (Euselius, H. E. iii, 4; comp. Jerome, De Vir. Illust. 7; In Matt. Pseudo.), though it is to be observed that Chrysostom, when dwelling on the historical associations of the city, speaks of it, "as the birthplace of that which he is the first to call the Gospel of Luke (Epiph. Har. ii, 11); one of the Greeks who desired "to see Jesus" (Luke xii, 20, 21), and the companion of Cleopas on the journey to Emmaus (Theophil. Proem in Luc.). An idle legend of Greek origin, which first appears in the late and credulous historian Niphephorus Callinus (died 1450), Hist. Eccl. ii, 43, and was universally accepted in the Middle Ages, represents Luke as well acquainted with the art of painting (διότι τὴν Σωγράφου τιγγυς Ιεωσαιφον), and assigns to his hand the first portraits of our Lord, his mother, and his chief apostles (see the monograph of Mami [Florid. 1794] and Schlichter [Hal. 1784]).

Nothing is known of the place or manner of his death, and the traditions are inconsistent with one another. Gregory Naz reckons him among the martyrs, and the untrustworthy Nicephorus gives us several details of the time, place, and mode of his martyrdom, viz., that he was crucified to a live olive-tree in Greece, in his eighteenth year. According to others, he died a natural death after preaching (according to Epiphanius, Contra Har. ii, 11) in Dalmatia, Gallia, Italy, and Macedonia; was beheaded in Egypt, whence his bones were translated by Constantius to Constantinople (Isid. Hspal. c. 82; Phileostorgius, vol. iii, chap. xxix). See generally Köhler, Dissert. de Luca Ev. (Lipsia, 1680); Credner, Einleit. in N. T. i, 124.

LUKE, GOSPEL according to the third in order of the canonical books of the New Testament.

I. Author—Genuineness.—The universal tradition of Christendom, reaching up at least to the latter part of the 3rd century, has assigned the third member of our Gospels to Luke, the Evangelist. Contra Har. ii, 11 I, who alone continued in attendance on his beloved master in his last imprisonment (Col. iv, 14; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv, 11). Its authorship has never been questioned until comparatively recent times, in the process of suppressing criticism of Germany—the main object of which appears to be to set up some new hypothesis in its stead—has been brought to bear upon it, without, however, effectually disturbing the old traditional statement. The investigations of Semler, Hilgenfeld, Ritche, Baer, Schleiermacher, Ewald, and others, who failed to overthrow the harmonious assertion of the early Church that the third Gospel, as we have it, is the genuine work of Luke. It is well known that, though the "Gospels" are referred to by Justin Martyr as a collection already used and accepted by the Church (Apol. 106, sect. 12; Apol. 203, sect. 10; 1 Apol. 2), there are a very considerable number of quotations, enabling us to identify, beyond all reasonable doubt, these ιατρική δέδωκαν; to the first three Gospels, we do not find them mentioned by the names of their authors till the end of the 2nd century. In the Muratorian Fragment, Luke can hardly be placed later than A.D. 170, we read, "Tertullian Evangelium librum secundum Lucam Lucas late medicus post ascensionem Christi cum eum Paulus quasi ut juris (τοι δι' αυτον) studiorem ['hiericus socius, Ruman] se cum ad summis nomine su ex ordine ['opinione,' Credner] concipienti (Dominium tamen nec i pie in carce), et idem prout assequi potuit, ita et nativitate Johannis inepti dicere" (Westcott, Hist. of Cont. G. p. 550). The testimony of Irenaeus, A.D. cir. 180, is equally definite, Λούκαι δὲ καὶ τῶν συνεργῶν τοῦ τῶν ἐκκλησίας ἐν τῇ καθόλω ἐν μιᾷ κατά τὸν αὐτό (Contra Her. iii, 1, 1), while from his enumeration of the many particular, primitiva evangeli (ib. iii, 14, 3), recorded by Luke alone, it is evident that the Gospel he had was the same we now possess. Tertullian's Diatessaron is an unimpeachable evidence of the existence of four Gospels, and that of Luke at an early period in the same century. The writings of Tertullian against Marcion, cir. 207, abound with references to our Gospel, which, with Irenaeus, he asserts to have been written under the immediate guidance of Paul (Adv. Marc. iv, 2; iv, 5). In Euselius we find both the Gos- pel and Acts. Eusebius, in this latter work, professes to secure for the early period of Luke's knowledge of the sacred narrative is ascribed to information received from Paul, aided by his intercourse with the other apostles (τας τῶν ἄλλων ἑπολομένων ἐμφανείς φρασμοίς, H. E. iii, 4 and 24). Eusebius, indeed, tells us that in his day the erroneous view which interpreted ιατρικήν (Rom. ii, 16; comp. 2 Cor. vii, 18) of a written document was generally received, and that, in the words "according to my Gospel," Paul was supposed to refer to the work of the evangelist. This is also mentioned by Jerome (De Vir. Illust., 7) and accepted by Origen (Eusebii, H. E. vi, 25)—one among many proofs of the want of the critical faculty among the fathers of that age.

Additional evidence of the early acceptance of Luke's Gospel may be derived from the quarto recension of its relation to the Gospel of Mark. This is not the place to discuss this subject, which has led critics to the most opposite conclusions, for a full account of which the reader may be referred to De Wette, Einleit. in N. T. p. 119-137, as well as to the treatises of Ritschi, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Hahn, and Volkmar. It will be enough for our purpose to mention that an attempt was made in pursuit of his professed object of restoring the purity of the Gospel, which had been corrupted by Judaizing
teachers, rejected all the books of the canon with the exception of ten epistles of Paul and a gospel, which he called simply a gospel of Christ. We have the express testimony of Irenaeus (Contr. Haer. ii, 27, 2: iii, 12, 12, etc.), Tertullian (Cont. Marc. iv, 1, 2, 6), Origen (Cont. Cels. ii, 27), and Epiphanius (Hær. xiii, 11) that the basis of Marcion's Gospels was Luke. He contra-restated and argued against him by suit to his peculiar tenets (for the alterations and omissions, the chief being its curtailing by the first two chapters, see De Wette, p. 128-132), though we cannot assert, as was done by his enemies among the orthodox, that all the variations are due to Marcion himself, many of them having gone too far to be in agreement with his heretical views and being, rather, various readings of great antiquity and high importance. Of late years, however, the op-posite view, which was first broached by Semler, Grass- bach, and Eichhorn, has been vigorously maintained, among others, by Kitälch and Baur, who have endeav-ored to prove that the Gospel of Luke, as we have it, is interpolated, and that the portions of Marcion is charged with having omitted were really unauthorized additions to the original document. See Bleeke, Einl. in das N. T. § 62. Voelckan, in his exhaustive treatise Das Evangelium, Akroasis, and especially pp. 185 seq., has satisfactorily disposed of this question, and has demonstrated that the Gospel of Luke, as we now have it, was the material on which Marcion worked, and, therefore, that before he began to teach, the date of which may be fixed about A.D. 139, it was already accepted by the general church. Zeller (Das Evangelium, 1860, § 158) and Ritshch have since abandoned their position (Theol. Jahrb. 1851, p. 387, 388, and Baur has greatly modified his (Markusevangel. 1851. p. 191). See also Hahn, Das Evangelium Marcionis (Königsb. 1823); Olahassen, Echt- heit der vier Kanon. Evangelien (Königsb. 1823); Ritshch, Das Evangelium Marcius (Tübingen, 1846); Baur, Krit. Untersuchungen über das Kan. Evangelien (Tübingen, 1847); Hilgenf. Krit. Untersuchungen (Halle, 1850); bishop Thiriiw's Introduction to Schleiermacher's on St. Luke; De Wette, Leibach d. N. T. (Berlin, 1846); Norton, Gema- tiness of the Gospels (Booth, 1844), iii, add. note C, p. xlix. II. Sources.—The authorities from which Luke de- rived his Gospel are clearly indicated by him in the in- troduction (i, 1-4). He does not claim to have been an eye-witness of our Lord's ministry, or to have any per- sonal knowledge of the facts he records, but, as an honest compiler, to have gone to the best sources of information then accessible, and, having accurately traced the whole course of the apostolic tradition from the very first, in its every detail (σαρκολοσθετούς ἀνώνυμον πάσιν αὐτοίς), to have written an orderly narrative of the facts (σαρπαλοσθετούς ἀνώνυμον πάσιν αὐτοίς), and chapters 1-11. Luke uses the Christian Church, and which Theophylact has already learned, not from books, but from oral teaching (σαρπαλοσθετούς ἀνώνυμον πάσιν αὐτοίς); comp. Acts xviii, 25; Gal. vi, 5). These sources were partly the "oral tradition" (σαρπαλοσθετούς) of those "who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and minis- ters of the Word," and partly the written records (to which Ewald, vi, 40, on unexplained grounds, dogmat- ically assigns a non-Judaic origin) which even then "many" (σαρπαλοσθετούς) had attempted to draw up, of which, though the evangelist's words do not necessarily bear the mark, Luke has preserved a copy, and which he himself used. Though we thankfully believe that, as well in the selection of his materials as in the employment of them, Luke was acting under the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, it will be remarked that he lays claim to no such supernatural guidance, but simply to the care and accuracy of an honest, painstaking, and well-in- formed editor, not so consciously under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit as to supersede the use of his own mental powers. His use of his authorities is not me- chanical; though often incorporating, apparently with little alteration, large portions of the oral tradition, es- pecially in the case of words of our Lord, or relating to him by whom he conversed, and adopting narratives already current (of which the first two chapters, with their harsh Hebraistic phraseology, immediately succeeding the comparatively pure Greek of the dedication, are an example), the free handling of his pen is everywhere to be recognised. The connecting links and the passages of transition evidence the hand of the author, which may again be recognised in the greater variety of his style, the more complex character of his sentences, and the care he bestows in smooth and aligned transitions, imparting a more classical air to the synoptical portions.

Notwithstanding the almost unanimous consent of the fathers as to the Pauline origin of Luke's Gospel (Tertull. adv. Marc. iv, 5, "Lucem digestum Paulus as- sertive solent:" Irenaeus, Cont. Haer. iii, 1; Origen, in Euseb. Praep. ev. iv, 21; Eus. H.E., iii, 25; Euseb. Hist. E., iv, 7; Jerome, De Vir. Illust. 7), there is little or nothing in the gospel itself to favor such a view, and very much to contradict it. It is true that the account of the in- surrection of the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. xi, 23-25, displays an almost verbal identity with Luke xxii, 19, 20; and, as Paul affirms that he received his "from the Lord," it is highly probable that the evangelist has in this in- stance incorporated a fragment of the direct teaching of his master. But this is a solitary exception (Luke xxvii, 44, comp. 1 Cor. xvi, 5), is too trifling to de- serve notice, and unless the gospel were understood as it should have expressed himself as he has done in his preface if he had derived the facts of his narrative from one who was neither "an eye-witness" nor "a minister of the Word from the beginning." Nor again in the argument by which he traces the origin of the gospel, or generally viewed, there is much that can fairly be consid- ered as bearing out the hypothesis of a Pauline origin. Those who have sifted the gospel with this object have, it is true, gathered a number of passages which are sup- posed to have a Pauline tendency (see Hilgenfeld, Evangel., and the ingenious essay prefixed to this gospel in Dr. Wordsworth's Greek Testament, e. g. Luke iv, 25 sq.; v, 52 sq.; x, 80 sq.; xvii, 16-18; and the parables of the prodigal son, the unprofitable servant, and the Pharisee and publican, which have been instanced by De Wette as bringing out the apostle's teaching on jus- tification by faith alone; but, as Dean Alford has ably shown (Greek Test. i, 44, note b), such a list may easily be collected from the other gospels, while the entire ab- sence of any definite statement of the doctrinal truths which come forward with the greatest prominence in the apostle's writings, and, with very scanty exceptions, of his peculiar theological phraseology, is of itself suffi- cient to prove how undue has been the weight assigned to Pauline influence in the composition of the gospel. It is certainly true that, in the words of bishop Thi- riliwe's Introduction to St. Luke, Introd. p. cxxiv, "Luke's Gospel contains the ideas of that enlarged view of Christianity which gave to the gospel, as preached by Paul, a form and an extent very differ- ent from the original tradition of the Jews," but no more can be legitimately inferred than that Luke was Paul's disciple, instructed by the apostle of the Gentiles, and naturally sharing in his view of the gospel as a message of salvation for all nations; not that his gospel was in any sense derived from him, or rested on the apostolic basis of Paul.

The question that naturally arises whether the gospels of Matthew and Mark were among the ἐγχριστικα ἦμνα ὑπὸ τοῦ Λουκα to which Luke refers. The answers to this have been various and contradictory, the same data leading critics to the most opposite conclusions. Meyer (Comment. ii, 217) is of opinion that Luke availed himself both of Matthew and Mark, though chiefly of Mark's "commis- sive gospel;" while De Wette, on the other hand (Ein- lei. sec. 94, p. 185), considers Mark's Gospel the latest of the three, and based upon them as authorities. In the face of these and other discordant theories, of which a list may be seen (De Wette, Einlei. § 86, p. 192-186), it will be wise to note here the careful and unprejudiced review of the evidence will, however, lead most unbiased readers to the conclusion that all three wrote in perfect independence of one another; each, under the
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guidance of the Holy Spirit, giving a distinct view of the great complex whole, if this is the rule of the writer's own individual impressions, and that least of all is Luke to be considered as a mere rédacteur of the prior writings of his brother synoptists—a theory, the improbabilities and absurdities of which have been well pointed out by de la Angel in the Prolegomena to his Greek Testament, i., 5-11.

III. Relation to Matthew and Mark.—Believing that no one of the three synoptical gospels is dependent on the others, and that the true explanation of this striking correspondence, not only in the broad outlines of our Lord's life, but in the details, must be found either in the original outline filled up, but also, to a considerable extent, in the parables and addresses recorded, and even in the language and forms of expression, is to be sought in the same apocalyptic oral tradition having formed the original basis of each, we have presented a very interesting point of inquiry in tracing the correspondence and divergence of the several narratives. In particular, a comparison of Luke with the other synoptists furnishes many striking and important results. With the general identity of the body of the history, we at once notice that there are two large portions peculiar to this evangelist, one of which is an important remainder made by Mark and Luke alone. These are the first two chapters, narrating the conception, birth, infancy, and early development of our Lord and his forerunner, and the long section (ix, 31-vii, 14) devoted to our Lord's final journey to Jerusalem and his crucifixion and resurrection.

We have also other smaller sections supplying incidents passed over by Matthew and Mark—the questions of the people and the Baptist's replies (iii, 10-14); Simon and the woman that was a sinner (vii, 36-50); the raising of the widow's son (viii, 11-17); the story of Zacchaeus (xix, 1-10); our Lord's weeping over Jerusalem (xix, 38-44); the journey to Emmaus (xxiv, 13-35). In other parts he follows a tradition at once so much fuller and so widely at variance with that of the others as almost to suggest the idea that a different event is recorded (ch. iv, 16-20; comp. Matt. xiii, 54-56; Mark vi, 1-6; ch. v, 1-11; comp. Matt. iv, 18-22; Mark i, 16-20). Even where the language employed so closely corresponds as to remove all question of the identity of the events, fresh details are given, often of the greatest interest, e. g. προσφηνέμονος (iii, 21); σωτηρίας εξ αὐτούς (iv, 1); ἡμῶν παρακλήσεως, κ. τ. λ. (iv, 6); ἀρχαίοι καίροι (iv, 13); ἡμῶν Κυρίου ἡμῶν, κ. τ. λ. (v, 17); καταλαμβάνειν ἄμαντον καὶ ὧδε μαζί (v, 28, 29); the comparison of old and new wine (v, 29); ἕναλλάσσειν ἑνὸς (vi, 11); ἡμῶν εἰς τὸ δικαίωμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῶν Ἰουδαίων (vii, 50); the collection for the poor (vii, 5). In the case of John's disciples (vii, 21), and the incidental remarks (ver. 29, 30); many additional touches in the narratives of the Gadarene demoniac (viii, 26-39), and the transfiguration, especially the fact of his praying (Luke records at least six instances of our Lord having prayed omitted by the other evangelists), and the subject of the conversation with Moses and Elijah (ix, 28-36); notices supplied (xx, 19; xxxi, 37, 38), all tending to convince us that we are in the presence not of a mere copyist, but of a trustworthy and independent witness. Luke's account of the ἀμαρτίας ἔλθεν and resurrection is to a great extent his own, adding much of the deepest significance to the synoptical narrative, particularly the warning to Simon in the name of the twelve (xxii, 31, 32); the bloody sweat (ver. 44); the sending to Herod (xxiii, 1-27); the words to the women (ver. 27-31); the prayers for forgiveness (ver. 34); the penitent thief (ver. 38-43); the walk to Emmaus (xxiv, 13-35); and the ascension (ver. 50-53).

It has been remarked that there is nothing in which Luke is more characteristically distinguished from both the evangelists than in the selection of our Lord's parables. There are no less than eleven quite peculiar to him: (1) The two debtors; (2) Good Samaritan; (3) Friend at midnight; (4) Rich fool; (5) Barren fig-tree; (6) Lost silver; (7) Prodigal son; (8) Unjust steward; (9) Rich man and Lazarus; (10) Unjust judge; (11) Pharisees and publicans; and two others, the Great Supper, and the Pounds, which, with many points of similarity, differ considerably from those found in Matthew.

Of our Lord's miracles, six omitted by Matthew and Mark are recorded by Luke: (1) Miraculous draught; (2) The son of the widow of Nain; (3) The woman with a spirit of infirmity; (4) The man with a droplep; (5) The ten lepers; (6) The healing of Malchus's ear. Of the seven not related by him, the most remarkable is the Syrophoenician woman, for which a priori reasoning would have claimed a special place in the so-called Gospel of the Gentiles. We miss also the walking on the sea, the feeding of the four thousand, the cure of the blind men, and of the deaf and dumb, the stater in the fish's mouth, and the curising of the fig-tree.

The chief omissions in narrative are the whole section, Matt. xiv-xvi, 12; Mark vi, 45-viii, 26; Mark xix, 2-12; xx, 1-16, 20-28; comp. Mark x, 35-45; the amnointing, Matt. xxvi, 6-13; Mark xiv, 3-9.

With regard to coincidence of language, a most important and important remainder made by Mark (Michaelis, v, 317), that when Matthew and Luke agree verbally in the common synoptical sections, Mark always agrees with them also; and that there is not a single instance in these sections of verbal agreement between Matthew and Luke alone. A careful examination will discover that the verbal agreement between Luke and Mark is greater than that between Luke and Matthew, while the mutual dependence of the second and third evangelists on the same source is rendered still more probable by the observation of Reuss, that they agree both in excess and defect when compared with Matthew: that when Mark has elements wanting in Matthew, Luke usually has them also; while, when Matthew supplies more than Mark, Luke follows the latter; and that where Mark fails altogether, Luke's narrative often represents a different wapélloias from that of Matthew.

IV. Character and general Purpose.—We must admit, but with great caution, on account of the abuses to which the notion has led, that there are traces in the gospel of a leaning towards Gentile rather than Jewish converts. The genealogy of Jesus is traced to Adam, not from Abraham, as in the synoptists, so as to humanize the savior, or make it the picture of the human race, and not merely with the Jews. Luke describes the messiah of the Seventy, which number has usually been supposed to be typical of all nations; as twelve, the number of the apostles, represents the Jews and their twelve tribes.

On the supposed "doctrinal tendency" of the gospel, however, much has been written which it is painful to dwell on, but easy to refute. Some have endeavored to see in this divine book an attempt to ingraft the teaching of Paul on the Jewish representations of the Messiah, and to elevate the doctrine of universal salvation, of which Paul was the most prominent preacher, over the Judaizing tendencies, and to put Paul higher than the twelve apostles! (See Zeller, Apostel; Baur, Kieron, Evang.; and Hilgenfeld.) How to interpret the mysterious and representative in the synoptists, the Gospel and the Acts, could have been taken for two tracts written for polemical and personal ends, is to an English mind hardly conceivable. Even its supporters found that the inspired author had carried out his purpose so badly that they were forced to assume that a second author or editor had altered the work with a view to work together Jewish and Pauline elements into harmony (Baur, Kieron, Evang. p. 502). Of this editing and re-editing there is no trace whatever; and the invention of the second editor is a gross device to cover the failure of the first hypothesis. By such a machinery it will be possible to preserve in after ages that Gibson's History was originally a plea for Christianity, or any similar paradox.

The passages which are supposed to bear out this
“Pauline tendency” are brought together by Hilgenfeld with great care (Evangelien, p. 250); but Heus has shown, by passages from Matthew which have the same “tendency” against the Jews, how brittle such an argument is, and has left no room for doubt that the two evangelists wrote facts and not theories, and dealt with their history as mere facts, for the benefit of a church, or de la Théologie, vol. ii, b. vi, ch. vi). Writing to a Gentile convert, and through him addressing other Gentiles, Luke has adapted the form of his narrative to their needs, but not a trace of a subjective bias, not a vestige of a personal motive, has been suffered to sully the inspired page. Had the influence of Paul been the leading and principal source of this gospel, we should have found it in more resemblance to the Epistle to the Ephesians, which contains (so to speak) the Gospel of Paul.

The chief characteristic of Luke's Gospel which distinguishes it from those of the other synoptists, especially Matthew, is its universality. The message he delivers is not, as it has sometimes been mistakenly described, for the Gentiles as such, as distinguished from the Jews, but for men. As we read his record, we seem to be looking at the world in the same light as the apostles who heard the Gospel message, when all distinctions of race or class should be done away, and all claims based on a fancied self-righteousness annulled, and the glad tidings should be heard and received by all who were united in the bonds of a common humanity, and felt their need of the Gospel. Luke presents the light to women, the Gentiles, and the glory of his people Israel. It is this character which has given it a right to the title of the Pauline Gospel, and enables us to understand why Marcion selected it as the only true exponent of Christ's Gospel. This universality, however, is rather interwoven with the Gospel than to be specified in definite instances; and yet we cannot but feel how completely it is in accordance with it that Luke records the enrolment of the Saviour of the world as a citizen of the world-embracing Roman empire—that he traces his genealogy back to the head of the human race—that his first recorded sermon (iv. 10-27) gives proof of God's wide-reaching mercy, as displayed in the widow of Sarepta and Naaman—that in the mission of the twelve, the limitation to the “cities of Israel” should have no place, while he alone records the mission of the seventy (a number symbolical of the Gentile world)—that in the sermon on the mount all references to the law should be omitted, while all claims to superior holiness or national prerogatives are cut away by his gracious dealings with, and kindly mention of, the despised Samaritans (ix. 52 sqq.); and so on.

As with the race in general, so with its individual members. Luke delights to bear witness that none are shut out from God's mercy—nay, that the outcast and the lost are the special objects of his care and search. As proofs of this, we may refer to the narratives of the woman who was a sinner, the Samaritan leper, Zachaeus, and the penitent thief; and the parables of the lost sheep and lost silver, the Pharisee and publican, the rich man and Lazarus, and, above all, to that “which has probably exercised most influence on the mind of Christendom in all periods” (Maurice, Unity of the Gospel, p. 274), the prodigal son.

Most naturally also in Luke we find the most frequent allusions to that which has been one of the most striking distinctions between the old and modern world—the position of woman as a fellow-heir of the kingdom of heaven, sharing in the same responsibilities and hopes, and that woman comes forward most prominently (the Syrophoenician, as already noticed, is a single marked exception) as the object of our Lord's sympathy and love. Commencing with the Virgin Mary as a type of the purity and sublimity which is the true glory of womanhood, we meet in succession with Anna the prophetess, the pattern of holy womanhood (comp. 1 Tim. v, 5); the woman that was a sinner; the widow of Nain; the ministering women (vii. 3, 5); Mary and Martha; the “daughter of Abraham” (xiii. 11); and close the list with the words of exquisitely tender and sympathy to the “daughters of Jerusalem” (xxiii. 28).

This universal character is one, the roots of which lie deep in the soil of human nature, and which is among the attributes of the Messiah as the Saviour of the world. With him, more than in the other gospels, Jesus is “the second man, the Lord from heaven” (Lange); and if in his pages we see more of his divine nature, and have in the more detailed reports of his conception and ascension clearer proofs that he was indeed the Son of God, yet it is here that we find the living sympathy and intercourse with the inner man, in the human fellowship grounded on not denying the divine condescension and compassion” (Maurice, u. c.), that we recognize the perfect ideal man.

Luke, it has been truly remarked, is the gospel of contrasts. Starting with the contrast between the doct of Zacharias and the trustful obedience of Mary, we find in almost every page proofs of the twofold power of Christ's word and work foretold by Simeon (ii. 34). To select a few of the more striking examples: He also shows the gulf between Simeon and the doctors of the law; between Joseph and Mary, the thankful and thankless lepers, the tears and hosannas on the brow of Olivet; he alone adds the “woes” to the “blessings” in the sermon on the mount, and carries on in the parables of the rich man and Lazarus, the Pharisees and publicans; and the good and the bad of contrasts which finds so appropriate a close in the penitent and blaspheming malefactors.

Once more, Luke is the hymn-writer of the New Testament. Taught by the church, the Gospel prolongs her hymns of praise to the glory of Christ (Christ's Year). But for his record the Magnificat, Benedictus, and Nunc Dimittis would have been lost to us; and it is he who has preserved to us the Ave Maria, identified with the religious life of so large a part of Christendom, and the Gloria in Excelsis, which forms the culminating point of its most solemn ritual.

To turn from the internal to the external characteristics of Luke's Gospel, these we shall find no less marked and distinct. His narrative is, as he promised it should be, an orderly one (eswΣΩLXII, i, 3); but the order is one rather of subject than of time. As to the other synoptists, though maintaining the principle of chronological succession in the main outline of his narrative, "he is ever ready to sacrifice mere chronology to that order of events which was the fittest to develop his purpose according to the object proposed by the inspiring Spirit; and its incidents according to the grander and deeper order than that of mere time" (Maurice, u. c.). It is true that he furnishes us with the three most precise dates in the whole Gospel narrative (i, 2; iii, 1, 28—each one, be it remarked, the subject of vehement controversy), but, in spite of the attempts made by Wieseler and others to force a strict chronological character upon his gospel, an unprejudiced perusal will convince us that his narrative is loose and fragmentary, especially in the section ix, 49-xvii, 14, and his notes of time vague and destitute of precision, even where the other synoptists are more definite (ch. v; 13; comp. Matt. viii, 1; ch. viii, 4; comp. Matt. xii, 1; ch. viii, 22; comp. Mark iv, 35, etc.).

"The accuracy with which Luke has drawn up his Gospel appears in many instances. Thus, he is particularly in telling us the dates of his more important events. The birth of Christ is referred to the reign of Herod, and the preparation of the way of the Lord, of John the Baptist, are decided by the facts given in Mark or Matthew (comp. ch. viii, 23 with parallel Gospels, and with Josephus, War, iii, x; Irby and Mangles, Travels, ch. vi). In ch. xx, 1, we read a gesture on

Amid this uncertainty, it will be well to see if there is any internal evidence which will help us in determining these points. We are here met at the outset by those who are determined to see in every clear prophecy a

vilification post eventum, and who find in the predictions of the overthrow of Jerusalem (xiii, 34, 50; xix, 44, 46; xxi, 51; xxii, 20), and the persecutions of our Lord's followers (xvii, 22, 25; xxii, 13), and the massacres of the

swappens (xxii, 23–25), a clear proof that the Gospel was composed after A.D. 70. This has come to be regarded as a settled point by a certain school of criticism (Ew ald, v, 148; De Weer, Eisdei; p. 298; Credner, Eisdei; p. 186; Meyer: Rev. xvi, 13; Nicolas, Estudes, N. T., etc.), though there is no small diversity among its representatives as to the time and place of its publication of the Gospel and the sources from which it was derived. Those, on the other hand, who, brought up in a sounder and more reverent school, see no a priori impossibility in a future event being foretold by the Son of God, will be led by the same data to a very different conclusion, and will discover sufficient grounds for dating the Gospel not later than A.D. 58. It is certain that the Gospel was written before the Acts. The Apostles (Acts i, 15) could not have been composed before A.D. 58, when the writer leaves Paul "in his own hired house" at Rome; nor probably long after, since otherwise the issue of the apostle's imprisonment and appeal to Caesar must have found its natural home in the next six or eight years in the other—when compared with their abundance in Matthew. Only eight out of the whole number are peculiar to our evangelist (marked with an asterisk in the annexed list), which occur in the portions where he appears to have followed more or less completely a synopsis of his own; the history of the birth and childhood of our Lord, the visit to Nazareth (ch. iv), and that of the passion. The rest are found in the common synoptic sections. We may also remark that, with the most trifling exceptions, Luke never quotes the O. T. himself, nor speaks on his own authority of events occurring in fulfilment of prophecy, and that his citations are only found in the sayings of our Lord and others. The following list is tolerably complete, exclusive of the hymns, which are little more than a cento of phrases from the O. T.

I. verse 2. Gen. xxx. 29. Lev. x. 18. xiv. 7. xxii. 13. xxiv. 15. xlvii. 27. xxv. 6. xlviii. 28. xxvi. 1. xlix. 6. "Vv. Quotations from the O. T.—It is a striking confirmation of the view propounded above of the character of Luke's Gospel, and the object of its composition, that the references to the O. T., the authority of which with any except the Jews would be but small, are so few—three-four in one place at sixty-five in the other—when compared with their abundance in Matthew. Only eight out of the whole number are peculiar to our evangelist (marked with an asterisk in the annexed list), which occur in the portions where he appears to have followed more or less completely a synopsis of his own; the history of the birth and childhood of our Lord, the visit to Nazareth (ch. iv), and that of the passion. The rest are found in the common synoptic sections. We may also remark that, with the most trifling exceptions, Luke never quotes the O. T. himself, nor speaks on his own authority of events occurring in fulfilment of prophecy, and that his citations are only found in the sayings of our Lord and others. The following list is tolerably complete, exclusive of the hymns, which are little more than a cento of phrases from the O. T.

VII. Time and Place of Composition.—In the complete silence of Scripture, our only means for determining the above points are tradition and internal evidence. The statements of the former, though sufficiently definite, are inconsistent and untrustworthy. Jerome (Pref. in Matthew) asserts that it was composed "in Asia, the western islands of the Euphrates and regions of Bactria," an opinion which appears to have been generally received in the 4th century (Gregory Nazianzen, Ec. 'Aya'ta, and has been accepted by Lardner (Credibility), who fixes its date A.D. 63 or 64, after the release of Paul. An Arabic version, published by Eraspini, places its composition in a city of Macedonia, twenty-two years after the ascension, A.D. 51; a view which Hilgenfeld and Wettstein (Gr. Text, i, 170) give in their adherence. A still earlier date, thirteen years after the ascension, is assigned by the signature in some ancient MSS. Other statements as to the place are Alexandria Trias, Alexandria in Egypt (the Peshito and Persian versions, Abufeda, accepted by Mill, Grabe, and Wetstein), Rome (Ewald, vi, 40; Olhausen), and Csesarea (Bertholdt, Schott, Thierncr, Aolf, Abp. Thomson).

VIII. For whom written.—On this point we have certain evidence. Luke himself tells us that the object he had in view in compiling his gospel was that a certain number among the Jews might believe in Christ. "The scripture of the Prophets in the east whereon he had been (orally) instructed." Nothing more is known of this Theophilus, and it is idle to repeat the vague conjectures in which critics have indulged, some even denying his personal existence altogether, and arguing, from the meaning of the name, that it stands merely as a title of honor (Acts xxiii, 28; xxiv, 3; xxvi, 25), indicates that he was a person of official dignity. He was not an inhabitant of Palestine, for the evangelist minutely describes the position of places to which such a
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see would be well known. It is so with Capernaum (v. 51), Nazareth (v. 20), Arimathea (xxiii. 51), the country of the Gadarees (viii. 26), the distance of Mount Olivet and Emmaus from Jerusalem (Acts i. 12; Luke xxiv. 13). By the same test he probably was not a Macedonian (Acts xvi, 12), nor an Athenian (Acts xxii, 21), nor a Cretan (Acts xxxvii, 12). But that he who wrote the second part of the book of Acts, perhaps the most important part of the New Testament, is probably from similar data. In tracing Paul’s journey to Rome, places which an Italian might be supposed not to know are described minutely (Acts xvii, 6, 12, 16); but when he comes to Sicily and Italy this is neglected. Syracuse and Megara, even the more obvious, are not once mentioned, and Apollonia and Ariminum (rimo), are mentioned as to one likely to know them. (For other theories, see Marsh’s “Michaelis,” vol. iii, part i, p. 236; and Kuinöö’s “Prolegomena.”) All that emerges from this argument is that the person for whom Luke wrote in the first instance was a Gentile reader. But, though the Gospel is inscribed to him, we must not consider that it was written for him alone, but that theophilus stands rather as the representative of the whole Christian world; not, as we have already seen, of the Gentiles, as such, to the exclusion of the Jews, but the whole body of Christians. Luke had his own interests, and for whom, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the work was adapted “as the Gospel of the nations (τοιο ὅ γε τῶν ἔθνων, Origin, apud Euseb. vi, 25), full of mercy and hope assured to the whole world by the Lord’s suffering Saviour” (Westcott, “Study of Gospels,” p. 218).

IX. Contents of the Gospel.—After the brief preface—the value of which it is difficult to overestimate as throwing light on the history of the composition of the gospels in general, and the true theory of scriptural inspiration—the narrative of the Gospel may be divided into four portions: 1. The time preceding our Lord’s public life, including the conception and birth of John the Baptist, and of Christ, his circumcision, presentation in the Temple, and the single incident recorded of his childhood (ii. 41-51), comprised in the first two chapters. The whole of this portion is in form, and to a considerable extent in substance, peculiar to our evangelist. See § X. 2. A large number of originally detached and independent narratives, comprising our Lord’s baptism, temptation, and Galilean ministry, almost the whole being confined to this volume in an interrupted state (iii. 1-ix, 49). 3. A large section, sometimes, but improperly, termed the “gnomon,” containing narratives of events and reports of discourses belonging to the period from the close of our Lord’s direct Galilean ministry to his ascension at Jerusalem, a few days prior to the formal entrance into Jerusalem, and mostly occurring during the actual journey (ix, 50-xviii, 14). The whole of this, in its present form, is peculiar to Luke. 4. The last days of Christ: his entry into Jerusalem, discourses in the Temple, his sufferings and death, his resurrection and ascension, common to Luke and the other evangelists in substance, though there are considerable differences in detail in the narratives of the passion and resurrection (especially the journey to Emmaus), and that of the ascension is entirely Luke’s own (xviii, 15-xvii, 54).

3. X. Integrity of the Gospel—the first Two Chapters. The Gospel was compiled by Luke, and by the author of the Clementine Homilies. The silence of the apostolic fathers only indicates that it was admitted into the canon somewhat late, which was probably the case. The evidence of the Marcionite controversy is, as we have seen, that our gospel was in use before A.D. 120. A special question, however, has been raised about the first two chapters. The critical history of these is best drawn out perhaps in Meyer’s note. The chief objection against them is founded on the garbled opening of Marcion’s Gospel, who omits the first two chapters, and combines them with other passages. (So Theodoret.) The question is, “Anno quintodecimo principatus Tiberian proponeit Deum descendisse in civitatem Galileam Cepharum?” But any objection founded on this must apply to the whole third chapter as well; and the historic character of our Lord’s childhood could not be known to and quoted by Justin Martyr (see “Apologetic,” i, § 88, and an allusion, “Dial. cum Tryphon” 109) about the time of Marcion. There is therefore no real ground for distinguishing between the first two chapters and the rest; and for the argument for the composition of Luke’s Gospel apply to the whole inspired narrative as we now possess it (see Meyer’s note; also Völekmann, p. 180).

XI. Commentaries.—The following are the special exegetical helps on Luke’s Gospel: Origin, Fragmenta (in Opp. iii, 97); also Scholia (in Bibl. Patr. Gallandii, xiv); Athanasius, Commentationes (Rima, iii, 81); Ambrose, Expositio (in Opp. i, 1257); Augustine, Questions (in Opp. iii, 111); Jerome, Homiliae (from Origin, in Opp. vii, 245); also Expositio (in Opp. Suppl., xi, 764); Cyril Alex., Allocutionem (in Mai, Script., Vet. i, 741); Commentaria (ed. Smith, Lond. 1858, 4to; Commentary, tr. by same, ibid. 1859, 2 vols. 8vo); Eusebius, Excerpta (Ibid. 1807, 6); Titus Bostrensis, Commentarius (in Bibl. Max. Patr., iv, 415); Apollinaris Loedicensis, Fragmenta (in Mai, Class. Auct. x, 490); Bode, in Lucam (op. vii, 276, Works); Photius, Bibliothek, 92, 93; ed. Gilson, x, 189, 189; Vett., i, 189; Nicetas Senon. Colena (ib. ix, 626); Eribdus Rivelinensis, Homiliae (in Bibl. Max. Patr. xxiii, 11); Bonaventura, Expositio (in Opp. ii, 5); Albus Magnus, Commentarius (in Opp. 10); Decoratus, Laudae (in Mai, Script., Vet. ii, 17); J. W. Wingle (in Opp. iv, 118); Brentius, Homiliae (in Opp. v, 2); Lambert, Commentarius (Norib. 1924, Argent. 1526, 8vo); Agricola, Commentarius (Aug. Vind. 1615, Norib. 1525, Hag. 1526, 8vo); Sarcer, Scholia (Basil. 1529, Francet. 1541, 8vo); Bullinger, Commentarius (Tigr. 1454, fol.); Hofmeister, Commentarius [including Mact. and Mark] (Lovan. 1652, fol.; Paris, 1556, Colon. 1572, 8vo); Logenhausen, Commentarius [from Augustine] (Antwerp, 1754, 8vo); Soar, Commentarius (Contim. 1754, Par. 1758, 8vo); Stella, Commentarius (Rom. Cath.); Salimart, Complut. 1578, Lugdun. 1580, 1585, 1592, Rom. 1589, Antwerp 1589, 1584, 1591, 1600, 1605, 1606, 1618, 1622, 1625, 1654, Mogunt. 1680, fol.; Ven. 1688, Mayence, 1681, 4to); De Horoeco, Commentarius (Complut. 1579, 4to); Gaustler, Homiliae (Tigr. 1585, fol.); Piscator, Analysis (Sigen. 1566, 1608, 8vo); De Melo, Commentaria (Villa. 1567, fol.); Toleus- tratus, Commentarius [in ch. i-x] (Rom. 1600, Paris. 1600, Colon. 1619, fol.; Ven. 1670, 4to); Winckelmann, Commentarius (Franc. 1561, Genua. 1569, Luth. 1618, 8vo); Del Pas, Commentaria (Rom. 1626, 2 vols. fol.); Corderius, Catece (Antw. 1628, 4to); Novarinus, Expensis (Lugd. 1649, fol.); Illuminatus (in Lucam); A Lapide, in Lucam (Antwerp, 1660, fol.); Spielenberg, Commentarius (Jen. 1663, 4to); Hartscker, Aemiliani- gen [continued by Molinaeus] (Anst. 1687, 4to); Tolmar, Verklaring (Hamb. 1741, 4 vols. 4to); Pope, Erläuterung (Bremen, 1771, 1781, 2 vols. 8vo); Anon. American (Lip. 1792, 8vo); Morus, Prolegomenon (Lips. 1793, 8vo); Schleiermacher, Versuch (vol. iv, 1817, 8vo); trans. Essay, Lond. 1825, 8vo); Major, Notes (Lond. 1826, 8vo); Bömermann, Scholia (Lips. 1880, 8vo); Stein, Kommentar (Halle, 1880, 8vo); Wilson, Questions (Cambridge, 1866, 12mo); Summer, exposition (3d ed. 1833, 8vo); Watson, Illustration (ch. i-xii) (in Works, iii, alio loco); Nearly, N. Y. 8vo); Short, Lectures (London, 1837, 12mo); Sirt, Notes (pt. i, London, 1843, 8vo); Trollope, Commentary (Lond. 1849, 12mo); Thomson, Lectures (Lond. 1849-51, 3 vols. 8vo); Ford, Illustration (Lond. 1861, 12mo); Cum- mining, Readings (London, 1854, 12mo); Foot, Lectures (Glas. 1857, 2 vols. 8vo); Goodwin, Commentary (Lond. 1865, 8vo); Stark, Commentary (London, 1866, 2 vols. 12mo); Van Doren, Commentary (Lond. and N. Y. 1868, 2 vols. 12mo); (Ibidet, Commentaire (Neuchatel, 1870, 8vo). See Goetz.

Luke of Fragace, one of the most celebrated bishops and writers of the Unitas Fratrum, or the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, was born about 1460, in Bohe-
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mita, and studied at the University of Prague, where he
tained to the degree of A.B. A member of the Uttra-
quast, or National Church, he quitted Prague in conse-
quence of difficulties with the Roman Catholics, sought
out the Brethren, whose simple faith and stanch con-
fusion of it attracted him, and joined their communion
about 1500. At the time they were the object of va-
erious dissensions, owing to the gradual separation of two
parties among them, the one extreme, the other moder-
ate in its views of the discipline. The former repre-
sented the illiterate, and the latter the educated portion
of the membership. Luke, being a thoroughly learned
man, at once perceived the great advantage of the execu-
tive ability and distinctive position. He held to the moder-
ate party, but enjoyed the confidence of many on the other side. In 1541 he
was sent, with three associates, on a visit to the East, in
order to find, if possible, a body of Christians free from
the corruptions of the age, with whom the Union Frat-
rum might establish a fellowship. Returning from
this journey without having accomplished its object, he
devoted himself to literary labors, and wrote a number
of works treating of the points in dispute among the
Brethren. One of these publications, a Latin treatise
not a little to the ascendency of the moderate party, and to
the final pacification of the Church in 1549, after the most
violent of the extremists had seceded, and organized a
sect of their own, called the Amalites, which soon de-
generated into a licentious sect. Thirty years later, Luke un-
dertook a mission to the Waldenses of Italy and France,
and on his return in 1570 was elected bishop. His
sound judgment and unflinching courage sustained the
Brethren in times of persecution; his sense of the
dignity and propriety of public worship served to develop
their ritual; his enthusiastic conviction of the scriptur-
al character of their faith opened the way for their
rapid increase among the higher classes; and his won-
derful diligence gave them a literature far superior to
that of the Utraquists and of the Bohemian Roman
Catholics. In 1560 he published a Catechism and a
Hymn-book, the first evangelical works of this kind in
the Middle Ages. Having, in 1518, become the senior
bishop of the Church and president of its ecclesiastical
council, he began to watch the progress of Luther's Re-
formation with close attention, and in 1522 sent a de-
putation to Wittenberg in order to present the good
wishes of the Brethren. The result, however, was not
satisfactory. Luke disagreed with Luther in regard to
the doctrines both of the Lord's Supper and of justifica-
tion by faith. On the one hand, he upheld the spiritual
priesthood of all believers, he gave the scriptural
interpretation of the Sacraments in opposition to all the
errors of infidels. His first work was his Ars major or generalis, which has so severely tested the acuteness of
commentators. This work is the development of the
method of teaching known subsequently as the " Lu-
lian method," and afforded a kind of mechanical aid to
the mind in the acquisition and retention of knowledge
by a systematic arrangement of subjects and ideas.
Like all such methods, however, it gave little more than
a superficial knowledge of any subject, though it was of
use in leading men to perceive the necessity for an
investigation of the truths it involved, and for bringing
about a reform not merely of Christian doctrine, but also of Christian
life. But again the negotiations
failed. Indeed, they produced a personal estrangement
between Luke and Luther, and for a time all inter-
course with Wittenberg was broken off. The real cause
of this disagreement is not clear. In part it was owing
to the grave offence which the deputies took at the
loose morals of the Wittenberg students, and to the free-
dom with which they denounced their manner of life.
Luther, on his side, attacked the rigorism of the Breth-
ren in his Zuckreden. In the following years the Breth-
ren suffered a severe persecution in Bohemia. Luke
himself was seized, loaded with chains, and imprisoned,
and escaped execution only through the intervention of
a powerful noble belonging to the Unitas Fratrum. Af-
ter his liberation he was active for a few years longer,
although suffering from a most painful disease, and
died at Zungzunblau Dec. 11, 1528. His literary labors were
astonishing. He was the author of more than eighty
different works, written partly in Latin and partly in
Bohemian, and consisting of doctrinal, exegetical, and
confessional works. The number of them is not
unknown. For a further account of his life, see Gindely, Geschichte der
Brethren, Brüder, vol. i, bk. i, ch. iii, and bk. ii; Creuzer,
Geschichte d. alten Brüderkirche, i, 95-192; Czerwek,
iii-vii. (E. S.)

Luton St. Day, a festival observed in the Greek and
R 0minish churches on the 18th of October.

Lukewarm (χληρος, tepid), moderately warm;
spoken figuratively of Christians in a half-acknowledged
state (Rev. iii, 16), who are threatened with the divine
discipline, as we instinctively reject from the mouth wa-
ter in this impure state.

Lullianus of Mayence, a noted German prelate of
the Romish Church, flourished in the 8th century as suc-
cessor of Boniface, in the archiepiscopal of Mayence.
He was a native of England, and was educated in
the cloister of Meldun, but went to Germany on invitation
of Boniface, and was his ambassador to pope Zachary about
754. He founded the Council of Attigny, and died at
Rome in 769. In 785 he baptized Wittikind, leader of
the Saxons. He founded the cloister of Hersfeld, and
on his death in 786 was buried there. See Hoefer, Ver.
Biog. Generale, xxxii, 221.

Lully (LLULL or LULLE), Raymond, sumamed
the Doctor Illuminatus, an eminent Spanish philosopher and
theologian, was born at Paris, and died on the island of Ma-
 Jorca, about 1294. In early life he followed his paternal
profession of arms, and abandoned himself to all the
license of a soldier's life. Even when married he con-
tinued to pursue pleasures inconsistent with conjugal
fidelity, and the theme of his poetical compositions was
sexual love. About the year 1296, sick and tired of
debauchery, he retired to a desert to lead a life of soli-
tude and rigorous asceticism. Here he pretended to
have visions, and, among others, a manifestation of
Christ on the cross, who called him to his service, and
to the conversion of the Mohammedans. He therefore
at once engaged in diligent study to prepare for the la-
bors and duties of a missionary. Having mastered the
Arabic, and thoroughly entered into the spirit of Arabi-
ian philosophical writings, he took to the use of his
pen for the conversion of the Saracens, seeking to dem-
strate the truth of the Christian religion to Mohammedans in opposition to all
the errors of infidels. His first work was his Ars major or generalis, which has so severely tested the acuteness of
commentators. This work is the development of the
method of teaching known subsequently as the " Lu-
lian method," and afforded a kind of mechanical aid to
the mind in the acquisition and retention of knowledge
by a systematic arrangement of subjects and ideas.
Like all such methods, however, it gave little more than
a superficial knowledge of any subject, though it was of
use in leading men to perceive the necessity for an
investigation of the truths it involved, and for bringing
about a reform not merely of Christian doctrine, but also of Christian
life. But again the negotiations
failed. Indeed, they produced a personal estrangement
between Luke and Luther, and for a time all inter-
course with Wittenberg was broken off. The real cause
of this disagreement is not clear. In part it was owing
to the grave offence which the deputies took at the
loose morals of the Wittenberg students, and to the free-
dom with which they denounced their manner of life.
Luther, on his side, attacked the rigorism of the Breth-
ren in his Zuckreden. In the following years the Breth-
ren suffered a severe persecution in Bohemia. Luke
himself was seized, loaded with chains, and imprisoned,
and escaped execution only through the intervention of
a powerful noble belonging to the Unitas Fratrum. Af-
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of which he said, "I see many knights going to the Holy Land in the expectation of conquering it by force of arms; but, instead of accomplishing their object, they are in the end all swept off themselves. Therefore it is my belief that the conquest of the Holy Land should be attempted in no other way than the Christian and his apostles undertook to accomplish it—by love, by prayer, by tears, and the offering up of our own lives." Meeting, however, with but little success, he returned to Tunis in 1291, and commenced labors as a missionary by holding conferences with the most learned Mahomedan scholars and theologians. In proclaiming to them the truth of the Christian religion, he insisted especially on the necessary adaptation which a perfect Being could not fail to establish between the primary cause and its effect, and attempted to explain the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation by purely metaphysical arguments. He was, however, expelled by the king of Tunis, and owed his life only to the intervention of a learned and liberal Mahomedan. Lully now went back to Paris, resumed his teaching there, and wrote his Tabula generalis and As exposita, which are a continuation of his former works, and present the same ideas under a different form. In 1298 he succeeded in establishing at Paris, under the protection of king Louis Philippe le Bel, a college where his method was taught. France was at that time in great ferment, and le Bel was anxious to establish the order of Knight Templars, and Boniface VIII, in re-vindicating the right previously claimed by Gregory VII, had aroused the greatest opposition in France. Lully himself, after having again in vain applied to Rome for help, had long out his plans, withdrew to labor wherever an opportunity offered itself. He sought by arguments to convince the Saracens and Jews on the island of Majorca. In 1301 he went to Cyprus, and thence to Armenia, exerting himself to bring back the different schismatic parties of the Ori- ent. He then turned to the Moors of Africa, Algeria, and other cities on the coast of Africa, and finally Bugia, then the seat of the Mahomedan empire. Here he publicly lectured in Arabic, proclaiming "that Christianity is the only true religion; the doctrine of Mohammed, on the contrary, false; and this he was ready to prove to every one." He was again imprisoned, but made his escape by the aid of some Genoese merchants, enduring many hardships on his journey to Europe by shipwreck. He finally reached Paris, and there resumed his lectures with great success. In 1311 the king of France, Charles le Bel, was anxious to give Italy a great exalt that pious monks retired into solitude, instead of giving up their lives for their brethren, and preaching the Gospel among the infidels. Concerning pilgrimages, he contrasted the gorgious processions of the pilgrims with the entry of Christ into Jerusalem; what he did to seek men, and what they do to seek him, and exclaimed, "We see the pilgrims travelling away into distant lands to seek thee, while thou art so near that every man, if he would, might find thee in his own house and chamber. . . . The pilgrims are so deceived by false men, whom they must leave to wait with them, that many of them, when they return home, show themselves to be far worse than they were when they set out on their pilgrimage." As a theologian, Lully, as we have seen from his history, was a self-taught man, not having been trained in the school of any of the great teachers of his time. The speculative and the practical were intimate-ly blended in his mind, and so they are also in his system. "His speculative turn entered even into his enthu-siasm for the cause of missions, and his zeal as an apologist. His contests, growing out of this latter in-terest, with the school of Averroes, with the next proceeding from that school which affirmed the irrefragable opposition between faith and knowledge, would naturally lead him to make the relation subsisting between these two a matter of special investigation. It is true, the enthusiasm for truth which filled his mind, the un-ion of a fervid imagination with logical formalism, led him to form extravagant hopes of a fancied absolute method adapted to all science—applicable, also, to the truths of Christianity, and by which these truths could be demonstrated in a convincing manner to every man. Yet his writings, generally ascetic—far removed from any formal system of science, his Ars magna—in deep apol-ogistic ideas. The enthusiasm of a most fervent love to God, a zeal equally intense for the cause of faith and the interests of reason and science, expressed themselves everywhere in his works" (Neander, CA. Hift. iv, 426).

One of his biographers states that the works of Lully numbered four thousand. Most of them are con-tained in an edition published at Mayence (10 vols. fol.), under title "Lulli Opera omnia, per Baccholium collecta, curante electore Palatino, et edita per Saltzingarium." They may be divided into two classes: one comprising the books of the "Ars magna:" Ars generalis; Ars demonstrativa; Ars invenieta; Ars expositoria; Ars brevia; Tabula generalis; Ars magna generalis ultima (this latter was published separately; Majorca, 1647); Arbor Scien-tiae (Barcelona, 1582); Liber Questionum super quatuor libris sententiarum (Lyons, 1451); Questions magistri Thoma Alabatrinus soluta secundum Artem (Lyons, 1451). II. Religious works: De articulis fidei Christianae demonstrativa probatia (Majorca, 1575); Controver-siae cum Homero Sorroceno (Valencia, 1610); De Demonstratione fidei Christianae, non contra Gentiles, no contra Barbaros, 1610; Liber natalis pueris Jesu. III. Against the Aver-roists: Libri duodecim Principiorum Philosophiam, con-tra Averroistas (Strassb, 1617); Philosophiae, in Aver-roistas, Expositio (Paris, 1616). IV. The works in which he speaks of the P china, De scienza et temporibus, (Urbino, 1649), and a very curious biography of R. Lully pre-served in MS. in the college of Sapientia, at Rome, and which appears to have been written by himself. To these must be added his numerous unpublished works, preserved in the Imperial Library, the libraries of the Arsenal and Ste. Genevieve, at Paris, and those of An-giers, Amiens, the Escorial, etc. We might also men- tion a number of works on alchemy generally attributed to him, but distinguished critics incline to the opinion that they are due to another person of the same name. Indeed, it appears certain that under the name of R. Lully several dis in this person have been confused together.

See Wadding, Vie de R. Lully; Bouvelles, Epistol. in Viz. R. Lulli, crenor (Amiens, 1611); Fax, Elogium Lulli (Alcala, 1619); Segni, Vie de R. Lully (Majorca, 1655); Collet, Vie de R. Lully (Paris, 1684); Muséum, et Martyre du docteur illumine R. Lully (Vendôme, 1667); Vernon, Histoire de la sorcellerie et de la doctrine de R. Lully (Paris, 1668); Dissertatio historica de culto in memo-ril de beato R. Lully (Majorca, 1700); Leve, De Vita R. Lulli specimin (Halle, 1680); Delenius, Vie de R. Lulli,
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in the Ruee Des Monses, Nov. 15, 1840; Hauréau, Hist. de la Scholastique, ii; Réan, Averarrus et Aver-


LUMINUM DIES (Day of Lights), another name for the Epiphany (q. v.), supposed to be the day of our Sav-

iour's baptism, and so named because baptism was fre-

quently called fire, or light.

Lump (λύμφ, debich), a round mass of any sub-

stance pressed together, specially of dried figs (2 Kings

xx, 7; Isa. xxxii, 21; c) cakes, 1 Sam. xxxv, 18; xxx

12; I Chron. xii, 40). The Greeks adopted the Heb.

term in a softened form, ψαλίθυ, which the Sept. uses.

This was the usual shape in which figs were preserved for sale or use among the ancients, and is still found in the modern package called a "drum of figs." (See Cel-

sii Hierobot. ii, 377-379; J. E. Faber on Harmar's Obs. i, 889 sq. See Fig.

The term rendered "lump" in the New Test. is φόρα-

μα, a knotted mass, e. g. of pottery's clap, prepared for

moistening (Rom. ix, 21), or a dough (proverbially 1 Cor. v, 6; Gal. v, 9; tropically, Rom. xi, 16; 1 Cor. v, 7). See POTTERY.

Lumpe, Gottfried, a noted Benedictine, was born in 1477, and entered in his youth the Benedictine

cloister of St. George at Villingen, in the Black Forest of Baden, where he remained a recluse, and as a

teological teacher, till his death in 1801, and distin-
guished himself by his works on Church History, the chief of which is Historia theologico-crítica de vita,

scripta utique doctrina S. Patrum, aliasque scripto-

ram ecclesiasticorum trium primorum aevi (Augs-

burg, 1753-1759, 13 vols. 8vo). See Wetzer und Wielis,

Kirchen-Lexikon, s. v.

Lumden, William O., a minister of the Method-

ist Episcopal Church, was born in Alexandria, Va., about

1805. He was converted in the fifteenth year of his age, was received into the Baltimore Annual Confer-

ence in 1824, and held the following appointments in the states of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia: 1824, Prince George's; 1825, Harford; 1826, Bedford Circuit; 1827, Phillipsburg; 1828, Gettysburg; 1829, Fairfax; 1830, Stafford; 1831, Prince George and St. Mary's; 1832-3, Montgomery; 1834, Severn; 1835, Springfield; 1836, Westmoreland Circuit; 1838-9, Fairfax; 1840, West-

moreland; 1841-2, Winchester Circuit; 1842-4, Calvert; 1845-5, William Street, Baltimore; 1847, Whatcoat, Balti-

more; 1848, Baltimore Circuit; 1849, Summerfield. In 1850 falling health obliged him to take a supernumerary

retirement. He died May 15, 1868. He was an active

and efficient laborer in the vineyard of the Lord to the

last. Though he was a superannuated for eight years, he ceased not to preach of "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." See Conf. Minutes, 1868, p. 18.

Luna, Pedro de. See Benedict XIII (A).

Lunatic (σεληνίας, to be moon-struck, as the Latin testum lunaticus also signifies, a term the origin of

which is to be founded in the belief that diseases of a par-

oxysmal character were affected by the light, or by the

changes of the moon), in Greek usage is i. e. epileptic,

the symptoms of which disease were supposed to become

more aggravated with the increasing moon (comp. Lu-

can. Tox. 24); in the N. Test. (and elsewhere) the same

malady is ascribed to the influence of demons or malign-

ants. In Matt. iv, 15; xvi, 15; Luke, iv, 37; 44; Lucan. Phi-

lips. 16; Isidore, Orig. iv, 7; Manetho, iv, 81, 216). In

the enumeration of Matt. iv, 24, the "lunatics" are dis-

tinguished from the demoniacs; in Matt. xiv, 15, the

term is applied to a boy who is expressly declared to

have been possessed. It is evident, therefore, that the

word itself refers to some disease affecting both the body

and the mind, which might or might not be a sign of

possession. Perhaps the distinction in the one case was

that of periodicity or lucid intervals, in contrast with the

continuity of possession in the other.

MAC. Persons of this description are highly venerated

in the East as saints, or individuals highly favored of

heaven. In Egypt, according to Lane (Modern Egyp-

tians, i, 545 sq.), "Lunatics who are dangerous to soci-

ety are kept in confinement, but those who are not are
generally regarded as saints. Most of the reputed

saints of Egypt are either lunatics, or idiots, or impos-

itors. Some of them go about perfectly naked, and are

so highly venerated that even women do not shun them.

Men of this class are supported by alms, which they

often receive without asking for them. An idiot or a

fool is vulgarly regarded by them as a being whose

mind is in heaven, while his grosser part mingles among

ordinary mortals; consequently he is regarded as an

especially favorite of heaven. This opinion entertained

of lunatics by the Orientals serves to illustrate what is said

of David when he fled to Achish, king of the Philis-

tines, and feigned himself mad, and thus saved his life

(1 Sam. xxxi, 10-16). Also the words of the apostle are

thought to be illustrated from the same superstitious

custom: "For ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye your-

selves to be wiser than they."" And soon after joined

Charles Osborne, Esq., in publishing The Emancipator,

at Mount Pleasant, O. In 1821 he successfully started

a monthly entitled The Genius of Universal Emancipa-

tion, into which he afterwards merged The Emancipator.

In 1824 he delivered his first anti-slavery address at

Deep Creek, North Carolina, and lecturing and journey-

ing about on foot from place to place, organized about

fourteen abolition societies in that state, besides some in

Virginia. In the same year he removed The Genius to

Baltimore, and issued it weekly. In 1825 he visited

Hartiy, and made provisions there for emancipated slaves.

In 1826 he visited the anti-slavery advocates of the East,

and lectured in their principal cities. In 1828-9 he was

assaulted for alleged libel, censured by the court, and

compelled to remove his paper to Washington, and final-

ly to Philadelphia, where he gave it the name of The

Independent and National Emancipator, and finally merged into The anti-

slavery Freeman. In 1836 his property was burnt up by the proslavery mob which fired Pennsylvania Hall.

Undaunted, he began anew by issuing The Genius at

Lowell, La Salle Co., Ill., and there continued until his

death, August 22, 1856. See Earle, Life, Travels, etc., of

Benj. Luney; Greeney, American Conflict, i, 111; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s. v.

Lunsford, Lewis, a Baptist preacher, born in Strat-

ford Co., Va., in 1758, began to preach when seventeen at the Potomac (now Hartwood) Church. Later be

travelled in Westmoreland, Northumberland, Lancaster,

and all the counties of the northern Virginia region, and several churches sprang up as the fruit of his toil;

among others, Nomini and Wicomico. On the estab-

lishment of Moratico Church in 1778, he became its pas-

tor for life. His sect was much persecuted at the time he was preaching in Richmond Co., and Lunsford

was arrested, and thereafter tried in vain to continue to

behave to the Church's call was sufficient. Faithful study in and out of his profession made up for a limited schooling. He died in Essex Co., Va., Oct. 26, 1793. See Sprague, Ana-

tica of the Amer. Pulpit, vi, 125 sq.

Lunt, William Parsons, D.D., an eloquent and

popular divine, born at Newport, R. I., April 21, 1805, was ordained pastor of the Second Unite-
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LUPETINO, Fra BALDO, one of the first martyrs to the Protestant cause in Italy in the 16th century, was born of ancient and noble parents in Albano, and actively propagated the reformed opinions in Venice. On becoming provincial within the Venetian territories of the Franciscan monks (to whose order he had been previously admitted) he urged the young men not to assume monastic orders. One of his contemporaries gives the following account of his further career. "After having long preached the Word of God in both the vulgar tongue of the Italian and Slavonic languages, the cities, and defended it by public disputations in several places of celebrity with great applause, he was at last thrown into close prison at Venice by the inquisitor and papal legate. In this condition he continued during nearly twenty years to bear an undaunted testimony to the Gospel of Christ, so that his bonds and doctrine were made known not only to that city, but to the whole of Italy, and even to Europe at large, by which means evangelical truth was more widely spread. . . . At last this pious man, whom neither threatenings nor promises could move, was released by his doctrine being bought and exchanged the fill and protracted tortures of a prison for a watery grave." See M'Crie's History of the Reformation in Italy (Philadelphia, 1842), p. 105, 221.

LUPSET, THOMAS, an English scholar and theologian, was born in London in 1498; was educated at English schools, but took the degree of B.A. in Paris. In 1518 he obtained the chair of rhetoric at Oxford University. Later he was secretary to the Italian ambassador. On his return he took charge of the education of the natural son of Wolsey in Paris. In 1530 he was appointed prebend of Salisbury. He died Dec. 27, 1532. Among his works we notice Epistola Vitirae, in the Epistola aliquot emult. Vitirae (Bale, 1520) — Treatise touching to die well (1584) — An Exhortation to young Men (1540, 8vo) — Treatise of Charity (1546, 8vo) — Rules for a godly Life (London, 1660). See Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s. v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, vol. xxxii, a. v.

LUPUS, SR. The Roman Catholic Church commemorates this name by the same. The most important of them was born at Toul about the beginning of the 6th century. He was of a good family, and received a good education. He was afterwards married to Pimeida, sister of Hilarius, bishop of Arles. Seven years after his marriage he abandoned his wife and children and joined the disciples of St. Honoratus, who were there laying the foundations of the afterwards renowned convent of Lerins. In 426 he returned to Macon, and was elected to the see of Troyes, and greatly distinguished himself by his learning, both classical and theological. In 429 a council of the bishops of Gaul sent him, together with Germain of Auxerre, to Brittany, to oppose the Pelagian heresy, which was making great progress in that country. In 451, when Attila conquered Troyes, we find the barbarian king in intimate association with the bishop, and in his presence Attila was accompanied by two guards as far as the shores of the Rhine. Lupus died, according to tradition, July 29, 479. His most distinguished contemporaries called him "episcopus episcoporum," the Jacob of his age, and praised him particularly for his experience and his knowledge in all ecclesiastical matters. We possess two works of his. One of them is an answer to some canonical questions propounded by Talsassius, bishop of Angers, and to be found among the Instrumenta of the Gallia Christiana (vol. iv, col. 89). It contains some interesting information concerning marriage among the clergy. There is, it seems, no general rule on this point: in the churches of Antun and Troyes married deacons are ordained without difficulty; but those who were single when ordained are not permitted to marry, and a married priest, on losing his wife cannot marry again. (Comp. Lex. Historia Sacrorum Cebolae, p. 84.) His other work is a letter to Apollinaris, published in Achery, Speculum, v, 579. See Hist. Litt. de la France, ii, 488; Gallia Christiana, xi, col. 488; Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, viii, 504; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxii, 16. (J. N. P.)

LUPUS, CHRISTIAN. See WOLF.

LUPUS, SERVATUS, or LOUP DE FERRIÈRES, a French ecclesiastical writer, was born in the neighborhood of Sens about the year 850; studied at the abbey of Ferrières, and afterwards at Fulda, under the celebrated Rabanus Maurus. Eginhard instructed him in the classics. In 836 he returned to Sens, where he soon acquired a great reputation for learning. He was called to the court of Louis the EMPEROR, and became a favorite both with Louis le Débonnaire and his successor, Charles the Bald. In 841, the latter prince, having resolved to remove Odon, abbot of Ferrières, appointed Lupus in his stead. This intervention of the royal power in the affairs of the Church displeased the ecclesiastical authorities, and Lupus failed to secure their sanction until he had obtained from King Charles a charter granting to the monks of Ferrières the right of appointing in future their own abbots. This charter is to be found in the Gallia Christiana, among the Instrumenta of vol. xii, column 8. Lupus had great influence both with the clergy and with the people, and was present at all the councils held in France from 844 to 859, taking an active part in their proceedings. When the Normans landed in France in 860 he sought refuge in the diocese of Troyes. Still in the same year we find him present at the Council of Pistoie, and in 862 at that of Soissons. There is no mention made of him afterwards; whether he died then, or whether, as would appear from the chronicle of Robert of Avesnois, he was exiled from Ferrières, and his rival Guenelon appointed in his stead, does not appear. His works, so far as they were then extant, were collected by Eustache Baluze, and published first in 1644, then, with notes and corrections, in 1710, 1 vol. 8vo. His treatise De tribus Questionibus discusses free-will, the twofold predestination, and the question whether Christ died for all men, or only for the elect. Gottschalk had mooted these three questions, strongly maintaining the necessity of grace; John Scottus Erigena, Rabanus Maurus, and Hincmar had more or less defended the doctrine of free-will. Lupus here attempts to conciliate these two opposite views, without, however, concealing his preference for that of Gottschalk. He does not think that, in the fall of man, the necessity, free-will does indeed, to some extent, participate in our good impulses, yet is of no effect compared with grace. These impulses themselves originate in grace, and can only avail through grace; but, at the same time, grace enlightens the will, which becomes then a voluntary agent in continuing the work thus begun by grace alone. The Jansenists often quoted these views of Lupus. See Gallia Christiana, xii, col. 159; Hist. Litt. de la France, v, 250; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxii, 19; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, viii, 562; Neander, Ch. Hist. iii, 459, 482.

LUPUS, HERNANDO DE, the first Spanish bishop of Peru, was born in Darien, Isthmus of Panama, towards the close of the 16th century. After teaching a short time, he became priest and vicar of Panama. In 1525, as appears from subsequent events, he represented the licentiate Gaspar de Espinosa, principal alcalde in Darien, who was at that time a nominee in a compromised contract between himself, Pizarro, and Almagro, by which he was to furnish the money for the outfit and expenses of an expedition for the conquest of Peru, the success of which depended mainly upon his exertions. His services were rewarded by the king of Spain, and joined with the king and he was, besides, declared Protector of the Indians of Peru. He died suddenly in 1582. See Oviedo y Valdes, Historia general y natural de las Indias, etc. (edit. de
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Lust (usually τὰ ἡμερῶν, ἐνίανία, in the ethical sense, is used to express longings—sinful either in being directed towards an object not of the body, or in being so violent as to overcome self-control, and to engross the mind with earthly, carnal, and perishable things. Lust, therefore, is itself sinful, since it is an estrangement from God, destroys the true spiritual life, leads to take pleasure in what dishonors God and violates his laws. The flesh is subjected to the dominion of the flesh, and makes man a slave of sin and godlessness. Lust, therefore, is the inward sin; it leads to the falling away from God; but the real ground of this falling away is in the will. It took place in the earliest days of mankind (Rom. i. 21), and is natural to all in the unregenerate state; it can only be abolished by Christ. The nature of man is not changed, only his empirically moral mode and place of existence. Lust, the origin of sin, has its place in the heart, not of a necessity, but because it is the centre of all moral forces and impulses, and of spiritual activity. The law does not therefore destroy sin, nay, it rather increases it, yet not in an active manner, but by the sinner's own fault. The psychological reason of this is, that the law does not destroy the lust, even while accompanied by punishment; on the contrary, the man who is bound by the law is cancelled by regeneration. This takes place in the reconciliation with God through Christ, because, in giving his Son as a ransom for sinners, God has manifested his love in such a manner as to awaken man, and give him the strength to love God again. This love of God forms the substance of regeneration, and of the operations of the Holy Spirit, and destroys sinful lust by bringing man into union with God, or by the reception of the Spirit of Christ through faith. According to Matt. v. 28, 'It is useless to look on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in her heart.' This forcible expression is correct, for he who is regenerated, and whose heart is filled with true love of God, and who is possessed of the Spirit of Christ, cannot have such worldly lusts. He, therefore, who looks on a woman to lust after her, or, in other words, he in whom her sight will awaken the lust of carnal pleasure, has already committed adultery in his heart. In Mark iv, 19 (Matt. xiii, 22; Luke viii, 14): 'And the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it become unfruitful.' This word is the objects of desire, for lust does not enter the heart, but, on the contrary, proceeds from it, as appears from Matt. xv, 19: 'For out of the heart proceed (through lust) evil thoughts [sin], murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies.' In Rom. i, 24: 'Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts,' and ver. 26, it is not God who awakened the lusts, but man, who had withdrawn from God, and made gods unto himself to worship. In view of its final object, this estrangement from God is a matter of free volition. Rom. vi. 12: 'Let not sin, therefore, reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof;' it can be understood how one could be good so far as intentions are concerned, while yet sin would reign in the lower part—he who is the perishable body (compare with vii, 16. Gal. v. 17). But the apostle considers man, spiritually and bodily, as a whole. He who lives in God through Christ, and is dead unto sin (Rom. vi. 11), must not let lust govern his perishable body, or listen to his desire, but, on the contrary, these ought no longer to exist in him; the body is to be made as subservient to righteousness as the spirit, for it is the temple of the spirit, and therefore is the instrument wherewith the human mind, animated by the Holy Spirit, is to act. Accordingly it is stated in Rom. vii, 8: 'For when we were in the flesh [before being regenerated], the motions [acts] of sin, which were by the law [which were shown by the law as such], did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.' So in Rom. vii, 8: "What shall we say, then? Is the law sin [the original source of sin]? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin [the fact of sin] but by the law; for I had not known lust [that it was evil] except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But [my natural] sin [the principle of sin, or lust], taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me in all manner of concupiscence [sinful desires resulting from the general lusts of the flesh]. For without the law sin was dead [i.e. not absent, but partly in the sense of not being recognised as sin or lust, and partly because the knowledge of the restrictions imposed by the law served but to increase the desire for what it forbade]. Xepi yap éxvse épamprá epírwp is a general and popularly expressed aphorism, which is not received in theory. In Gal. v, 17, 24, we are directed, 'Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh. For the flesh [sin] lusteth against [in contradiction with] the [Holy] Spirit, and the Spirit against [against the] flesh; and these are contrary to the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the thing that ye [simply] would: but they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh (in the regeneration), with the affections and lusts.' The effect of the struggle between the flesh and the Spirit is to prevent the evil which would have sprang from man's estrangement from God only to be cancelled by regeneration. The image of God is never entirely obliterated, but the lusts of the flesh can lead into enormous sins, and have done so. In like manner, in Rom. i, 24, etc.; Eph. iv, 22 (Col. iii, 5 comp. with Eph. ii, 2; Tit. iii, 8): 'That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; lust (estrangement, from God), as an impulse of free volition, is the original source of error which obscures both the mind and the heart. Further, Rom. i, 21, 22: 1 Tim. vi, 9 (But they that walk otherwise fall in; and many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition): 2 Tim. ii, 22 ('Flee also youthful lusts'); Tit. ii, 12 ('Teaching us that, denying ungodliness [devianóma] and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world'); Tit. iii, 8: 'That the aged women should likewise be reverent, not to suffer the head of the family to fall into the lust of youth'; Tit. iii, 9: 'That the aged women should be reverent, not to suffer the head of the family to fall into lusts.' Christians can and must be in the world, but not of the world, and must hold themselves aloof from its contamination. So, again, James i, 27; 1 Pet. ii, 11 ('Dearly beloved, I beseech you, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul'); 1 Pet. iv, 1-3 ('He that hath suffered the flesh ['lust'] lately, is dead unto the flesh ['lust'] he hath crucified from sin; that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God. For the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in
LUSTRE

LUTHER

successors, lust, excess of wine, revellings, banquets,
and abominable idolatries"; compare 1 Pet. i, 4; 2 Pet. ii, 10, 18; iii, 8; Jude 16. Once more, 1 John ii, 15-17: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. For if a man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof." Finally, James i, 14, 15: "But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death (or misery)."

The N. T. teaches us that man should eagerly avoid himself of the power of sanctification proffered through grace. But the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life is a sin, and he that committeth sin is of the devil (1 John iii, 19). The law and general lustration of the whole Roman people took place after the completion of every lustrum, when the censor had finished his census, and before he laid down his office. This lustrum (also called iustrum) was conducted by one of the censors, and held with sacrifices called suovetaurilia, because the sacrifices consisted of a pig (or ram), a sheep, and an ox. It took place in the Campus Martius, where the people assembled for the purpose. The sacrifices were carried three times around the assembled multitude. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiquities, s. v. Lustration.

Something of the nature of lustration prevails in the use of "holy water" (q. v.) by the Roman Catholics.

Lutši, earthy, one of the terms of reproach with which the first Christians were assailed by their persecutors.

Luther, Martin, the greatest of the Reformers of the Christian Church, whose name is the watchword of Protestantism, and marks a new era in the history of Europe.

I. Youth.-He sprang from an old and widely-extended German family, of which there are documentary traces as early as 1137. He was born at Eisleben, a village of Lower Saxony, Nov. 10, 1483 (see, however, an argument for a later date, 1484, Studien u. Kritiken, 1872), fifteen years before the martyrdom of Savonarola. As one of the heralding stars destined toManifield, this young man became a man of property and town senator. Luther grew up under pious but rigorous discipline. His father was characterized by severity, tempered with great honesty and clearness of judgment. Luther's mother was a woman of earnest piety, which, however, had also a tinge of harshness. Luther went to school at Magdeburg in 1497, in 1498 to Eisleben, and in 1501 he entered the University of Erfurt. Here he took the Bachelor's degree in 1508, and the degree of Master of Arts, which entitled him to teach in the university, in 1505. He was designed for the profession of the law, but a prevailing discomfort and occasional anguish of mind, under a sense of sin and the dread of the wrath of God, heightened first by the sudden, violent death of a friend, and later by a stroke of lightning which fell near his feet, determined Luther quite otherwise. He vowed to St. Ann that he would become a monk. The evening before his entrance to the cloister of the Augustinians he spent in lively conversation and song with his university friends, and the first announcement to them of his purpose was made at the close of the festal houn. "To-day you will see me a monk," he said. "To-morrow I will be no more," said Luther. When night was passing into morning, July 17, 1505, he presented himself for admission at the convent—soon to become the birthplace of Lutheran Protestantism and of the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith without the works of the law.

II. Cloister Life (1505-1517).—He passed through his
revived his earliest theological lectures, were the Psalms and the Epistle to the Romans. The lectures rested upon a study of the Vulgate and of the fathers. Philosophy he still prized, but most of all as a handmaid to true theology, which, he says, "searches for the kernel of the nut, the marrow of the fruit."

A Journey to Rome was made by Luther in 1510, on foot. He was cashiered from the University; he did not get the degree of his order, and yet more as a pilgrim. As the Eternal City rose before his eyes, he fell on his knees, and fervently exclaimed, "Hail, sacred Rome! thrice hallowed with the blood of martyrs!" St. Peter's was half finished. The man now looked upon with horror was the man who had been so recently the arch-enemy of the Roman Church, though Rome held the world's offers in her hands. New Rome stood on the heaped graves of the dead, old pagan city. Luther was not insensible to the historical and antiquarian interest which clustered around every site, but every other feeling was subordinate to the religious one. He was full of honest fervor, full of pious credulity. He went up the stairs of Pilate on his knees, yet with his heart protesting as he crept: Not thus do the "just live by faith." He looked upon the handkerchief of Veronica; he gazed on the chains of Paul and Peter, and his strong sight was too much for his strong credence—he could not see in his heads carvings in wood, and bad carvings. Luther saw the poms and the corruptions of Rome, but his heart remained fixed still in its strong love to the Roman Church, honored of God above all others" (1519).

The first light of the Gospel as Luther sheds it, beams forth in his lectures on the Psalms and Romans. Among his earliest works are his series of sermons on the Ten Commandments, his exposition of the penitential psalms, his catechism, and his instruction to the clergy. From the medievals to the moderns, Bernard was recognized as the highest place in Luther's regard. If ever there was a holy monk, Bernard was that monk. He is golden when he teaches and preaches—then he surpasses all the doctors in the Church (Weller, xii, 1502, xiii, 2000). Augustine and Bernard became increasingly precious to him as his continued studies of the holy Scriptures brought him to a profounder acquaintance with the truth. In 1508 his scholarship received acknowledgment by a call to the chair of philosophy in the newly-founded University of Wittenberg, the capital of the old electorate. The university was under the protection of the elector (Frederick)—not of an ecclesiastic—which was a happy circumstance for its part in the future. Its patron saints were Paul and Augustine. Luther went thither, and lectured on dialectics and physics according to Aristotle. In 1509 he became Doctor of Philosophy and Bishop. 1511, Sentiamiarus (Sentences of Lombard, first two books), Formatus (Sentences, last two books); October 4, 1512, Licentiatas (to teach theology in general); and October 19, 1512, Doctor of Theology, a degree which involved not a mere honor, but an office, in receiving which Luther swore "to teach purely and sincerely according to the Scriptures." He now transferred his labors from philosophy to theology. His favorite books, on which he de-
toward this traffic, his design was not to array himself against the Church, but to vindicate her against what he believed to be an abuse of her sacred name. As the \textit{confessional notice} in the pulpit, and the heavenly body was possible. He wrote earnest letters of remonstrance to the bishops of Brandenburg and Mayence, holding in regard to repentance that a distinction is to be made between the internal repentance, which is of the heart, and the external thing of confession and satisfaction. Receiving unfavorable comments on his position from the prelates, he determined to make his opposition public.

III. \textit{First Movements as a Reformer} (Oct. 81, 1517–May 4, 1521).—On the 31st of October, 1517, at midday. Luther affixed to the castle church at Wittenberg ninety-five theses. It was a blunder to his own advantage, to his own destruction, completely denying the position on which Tetz\textsuperscript{el} rested the merits of indulgences. He declared, in substance, that the command of Jesus to repent implies that the whole life is to be a repentance, not to be confounded with the confession and satisfaction made to a priest. Repentance, indeed, demands with that which is internal an external mortification of the flesh. The power of the papal indulgence can go no further than the penances imposed by the pope himself. The papal indulgence, consequently, can produce no reconciliation with God, no true grace, no true salvation; it can only cover the smallest daily sin. The pope can only announce and confirm the forgiveness imparted by God. This, indeed, is not to be despised, yet it can be found without the pope's indulgence where there is true compunction and faith. The true Church is not bound by these indulgences intrusted to the pope, but is the Gospel of the grace of God. He distinctly held the obtaining of grace to be a thing of immediate relation between the soul and God. In these theses Luther believed that he expressed throughout the mind of the pope, who he supposed was ignorant of the abuses that had been practiced in his name. It seems at first remarkable that Luther gives so little prominence to faith in the theses, and in the sermons on indulgence and grace which appeared simultaneously with the theses, and were meant for the people, Nov. 1517. But a careful study will show that his conception of repentance is that larger Biblical one in which it embraces both penitence and faith. Repentance is sometimes used as synonymous with penitence, and we then speak of repenting and believing, repentance and faith. Sometimes repentance covers both, and the penitent demand and repent. Thus, in the 12th art. of the \textit{Augsburg Confession}, it is said: "Repentance properly consists of these two parts: The first is contrition, or the terror of a conscience smitten with acknowledged sin. The other part is a confession, to the faith which believes, and believes that for Christ's sake sins are remitted." This first act of Luther's evangelical life, says Gieseler, "has been hastily ascribed by at least three eminent writers of very different character—Bossuet, Hume, and Voltaire—to the narrow monastic motive, the jealousy of a rival order. It is asserted that the Augustinian friars had usually been invested in Saxony with this profitable commission, and that it only became offensive to Luther when transferred to the Dominicans. There is no ground for this assertion. The Dominicans had been for nearly three centuries the peculiar favorites of the holy see, and objects of all its partialities; and it is particularly remarkable that, after the middle of the fifteenth century, during a period scandalously fruitful in the abuse in question, we very rarely meet with the name of any Augustinian as employed in that service. Moreover, it is through all the three great pontificates of the religious and contemporary adversaries of Luther ever advanced this charge against him, even at the moment in which the controversy was carried on with the most unscrupulous wrath. The influence of the theses was instantly felt far and wide. The theses," says Luther himself, "ran clear through all the northern states and many of the southern states, and all the empire was complaining about the indulgences; and because all the bishops and doctors were silent, and nobody was willing to bell the cat, Luther became a renowned doctor, because at last somebody had come who took hold of the pulse of Luther, in his frame, unless confide that the pope would be his most enthusiastic patron, was soon undeceived, but his higher trust was strengthened by the course of events. "Ill," he said, "the work of God, who can overthrow it?" (Compare here the article Lazo X in this volume, especially p. 868 sq.) A careful reprint of the theses, after the original, is given in Ranke's \textit{Reformation's Geschicht.})

In 1518 the Augustinian Order held a convention at Heidelberg. All of Luther's friends counselled him against going thither, as his life was threatened. Luther, faithfully and strongly adhering to his own convictions, went, and attended the convention. In Heidelberg he disputed on theses in theology and philosophy; on free-will and the fall; grace, faith, justification, and good works. He took ground against Aristotle. An immense audience, not only of students, but of citizens and courtiers, attended the disputation. Among the auditors were Bucer, Brenz, and others, destined to play a memorable part in the scenes of the coming Reformation. Meanwhile the principles maintained in the ninety-five theses had provoked the assuaults of a number of stanch adherents to the papal authority. Among these was Melancthon, who stoutly defended himself against all of them in his \textit{Resolutions}, that is, solution of points in dispute concerning the virtue of indulgences; and, still hoping for redress from Rome, sent these to Leo X. His appeal was first of all to the holy Scripture, and, next to this, to Augustine, as the profoundest expositor of Scripture among the fathers.

While the elector, in the interest of the university, protected Luther, Rome avoided coming to the last extremity. As early as Feb., 1518, the pope had instructed the general of the Augustinian Order, Gabriel Venetus, to turn Luther from the path he was following. As this measure failed of success, Luther had been called forward for trial to Rome. By the intercession of the elector, in place of appearing at Rome to answer the citation, the appointment was made that cardinal Cajetan should give him a hearing at Augsburg. Urban, the court of the marquis of Montferrat, tried his arts of persuasion previous to Luther's meeting Cajetan. To him Luther said, "If I can be convinced that I have said anything in conflict with the understanding of the holy Roman Church, I will recant it in the presence of the said pope and all his court. "Do you think the elector is going to hazard his land for you?" Luther replied, "I would in no wise have it so." "Where, then, will you abide?" Luther answered, "Under the cope of heaven." The Italian replied, "Had you said thus to the pope, he would have given you what would you ask for?" "I would," said Luther, "give them all due honor and reverence." At this the messenger, after the Italian manner, biting his thumb, went away (Fuller, \textit{Abel Rodervicus} [Nicholas], 1867, i, 44).

The cardinal himself attempted, Oct. 1518, to bring "little brother Martin" to submission, but without success. "I don't wish to talk more with this beast; he has a deep eye, and marvellous speculations in his head." The good offices of Staupitz, the head of the Augustinians, and a firm friend of Luther, were also called in to move Luther, but the service was not one after his heart. When Luther asked Staupitz for some other interpretation of the Scripture than that on which his faith rested, Staupitz acknowledged that he could not give it, and showed where his heart was when he said to Luther, "Remember, dear brother, that thou hast begun in the name of Martin Luther, and not in the name of Leo X." But Luther, being hampered, Staupitz had absolved him from the vow of obedience to the order. Luther finally appealed from "our most holy master Leo X, ill informed, to Leo X, to be better informed." Having reason to fear violence, he made his escape in the night of Oct. 20. He was furnished with a vesture of all and unerring grace. Luther, disguised in a long mantle, barefooted, and unarmed,
tude until the evening of the day following, and when
dismounted, could not stand, but lay helpless on the
straw. At Gräfenthal he was overtaken by count Al-
bert of Mansfeld, who laughed heartily at Luther's style of
herneship, and insisted on having him as his
guest. Two days after Luther's departure the appeal
was fastened to the door of the cathedral at Augsburg.

The use of all the month failed to make the
attacks upon indulgences, and claimed for the pope
the power of delivering sinners from all punishments
due to every sort of transgression. Luther, now despairing
of any reasonable accommodation with the pontiff, find-
ing that nothing else of the six letters "r v o e a v" would answer, appealed on Nov. 25, 1518, from the pope
to a general council. Leo, however, by this time aware of
the greatness of the schism likely to occur in the
German Church, seeing around Luther fast gathering the
great, and the strong, and the learned, hastily dis-
patched Militiz, the papal chamberlain and legate, whose
moderation and skill adapted him for the mission of con-
ciliation. Though he utterly failed to procure any re-
conciliation, he yet succeeded in obtaining from Luther
(1519) an expression of submission, and induced him
to promise the publication of a tract on indulgences, which
promising silence if it were also imposed on his ad-
versaries. See Loo X.

IV. Leipzig Disputation.—But the vanity and eagerness
of his opponents were too great to allow the stipula-
tion any practical force. They saw spurs to be won, and
see the advantage from the chances from whom. In the
previous year (1518) had challenged Carlstadt to a dis-
putation, but his whole course proved that Luther was
to be the main object of his attack, and Luther hesita-
ted not to appear in defence. The disputation took
place at Leipzig in the Pleissenson Castle, from June
26 to July 16, 1519. Carlstadt was no match for Eck,
who was incomparably the best debater on the side of
Rome in the century. The discussion was so tedious at
times that the hall was emptied. The debate itself,
and the part Luther himself took during its progress,
have already been spoken of in the article Eck, in vol.
li, especially at p. 47 sq.

The breach with Rome was decided at these disputa-
tions by Luther's declaration that among the articles of
Huss there were also some condemned by the Council of
Constance completely Christian and evangelical, thus
clearly denying, de farto, the authority of the Church to
decide in matters of faith. In August, 1520, appeared the
reformatory writing, "To the Christian Nobles of the
German Nation, of the bettering of the Christian
State." In this work Luther unsparingly exposed what
the Church had done to convert the noble, loyal race,
to treacherous perjurers, and showed with what
forbearance Germany had borne these indignities.

The German knighthood had offered to draw sword in
Luther's defence, but he declined the aid of all earthly
power, was out of keeping with the holy interests of the
kingdom. This great book showed to the knights that Luther's
armies were mightier than theirs. In his book,
"Of the Babylonian Captivity of the Church," Oct. 6,
1520, Luther presented the doctrinal aspects of the Re-
formation, as in his book to the nobles he had looked at
it in its political relations. He demanded the total ab-
rogation of indulgences as "devilish institutions," the
restoration of the cup to the laity, the limitation of the
number of the sacraments: "If we wish to speak rigid-
ly, there are in the Church two sacraments only." He
declared transubstantiation to be no article of faith, and
set forth the view that "true bread and true wine," not
their mere accidents, remain in the Supper. He urges
the cessation of external ecclesiastical satisfactions.

Through the whole he urges the sufficiency of the
faith by which alone man is justified. It might have
seemed strange that so intimate a collaborator with the Church of
Rome was no longer possible; yet, as the result of a
second conference with Militiz at Lichtenberg, Oct. 12,
1520, Luther expressed himself willing once more to
test the question. If reconciliation were to be had
at all, the sermon "Of the Freedom of a Christian Man"
(Wittenb. 1520) breathed the very spirit in which alone
it was possible. It is "pleasant, without pomelics, full of
devoutness, and of the overwhelming might of love to
God and love to man. In it the reformatory princi-
ple is deep and broad, its rich devotion, its rich religious
freshness. Its life-breath is the spirit of the higher
peace; it contains a treasure of new impulses for the
intellectual, and, indeed, the speculative life of the
Christian soul. The evangelical principle, as it involves
faith and love, has perhaps never been unfolded with
such clearness, fullness, and depth. It is noble and full
of significance that Luther appended this golden little
book to his last letter to the pope (Sept. 6, 1520), as
if with a petition for a peaceful separation and a more
kindly construction. But it is a happy thing besides to
note the profound, the pious, the deep, and the clear
ness of soul with which Luther stood as the strife
grew more threatening, and the bull of excommuni-
cation was impending. This undoubted mirror of a child-
like heart, reflecting the peace of heaven, is in amazing
contrast with the thunder-storm which gathered about
it, and which still the pope's excommunication, which
is by faith had what he confessed, and was what he taught" (Dornier, Gesch. der Prot. Thol. p.
101, 108). Rome had meanwhile been getting ready
to settle the whole matter by a coup de main. In Sep-
tember, 1520, Eck appeared in Germany with the papal
bull, containing the excommunication. But one proposi-
tion extracted from Luther's writings, or-
ered his works to be burnt wherever they were found,
and summoned him, on pain of excommunication, to
confess and retract his errors within sixty days, and to
throw himself upon the mercy of the pope. This bull
brought Luther to a step decisive beyond recall.
Susceptible to gentleness, he met violence and
threatening with unshakable courage. Like a great general,
promptly accepting the warfare forced upon him, he carried
the war instantly into the heart of the enemy's territory.

Before the gate which open, towards the river Elster,
at Wittenberg, in the presence of a vast multitude of all
ranks and orders, he burned the papal bull, and with it
the decree, the decretals, the Clementines, the Extrava-
gantas, the entire code of Roman canon law, as the root
of all the evil, Dec. 10, 1520. Archdeacon Manning,
whose testimony here will carry peculiar weight, says:
"The just causes of complaint which made Luther first
address the bishops, his steady appeals through every
graduation of ecclesiastical order to the award of a gen-
eral council; and, on the other, the violent and corrupt
administration of Leo X., enabled the Emperor, to
the exclusion of all personal considerations, to call
against a man whose cause was still unheard, seem ef-
fuctually to clear both him and those who, for his sake,
were driven from the unity of the Church from the
guile of schism" (Unity of the Church [London, 1842], p. 328,
1829). Thus Luther broke openly, as he had already
broken virtually, with Rome, forever. This final rupture
gave a character of sharpest decision to his appeal to
a general council, with which he prefixed the burning
of the bull, and to his writings Against the Bull of Awi-
chirri, against Emser, and others. He still continued
a faithful member of the Catholic Church of the West,
holding its old faith, which knew nothing of a pope
with unlimited despotic authority. He stood then
in many respects in the same general position which is oc-
cupied by Döllinger now. The bull of excommuni-
cation promptly followed, Jan. 6, 1521. The same
sequence of Luther's daring act, the papal legate, Alexander,
dem-
manded of the Diet sitting at Worms that he should be
put under the ban of the empire. But it was the wish
of the estates of the empire that, in advance of giving
effect to the papal bull, Luther should be summoned
to appear and have a hearing before the Diet at Worms.

Luther wrote, saying, "Though there were
as many devils in Worms as there are tiles on its roofs, still would I enter." In the memorable transaction at Worms, "the most splendid scene in history," as it has been called, Luther, in the presence of the emperor, the archduke Ferdinand, six electors, twenty-four dukes, eight margraves, thirty bishops, and other princes and prelates of the realm, April 17, 18, 1521. It was the most remarkable assembly ever convened on earth—an empire against a heretic! Large numbers of the people were present, and the whole city of Worms was surcharged with the spirit of Luther as he stood there, so lone and strong, with his great full heart—a second Prometheus, confronting the Jove of the 16th century and the German Olympus. "His friends were yet few, and of no great influence; his enemies were numerous and powerful, and eager for his destruction: the church, from the hope of religious regeneration, appeared to be placed at that moment in the discretion and constancy of one man. The faithful trembled." But Luther was victorious in his good confession. Having examined the looks laid before him, April 17, he acknowledged them as his own. After deep reflection, for which he had solicited time, he defended himself on the following day in an address of two hours in length. He upheld freedom of conscience, and denied the right of the priest to control by force the religious convictions of men. His religion, as a rule, was neither open nor secret, and his politics was modest, gentle, and humble; "but in the matter of his public apology he declined in no one particular from the fainess of his convictions. Of the numerous opinions which he had by this time adopted at variance with the traditions of Rome, there was not one which in the hour of danger he consented to compromise." At the close of his speech, which was in German, he commenced with the request to repeat it in Latin, for the sake of the emperor and of others. When urged with the direct question whether he would recant, he replied in Latin, "Unless I shall be convinced by the testimonies of the Scriptures or by evident reason (for I believe neither pope nor councils alone, since it is manifest they have often erred and contradicted themselves), I am bound by the Scriptures I have quoted, and my conscience is held captive by the word of God; and as it is neither safe nor right to set against conscience, I cannot and will not retract anything." He added in German, "Here I stand; I cannot otherwise; God help me. Amen." (Acta Wormske hubel, in Opera [Jena], ii, 414. The historical character of these last [German] words has been overestimated. Luther did not sacrifice either his hope but without good grounds. Luther's enemies now made violent efforts to effect his ruin. They counselled the violation of the imperial safe-conduct. They appealed to the crime of Constance as a precedent. Charles replied, "If it was established that Luther had not come home, it ought to find refuge in the heart of kings. The ban of the empire was published May 25, 1521. It made Luther an outlaw.

VI. The Wartburg Exile and the Return (May 5, 1521—1524).—On Luther's return from Worms the imperial herald accompanied him to the border of Hesse. At this point Luther, with no companion but Amsdorf, turned his face towards Möhra, to visit his grandmother. At Altenstein, May 4, in the Thuringian Forest, he was seized by masked horsemen, and was taken for protection by his friend the elector to the Wartburg, the Patmos of the opening apocalypse of history (see Leo and Luther), by Eugene Lawrence, in Harper's Monthly, xxxix, 91—106). Here, in the apparel of a knight, he was known as Jungkner George. His enemies accounted for his sudden disappearance by asserting that he had been carried away in a fit and died. A careful observer, however, with a point of view, does not give to that august person the due generally conceded to his sagacity—if Rome was right, there was no one whom the devil had so much reason to wish to keep on earth as Luther. The leisure enjoyed by Luther in the Wartburg was employed by him in preparing the draught of the translation of the New Testament. After an exile of ten months he was called back to Wittenberg, March 6, 1522, by the disorders which had broken out. The Augustinian monks had abrogated the mass; in the transactions which took place between them, the university, and the elector, Carlsbad had intermeddled. Carlsbad had gone on at once to introduce what, in his judgment, were manifest consequences of Luther's principles. The communion was administered in both kinds; the alteration of the elements and of the mass, and without confession. A great number of the usual ceremonies also were set aside, and the marriage of the priests, and of others under ecclesiastical vows, was introduced. The radical violence of the whole tendency and of its modes gave evidence that Carlsbad was availing himself of Luther's absence to attempt what he would not have dared to do when Luther was present. The passionate violence of Carlsbad was fanned by the Zwickau Prophets, who at this time made their appearance at Wittenberg. The wild storm of iconoclasm was met by Luther with discussion for the scholar, with sermons for the people. The personal character and force of Luther, the solid truth of his position, and his irresistible popular eloquence gained a complete victory over Carlsbad (q.v.). The two men were in heart sundered from this hour, though they met into open discourse. Previous to the struggle with Carlsbad the life of Luther in every element and trait had made an ineffaceable impress of grandeur on the hearts of the whole German nation. Every independent heart, and all the nobler Roman Catholics, acknowledged him in the highest sense a man of the people, and, in a sense not quite high, a man of God. He had "opened the sanctuary of a pure faith, and in heroic struggle had kept it open" (Dorner, Historie der Theol., trans. by Robinson and Sophia Taylor [Edinb. 1871], i, 97, 98). At this time took place his change from monasticism and asceticism to evangelical life: the former in 1524, when he dropped the monastic dress; the latter in 1525, when he married. Here also belong the part he took in 1529 at the colloquy in Marburg (q.v.), where an effort was made to harmonize the peculiar views of Luther and Zwinglei on the Lord's Supper; and his work for the Augsburg Confession (q.v.).
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(Lutheran) princes declined to participate in the council. Melanthon in 1545 prepared the Wittenberg Reform, the sketch of a plan of union. To this Luther gave his subscription, but shortly afterwards published his book Against the Popery at Rome, founded by the Devil, one of the very fercest of his controversial works.-

VII. Luthe and the Bohemians.—On the other hand, Luther sought to perpetuate the fellowship formed with the Bohemians, who in 1536 had again sent their representatives to him. He wrote prefaces to their Apology of the Faith in 1533 and 1538. The dissatisfaction he had felt in 1534 with some things in their doctrine of justification, which appeared to him suspicious, was dispelled in 1534.

VIII. Luther's last days.—The Protestant princes had drawn the sword in the feud. Luther did all in his power to preserve the peace between the princes and the emperor; but the future looked threatening, and his soul was as full of solicitude as a soul could be whose trust in God was so implicit. The council and the congregation in Wittenberg gave Luther very serious trouble. The great renown and prosperity of Wittenberg, given to it by Luther and his coworkers, had brought with it such natural anxieties as the inflowing of wealth and the attainment of position. Frivolity and fashion corrupted the people. Luther fought with all his energies against the evil. In 1580, after a powerful sermon of rebuke, he withdrew, disheartened, for a long time from the pulpit. He at length left Wittenberg, as if he were selling his soul to save the principle there. The elector himself was obliged to interpose, to restore the old relations. From the time of his return Luther continued to preach, but discontinued his lectures.

Luther's last work was one of love and conciliation. Under the pressure of many cares, he started, in February, 1546, on a journey to Eisleben, to attempt a conciliation between the counts of Mansfeld, a work in which they had solicited his good offices. For fourteen years Luther had been a sufferer from severe and complicated diseases. He was not well when he reached the inn at Eisleben, and from the beginning of his sickness he had a presentiment that he would die in the place where he was born. He was able, however, to preach once. The day before his death he expressed a strong assurance that we shall know our loved ones in heaven. February 17 he lay in his bed. When Auriol came, he found him so much worse that he summoned medical aid at once. Rubbing and bathing afforded him temporary relief, and about nine o'clock Luther lay down upon a couch, and after gathering a little strength by an hour's rest, proposed to his attendants that he should lie in his bed. January 18, Martin, Paul, Luther's sons, and two servants, watched by his side. His pains, however, became so great that he could not remain in his bed. Count Albert and the countless sent in haste for their own physicians. Luther used everything prescribed, but spoke of nothing but his death, which he felt sure was at hand. He poured forth his soul in fervent prayer, and, after commending his soul into the hands of God, lay silent and waiting. Among the stimulants used was shaving of the horn of the natural, or so-called, a remedy then greatly prized. None of the stimulants had any effect. A little before his last breath Jonas and Celius asked him whether he died in firm assurance of the truth of the doctrine he had taught. With a distinct voice, he replied, "Yes. He expired about four o'clock in the morning, Feb. 18, 1546 (C. E. Stearns, Last Days and Death of Luther, in the Biblical Repository, 1845, p. 195, 212)."

His body was taken to Wittenberg, followed along the whole route by thousands of mourners, the tolling of the bells, and the dirges which gave expression to a universal sorrow. It was interred in a vault of the pulpit in the Castle Church. The funeral discourses were given by Bunkenhagen and Melanchthon. Six weeks after Luther's death his wife wrote: "My dear husband was not the minister of a city, or of a land, but of the whole world. To have lost a prince, to have lost an emperor, it is not such a loss as I deplore" (Brocke's De Wette, Leidemann, vi. 650).

Luther's situation in reference to earthly possessions would have been that of very moderate competence (his greatest income was about three hundred guineas), but not his penury which kept him perpetually poor. The large or older cloister of the Austin monks in Wittenberg was given to him by John the Constant. It was purchased from Luther's heirs for the academy at the price of 3700 guineas. Luther purchased the Little Cloister for 450 guineas; it was sold by his heirs for 4700 the same year. He also owned an orchard valued at 500 guineas, the manor of Wachendorf, a malefie valued at 1500 guineas, and the Zeilsdorf property, which sold for 956 guineas. For his books, which enriched his publishers, he would take nothing.

IX. Domestic and Social Life.—In the midst of the warfare which conscience compelled him to carry on with Erasmus, Carlstadt, and others, who professed to take in whole or in part the general ground against Rome, Luther entered on that domestic life, the charm of which still wins the heart of men, whose sympathies extend over the whole range of the human and natural side, the charm of which, in the spirit of the age, was spent in reformation. June 18, 1525, he married Catharina von Bora, who had fled from the Cistercian nunnery of Nimpfach. "This was the event of his life which gave most triumph to his enemies and perplexity to his friends. It was in perfect conformity with his maso- line and daring mind, that, having satisfied himself of the nullity of his monastic vows, he should take the boldest method of displaying to the world how utterly he rejected them." Luther's intercourse with his wife and children, his letters to them, the touching story of the death of Margaret and of Magdalena, present him as the model of the head of a Christian family (Krauth, Conservative Reform, p. 38-39; Stork, Luther at Home [1872]).

Luther had six children: 1. John, born June 7, 1528, was a jurist in Königsberg, and died there October 29, 1575. 2. Of his descendants were found in Böheim in 1880 in a state of poverty. 2. Elizabeth, born Dec. 10, 1527; died Aug. 3, 1582. 3. Madeleine (Magdalena), born May 4, 1529; died Oct. 20, 1542. 4. Martin, born Nov. 7, 1531, studied theology, but had not the intellectual capacities necessary for the work of writing and the memory; he laid down his office, and died as a private citizen, March 8, 1565. 5. Paul, born Jan. 28, 1538, was physician in ordinary at various courts, and died March 8, 1588. 6. Margaret, born in 1534, was married to George von Kunheim, Prussian counselor, and died in 1578. See Nobbe, Stammbaum der Familie von Bora, ed. (Grinnin, 1840). 6. Catharina von Bora, oder Luther als Gatte u. Vater (Leipzig, 1845); C. Becker, Luther's Familienleben (Königsb. 1858).

The direct line of male descent from Luther terminated with Martin Gottsch L, who was an advocate in Dresden, and died in 1728. The family to carry on Luther's brother, and of Catharina von Bora, have living representatives.

The great coworkers with Luther were also his dearest personal friends. First among them were Melan- thon, Amelot, Justus Jonas, and Bungenhagen. The Table-talk (Table-talk), which appeared twenty years after Luther's death, professes to be a record of his conversations, made immediately after them. It is not strictly authentic, and where it conflicts with well known and carefully avowed opinions of Luther, is of no value as testimony. It often prevents the true construction of the poetry of Luther's mind, and the fullest matter-of-fact perversion of his most brilliant thoughts. It confounds Luther himself with the character he dramatizes, in order to vivify his avatars to it, and the liveliest sallies of his wit and humor are given with the grace and spirit which the situation seems. Luther's annalst had the idiocy of a Bowery, but lit- tle of his skill. Nevertheless, the Table-talk is a record,
thoughtless boy, one of many of Luther's best sayings. Luther and Erasmus. In their negotiations Luther and Erasmus had many points of contact and sympathy. Luther admired the polished scholarship of Erasmus; Erasmus acknowledged the power of Luther, the purity of his motives, and the necessity for his earlier work. He wrote to Luther and of him as a friend (1519).

When the diversity of their positions, the difference of their characters, and the pressure of circumstances made a conflict between them growingly probable, each dreaded the other as an antagonist as he dreaded no other man. (Compare here Luther's letter to Erasmus, cited in the article Erasmus.) Erasmus was forced into the controversy and in the end, with his voice of the nation. He had perhaps never entered the lists against Luther, and he would never have written his Defence of freewill. The will of Erasmus was under bondage to the will of Henry VIII. Luther, with more solicitude than the presence of princes and prelates had ever given him, was obliged to take up the gage of battle. To the years 1524, 1535 belongs this controversy. It began with an attack on the part of Erasmus in his book De libero Arbitrio. Luther wrote De servo Arbitrio. Erasmus wrote in reply his Hyperaspistes. Luther felt that the fire of his own heart was the hotter, that his own had been sufficiently put, and the controversy ceased. As regards the vital point in this discussion, the mass of earnest Christian thinkers from Luther's time to this have been a unit in their estimate. Erasmus simply made a development of a refined pagan naturalism (for humanism is no true philosophy) under the pressure of Christianity. Luther's main point is the common ground of evangelical Christianity, though many of his particular phrases might not meet with universal approval. "Erasmus makes man at first richer than Luther does, but yet how far is Luther's conception of freedom ultimately superior to that of Erasmus, who views the highest and best element of freedom as reached in freedom of choice, and who accordingly must logically teach an everlasting possibility of falling, and make perfection eternally insecure! Luther's conception of freedom leads to godlike, real freedom by grace; for this it could seem to be no advantage, but only a defect, to be involved in choice and hesitation" (Dornob Hess, Hist. of Prot. Theol., transl., i, 217).

In justifying the clash of this controversy with Luther's war against Rome, Eichhorn, "Erasmus was not only a political economist but he was a statesman of the utmost pressure brought to bear on him by the papal opponents of Luther, but Luther, in his reply, shows that he recognizes the same interest as involved here, as that which had so far conditioned his whole struggle with Rome. He writes under the consciousness that in Erasmus he has a rival who is not "a great dab in the Pelagianism of Rome" (ii, 36)." (Comp. here a review of M. Durand du Lau's Erasme in The Academy, September 15, 1872.)

XI. The character of Luther lies so open in his life that it is impossible not to view it in its light. He was so ingenuous that if all the world had conspired to cover up his faults, his own hand would have uncovered them. His violence was that of a mighty nature, strong in conviction, waging the battle of truth against imincible foes. The expressions which jar upon the refined ear of the modern world were natural in a rough age, and from the lips of one who was too pure to be prudish. The coarseness of the mendicant life can hardly fall to leave their traces on any man who has been subjected to them—the taint of a system in which filthiness is next to godliness, or, rather, is a part of it. The inconsistence of Luther is that of the man of a great intuition, who grows perpetually, and who will not stop for the hopeless and useless task of harmonizing with the crudities of yesterday the ripeness of to-day. His widest diversities, after the sap of Reformation began to swell in its veins, were like those of the tree which bends with the mellow fruit of autumn, careless of consistency with its first buds in the cold rains of March. That Luther was unselfish, earnest, honest, inflexibly brave in danger, full of tenacity and benevolence, the ideal of Old Testament strength and of Germanic goodness; that he was one of the greatest creative spirits of the race, mighty in word and deed, matchless as a popular orator, one of the very people, yet a prince among princes, a child of faith, a child of God—this is admitted by all (see Erasm's "Conservative Reformation," p. 187).

There is scarcely another instance in history in which an individual, without secular authority or military achievement, has so stamped himself upon a people, and made himself so great an extent the leader, the representative, the voice of the nation. He has been to Germany what Homer was to Greece. "He was the only Protestant reformer," says Bayard Taylor, "whose heart was as large as his brain." (See "An Interview with Martin Luther," in Harper's Monthly, xxii, 281.) Luther was well-set, not tall, was handsome, with a "clear, brave countenance," and "earnest soul." His eyes were remarkable for their keenness, "dark and deep-set, shining and sparkling like a star, so that they could not well be looked upon," as old Kessler describes them. The fulness of face given him in his later pictures, is not of recent origin; the roundness of forehead, the tendency, resulting from his early austerities. His physical life was largely one of suffering. His habits were abstemious, and his enjoyments at the table were social, not Epicurean. His voice was not loud nor strong. Melanchthon's happy phrase touching Luther's words is, that they were "fulminant," not "tumultuous"—it was their lightning, not their thunder, by which their mighty effects were produced. The papal system, the ups of the ages, which they struck, is not dead, but it is riven and blasted from its crown to its root.

Luther as a Conservator. The culmination of Luther's epic for the world at large is undoubtedly the defence at Worms. An obvious source of the diminution of interest in the later years of Luther's life is that the carrying through of what had been so grandly begun presents, in the nature of the case, less that bringing before the mind, in all the magic of its unparalleled power, the personal character of Luther. When the warfare is ended, the life of the greatest soldier becomes as tame as that of the ordinary man. But, beyond this, a diminished interest and a divided sympathy are due alike to the discord between the movement of the constitution of the Church Luther took a position on which the Protestant world has divided. The occasion for the exhibition of Luther's conservatism was given by his conflict with the Zwickau Prophets (1822) and Carlistard, and by the dreadful excesses of the peasant insurrection. In the Holy Roman Empire, the Germanic enthusiasm led to be results of the German mystical thinking—a mysticism which he himself had cherished; he found that these wild fanatics put their own construction upon his views of Christian liberty and the rights of the congregation, and applied those views of their own invention. These results and the construction Luther looked upon with abhorrence. Luther brought to a fuller exhibition what was the real difference in principle between the position of these fanatics and his own. He saw that they consciously ignored and rejected a principle without which reformation would be transformed into a radical and violent revolution, foreign to its own nature to the whole genius and history of Christianity. This principle is that of the unbroken historical life and development of the Church. Not as a something isolated from the Church, but as a divine tradition which had the truth of God reached the soul of Luther. The power which opened to Luther the true nature of repentance, justification, and grace, had not simply lingered in the Church, but had ripened in it, and the Reformation could no more have been, nor Luther have been Luther, but for the Church's history, than without the Word. Men are begotten of God through the
Word, but the Church is the mother who bears them. The Word of God is the all-sufficient rule of faith, but it must be seen or heard in order to be applied; and the rule of faith is to be neither written, private, nor that which stands for itself, or speak itself, and all the ordinary organs of its perpetuation, circulation, and application are within the Church. The divinity of the Word and the divinity of the Church are doctrines not only in harmony with each other, but necessary to each other's existence. The first, without the second, is fanaticism and antichristianism, and hopeless individualism; the second without the first is popery. The movement of Luther, from the hour of his riper self-perception, was so completely churchly and historical that the fanatics hated Luther more than they hated the pope, and the only indication that Luther needed in the need of building the sound, as well as of thinning down and removing the rotten, may be mentioned the Wittenberg Order of the Congregations, 1522; the Leis- ning Order of the General Fund, 1523; letter to the land-grave of Hesse in regard to the Hambach Church-Or- der, 1527; the Visitation, 1527-1529; the part he took in the arrangement of the consistory and for the govern- ment of the Church.

Those who do not sympathize with his conservatism yet admit that Luther's personal religious character was deep and intense, and that in the point of conscience, and where he stands on the verities of his own internal experience, he is the unshakable reformer. But it is said by these objectors that where his own immediate religious consciousness ceases he shows himself under the influence of other views. If the unknown, unknown himself, he stands forth with the "inexceaseable traces of the monk, the priest, and the scholastic theologian." By this supposition is solved the fact that, while he rejected the mass as it embodied the idea that the Lord's Supper is a proper sacrifice, and rejected transubstantiation, he yet found it impossible to abandon the thought that the Lord's Supper veils the mystery of redemption, and is "more than an act in which a congregation unites in a pious and believing memorial." This it was, they think, which led him to "a conception of the sacrament obscure and indeterminate, and to a doctrine which maintains on a scholastic basis the presence of Christ, and the ubiquity, the omnipresence of his body." From the same direction comes the charge that, "blinded by the halo which to the eyes of the people invests the head of the imperial majesty, he overlooked the fact that the supposed Christian for a time, forgot that he had to go cheerfully to the scaffold, but that it is also Christian and manly for inalienable rights to resist imperial op- pression with the sword." Luther's holding back, and Luther's scruples, are charged as the main cause that the Reformation made so little. This is the favorite- able opportunity which were so often presented in the political relations of the times; opportunities which, rightly used, would have enabled them to seize and to maintain the pre-eminence.

To these objections it may be answered that all that is of real importance in the judgment of Luther's posti- tion as to the Lord's Supper hinges upon the question, Is his doctrine the Biblical one? If it be Biblical, the main objections vanish. They could at the worst fix no more than the charge of doing a right thing in a wrong way. If we were to concede for Luther in these cases that he was what he confessed for himself at Worms, that he had fallen into personal expressions which did not become his character as a Christian, nor as a minis- ter of Christ, yet we could say for him, as he said for himself at the same great era, the question is not con- cerning it as a doctrine, but whether it is unbiblical, the proof of that fact swallows up all minor questions. But those who prize the thing will at least forgive the mode. Loving him for the "re" in which he was "fortier," they will absolve him for its sake for having carried the "fortier" also into the "modo." Here they were, they properly made from the position of those who harmonize with his views, not of those who differ from him, for the practical difference between the construction of frimmess and obstinacy usually is, that firmness stands fast to its object, and obstinacy holds stiffly what was reject, or care nothing about. To the Romanist Luther was obstinate at Worms, firm at Marburg; to the Zwing- lian portion of Protestants he was obstinate at Mar- burg, firm at Worms. As regards Luther's political position, it may be said that it received the Reformation in its infancy: and when evil counsels of the friends of Protestantism harmonised with the efforts of the Romanists to drag the question of the era into the arena of state-struggle, the Reforma- tion was brought to the verge of ruin. Had Luther shared the political views of the Zwinglian side of the Reformation, the appeal to arms made in the Thirty Years' War might have come a century earlier, and might have ended in the overthrow of the Reformation. But once in his career did Luther yield to the pressure of political considerations (the bigness of the landgrave of Hesse), and in that yielding the Reformation received its severest blow, and the name of Luther its solitary blot. His simple trust in God was the highest prin- ciple. It was, though Luther did not think of it as such, the highest policy.

A clear, comprehensive, and systematic statement of his doctrines was never given by Luther, not even in his confessional writings. Others have endeavored to arrange his views in systematic order: Kirchner, Theo- sumus (in Latin,1668); in German, 1566, 1576, 1598); Luther, Latin, 1574, 1631; Latin, and in German, 1597); Maltz, M. L. Theology of Pura (1709; with a Supplement, 1710); Beste, M. L.'s Glaubenslehre (Halle, 1845). In this general class may also be mentioned And. Musculus, Schacta (1577), and Salzburg, Singularka Lutheri (1684, fol.). It was La- ther's work to restore doctrine, he left to others the ar- rangement of it. He made history, others might write it. Luther's great aim constantly was to give promi- nence and strength to those doctrines which were denied, ignored, or corrupted. His plan of warfare was that of attack rather than of defence. He fought many battles, but underwent and conducted few sieges. "The wealth of his theological knowledge and teaching rests essen- tionally upon his direct mighty grasp, intuition, and um- vising view of truth. As the result of this, it is the peculiarity of his mind that there is a relative throwing of ideas into a shape that tends to give them greater intelligence which are directed to calm reflection upon the diverse individual elements and parts of the object, to notional formulating, to logical or dialectical syste- matising" (Köstlin, The Theology of Luther [1893]).

XIII. Polenics and Iremics.—Inflexible in his opposi- tion to Rome, he yet showed himself solicitous to pre- serve peace while peace was possible. Very gradually and very cautiously he declared himself for the right of armed resistance, when, in the conscientious judgment of men learned in the law, the nature of the violation of rights is such as to demand war as the sole possible mode of self-defence.

1. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper grew to a sub- ject of extended conflict, and of far-reaching doctrinal and practical power in Luther's life and in the Reforma- tion. It became, indeed, a touchstone. The laws of interpretation which determined the doctrine of the Supper formed the principle more or less of the distinctive characteristics of both tendencies in the Re- formation. While he was engaged in the controversy with Carlsstadt, he heard, Nov. 12, 1524, that Zwing- li, and Jan. 13, 1525, that Zcelomacius held the same view the poison widely creeping." There- in fact, if these views were of the character previously interpreted; and, as the three intervened the other two, and
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was overthrown by them; but as they concurred in the one result, the denial of the true presence, Luther regarded them from the beginning as essentially one view.

2. Luther's course in the sacramental controversy exercised an immense influence on the internal and external history of the Reformation, and on things in his history has Protestant sentiment been so completely and so passionately divided. In his sermon on the venerable sacrament (1519), in which he for the first time presented with comparative fulness the evangelical view of this subject, Luther stood unquestioned. His own doctrine of the true presence of the body and blood of Christ without a change in the elements ("true bread and wine remains") he first brought clearly forth in his work on the adoration of the holy sacrament (1523), addressed to the Bohemian Brethren, who had directed their inquiries in him. They claimed that they held an objective gift of God in the sacrament; and, although their doctrine has been asserted by some to be that of a purely spiritual presence, they gave it such an approximation to the doctrine maintained by Luther that he was entirely satisfied with the instrumentality of the Bohemians. He stood diametrically opposed to their views, and further in a letter to the preacher at Strasbourg (1525), and in a preface to the Swiss Synghramma (1528), with which he declared himself in harmony. He fought earnestly against the doctrine of the Lord's Supper proposed by his opponents, and commented with such a feature that it regarded the Lord's Supper not so much as a divine institution as a movement of man towards God. Over against these views Luther designates the forgiveness of sins as the special, distinctive grace of this sacrament, as is in that forgiveness Christ has laid the efficacy of his passion. That bread remains bread, and is yet, in the sacramental complex, the body of Christ, involves to faith no contradiction. He defended his views in the Sermon of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ (1520); that the Words "This is my Body" still stand at the Consecration in the Supper (1529); The colloquy at Marburg (1529) and in part removed his suspicions of Zwingle: "You have another spirit than we." The Schwaebach Articles gave renewed expression to the doctrine of the true presence, even stronger than that in the articles which were drawn up at Marburg to express the consent and dissent of the two parties. A more hopeful turn of mind was called forth by the visit of Bucer to Colberg in 1530. As a result of this visit, Luther, in letters to Albert of Prussia and to the people of Frankfurt, expressed himself more gently towards Zwingle. The Wittenberg Concord of 1536, the Marburg Articles and the Zurich Confession (1536) sought to accommodate a temporary friendly recognition of the Swiss, and a correspondence with them; but all the old distrust showed itself again in the Short Confession touching the Holy Sacrament (1544). Luther had set himself with unshakable decision against every league of the Evangelical (Lutheran) States with the Swiss. He had not been able, however, to deter the landgrave Philip from forming a league with them. In the conflict with Zwingle there had been a special development of Luther's Christological views, and an expansion and distinctness in his entire theology.

3. The controversies which most deeply distressed Luther were those which took place within the Evangelical Church itself. The Osnabriick controversy in Nuremberg, 1536, in regard to the general form of public administration, to which Andrew Osiander (q. v.), who was constitutionally self-opposed, had been opposed, was decided by Luther with that thorough moderation which never failed him when he believed that principle was not compromised. He thought the form objectionable, but said that it was leached and made a rule. In the controversy about the Peace of Augsburg (1555), Luther had in mind the real and hardly less than if he had been there in person. The great hymn "Ziehe fest Burs" is generally supposed to have been written at this time, but there are strong grounds for believing that it appeared in 1529. In 1557 he prepared the Schmalkald Articles, to be laid before the Diet of Speyer, which was convoked for the last time in 1556. At the formation of the Torgau alliance (1526) and of the Schmalkald League (1530) he had sent his opinion and advice, and, with his counsel to his elector, the protestation was made at Spires (1529).

friends. Agricola completely retracted his erroneous views, but the tenderness of the old confidence and love was never restored.

XIV. Literary Activity.—The activity of Luther in the period which followed his return to Wittenberg was largely directed to the internal shaping of the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church. Among its richest results may be mentioned, 1. his German hymns in the first German Hymn-book (1524), and the Wittenberg Hymn-book (1528). He stands forth in these as the father and founder of the German hymnology and Church music. See Hymnology. He was the author of thirty-six hymns, and of several original melodies adapted to them.

2. His Order of Divine Service and of the Congregation (Wittenberg, 1528); his Formulae Messe et Communio (1524); German Mass and Order of Divine Service (1529) (all of these are given in Sunday Service of Churches of the Reformation, by C. P. Krauth), with which he connected his Ritual of Baptism and Marriage, and a form of Confession. The great visitation in the states of the elector of Saxony (1527-1529) led to Melancthon's writing the Book of Visitation. This was revised by the latter and issued in 1530.

Among Luther's greatest labors are to be mentioned the two Catechisms (1529), and his Translation of the Bible. This he commenced with the New Testament in 1522; the Old was sent out in parts, commencing in 1525, and completed in 1535. The final revision was made in 1541, and the latest edition of this final revision, which Luther himself helped to correct, typographically, appeared in 1545. The Bible of Luther is an acknowledged masterpiece—one of the wonders of the intellectual world. The modern German attained its full development and perfect finish in Luther's version. By means of that book it obtained a currency which nothing else could have given it. It became fixed; it became universal; it became the organ of a literature which, more than any other since the Greek, has been a literature of popular science. It became the vehicle of the modern philosophy, the cradle of those thoughts which at the moment act most intensely on the human mind" (Hedge). "He created the German language," says Heine.

XV. Activity in Church Constitution.—He took an active interest in the constitution of the Consistories: Rehhem—Considerations of the Theologians touching Consistories (1538). An important part was borne by Luther in the preparation of the confessional writings of the renewed Church. He was, in conjunction with other divines, the author of the Marburg Articles and the Zurich Confession (1529). The Centenary Articles (1550) were founded on, and, to a large extent, the material, both doctrinal and verbal, of the Augsburg Confession (1530), during the direct preparation and presentation of which Luther was at Colberg. As he was under the ban of the empire, to have appeared at Augsburg would have almost certainly cost him his life, and would have made all negotiation impossible, as it would have been regarded as an open act of aggression on the part of the Protestant princes. He was brought, therefore, to the nearest point at which he could be safe, and where he could be consulted in the business. At this point, and which had been summoned at Mantua. In aiding in giving to the Church her proper external relations, Luther exercised his influence by letters, and by his writings in connection with the Diet of Nuremberg and of Ratibson, the religious peace of which he had been a prominent factor (1555). At the formation of the Torgau alliance (1526) and of the Schmalkald League (1530) he had sent his opinion and advice, and, with his counsel to his elector, the protestation was made at Spires (1529).
Luther's Letters have been edited, 1. by G. Th. Strobel (1780–88) and by De Wette (1825–29); supplement by Seidenmann (1866). 2. Correspondence edited by Burchardt (1866). See Veesemeyer, Literaturgeschichte ("Literature History of the Collections of Luther's Letters," Berlin, 1821).

The "Table-Talk" (Tischreden, Aurifaber, 1656; Stangwald, 1571, 1591) has been critically edited by Fürstemann and Bindseil (1844–48). The most complete translation into English is by Cap. Henry Bell (Lond, 1832; folio; 3d ed., 1871; new ed. Budehurtz, 1840 [garrified]; transl. by Wm. Hazlitt, London, 1848; new ed., with additions, London [Bohn], 1857, Philad. 1868).

The writers on the life of Luther are numerous (Fabrici Casteliotham [Hamb, 1728, 1730, 2 vols.; Uker, 1754; E. G. Vogel, Bibel, 1841; new ed., Budehurtz, 1851], give the literature), namely, Melanchthon, Historia de acta et acta Lutheri (Wittenberg, 1546; edited by Augustus, Breslaw, 1817; with Preface by Neander, Berl. 1841; transl. by Zimmermann, Göttinigen, 1816; in English, London, 1861, 1861; Crusiger (1558); Mathesius, Geschichte Luther's in Stresemann's Jornal (Nurnberg, 1863), and frequently since; edited with observations by Rust, Berl. 1841; by Schubert, Stuttg, 1852; Selnecker (1557); Dresser (1858); Walch, in his edition of Luther's Werke, xxiv, 1–875; Keth (3d ed. Leipzig, 1764, 4 vols.); Schrock (Leipz, 1779); Tischer (Leipz, 1798; new ed. 1803); Uker (1807); Uker (1817, 2 vols.); K. H. Stuttg, Geschichte Luther's und der Reformation (Berlin, 1818, 1 vol.); Stang, Leben u. Wirken (1835–37; after J. Mathesius, Nurnb. 1883); G. Pfister (Stuttg. 1856); Ladenriether (1860); Meurer, Luther's Leben, aus den Quellen, erschlielt (Dresden, 1845–1846 [transl. N.Y. 1847]; 3d ed. 1870; abridged, 1850, 1861, 1891); F. W. Genz, Leben u. Werke (Eisdieb, 1841–45); Jürgens, First Diviz. 3 vols.—reaches only to 1517 (Leipz, 1846–47); Weydmann (1850). H. Gelzer, Historical Sketches, with pictorial illustrations by G. König (Hamb. 1861; transl., with an introduction and view of the Reformacion in England by Croly, 1858, 1858; 3d ed. Bohn, 1860; reprinted, Philadelphia, with Introduction by T. Storck, 1854); J. A. Jander, Luther's Leben (Leipz, 1858); K. Zimmermann (Darmstadt, 1858); G. A. Hoff, Vie de Luther, Paris, 1863. H. W. Thiersch, Luther, Geschichte, Adolph, and Marcellin J. (Nord. 1869); Jikkel, Dr. M. L. Gesch. seines Lebens u. seiner Zeit (1870); Schultz (E. F. F.), Luther's Leben u. Wirken (Berl. 1870); Lang, M. L. (1870). The biographical dictionaries and the encyclopedias all have articles on Luther. Among the former may be mentioned the American Dictionary of Biography, the Baye, the Colman, the Duden, the Eberhard (1870) and Herrzog (by Kästlin). Many of the most important works which treat of Luther's life, as, for example, Seidel, Scoltetus, Seckendorf, Tenzel, Spalatine, Myconius, among the older writers, and Marheineke, Ranke, D' Aubigne, Waddington, among recent ones, present it in its connections with the history of the Reformation (q.v.).

The most noticeable lives of Luther from Roman Catholic hands are by Cochlaeus (1549; tr. into German by Huyer, 1858), Ueberg (1822; trans., into German, Mainz, 1858), Michelet (1823–36, trans., by Lawson, 1856; 2d ed., by W. G. H. [John C.], Hemmert, 1861); Herzog (by Kaestlin). Many of the most important works which treat of Luther's life, as, for example, Seidel, Scoltetus, Seckendorf, Tenzel, Spalatine, Myconius, among the older writers, and Marheineke, Ranke, D'Aubigne, Waddington, among recent ones, present it in its connections with the history of the Reformation (q.v.).

The best known by English hands are by Bower (1819), Riddle (1837), and John Scott (London, 1831; New York, Harper, 1851). The Scott-Coxey Family (1863) is the best picture of Luther from an English pen; little more than the frame is fiction.

From the hands of American authors we have the Sears (1850), Weiser (1848, 1866), Loy (tr. of Frick, 2d ed. 1869). J. G. Morris (Quasi Sayings and Doings concerning Luther, 1859), and A. Carlson, The Life and Times of Luther (1888, 1885; transl. Philad, 1841; by Trumpbell, London, 1854).
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From the hands of American authors we have the Sears (1850), Weiser (1848, 1866), Loy (tr. of Frick, 2d ed. 1869). J. G. Morris (Quasi Sayings and Doings concerning Luther, 1859), and A. Carlson, The Life and Times of Luther (1888, 1885; transl. Philad, 1841; by Trumpbell, London, 1854).
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appealed at this time the account of Luther's last hours by two eye-witnesses, Justus Jonas and Celius of Mansfeld; Luther's sermons, hitherto unprinted, edited by Hek (from the MSS. of the Wollenbittel Library); selections from Luther's German letters, by Düring; and Luther's hymns, by Bachem-Magengel, and Crum. Among the best books called forth is the prize work of Hof—the critique (Würdigung) of Luther's translation of the Bible, with reference to the older and the more recent translations (1847).

On Luther's theology, see Julius Köstlin, L. s Theologie, Luther's Theology, in its historical unfolding and in its internal connection (Stuttgart, 1863); L. s Theologie, Luther's Theology, with special reference to his doctrine of Atonement and Redemption (Harnack, 1882-7); Dorners, Gerech. der Protestant. Theolog, (München, 1867, trans by Holben and Sophia Taylor, Edinb. 1871, 2 vols); Plitt, Einleitung in die Augsburger Erlangung, 1869; Chr. Weise, Luther's Christologie (1855); Luther's Philosophie von Theophilos (1 Theil, die Logik, Hanover, 1870)

On Luther's German style, see Dietz, Worterbuch zu Dr. M. L. s Deutschem Schriftst (Leipsic, 1868); Opitz, Die Sprache L. (Halle, 1869).

On the character and merits of Luther, Ackermann L. Seinem Vollem Werth und Wissen nach, aus seinen Schriftstern dargestellt (1 Heft, "Luther im Kampf," Jena, 1871).

For a more complete view of the doctrines of Lutheranism, see Krauth, Conservative Reformation (Phila, 1871), and Prof. Jacoby in the Mercersburg Review, Jan. 1872, p. 77 sq.; Zöckler, Augsburgerische Confession (1870)

I. Origin and Development.—The rise of the Lutheran Church was due to the confluence of the Reformers' ideas and the religious ferment of the time. The preaching of a simple and direct way to salvation, the establishment of a new Church, the separation from the Roman Church, and the establishment of a new Church, were the main ideas that animated the Reformers. The Lutheran Church was founded in Germany in 1522, when Martin Luther, a German monk, began to preach reforms in the Church. The Reformation spread rapidly, and by 1524, the Lutheran Church had become established in Germany. The Reformation spread rapidly, and by 1524, the Lutheran Church had become established in Germany. The Reformation spread rapidly, and by 1524, the Lutheran Church had become established in Germany.

The Lutheran Church is the ecclesiastical communion which adheres to the rule and articles of faith restored in the Reformation, of which Luther was the chief instrument. The acceptance of this rule (God's Word) and the confession of this faith are set forth in the Augsburg Confession of 1530, which is the common confession of the entire Lutheran Church. The major part of the Lutheran Church formally and in terms acknowledges, and the rest of it, almost without exception, voluntarily acknowledges the Apology of the Augsburg Confession of 1530, the Schmalkald Articles of 1537, the Two Cathechisms of 1529, and the Formula of Concord of 1579, as according to the rule of faith with and with the Augsburg Confession. These confessions, together with the eccumenical creeds, form the Book of Concord of 1580, and are often styled The Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church. The system of faith and life involved in the doctrine of the Lutheran Church is Lutheran, the Church which officially receives it is the Lutheran Church, and the members of that Church are Lutheran. The faith of the Lutheran Church is thus summarily presented by Dr. Cha. F. Krauth (Conservative Reformation, p. 127): "We are justified by God, not through any merits of our own, but by his tender mercy, through faith in his Son. The depravity of man is total in its extent, and his will has no positive ability in the work of salvation, but has the negative ability (under the operation of grace) of ceasing to resist. Jesus Christ offered a proper, vicarious, propitiatory sacrifice. Faith in Christ presupposes a true repentance. The renewed man co-works with the Spirit of God. Sanctification is progressive, and never reaches absolute perfection in this life. The Holy Spirit works through the word and sacraments, which only in the proper sense are means of grace. Both the Word and the Sacraments bring a positive grace, which is offered to all who receive them outwardly, and which is actually imparted to all who in faith embrace it." The chief peculiarities of Lutheran doctrine, which have to any considerable degree become subjects of controversy outside of the body itself, relate to (1) Original Sin, (2) the Person of Christ, (3) Baptism, and (4) the Lord's Supper. These will be found specially treated under these heads. Luther's own views on the last point will be detailed under the art. Transubstantiation. For a more complete view of the doctrines of Lutheranism, see Krauth, Conservative Reformation (Phila, 1871), and Prof. Jacoby in the Mercersburg Review, Jan. 1872, p. 77 sq.; Zöckler, Augsburgerische Confession (1870).
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In Württemberg it was introduced under duke Ulrich in 1534; in the bishoprics of Magdeburg and Halberstadt in 1541; in Brunswick about 1545. The views which Luther had expressed at an early period in regard to a congregation were thereby brought into the background by the disturbances of the Anabaptists and the insurrections of the peasants. The leagues of the evangelical princes were one of the earliest forms in which there was an expression of the unity of the different parts of the Lutheran Church. The conventions of the theologians for the adjustment of doctrinal controversies tended to the same end. In the political relations of the Church the unity found expression in the "Corpus Evangelicorum" (q.v.) at the Diets.

The rapid, and, for a time, resistless growth of the Lutheran Church received its first check in the "ecclesiastical reservations" of the religious peace of Augsburg. By the terms of this peace the transition of an ecclesiastical prince was attended by a loss of his secular power. The miscarriage of the attempt at reformation by Gebhard Truchsess in the archbishopric of Cologne in 1539 was a serious disaster to the Lutheran Church. The larger part of Germany was inclined to the Lutheran faith. The apostasy of several of the princes, as, for example, Pfalz-Neuburg, on political grounds, and the influence of the counter reformation conducted by the Jesuits in Bavaria and Austria, preserved a part of Germany for the Roman Catholic faith. Yet the constitutionally fixed the boundaries of the Lutheran Church in Europe, and they remain, very much as they then were, to the present day. The transition of the elector of Saxony, of the duke of Brunswick, and of other princes to the Church of Rome exercised no very marked influence upon their people.

A large part of the higher nobility, which in the earlier movements of the Reformation had manifested, almost without exception, a drawing towards it, gradually lapsed again into Romanism. (On these perversions, and other losses to the Lutheran Church, see Löbel's *Hist. Briefe.* Hamburg, *Grosse Geschichte,* vol. vii [1868].) At an earlier period than that of these changes, the Philippist and Reformed churches of the Palatinate, and in Hesse, in Anhalt, and on the Lower Rhine, in East Friesland and Bremen, Lippe, Nassau, and Tecklenburg, had surrendered themselves from the Lutheran Church. In the present century these churches have come together in the "Union." Beyond the bounds of Germany the Lutheran Church was firmly established in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, and in the German Baltic provinces of Russia. In Poland it was suppressed (comp. Krasinski, *Index Historiae Poloniae, vol. i. [1865].) In the United States of America the Lutheran Church has won a new territory. (See below, LUTHERANS IN AMERICA.) In Hungary and Transylvania the German (Saxon) nationality accepted the Lutheran confession. The Magyars became converted to the Evangelical church. The pupils of Luther, preached the purified faith. Gustavus Vasa, king of Sweden, greatly promoted the interests of the Lutheran Church; and at the Diet of Westerlitz, in 1544, the last remnants of the papal system were removed. In Denmark, as early as 1527, Christian II had favored the Reformation. Frederick I was also a decided Lutheran. Christian III called in Bugenhagen to prepare and introduce a Church discipline and ritual. Riga and Courland entered into the League of Schmalkald in 1538. Apart from the vast Lutheran element within the "Union" in Prussia, the Lutheran Church was thrown into the hands of the German lands: Baden, Brunswick, Mecklenburg, Oldenburg, the principality of Reuss in Hesse, the Saxon lands, Schwarzburg, and Württemburg; also in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden; in Russia, in the departments of Livonia, Estonia, and Courland. In the Baltic and Baltic Gulf, the Lutherans constitute a large body in Hungary, France, the British empire, and North America. They are, in fact, found the world over. There are not less, probably, than forty millions of them altogether. (Comp. Krauth, p. 124, 125.)

III. Organisation and Constitution.—The first fresh impulses of the evangelical life of faith was not allowed to shape a complete congregational life in entire accordance with the pure principles which had been restored. With the early Lutherans the Church was a body, men of devoted piety, yet the interest of the Church in the particular state territories was subjected to political policy. The tendencies of the Roman ideas, which in every department had struck their roots too deeply into European life to be easily eradicated, put forth new vigor in the reactionary after-time. The Lutheran Church was repressed in one part of her development, and stimulated to the highest degree by her liberty in another, and by the doctrinal necessities which taxed all her resources. The result was that she matured abnormally—the strength of her policy bore no proportion to the perfection of her doctrinal system. In the organization of the Church an important part was borne by the Church visitation in Saxony in 1529, and resulted in assigning the oversight of the churches and schools to superintendents (q.v.). A Saxon Church Order of Discipline and Worship was prepared, which became, to a very large extent, the model in the organization of the state churches throughout Germany. The Lutheran Church held herself in principle remote from the two extremes of hierarchy, which absorbed the State into the Church, and Cessopapacy, which absorbed the Church into the State. In the series of official acts, the Church, in the time of the Church's need, took the position of provisional bishop. They were the supreme officers in the Church, its highest representatives. In the execution of the duties thus assumed they called to their aid Consistories (q.v.), as the official board composed of clergy and laymen. A condition of things which had been justified by the immediate necessity of the Church gradually became normal in the "Episcopal system." The provisional became legalized into the fixed, and the head of the State was in effect the chief bishop of the Church. The distinction as Bishop of Spirit and of laymen had made between clergy and laity, which neglected the great New-Testament doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, was no longer recognized. The ministry ceased to be a self-perpetuating, independent order, and was regarded as a divine office, with a divine vocation, given by Christ's command, through the Church. A hierarchical division of the clergy, as of divine right, was rejected as at war with the Christianity of the New Testament and of the early Church; but the propriety and usefulness of grades in the ministry (bishops, superintendents, professors) in the Church at large is generally acknowledged, and they are retained in some countries. Thus, in Denmark, in the very infancy of Lutheranism, evangelical bishops took the place of the deposed Roman Catholic prelates; while in Sweden the privilege of naming the Royal bishops was retained in office, and thus secured to that country "a sacerdotal succession" in the High-Church sense. Very generally the rule of the Church is by consistories, but as these depend upon the instructions of the congregations, the ultimate power lies with the latter. See ConsISTORIES; SYNODS and CHURCHES.

IV. Progress.—The internal history of the Church became largely a process of the development of doctrine (see Hundsbaehausen, *Breit, u. Kirch-politik*); and in this progress, naturally enough, opposition was encountered, and gave rise to controversies with parties both from within and without the Church. Thus, the minor God of the history of the Lutheran Church, her chief struggles were with Popery, the Anabaptists, and the Sacramentarians. These controversies drew the boundary-lines of her own territory, as biblical over against Rome, historical and conservative over against the early Lutherans, and limited the degree of Protestantism. To the fixing of the bounds of her territory succeeded a longer series of efforts to bring that territory under complete and harmonious cultivation. To be consistent in general over against systems which, as systems, were indefeasible, was not enough. The
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Lutheran system was to bring all its own parts into working harmony, and hence the various dimensions and difficulties when it was yet in its infancy. The most important of the internal controversies which arose during this effort are: 1. The Antinomianism, from 1587 to 1589, on the relation between the Gospel and the law, the use of the law, and the necessity of the church law. 2. The Agricola Controversy, from 1589 to 1591. 3. The Oecumenical Controversy, from 1591 to 1594, on the doctrine of justification, sanctification, and election. See Osiander, Andrew. 4. The Reformation, from 1561 to 1562: Are good works necessary to salvation? And in what sense? See Major, G. 5. The Stoeic Controversy, from 1563: According to what principle of reason should a Christian's redemptory word be interpreted? See Major, G. 6. The Antinomianism, from 1556 to 1557, on the question whether there is an active co-operation on the part of man before and on his conversion. 7. The Flaccias, 1561: Is original sin substantial or accidental? See Flaccas, Ilex. All these controversies had a common aim—they wished to define more perfectly the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith, to show what it presupposed and what it involved, to exhibit its objective and subjective aspects. All doctrines were viewed in their relation to the nature of God, and the great aim was to adjust them to it (see Denk, Geschichte der Politiken. 1867; in English dress, Edinb. 1872, 2 vols. 8vo). A deeper impression was made upon the life of the people by the controversies which grew out of the interims in 1548, involving the individual persons of the princes and the great powers, which appealed to the senses as well as to the convictions of the worshippers. Out of it arose the A dialektische controversy (q.v.) (1550-1555): Whether the Church could permit certain usages, in themselves indifferent, to be imposed upon her by force of civil power. ('See Rechlin, Geschichte der A. K. (1862).) This vehement opposition of the Flaccias to the Philippists also had a great influence upon the shaping of the Lutheran Church. Unfortunately, however, these divisions among the Protestants gave the Romanists many advantages: they tended at the Diet of Augsburg (1566) to change the political situation greatly in favor of the Roman Catholics, and prostrated the strife for years (Ranke, Deutsche Geschichte, vii, 63). See Interim. Against Calvinism, the controversy turned especially upon the doctrine of the Lord's Supper and the associated doctrine of the Person of Christ, and the doctrine of predestination. It involved the whole essential diversity between Lutheranism and Calvinism; also the Philippist tendency, so far as it approximated to Calvinism in some features (Calvinismus). To compose these differences and close up these questions within the limits of the scope of the controversy seems which, after various ineffectual efforts in the same general direction at the Assembly of the Electors in Frankfurt (1558), at the Assembly of the Princes in Naumburg (1561), and at the Altenburg Colloquy (1568), was finally carried out in the Peace of Passau. The Peace of Passau, which was the most successful compromise at Winterberg, near Magdeburg, in 1577. See Concord, Formula of. The preparation of the Formula of Concord is the last act in the series of events which gave full confessional shape to the doctrines of the Lutheran Church. During Luther's lifetime the Lutheran Church had taken a firm and final position over against the Roman Catholic. The Augsburg Confession was the rallying point of the friends of the revised faith. The Apology defended the Confession in Melanchthon's incomparable manner; the Schmalkald Articles gave forth Luther's trumpet note of a battle in which no quarter could now be expected from the papal band of destroyers. See Apology, as a they had their Manual in the Shorter Catechism, and the pastors, in using it, had the Larger Catechism, the best commentary on the lesser. Yet these immortal documents did not exhaust the development of the faith. Even theuggy faith was alarmed, and the 'Consensus' of 1559, on the Meditations of Melanchthon there were impulses to conflicting tendencies. After Luther's death the Lutheran Church was threatened with a schism, which might have been followed by the complete triumph of Rome over the whole reformation work. On the one side was the gentle, unionistic tendency of Melancthon and his party (the Philippists), yearning for union, and temporizing sometimes with Calvinism, and yet more frequently with Romanism. On the other side stood the stricter party, headed by Amsdorf, Flacius, and Wigand. Over against the Church of Rome on the one side, and the Lutheran Church on the other, the Lutheran Church inclined earnestly on the doctrines which distinguished and separated her from both. She was unwilling that open questions should be perpetuated, and desired that the points of controversy should be adjusted and the controversy closed. Shall theology be simply a mode of thinking, or shall it be a system of faith? was the question involved. Shall it be a ball for the play of theologians, or a world for the firm footing of believers? The controversies which now arose took their root in questions which involved the relations of the two parties, on the one side to Romanism, on the other to Calvinism. Toward the Church of Rome the question in controversy had reference to the doctrines of redemption and justification. The intellectual centres of these struggles were the universitates (q.v.). In the 16th century Wittenberg was one of the most important. A strong party was in the, Calvinism. Its great antagonist in the interests of the conservative Lutheranism was Jena, which for various causes—some of the subordinate ones, no doubt, being of a political character—had been founded in 1568 by the older Saxen line. It was the citadel of conservative Lutheranism, and the host in conflict with it for conscience sake. Their refuge proved to be Magdeburg. This period reaches its culmination in the preparation of the Formula Concordis, in which the Swiss church, whose great representatives were Breitinger, and Zwingli, and whose political and cultural center was Schmid, Geschichte der A. (1862). The orthodoxy thus fixed was dominant from this time to the beginning of the 18th century. Its elaborate polemics were built up on almost imprecivable doctrinal authority. The scholastic acuteness and dryness more and more supplanted the freer and more vital faith of the Reformation. The religion of the heart was too much absorbed into the elaborate system of theology. The temple was solid and grand, but the heartlessness of the people were too often cold. George Calixtus (1566-1656) revived in Helmstadt the humanism of Melanchthon. His school became involved with orthodoxy in the Syncretistic controversy (q.v.). It sought, in the interests of Church peace, to soften the asperities of dogmatic disputes and the exclusiveness of the doctrinal systems. The plan on which it proposed to accomplish this result was to distinguish between fundamentals and non-fundamentals, and to return to the yet largely vague and general expressions of the first five centuries, which, while they regarded a pure faith as necessary to salvation, endured, without deciding the conflicting opinions on various points. The most unsparring and one of the most opposition of this tendency was Abraham Calixtus (q.v.) Spener. In piety, piety was needed in opposition to the one-sided scholasticism which had grown up in the Church. So far it revived the true spirit of the Church. It is evident from the passages in the Church, it brought in its better forms a more earnest spirit in theology. Its object was to reestablish the, the literature, the life, the renewal of the best type of piety, was Aug. Hermann Francke (q.v.). Its most distinguished opponents were Johann Benedict Carpoz (q.v.) and Valentine Ernest Loscher (q.v.). The inflexible narrowness of the Church life was changed by the action of a small band of reformers, most of them by the mystical fellowships which attached themselves to J. Boehme, Gichtel, and Dippel, and by the Church of the Brethren. By these movements, and by Bengal
and the theology of Oetinger, the dominion of the
mediavalism of the seventeenth century was broken.
Under the influence of rationalism, at the end of
the eighteenth century, the points of distinction between
the Lutheran and the Reformed churches, both in
Church history and in theology, lost more of their
significance. Efforts at union, which were vigorous
without being in any high sense earnest, were made,
especially in Westphalia and on the Rhine. These
efforts resulted in very little until after the Wars of Lib-
eration. From that great series of struggles went forth
an intense religious feeling through all Germany. It
was felt alike in both the Protestant churches. It
stood in strong opposition to the shallow spirit of ra-
nionalism, but was, in the nature of the case, more
interested at the beginning in the great common princi-
ples of the religious life of the whole Protestant move-
ment than with particular, and still more than with spe-
cific distinctive doctrines. Prussia now took steps for
what is called an "union" of all the Protestants. By the Lutheran con-
servatives this new movement was looked upon with
distrust. The union, they held, depended for its moral
power upon a depreciation in part of the confession.
It had been made possible by rationalism; but its per-
plexity was that, if it remained true to what was in
theology, the changes in the liturgy, the hymn-books,
and in the church usages of various kinds, were regarded with suspicion as an
attempt to undermine Unio of the fathers. Under the
leadership of Scheibl, in Breslau, Huchse, the distin-
guished jurist, and Steffens, the natural philosopher,
separated itself from connection with the State Church
and formed an independent communion. See Ola Lo-
tism. The religious life of the Church continued to
suffer from the evils which in the course of her
history had been fixed upon German Lutheran Protoc-
It was prominent among them were the hampering
of the congregational life—a life which was demanded
by the principles of Lutheranism—and the repression
of the spirit of criticism which characterized the
nineteenth century. The newly awakened religious
life withdrew itself, in consequence, very largely into
the smaller religious circles, and derived from them
more or less of a Pietistic hue. See Pietism. These
circles themselves drew more and more toward the an-
iscent orthodoxy. To this they were impelled by the
unionistic efforts, and the havoc created by indelibility and
rationalism. The new theological tendencies were met
by the system set forth in the Confessions. The feel-
ing grew that without a restoration of the old
relations of the bishop and the ministers to the Church,
the Church, as it were, would break up, and in the
middle of the century in which the sharpness of the antithesis is lost.
This method of union may be applicable to a certain set of
doctrines, but it goes to pieces of necessity on the dis-
sective doctrines which can allow of no modification
without loss of their essential character. The principle
on which the theology of the consensus rests is that
that alone is essential in Protestantism in which the
two confessions agree. Schleiermacher was the first to
maintain this, but his object was by it to neutralize
and render indifferent both systems, in order to set
thus a limit to, and to clear the ground of view in connonc with modern culture. With all
the care which Schleiermacher takes to give himself the
appearance of complete harmony with the ancient sys-
tem, it is easy to see that the new form of consciousness
breaks through the old, and that old and new are simply
to introduce the new, and to smooth the way for it.
In the case of these doctrinaries of the union, however,
the dogmatics of the consensus is a mere illusion, which
has no ground except in their lack of mental freedom.
They find the particularism of the confessional systems
too narrow for them; they are urged by their weight
within them to sustain a free relation to those systems;
and there is no ignoring the fact that they take a posi-
tion which has gone beyond them. But they are not
willing to confess this to themselves; instead of looking
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forward where their proper goal lies, they turn back-wards. They are constantly recurring to the point on which the old system is based. They desire to establish by the Church confessions what they hold to be the real substance of the evangelical faith. Yet they must themselves confess that they cannot be satisfied that they are throughout in harmony with either the Lutheran or the Reformed doctrine, and that on this ground they are wishing for what cannot be found in neither. The more the two systems are compared, the more do they show that the one excludes the other. This is the contradiction out of which there is no escape, the code in which there is a perpetual revolu-
tion of brotherly confusion. The old system is lost, and yet there is lack of force and courage to rise to a new one. Men know in their hearts that they are no longer at one with the Church, and yet they are afraid to break with it outwardly. They hold fast to the union, and yet cannot let go of the confessional. Is it a matter of wonder that all the dogmatic products of this school of theologians have an air of feebleness, superficiality, and lifelessness? From the dogmatic position it is impossible to deny that the opponents of the theology of the union are right; from it it is impossible to condemn the whole system, with all the offensiveness of its particularism, has at least the advantages of character, decision, and logical consistency” (Kirchengeschichte des Neuen Jahrh. (Tübingen. 1862). p. 409-411).

Mecklenburg isolated itself by its exclusive state-churchism. Even in the overzealous Catechisms, with which the earliest agitations in North Germany had been connected, did not secure the unmixed approval of the portion of the Church with whose views it was in sympathy. New Lutheranism has been accused of making the same tendency toward Romanizing, especially in the doctrine of the ministry, of the sacraments, and of the Church. To the ministerial office it is charged with imputing a hierarchical priestly character. It is charged with holding that ordination confers a divine authority for the ministration of the Word and sacraments, and for the discipline and government of the Church. With this tendency has been connected a desire to restore private confession, which its opponents say is almost equivalent to auricular confession. With it has arisen a strong opposition to the presbytery-

al constitution. It is said to maintain that the sacra-
ments derive their efficacy from the church, not from the means of grace.” In connection with this view, an ex-
alted importance is attached to the sacraments. The Lord’s Supper is made the proper centre of the public service. The whole artistic sense has been developed in the Lenten season. Its meaning is not found in the proper performance of the ritual, and, indeed, of the whole liturgical service of the Church. The in-
toning and the whole musical element in worship has been assigned its old place of esteem. This school has been charged with maintaining that, in order to pre-
serve the pure doctrine of the Church, it is necessary that of Rome is to be held. Subjection to the au-
thority of the Church is to be substituted for individual faith. The most important literary organ of this ten-
dency has been Hengstenberg’s Evangelische Kirchen-
 Rellese, established in 1827, which maintains within the Prussian union, with immense force and success, the po-

ition of distinctive Lutheranism. This tendency sep-

arated itself from the orthodoxy which bore the tinge of pitiable, and from the mediating theology, especially in the work of inner missions (z. v.), with which it re-
 undisputed. It is on the ground that it is not churchly. In the Prussian Church it opposed itself to the regulations of the congregations, and to the consti-
tution of the State Church. In the department of mis-
sions to the heathen (the term foreign missions has ceased to have a meaning), it was necessary for the one set of Christians to establish missions for the con-

version of another set), the revised New Lutheranism

has pursued an independent course. Against this Dor-
per expressed himself, in a memorial of the Prussian High Constable, in 1866, which denounced new state chur-

vent the newly-acquired state churches (such as Han-

over, etc.) from being placed under the care of the minis-
ter of cultus. The Lutherans outside of Prussia, the

Mackenburgers, Bavarians, and others, at the confer-

ence at Hanover in 1866, with the Hanoverians, and

others in Church fellowship with them, made use of the sev-

enth article of the Augsburg Confession (of the Church and its true unity) to keep up the agitation against all union with the rest of the State Church of Prussia. See Neue Evangel. Kirchenzeitung (1866); Boelsch, in Domus Zeitschrift für das Kirchenleben (1869); Matthaei, Allgemeine Kirchliche Chronik (1871).

V. Ritual and Worship (cultus) of the Lutheran Church.—The foundation for these was laid by Luther in his Formula Missae (1523) and his German Mass (1546). In these he proceeded upon the principle, which he expressed and defended, that the Church service was not to be abrogated as a whole; that the vital parts of it had a noble origin; that the great thing was to purge off its excesses and defilements, and to restore to its true place in it the Word of God, which had been more and more neglected. In conformity with these fundamental principles, the ritual was purified, the neglected elements replaced, and the more necessary parts de-

veloped still further. It was brought back to the stand-

ard of the Bible, and of early pure Catholic antiquity.

The Lord’s Supper, restored to its true position, became the grand point of culmination in all the chief services. The office of the Word was renewed. Preaching became a great indispensable element of the chief public ser-

vices. The congregation took a direct part in the ser-

vice in response and singing. The services were held either in the vernacular or the popular language. A portion of the familiar old Latin part of the services was in many cases continued, mainly, however, in order to re-

tain the noble Church-music, until time had been given to fit it to a vernacular service complete in all its parts. Luther insisted simply on an organization of worship which should preserve its rich treasures and resources. Services for the morning and evening, and for the days of the week, were retained or arranged. More than all, congregational singing was developed. In conformity with these views, there arose the service of the Luther-

an type which we find in the agenda (q. v.) of the 16th

and 17th centuries in the eastern parts of Prussia, in the whole of Germany the Wittenberg order was followed, and is maintained to this day. The service is of moderate length, and is rich liturgically.

The forms established in the era of the Reformation were more or less broken through, or altered in a very wretched manner, in consequence of the theological rev-

olution which marked the 18th century. With the reli-

gious life, whose reviving power was felt towards the close of the first quarter of the 19th century, came a strong desire for relief from these mischievous changes. To this desire, and of its greatest motives, the Prussian agenda owes its origin; yet, alike in the mode of its introduction and in elements which per-

vaded it throughout, it involved a breach with the origi-

nal Lutheran type, to which it claimed in large mea-

sures to conform. As this fact became more and more manifest, the effort was made to bring the forms of the agenda into harmony with the better elements which still survived in the congregations; yet, after all that could be done in this way, the result was imperfect and unsatisfactory. In consequence of this, in the most re-

cent period, a still closer approximation has been made in Prussia to the original Lutheran ritual. One set of influential thinkers, as Höfling and Kliefoth, contended for an unconditional retribution of the worship of the Reformation time. Others held that various changes were necessary to adjust the new forms for a new and more fully developed Church worship with the well-grounded views of the present and the actual needs of the congregations.

V—19
The "agendas" became a source of special trouble in the controversy between the Unionists and the "Old Lutherans." The contest on the agenda raged particularly severe in Silesia. Among the most active participants in this struggle were the pastors Scheibe, Berger, Wehrhahn, and Kellner, at Hönigern. A pacific royal order of Feb. 28, 1834, in regard to the continued forms of union, accorded the Hönigern to leave the conflict aslyed by the rescry of the Consistory of Breslau, May 16, 1834, which demanded that the clergy who had not acceded to the Union should use the revised agenda of 1829, and forbade any public attacks upon the Union as a course of instruction of instruction. The consequence of these was that the offending clergymen were suspended (1834). In Hönigern the military were called in to force open the Church for the introduction of the State-Union service (Dec. 24, 1834). Similar disturbances arose in Halle in connection with Guericke, professor in the university, who was removed by the government in 1836. But this opposition element was not to be seduced by flattery nor terrified by force. In a synod held at Breslau in 1835 they had resolved to exhaust all legal measures to secure for themselves purity, independence, and integrity in doctrine, worship, and constitution. The Missionary Synod travelled from place to place, administering baptism and the Lord's Supper. In Berlin and Erfurt new congregations were formed. In the Mark and in Silesia a special apostolic Church constitution was adopted. Among the decided Lutherans, however, there was a minority. The synod demanded a complete separation from the State Church. The relatively more moderate party, with which Guericke stood, desired to carry out their Lutheran convictions within the State Church as far as the legal concessions allowed them to do so. These troubles matured a purpose in thousands of the opposed confessions of the faith to leave their native land for conscience sake. In spite of various concessions on the part of the government, a great emigration to Australia took place under the leadership of Kavel. To these "pilgrim fathers" of our day were added many from Saxony, led by Stephan, and from Wittenberg and the Wupperthal. From 1888, and especially after the advent of Frederick William IV to the throne of Prussia (1840), the tone of the government towards the Lutherans became milder.

VI. "Separate Lutherans."—A royal general concession was granted to the bulk of the population in Saxony, on condition that the Lutherans who held themselves aloof from the State "Evang" Church. They were granted the right to form congregations of their own, and to have them united under a common direction, which was not to be subject to any control or supervision of the State Church; having obtained the consent of the state to its formation, could call pastors, whose vocation was to be confirmed by the Direction, and who were to be ordained by ordained ministers. The baptisms, confirmations, proclamation of the banns, and marriages of these clergy were acknowledged in law, and their church registers were to be received in evidence. Their obligation was regarded as the taxes and burdens of the parochial connection to be determined by the common law. Under these provisions the Lutherans constituted a High Consistory in 1841 under the presidency of Professor Huchke. This official board is the supreme ecclesiastical authority for the Lutherans in Prussia. It consists of four regular members; it is controlled by the Synod, and has charge of the purity of the Church in doctrine and life, of the reception of new congregations, the regulation of fiscial relations, and the appointments of clergy; to it is committed the decision in complaints made by the officials of the churches and of the higher schools. It has oversight of the ritual, of the decisions in ecclesiastical cases, and of censures against the clergy, and similar matters. The clergy are supported by a fixed salary, and by perquisites. The processes of Church discipline areimonition, temporary exclusion from the communion, the making of apologies in various degrees, and final excommunication. The Church service is conducted according to the agenda which have been in use; the preaching or free texts requires the permission of the Board of the High Consistory; the Lord's Supper is an essential part of the chief service. The Lutherans are not obliged to send their children to the United schools. Thus the Lutheran Church in Prussia, an Church, has an independent foundation. In 1847 the High Consistory had in its care twenty-one congregations recognized by the state, and numbering about nineteen thousand souls. Of these the largest proportion was in Silesia—ten congregations, numbering about six thousand, and about the same proportion was in Westphalia and in the Rhine Provinces. In addition to these Separate Lutherans there was an immense number of Lutherans who, in consequence of concessions guaranteed by the government, remained in the State Church. Outside of Prussia, a Lutheran movement was felt in Nassau in 1846, in which Brunn of Steeten, near Runkel, was leader. The government and the deputies declined to authorize the formation of a separate Lutheran commission. The connection between the Lutherans was strengthened by the press and the means of instruction. The "Zeitschrift für Luthersche Theologie," edited by Eitelbach and Guericke; the "Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche," edited by Harless and others; and various popular periodicals, such as the "Pilger aus Sachsen," the "Sonntagsschriften," and others. Conventions were held at Berlin and Gittern in 1835, the Strasbourg Synod in 1842, and a Sanhedrin in Leipsie held its first session in 1848. With the great political movement of 1848 the interests of the Positive Lutherans entered on a new era. Of the urgent demands made at that time for the separation of Church and State, they took advantage especially in their struggle against the Alliance established by the State Church. Meanwhile the difference of conviction between the Lutherans within the Union and those separated from it was not completely removed. The Separate Lutherans urged the impossibility of a Lutheran clergyman's remaining with good conscience in the Union. The Lutherans who did not withdraw from the government Church nevertheless began to come into closer association under the leadership of Göschel, Stahl, Heubner, and Schmiedier. Their views and claims were supported by Hengstenberg's Kirchenrat und Kirchenfreunde; and by the religious periodicals of Saxia, and Posen. They agreed, at a meeting in Wittenberg, in September, 1849, on the following principles: "We stand upon the Confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church; our congregations have never justly accepted the political incapacity for congregations; we have never sought recognition and adherence to the Lutheran Confession in worship, the order of the congregation, and Church government; first of all is to be insisted on the freeing of the altar service from everything that is dubious, and the giving of the stamp of the Confession to the entire service; furthermore, there should be in the government of the Church a management which would give security to confessional independence; finally, there should be a guarantee of Lutheran principles in the constitution of the congregations." These aims they did not, however, propose to secure by separation, but by contending within the State Church for the rights of the Lutheran Church in the districts belonging to it. This decision rendered more bitter the feeling of alienation between the Lutherans who remained in the State Church and those who separated from it. In addition to these internal controversies, there arose also differences with the civil government of the Church, especially on the part of Lutherans within the State Church. These differences were caused partly by the establishment of the High Consistory in 1830, and partly by the proposed Erklärung before the other churches, which was opposed on the ground that the Confession was not sufficiently secured. The High Consistory attempted to meet the opposition, and to harmonize fed-
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ings by various concessions; but, with a growing conscious-ness of need and of right, the Lutherans constantly rose in their demands. They asked for the abolition of the mixed boards, the institution of exclusively Lutheran faculties, the return of the Church property, and for other changes looking in the same general direction. The result finally was the issue of a cabinet order of July 12, 1833, which showed that the king, Frederick William IV, was determined to make no further concessions. The stricter Lutherans had shown that they were prepared to use unceasing energy in various movements of the time. Thus had they declined to co-operate in the plan of the Innen Missions (1849), and opposed the confederation of churches proposed at the Church Diet at Wittenberg in 1849. In other lands the struggles of the Lutheran Church for truth and rights continued. The University of Erlangen was the centre of the struggle in Bavaria, and Harlesia, the president of the High Consistory, one of its great supporter. But as the General Synod at Anspach, in consequence of opposition on the part of the congregations, the stricter Lutheran views could not be carried out in regard to creed, Church government, changes in the liturgy, confession, and Church discipline. Here also arose the stricter party, with the pastors Löhe and Wachern, which took ground against fellowship at the Lord's Supper with the reformed Lutherans. Immediately after their acrimonious debate in 1836, the party was resisted by the High Consistory. In Nassau, the two Hess, Hanover, and the Saxon duchies, the stricter Lutheranism had adherents. As a rule, the mission festivals were their centres of union. In Baden, under pastor Eichhorn as leader, the conflict with the government resulted in a legal separation from the State Church in 1856. In Saxony, especially about Schönburg, the stricter Lutheran clergy were numerous. The emigration of Stephan injured the cause very much in the general estimation. During these public movements, the most longed after and consistently insisted on was the union of Lutherans in the United States. The doctrine of theDownloader errors were deleted.

LUTHERANS IN AMERICA. I. Early History.-The celebrated German divine, Dr. Henry Melchior Mühlenberg (q. v.), is generally and justly recognised as the founder of the Lutheran Church in America. He arrived in this country in 1742. Long previous to his coming, however, the Lutherans had gained a footing here. Adherents of the Church of the great German reformer first came to these shores of the West from Holland in 1621. In consequence of the severe measures adopted by the Synod of Dort (1618-19), the stay of non-conformists was uncomfortable in the mother country, and with the first Dutch migration the province of New Amsterdam (now New York) came several Lutheran immigrants, seeking here a home, and a place to worship God agreeably to the dictates of their conscience. They had come, however, without a shepherd, and for years were dependent upon lay supervision and instruction. The first Lutheran communicants who brought thither one to minister unto them came from Sweden in 1688, and settled on the banks of Delaware Bay, where now stands the thriving city of Wilmington. For a number of years the Swedish Lutherans only were favored with ministry, and for years were dependent upon lay supervision and instruction. The first Lutheran communicants who brought thither one to minister unto them came from Sweden in 1688, and settled on the banks of Delaware Bay, where now stands the thriving city of Wilmington. For a number of years the Swedish Lutherans only were favored with ministry, and for years were dependent upon lay supervision and instruction. The first Lutheran communicants who brought thither one to minister unto them came from Sweden in 1688, and settled on the banks of Delaware Bay, where now stands the thriving city of Wilmington. For a number of years the Swedish Lutherans only were favored with ministry, and for years were dependent upon lay supervision and instruction. The first Lutheran communicants who brought thither one to minister unto them came from Sweden in 1688, and settled on the banks of Delaware Bay, where now stands the thriving city of Wilmington. For a number of years the Swedish Lutherans only were favored with ministry, and for years were dependent upon lay supervision and instruction. The first Lutheran communicants who brought thither one to minister unto them came from Sweden in 1688, and settled on the banks of Delaware Bay, where now stands the thriving city of Wilmington. For a number of years the Swedish Lutherans only were favored with ministry, and for years were dependent upon lay supervision and instruction. The first Lutheran commun...
epoch in which it assumed organic form. No man could have been more eminently fitted than was H. M. Muhlenberg for the mission to be accomplished. "He possessed faith, the experience of perseverance." He was, moreover, "deeply interested in the work to which he had devoted himself, as is apparent from the manner in which he discharged his duties, and the condition in which he left the Church at the time of his decease." When he came there was an absence of all organization. It is true the Swedish brethren gave assistance to their German brethren freely and cheerfully, but this was by no means sufficient to advance the interests of Lutheranism. Muhlenberg saw this clearly, and he at once applied himself to the task of effecting the organization of the German Lutherans at least. The greatest obstacle he found in the want of preachers and of houses of worship; but he was not in the least daunted by this jejuneness of his beloved Church. His influence at home was that of a piouis and devoted servant of the Lord, and he soon drew a number of his former associates and friends to this side of the Atlantic, so that by 1748, only six years after his landing on these shores, he was enabled to call around him the strongest and ablest representatives of the Lutheran ministry in America, to counsel together and form a synod. They met in 1748 and recommended the election of one of their own number as provost (q.v.), to preside over them and act as their representative before the country. Muhlenberg, however, desired stricter conformity to the rules and regulations of the mother Church, and in 1750 the Swedish Lutheran Church afterwards showed, his course proved to be the only safe way towards a perpetuation of the Lutheran Church in America.

The men who joined Muhlenberg in the convention at Philadelphia, Aug. 14, 1748, for the purpose of organizing the first Lutheran synod in America, were Brunnholz, Handschuh, and Hartwig, of the German, and Sandin and Næssen, of the Swedish Lutheran Church. It was by this body that the first German Lutheran was regularly set apart in this country to the work of the ministry. His name was John Nicholas Kurtz. He was not, however, the first Lutheran minister ordained here. As early as 1701, Falkner, a student of divinity, was ordained by the Swedish ministers Rudman, Björk, and Auren, to labor in the Swedish Lutheran Church; quite an eventful act, also, because it set aside forever the supposition that the Swedish Lutherans received the doctrine and the ministers in the synod which it taught in the Anglican Church. After 1748 the synod met regularly each year, and these meetings "were attended with the most beneficial results. They not only advanced the prosperity of the Church, but the hands of the ministers were strengthened, and their hearts encouraged. They promoted kind feeling, and formed a bond of union among the churches." In 1765 a private theological seminary was started, under the care of Dr. Helmuth and Schmidt, and in 1767 the Legislature of Pennsylvania established Franklin College, "for the special benefit of the Germans of the commonwealth, as an acknowledgment of services by them rendered to the state, and in consideration of their industry, economy, and public virtues." There were, in the year of Muhlenberg's arrival in this country, in Pennsylvania alone, 110,000 Germans, and of these about two thirds were of the Lutheran Church. One of the sons of Dr. H. M. Muhlenberg—Henry Ernest—at this time pastor of the Lutheran Church in Lancaster, Pa., was honored with the distinction of first president of this now widely celebrated institution of learning. In 1781 the Lutheran Church in this country received the recognition of the state to education by the Pennsylvania Legislature in the gift of 5000 acres of land "to the free-schools of the Lutheran Church in Philadelphia," the charter of the Dr. Henry Mechilor Muhlenberg's labor. During the Revolutionary days the Lutherans acted the part of patriots and Christians; many of their number came forward in defence of the country of their adoption. Dr. Muhlenberg, among others, had two sons in the army; one of them exchanged the gown for the colonel's uniform. In consequence of this identification of the Church with the Revolution, and the struggle of the English to dislike them greatly, and many were the sufferings and deprivations to which they were subjected; several of their churches were burned or desecrated, and all manner of oppression was visited upon them. The close of the War of Independence, however, left them, if anything, gainers in the struggle. Aside from the liberal donations which they received in Pennsylvania, as we have seen above, they received large accessions from the very ranks of their enemies. Many of the German soldiers who, by the ignominious treaty of 1783 with the English, were sent to this country to exterminate the love of freedom, at the close of hostilities concluded to remain this side the Atlantic, and became valuable members of the Lutheran Church in America. Out of 5728 soldiers that had come here from Brunswick, 1800, with seven officers and their chaplains, at one time entered the fold of American Lutheranism. Of the Hessians, also, some 7000 remained to swell the number of adherents to the Church of the great German reformer.

Not so auspicious was the outlook at the close of the eighteenth century. On October 7, 1787, the patriarch and founder of the Lutheran Church in America departed this life, and the Church was bereft of its great strongbould. There had been slowly growing, ever since the establishment of American independence, a decided and strengthening tendency among the German Lutherans into the exercises of public worship. The older and more conservative portion of the Church contended for the use of the language which the great reformer had so much embellished and invigorated, and of which he was really the second father. Some of the Germans eran believed that their language might actually be made the language of the country, and thus the proposition of the younger and Americanized portion for the use of the English proved an occasion of discord and alienation, "resulted in serious injury to the Church, and almost caused its total ruin. . . . Thousands abandoned their parental communion, and sought a home among other denominations, because their children did not understand the German, while many who remained, because of their limited acquaintance with the language, lost all interest in the services, and became careless in observance of their sevices; the Church of the United States, when Dr. Muhlenberg had counselled due consideration of the wants of this young and growing element, and frequenty himself preached in English; but, his tongue once silent, the conservative element impolitically gloried in its wearisome ignorance..."

Ch. [5th ed. Philad. 1852, 12mo], p. 27-29. The first Lutheran Church in which the English was exclusively used was not built until 1809, and it remained for many years the only one to represent the English-speaking element in the Lutheran Church. Efforts for more complete and effective organization may be traced in New York State in 1785 by the establishment of the New York Synod; hitherto the Pennsylvania Synod was the only minsterium (q.v.) in existence. In 1808 a synod was organized in North Carolina; in 1819, in Ohio; in 1828, both in Maryland and Virginia. In 1816 the educational advantages of the Church also received new strength by the founding of a theological seminary at Hartwig, N. Y.—the first public training-school of the American Lutherans for young men prospecting the holy office of the ministry. An asylum for orphans the Lutheran Church has been organized there to service early training and education in the midst of the thriving colonies at Ebenezer, in Georgia. It was widely known as the "Salzburger Waisenhaus," and is said to have received no little encouragement from Whitefield.

II. The Development of the General Synod of American Lutherans.—The need of a central bond of union for the different synods extending over a territory so vast as...
that of the United States gave rise in 1820 to the formation of a "general synod"—a starting-place and a central radiating point of improvement in the Church.

There were at this time 170 ministers connected with the Lutherans, and 35,000 communicants in the Lutheran connection. Of these, 155 preachers and 35,000 communicants, at the meeting of the synod held at New York, Oct. 22, 1820, formed the General Synod. The constantly increasing influx of Ixfopean Lutherans frequently gave rise to the manifestation of the most diverse opinions on ecclesiastical matters, and, in consequence, to many controversies. The general council, and gradually and more decisively, until a schism became inevitable. Even previous to the outbreak of our civil war there had been frequent secessions of several of the synods from the general body, but the strife of 1861–65 gave a more decided influence in favor of the establishment of rival bodies by the side of the "General Synod." The first to establish themselves independently were the Southern Lutherans, who instituted a "Southern General Synod," later known as the "General Synod of North America," and now (1872) embracing 5 synods, 92 ministers, 175 churches, and 18,250 members. The division was, however, preparing, on doctrinal grounds, in the Northern synods. The constitution of the General Synod did not make membership dependent upon an adherence to the letter of the "Augsburg Confession" of 1530, the great standard of faith in the Lutheran Church, but by inserting in the Augsburg Confession as the most important historical document as regards the doctrines of the Church, the constitution aimed to secure to all Lutherans the liberty of rejecting some utterances of that confession which had early been discarded by a considerable number of the followers of Luther as unscriptural and semi-papal. This feature was obnoxious to the strict Lutheran party, which regarded Lutheranism to remain for all time to come as defined by the Augsburg Confession of 1530, and which desired to bring back the whole Lutheran Church of the United States to this point.

III. Organization of the "General Council."—The party differences, after creating frequent disturbances at the meetings of the General Synod, led to an open rupture in 1864, when the Franciscan Synod, a New York State body, which was regarded by the Confessional Lutherans as positively unchurchly and heretical, was admitted to the General Synod. In consequence of this act, the oldest synod, that of Pennsylvania, withdrew from the Convention. At the next meeting of the General Synod of 1865, the "General Council," a body of five—synods, 8; ministers, 910; churches, 1559; communicants, 259,801. The Southern General Synod embraced—synods, 9; ministers, 201; churches, 885; communicants, 37,528. The grand total is—synods, 58; ministers, 4692: churches, 7948; communicants, 1,099,868. The statistics are:—English, 48; German, 54; Norwegian, 16; Swedish, 26.

Growth of the Lutheran Church in the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Synods</th>
<th>Ministers</th>
<th>Congregations</th>
<th>Communicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>138,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>2272</td>
<td>222,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>246,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>2575</td>
<td>270,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2152</td>
<td>3727</td>
<td>460,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4692</td>
<td>7948</td>
<td>1,099,868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For special local and national statistics of the Lutheran Church, see America; Anhalt; Austria; Baden; Bavaria; Belgium; Bohemia; Brunswick; Bremen; Carinthia and Carniola; Denmark; England; France; Hesse; Holland; Hungary; Iceland; Ireland; Lolland; Livonia; the Philippines; Norway; Oldenburg; Poland; Prussia; Russia; Saxony; Silesia; Steiermark; Sweden; Thurin-gia; Transylvania; United States; Westphalia; Wurttemberg. For missions of the Lutheran churches, see Mission.

On the history of the Lutheran Church, compare Krauth, The Conservative Reformation and its Theology (Philadelphia, 1871, 8vo), especially ch. iv; Giebel, Die religiösen Eigenthümlichkeiten d. Luth. u. ref. Kirchen (1857);
Auguste, Beiräte v. Geschichte u. Statistik der Evangel. Kirche (1838); Wiggers, Statistik (1842; 2 vols.); Har- nack, Die Luth. Kirche im Lichte d. Gesch. (1855); Rah- nitz, German Protestantism (1860); Selas, Ecclesia La- tina, 2, 2 vols. (1861); Fine, Geschichte der Reform. Kirchen; Donner, Gesch. der Protestant. Theologie (1867); Müller (J. T.), Die symbolischen Bücher der evangel. Luth. Kirche (Stuttgart, 1860; 8vo); Plitt, Lutherrische Missionen (Erlangen, 1871; 8vo).

Lütkenmann, Joachim, a German theologian, was born at Dammn, in Fomerania, Dec. 15, 1608; studied at Tostett, and afterwards at the University of Gris- wald and Strasburg; then travelled through France and Italy; and was magister legenti of the philosophical fac- ulty of Rostock in 1638, and appointed professor of meta- physics in 1648. He published at this time several philosophical works, such as his Laucenita corporis physici (Rostock, 1647). He also preached at the same time, and soon acquired great reputation by his elo- quence and Christian earnestness. He became involved, however, in a quarrel with the strict orthodox party of Neickenburg, upheld by the duke, on the question of the humanity of Christ in his death. Lütkenmann de- fended his views in his Dissertatio physico-theologica de erro homine, maintaining that the human nature of Christ ended in his death. He was expelled for these views, but immediately called to Brunswick as general superin- tendent and court preacher. Here he lived in 1651 a School Discipline, and in 1652 a Church Discipline, which were adopted in Brunswick. He died in 1655. His most important works were devotional, and in this line he may be ranked next to Arndt and Müller. The princi- pal are: Vorschau d. göttlichen Güte (Wolfenb. 1648); — Vom trieblichen Paradies — Hafte auf sehn sollen. See P. Rehmeyer, Schicksal, Striften u. Gaben Lütken- manns (Brunswick); Tholuck, Akad. Leben, part ii, p. 109; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. viii, 566; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, vol. ii, § 217.

Lutz, Johann Ludwig Samuel, a distinc- guished German theologian, historian, and biographer, was born at Darmstadt in 1750; studied in his native city, then at the universities of Tubingen and Göttingen; was in 1812 appointed professor of the gymnas- ium, and rector of the literary school of Bern; in 1824 became pastor of Wynau, and afterwards of Bern; and was in 1844 appointed professor of theology. He died Sep. 21, 1844. Among his works the most note- worthy is Grach, der Reformations in Basel (Basle, 1814, 8vo). His theological publications were published by Rüt- schi and A. Lutz, under the title Bibliotheca Dogmatik et Hermetica (1847 and 1849). See Hummelschon, Lutz, Johann Ludwig; Characterbild, 1844; Neuer Nomenclator Deutscher, vol. xxii: Pierer, Universals-Lexikon, x, 631; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. xxxii, 914. (J. N. P.)

Lutz (or Lucius), Samuel, one of the most import- ant representatives of early Pietism in Switzerland, was born in 1674. His father, the pious and learned pastor of Biglen, was his first teacher. Lutz at first turned his attention especially to mathematics, the classics, and Hebrew, then to Church discipline, and finally left all these to devote himself exclusively to the study of Scripture, and the works of the fathers and reformers, especially Luther's. German Pietism was then beginning to strike root in Switzerland, in spite of all the ef- forts of the orthodox party, headed by the theologians of Berne. To oppose it, a committee was appointed to take charge of all things pertaining to religion, and in 1699, by its influence, several prominent and influential preachers, tainted with pietism, were exiled or deprived of their livings, and a number of adherents of the pietist parti- fied or otherwise punished, and several stringent laws passed to secure the "uniformity of faith, doctrine, and worship." Finally both the citizens and clergy were obliged to take the so-called oath of association—a sort of Test Act. Lutz's first and rather insignificant appoint- ment as pastor was at Yverdon in 1705. Here he labored faithfully for twenty-three years, winning the respect and affection not only of the German, among whom he labored, but also of the French inhabitants. As he was accused of pietism, all attempts to secure more impor- tant appointments, even of the city, in which increasing his sphere of usefulness, were defeated, in spite of his reputation for learning and eloquence, until about 1726, when he was appointed pastor of Amdingfingen. In 1738 he moved to Diesbach, where he died, May 28, 1750. His col- lected works were published under the title Wirkungen, der Strauss u. schönen u. gesunden Himmelslebense (Basle, 1738 and 1756, 2 vols.). See Leu, Schweis. Lexikon, xii; Haller, Böd. d. Schweizerges. ii, 390; Hurn's Hagen- bach, Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries, i, 191 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. viii, 621.

Lux Mundi (the light of the mind), another name for baptism, so called on account of the instruction in the Christian religion which was given to the candidates for baptism before they were admitted to the ac- corded ordinance.—Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s. v.

Luxury, a disposition of mind addicted to pleasure, riot, and superfluities. Luxury implies giving a one's self up to pleasure; voluptuousness, an indulgence in the same to excess. Luxury may be further considered as consisting in: 1. Vain and useless expenses; 2. In a parade beyond what people can afford; 3. In affecting to be above our own rank; 4. In living in a splendor that does not agree with the public good. In order to avoid it, it is necessary to consider that it is considered to be some, sinful, and ruinous. See Robinson's Claude, i, 385; Ferguson, On Society, part vi, sec. 2; Buck, Theological Dictionary, s. v.

Lux (Heb. id. 112, a nut-bearing tree, either the al- mond or hazel, as in Gen. xxx. 37 [but according to Fürst, after Millar, medin, as of a valley]; Sept. Ace- re, but in Gen. xxvii. 12, 19 unites with the preceding word θετακλησις, the name of two places.

1. The ancient name of the Canaanish city on or near the site of Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 19; xxx. 6; xlviii, 8), on the border of Benjamin (Josh. xviii. 13); taken and destroyed, with all its inhabitants (except one family that had acted as spies), by the descendants of Joseph (Judg. i. 22). The spot to which the name of Bethel was given appears, however, to have been at a little distance in the environs of Luz, and they are ac- cordingly distinguished in Josh. xvi. 2, although the Heb. text of Ps. lxxii. 3 shows that they were continually sup- plied by one Luz; or rather, perhaps, Luz was the name of a locality near which Bethel was afterwards built. The form of the name in the Sept., Eusebius, and the Vulg. seems to have been derived from Joel. xiii. 16, where the words כבש ומכ ה are supposed to correspond to ordinary usage, the modern word כבש, "the shoulder of Luz," or the skin, which is the particle of motion in Hebrew, not being re- quired here, as it is in the former part of the same verse. Other names are found both with and without a similar termination, as Jobab, Jobbabah, Timmuth, Timmutha- thah; Riblah, Riblatbah. Laish and Laishah are proba- bly distinct places. Yehudah is confident that he has recovered the site of Luz in the modern ruins called Khurbet el-Losch, one hour and a half west of Bethel (Notes to the 22 ed. of his Map, p. 16). See Berthelot.

2. A small place in the district of the Hittites, found by an inhabitant of the former Luz, who was spared on the destruction of this place by the tribe of Benja- min (Judg. i. 26); and this seems to dispose of the identi- fication with the ruins still found on Mt. Gerizim (Sta- ley, p. 251 sq.), bearing the name of Luzo (Seetzen, Reis. i, 174; Wilson, ii, 68), about ten minutes beyond the trench near the village of the same name (Mountain of Gerizim, p. 881). Schwarzk thinks the site may be identified with that of wady Luzun, in the interior of the desert of et- Tih, north-west of Jebel el-Arati, on the strength of the Talmudic statement that this place lay without the bounds of Palestine (Pueis, p. 218). This is doubted by the wady Luzun described by Dr. Robinson as a broad
plain swept over by torrents from the mountains on the right, destitute of any fountain or water, and containing only a few remains of rude walls and foundations, which he regards as the traces of the Roman station Lyua along this route (Researches, i, 276, 277). Rosenmüller (Al-terk, ii, 189) refers the name to Laza, a city, according to Onomast. (Onomast., v. v.) or Eunomus from Socheem; but this could not have been Hittite territory. Studer (Buch d. Richter, p. 45) adopts a suggestion of D. Kimchi, that it was a city of the Phcenicians (Kitim, so Euseb. Hr. epist., Onomast., s. v. 2) is meant. Probably it was some place near Hermon or in Southern Palestine, where the Hittites settled. See Hit-3.

LYC. See HAZEL.

Luzzatto, Mosse Chayim, ben Jacob, the great modern Jewish mystic of Italy, was born at Padua in 1708, and enjoyed the highest educational advantages the country of his birth could afford. When a youth of only twenty, his extensive studies in Hebrew literature, especially the cabalistical writings, secured for him a universal reputation. Had he known how to avoid mysticism, he might have proved one of the greatest ornaments of Judaism, but the Cabala (q. v.) led him astray. Of his first work, a second Zohar (q. v.), but actually came to believe himself the predicted Messiah of his people. He was excommunicated, and obliged to quit Italy. For a time he flourished in Amsterdam, and about 1744 he removed to the Holy Land. He died shortly after, at Safed, in May, 1747, and was buried at Tiberias. Of the remainder of his writings, only a few have been published, comprising treatises in theology, dogmatic and cabalistical, philosophy, morals, and rhetoric, and a body of poetry, devotional, lyrical, and dramatic. His most important writings besides Eshet ha-Ever, are his "Eshet ir, an Eshet ha-Ever," and his "Eshet ha-Ever," 1835, 388; and his biography in Kerem Chemed (1838), iii, 113 sq. (J. H. W.)

Luzzatto, Samuel David, one of the most noted Jewish writers of our day, the Jehovah ha-Leri (q. v.) of the 19th century, was born at Trieste (Italy) in 1800, the son of one of the most eminent Rabbis in that city. He received a thorough academic training, and early displayed great ability as a writer. Greatly interested in the study of the history and literature of his people, he became one of the most prominent writers in this field. Says Sasso (vi, 609): "Luzzatto, indeed, learned, wrote, Rappaport were the fathers of Jewish history, Luzzatto must be acknowledged as her mother." He brought to light the most beautiful pages of Jewish history of the Franco-Spanish epoch—the tragic fate of the Jews in the persecutions of the Middle Ages and the reformatory psalms—which had been given up as lost; and thereby prepared the way for the labors of Kuyserling, Sacha, Zana, and others. Luzzatto also labored creditably in the department of O.-T. exegesis, and when the collegio rabbinico was opened at Padua in 1829, he became one of its professors, continuing in this service until his death in 1865. He wrote Hebrew, Italian, French, and German. His diction is graceful and exceedingly pleasant. His essays and treatises in this field appeared first in the "Bikkure Itinim," and afterwards (1841, etc.) in the "Kerem Chemed," published in Vienna and then in Prague by a man of great learning in Jewish literature, Samuel L. Goldenberg, of Tarnopol. One of his best books is his Dialogues, etc., on the Cabala, the Zohar, the antiquity of the voxel-points and accents of the Bible (1862), which shows the folly of the Cabala, the origin of the Zohar in the 18th century, and the vowel-points in the 5th, and the accents probably in the 6th. Luzzatto also published on Hebrew grammar, Prolegomena ad una gram. Heb.; and later a complete Hebrew grammar, Okeb guer ( "ו" גות הער); a work on the Arabic version of Onkelos (Vienna, 1880); an Italian version of Job (Livorno, 1844); French Notes on Isaiah (in Rosenmüller's version, Leips., 1884); Heb. Notes on the Pentateuch (Vienna, 1850); and finally Isaiah, an Italian translation with an extensive Hebrew commentary (Vienna, 1850). See Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden, xi, 499 sqq.; Jose, Geschichtliche d. Judenthums, iii, 345 sqq.; Magold, 1864-1865; The Israelite (Cincinnati, O.), Jan. 19, 1872. (J. H. W.)

Luzzatto, Simone (Heb. Simuel), a noted rabbi, who flourished in Venice about 1590, exerted considerable influence on the Italian Jews of the 17th century. He was an associate of Leo da Modena (q. v.), and aided the latter greatly by his superior abilities. He died in 1683. He wrote Vodi della Fede, in which he teaches that the prophecies of Daniel refer rather to the millennium age than to a future Messiah. This peculiar view has given rise to the belief that he accepted Jesus as the Messiah (see Wolf, Bibl. Jud., iii, 1128). His most valuable work, however, is his Discorso circa il stato degli Hebrei (Venice, 1688), in which he ably defends Judaism and the Jews. The excesses of the Cabalists he deplored, and stoutly opposed all relation with them. See Gritz, Geschichte der Juden, x, 162 sqq. (J. H. W.)

Lybon or Libo, a city mentioned in the Antonine Itinerary as being situated thirty-two Roman miles from Heliopolis (Baalbek), and the same distance from Damascus (Damasus). There has only compiled, there is no trace of the same itinerary by that of Conna. The modern village of Lebanon is doubtless the same (Bibl. Sacra, 1848, p. 699), although the distances have become corrupted (Porter, Damascus, ii, 322 sqq.). It is a poor village, in the middle of a basin, on a low tell among the streams on the eastern slope of Lebanon, with some remains of antiquity, and a considerable Arabian history (Robinson, Later Res. p. 582 sqq.).

Lybrand, Joseph, an eminent Methodist Episcopal minister, was born of Lutheran parentage in Philadelphia, Oct. 3, 1738; was converted at about ten; entered the Philadelphia Conference in April, 1811; was presiding elder on Philadelphia District in 1824-8; 1834-8 was on stations in Philadelphia; desisted from labor in 1843 at Harrisburg, and died April 24, 1845. Mr. Lybrand was a man of deep fidelity to God, and immovable fidelity to man. As an eloquent preacher he had few equals in the American pulpit. His style was eloquent and weighty, full of masterly argument and powerful exhortation, and many souls were added to the Church by his long and blessed ministry. So strong was his conviction in his duty to preach only that he refused God rest from the first to the last; he desired none of the drift of his denomination. Thus he declined in 1832 to assume the responsibilities of the publishing house taken from Dr. Emory, who had been elected bishop. - Minutes of Conferences, iii, 595.

Lyceos'ia (Λυκεισία, either from the mythologi- cal name Lykos, or from λυκός, a wolf), a province of Asia Minor, having Cappadocia on the east, Galatia on the north, Phrygia on the west, and Isauria and Cilicia on the south. These boundaries, however, are differently described by ancient authors (Ptolemy, vi, 16; 6; Pliny, v, 29; Strabo, xiv, 688; Livy, xxxviii, 89). It extends in length about twenty geographical miles from east to west, and about thirteen in breadth. It was an undulating plain, involved among mountains, which were noted for the concourse of wild asses. The soil was so strongly impregnated with salt that few of the Brooks supplied drinkable water, so that good water was sold for money; but when threw 17th century, and were reared with great advantage (Strabo, xii, 688; Pliny, Hist. Nat. viii, 69). Lyceos'ia first appears in history in connection with the expedition of Cyrus the younger (Xenophon, Anab. i, 2, 19; iii, 2, 28; Cypres, vi, 2, 20). The inhabitants were a hardy race, not subject to the climes, and led by Philip of Macedon to foray (Dionysius, Per. 857; Prisc. 806; Avien. 1020). With these descriptions modern authors agree (Leake's Journal, p. 67 sqq.; Renan, Geog. de l'Ouest Asia, ii, 93; Cramer, Am. Min. ii, 50; Mannert, Geog. V, ii, 190 sqq.). It
LYCIA

was a Roman province when visited by Pau. (Acta xiv, 6), and its chief towns were Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, of which the first was the capital (see Smith's Dict. of Class. Geog. s. v.). "The speech of Lyconia" (Acta xiv, 11) is supposed by some to have been the ancient Lycaonice, also spoken by the Cappadocians (Jablonsky, Disquis. de Lingua Lyconica, Berlin, 1714; also in his Opusc. iii, 3 sq.); but it is more usually conceived to have been a corrupt Greek, intermingled with many Syriac words (Guhlmg.; Dissert. de Lingua Lyconica, Vithe, 1726), since the people appear to have come from the account in the Acts, to have adopted the Grecian mythology as the basis of their religion (see Sommel, De Lingua Lycon. Lond. 1787). "It is deeply interesting to see these rude country people, when Paul and Barnabas worked miracles among them, rushing to the conclusion that the strangers were Mercury and Jupiter, whose visit to this very neighborhood forms the subject of one of Ovid's most charming stories (Ovid, Metam. viii, 626).

Nor can we fail to notice how admirably Paul's address on the occasion was adapted to a simple and imperfectly civilized race (Acts xiv, 15 sq.). See Homer, De Paulo in Lyconia (Lips. 1708). See Asia Minor; Paul.

Lyco'sa (Alexia, from λόκος, a wolf; according to some, from its earliest king, Lycaus; for a Shemitic origin of the name, see Simonis, Onomast. N. T. p. 101; Sichler, Homiliae, p. 566.), a province in the south-west of Asia Minor, opposite the island of Rhodes, having Pamphylia on the east, Phrygia on the north, Caria on the west, and the Mediterranean on the south. The last eminences of the range of Taurus come down here in majestic masses to the sea, forming the heights of Cragus and Antacragus, with the river Xanthus winding between them, and ending in the long series of promontories called by modern sailors the "Seven Capes," among which are deep inlets favorable to seafaring and piracy. It forms part of the region now called Tekke. It was fertile in corn and wine, and its cedars, firs, and other trees were celebrated (Pliny, Hist. Nat. xii, 6). Its inhabitants were believed to be descendants of Cretans, who came thither under Sarpedon, brother of Minos. One of their kings was Bellerophon, celebrated in mythology. Lycia is often mentioned by Homer (Il. vi, 171; x, 430; xii, 312; Odys. v, 282, etc.), according to whom it was an ally of Troy. Herodotus assigns several ancient names to the country (i, 178). The Lycians were a warlike people, powerful on the sea, and attached to their independence, which they successfully maintained against Croesus, king of Lydia, and were afterwards allowed by the Persians to retain their own kings as satraps, and their ships were conspicuous in the great war against the Greeks (Herod. vii, 91, 92). After the death of Alexander the Great, Lycia was included in the Greek Seleucid kingdom, and was a part of the territory which the Romans forced Antiochus to cede (Livy, xxxvii, 55). It was made, in the first place, one of the continental possessions of Rhodes [see Caria]; but before long it was politically separated from that island, and allowed to be an independent state. This has been called the golden period of the history of Lycia (see further in Smith's Dict. of Class. Geog. s. v.). It is at this time that it is named in 1 Mac. xvi, 23, as one of the countries to which the Roman senate sent its missives in favor of the Jews. The victory of the Romans over Antiochus (B.C. 189) gave Lycia rank as a free state, and preserved it till the time of Constantius, when it was made a province of the Roman empire (Sueton. Claud. 25; Vespas. 8). At first it was combined with Pamphylia, and the governor bore the title of "Proconsul Lyciae et Pamphyliae" (Gruner, Thees. p. 458). Such seems to have been the condition of the district when Paul visited it (Acts xxii, 1, 2; xxvii, 5). At a later period of the Roman empire it was a separate province, with Myra for its capital. Lycia contained many towns, two of which are mentioned in the New Testament: Patara (Acts xxii, 1, 2) and Myra (Acts xxvii, 5); and one, Phaselis, in the Apocalypse (1 Mac. xvi, 23). This region, abounding in ancient remains and inscriptions (the last copiously illustrated by Schmidt, Jena, 1868, fol.), was first visited in modern times by Sir Charles Fellows. See his Journal (London, 1839, 1841); Forbes, Travels (London, 1843); Teisseret, L., 1 Mac., ii (Paris, 1888); Encycl. of Useful Knowledge, xiv, 210 sq.; Cramer's Asia Minor, ii, 282 sq.; Mannert, Geogr. VI, iii, 150 sq.; Cellarius, Notit. ii, 85 sq.

LYCDDA

Coin of Lycia.

Lychnos (Lychnos), a river of Palestine, mentioned by ancient geographers as situated between ancient Bibus and Berytus (Strabo, xvi, p. 755; Pliny, v, 20). This is evidently the modern Naher el-Keb (Dog River), at the mouth of which, about 2 hours N.E. of Beirut, are found the remarkable rock-tablets of ancient victorious kings (Wilson, ii, 406; Robinson, Later Res. p. 619 sq.).

Lychnoscope (an opening for watching the light), a name assigned by the ancients to an unplugged window or opening, which is frequently found near the west end of the chancel, and usually on the south side, below the range of the other windows, and near the ground. What purpose these low side windows served in churches is not now known.

Lycurgus (Wulf), a river of Palestine, mentioned by ancient geographers as situated between ancient Bibus and Berytus (Strabo, xvi, p. 755; Pliny, v, 20). This is evidently the modern Naher el-Keb (Dog River), at the mouth of which, about 2 hours N.E. of Beirut, are found the remarkable rock-tablets of ancient victorious kings (Wilson, ii, 406; Robinson, Later Res. p. 619 sq.).

Lydda (Lydia), Acts ix, 22, 32, 38; from the Heb. עֲלָלָה, 37th and 36th Heb. letters. In Chron. viii, 12.

Lydda v. v. Ladei, by union with the following name, Ezra ii, 38; Neh. vii, 87; Aida, Heb. xi, 35; 1 Mac. xi, 34; so also Josephus), a town within the limits of the tribe of Ephraim; according to Eusebius and Jerome, nine miles east of Joppa, on the road between that port and Jerusalem; according to the Antonine Itinerary, thirty-two miles from Jerusalem and ten from Antipatris. It bore in Hebrew the name of Loy, and appears to have been first built by the Benjamites, although it lay beyond the limits of their territory (1 Chron. viii, 12); and we find it again inhabited by Benjamites after the exile (Ezra ii, 33; Neh. vii, 35). In all these notices it is mentioned in connection with Ono. It likewise occurs in the Apocrypha (1 Mac. xi, 34) as having been taken from Samaria and annexed to Judea by Demetrius Nicator; and at a later date its inhabitants are named among those who were sold into slavery.
ly by Caesar when he inflicted the calamity of his presence upon Palestine after the death of Julius Caesar (Josephus, Ant. xiv. 11, 2; xii. 6). In the New Testament the place is only noticed under the name of Lydda, as the scene of Peter's miracle in healing Eneas (Acts ix. 32, 40). Some years later the town was reduced to ashes by Cassius Gallus, in his march against Jerusalem (Josephus, Wars, iii. 5, 5; iv. 8). At that time it is described (Josephus, xiv. 2, 3) as having 700 houses, and situated 23 miles from Jerusalem, as a village equal to a city; and the Rabbins have much to say of it as a seat of Jewish learning, of which it was the most eminent in Judaea after Jabneh and Bether (Lightfoot, Parchon, § 8; Hors Horab. p. 35 sqq.; Othon, Let. Rabb. p. 899 sqq.). About the time of the siege it was petitioned over by rabbi (Hamdall) of the name of the Lightfoot, Chronicles, xxvi. Some curious anecdotes and short notices from the Talmuds concerning it are preserved by Lightfoot. One of these states that "queen Helen celebrated the Feast of Tabernacles there!" In the general change of names which has taken place the town of Ludd in the Bible has been changed into Lydda. Lydda became Diasporia (Ptol. v. 16, 6; Pliny, v. 13; see Reland, Palast., p. 677), and under this name it occurs in coins of Severus and Caracalla, and is often mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome. It was early the seat of a bishopric, and at the difficult times of the fourth century four bishops, not subscribed their names variously, as of Lydda or Diasporia; but in the later ecclesiastical records the name of Lydda predominates. Traditions report that the first bishop was "Zenas the lawyer" (Tit. iii. 13), originally one of the seventy disciples (Domingo, in Reland, p. 679); but the first bishop concludes the list in the signature of "Arius Lydensis" to the acts of the Council of Nicea (A.D. 325; Reland, p. 676). The bishop of Lydda, originally subject to Caesarea, became at a later date suffragan to Jerusalem (see the two lists in Von Raumer, p. 401); and this is still the case. In the latter part of 415 a council of fourteen bishops was held here, before which Prigias appeared, and by whom, after much tumultuous debate, and in the absence of his two accusers, he was acquitted of heresy, and received as a Christian brother (Milner, Hist. of Ch. of Christ, cent. vi, chap. iii.). The last known bishop in this connection is Michael, d. A.D. 518. Lydda early became connected with the housepaid to the celebrated saint and martyr St. George, who was not less renowned in the East than afterwards in the West. He is said to have been born at Lydda, and to have lived at Nazareth; he was among the earliest persecution under Diocletian and Maximian, at the end of the 3rd century. His remains were transferred to his native place, and a church erected in honor of him by the emperor Justinian. This church, which stood outside the town, had just been levelled to the ground by the Moslems when the Crusaders arrived at Lydda; but it was soon rebuilt by them, and they established a bishopric of Lydda and Ramleh. Great honors were paid them by St. George, and they invested him with the dignity of their patron: from this time his renown spread rapidly throughout Europe, and he became the patron saint of England and of several other states and kingdoms. The church was destroyed by Saladin in 1191, and there is no evidence that it was ever rebuilt, although there was in later centuries an impression that the church of the Muslims of which they were supposed to have existed, had been built by the English king Richard. From that time there has been little notice of Lydda by travellers. It now exists, in a fruitful plain, one mile north of Rama, and three east of Jaffa, under its ancient name of Lud or Ludda (Jold in Tobler's Die Weltatlas, p. 69, 456). Within a circle of four miles still stand Ono (Kefr Auna), Hadid (el-Hadith), and Neballat (Beit-neballah), three places constantly associated with Lyd in the ancient records. The water-course outside the town is said still to bear the name of Ali-Shatrus (Peter, in memory of the apostle (Tobler, p. 471). The town is, for a Mohammedan place, busy and prosperous (see Van de Welde, Syr. and Palest., i, 244). Buried in palms, and with a large well close to the entrance, it looks from a distance inviting enough, but its interior is very repulsive on account of the extraordinary number of its old and young, whom one encounters at every step, either totally blind, or afflicted with loathsome diseases of the eyes. It is a considerable village of small houses, with nothing to distinguish it from ordinary Moslem villages that are barren and overgrown with thorns; the church, the celebation of St. George, which are situated in the eastern part of the town. The building must have been very large. The walls of the eastern end are standing only in the parts near the altar, including the arch over the latter; but the western end remains more perfect, and has been built into a large mosque, the lofty minaret of which forms the landmark of Lud. As the city of St. George, who is one with the famous personage El-Khudi, Lydda is held in much honor by the Moslems. In their traditions the gate of the city will be the scene of the final combat between Christ and Antichrist (Selim's Kehf-i, 487; and Prel. Disc. iv. § 4; also Jalal ad-Din, Temple of Jerusale, p. 484). See Rauner, Palatinus, p. 208; Robinson, Bib. Researches, iii, 55; Sandy, Travels; Cotovicius, Itiner. p. 137, 188; D'Arvieux, Memoires, ii, 28; Poocke, Description, ii, 59; Volney, Voyage, i, 278; Thomson, Land and People of the Holy Land, p. 294.

Lydgate, John, an ancient English theologian, celebrated particularly as a poet, one of the successors of Chaucer, was a monk of the Benedictine abbey of Bury St. Edmunds, in Suffolk. The dates of only a few of the events of his life are known. He was ordained a subdeacon in 1389, a deacon in 1388, and a priest in 1387, whence it has been conjectured that he was born about 1375. He seems to have arrived at his greatest eminence about 1450. After a short education at Oxford he travelled in France and Italy, and returned a complete master of the language and literature of both countries. He chiefly studied Dante, Boccaccio, and Alain Chartier, and became so distinguished a proficient in polite learning that he opened a school in his monastery for teaching the sons of the nobility verification and composition. Although philology was his subject, he wrote on his favorite topic in harmony with the philosophy of the day: he was not only a poet and a rhetorician, but a geometrician, an astronomer, a theologian, and a disputant. He died about 1467.—English Cyclop. s. v.; Warton, Hist. Engl. Poetry; Chambers, Cyclop. Eng. Lit. i, 45 sqq. 2. Lyd'a (Aed'ion), the name of a country, and also of a woman in the New Testament.

1. The Hebrew Ladin ("Lydia" in Ezek. xxx. 5; see also Ludim), a province in the west of Asia Minor, supposed to have derived its name from Lod, the foundation of Shem (Gen. x. 22). Thus Josephus states "those who are now called Lydians (Aediones), but anciently Ludim (Aediones), sprung from Lud" (Aediones, Anti. ii, 6, 4; compare Bochart, Opera, i, 83, and the authorities cited there). See ETHNOLOGY. Lydia was bounded on the east by Greater Phrygia, on the north by Cossia or My- sia, on the west by Ionia and the Aegean Sea, and on the south it was separated from Caria by the Manander (see Smith's Dict. of Class. Geogr. s. v.). The country is for the most part level (Schubert, stabt. 1, 369 sqq.). Among the mountains, that of Cithaeron is remarkable for its saffron and its wine (Xen. Cyp. vi. 2, 21). Lydia, however, lay on the west coast of Asia Minor, and thus was far removed from the other possessions of the Shemitic nations. Greek writers inform us that Lydia was originally peopled by a Pelasgic race called Lycians (Herod. Hist. ii, 431, xxxi, 1, 481, who derived their name from Mecon, an ancient king (Bochart, l. c.). They also state that the name Lydians was derived from a king who ruled them at a later period (Herod. i. 7).
About eight centuries B.C. a tribe of another race migrated from the east, and subdued the Maccabees. These were the Lydians. For some time after this conquest both nations are mentioned promiscuously, but the Lydians gradually obtained power, and gave their name to the country (Kalisch, On Gen. xiv; Dionysius, i. 30; Pliny, v. 29. 205). They were the proud of the seven nations, and were described by Herodotus (vii. 79) as being distinguished in horsemanship (fē), and accustomed to serve as mercenaries under foreign princes (vii. 71). Now, in Isa. lxvi. 19, a warlike people called Lud is mentioned in connection with Tarshish and Pul; and again in Ezek. xxvii. 10, the prophet says of Tyre, "Thy of Persia, and of Lud, and of Duh, were in thine army, thy men of war."

There can scarcely be a doubt that this is the Semitic nation mentioned in Genesis, and which migrated to Western Asia, and gave the province of Lydia its name. The identity has recently been called in question by professor and Sir Henry Rawlinson, and the arguments do not seem sufficient to set aside the great mass of circumstantial evidence in its favor (Rawlinson’s Herodoto, i. 160, 659, 667; comp. Kalisch, ad loc. Gen. xiv; Frichard, Physical History of Mankind, iv. 562 sq.; Niebuhr, Lecturae in Ancient History, 167; Gesenius, Theoseus, p. 353). Of the days of Lydia’s kings rulers from the shores of the Aegean to the river Halysa; and Croesus, who was its king in the time of Solon and of Cyrus, was reputed the richest monarch in the world (Strabo, xv, 735). He was able to bring into the field an army of 420,000 foot and 60,000 horse against Cyrus, by which however, he was defeated and his kingdom annexed to the Persian empire (Herod. i, 6). Lydia afterwards formed part of the kingdom of the Seleucids; and it is related in 1 Macc. vii. 8, that Antiochus the Great was compelled by the Romans to cede Lydia to king Eumenes (comp. Apian. Syc. 88). Some difficulty arises in the passage referred to from the names “India and Media” found in connection with it; but if we regard these as incorrectly given by the writer or by a copyist for “Ionia and Myasia,” the agreement with Livy’s account of the same transaction (xxxvii. 56) will be sufficiently established, the notion of the maritime provinces alone in the book of Maccabees being explicable on the ground of their being best known to the inhabitants of Palestine. In the time of the travels of the apostles it was a province of the Roman empire (Pebius, H. J., viii. 301). The most powerful towns were Sardis (the capital), Thyatira, and Philadelphia, all of which are mentioned in the New Testament, although the name of the province itself does not occur. Its connection with Judea, under the Seleucids, is referred to by Josephus (Ant. xiii. 3, 4). The manner of the Lydians were corrupt even to a proverb (Herod. i, 89). See Th. Menke, Lydias (Berlin, 1844); Cramer, Asia Minor, i. 413; Fortugier, Handb. der Alten Geogr. ii. 107; Clinton, Fasti Hell. Appendix, p. 361; Niebuhr, Lecturae in Anc. His. i, 82; Cellarius, Notitia, ii, 108 sq.; Mannert, Geogr. v. ii, 346 sqq.; Alphen-Wilhelmiss, iv. 625 sqq.; Beck, Weltg. i, 308 sqq.; Heeren, Ideen, i, 1, 154 sqq.

2. A woman of Thyatira, “a seller of purple,” who dwelt in the city of Philippi, in Macedonia (Acts xvi. 14, 15). A.D. 47. The commentators are not agreed whether “Lydus” should be regarded as an appellative, or a derivative from the country to which the woman belonged, Thyatira, her native place, being in Lydia. There are examples of this latter sense; but the preceding word ὀμορίασι serves here to support the former, and the name was a common one. (See Briel and L. Hase in the Bibl. Bren. ii, 411; iii. 275; v. 670; vi. 1041; Symb. Bren. ii. 124; compare Ugolini Theosea, xiiij., xxix.) Lydia was not by birth a Jewess, but a proselyte, as the phrase “who worshipped God” imports. It was at the Jewish Sabbath-worship by the side of a stream (Acts xvi. 18) that the preaching of the Gospel by Paul reached her heart. She was converted, being the first person in Europe who embraced Christianity there, and after she and her household had been baptized she pressed the use of her house so earnestly upon the apostle and his associates that they were constrained to preach it (Acts xvi. 6). We infer that she was a person of considerable wealth partly from the fact that she gave a home to Paul and his companions, partly from the mention of the conversion of her “household,” under which term, whether children are included or not, slaves are no doubt comprehended. Of Lydia’s character we are led to form a high estimate from her candid reception of the Gospel, her urgent hospitality, and her continued friendship to Paul and Silas when they were persecuted. Whether she was one of “those women who labored with Paul in the Gospel” at Philippi, as mentioned afterwards in the epistle to that place (Phil. iv. 3), is impossible to say. The Lydians were famous for the art of dyeing purple vested (Pliny, viii. 57; Max. Tyr. xi. 2; Valer. Flacc. iv. 358; Claud. Rapt. Proserp. i, 273; Elian, Anm. iv. 46), and Lydia, as “a seller of purple,” is supposed to have been one of those who were trusted rather than in the dye itself (see Kuinol on Acts xiv. 14).

Lydian (Jer. xlv. 9). See LUD; LYDIA; LYDUS.

Lydius, Balthasar, a Dutch theologian of German origin, was born at Utrecht, near Darmstadt, about 1577; studied at Leyden; became pastor at Streefkerk in 1602, and in 1608 at Dordrecht. He was present at the Synod of Dort. He died in 1628. Lydius was a violent opponent of the Remonstrants. Of his literary labors, one deserves special mention, Waldenia (now very rare, Rotterdam, 1616-17; 2d ed. Amsterdam, 1625, 2 vols. 8vo), in which he seeks to show an intimate connection between the Moravians and Waldensians. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. xx, 63, 64.

Lydius, Jacob, a Dutch theologian, son of the preceding, flourished about the middle of the 17th century at Dordrecht, and took a prominent part in the synod held there. He died in 1688. Some of his works deserve special mention: Agonistica Sacra, sive Synagma regum maximos sive Iugum Corporis Christi a temporibus occurrunt (Rot. 1657, 12mo)—Florius Spirana ad historiam passionis Jesu Christi (ibid, 1672, 8vo). See Brandt, Hist. of the Reformation in the Low Countries; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxii, 388.

Lydius, Johannes (1), a German theologian, brother of Balthasar, was born at Frankfurt about 1577, and became pastor at Gudewarker (the birthplace of Arnim) in 1602. He died in 1643. Like his brother Balthasar, he is noted for his opposition to Arminianism. He was the editor of the works of Clamens, Wessels, etc. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. xx, 64.

Lydius, Johannes (2), one of the early Dutch ministers of the Reformed Church in America, was educated in Holland, and settled at Schenectady and Albany, N.Y., in 1702. Like his predecessors in the same Church, he labored successfully for the instruction and salvation of the Mohawk Indians. He ministered amongst the tribes of the “Five Nations,” and rendered to the governor and council suitable compensation for his services. He died March 1, 1710. About thirty Indian communicants were in connection with his Church at his decease. He is represented by his contemporary, Rev. Thomas Barclay, of the Church of England, in a just and impartial report. He also was a most judicious and sagacious character of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, as “a good, pious man,” who “lived in entire friendship with him,” and “sent his own children to be catechized.”—Documentary Hist. of N. York, iv, 897; Dr. Rogers’ Hist. Discourses. (W. J. R.T.)
LYDIUS, Martin, a noted Dutch theologian, father of Baithasar and Jacob, was born at Lubeck, Germany, in 1539 or 1540, of Dutch parentage, and was educated at the universities of Tbingen and Heidelberg, where in 1566 he was employed at the Collegium Sopranum as teacher. On account of persecution, in 1565, he fled to Flanders, and he went to Holland, and became in 1579 pastor of a Church at Amsterdam. Upon the founding of the university at Franeker in 1585, he was called thither as professor. He died in 1601. He is noted for the part he took in the Arminian controversy. It is he who forwarded to Arminius the works of Oornest and Arnold Cornelius for refutation, which resulted instead in the conversion of Arminius. See Herzog, Real-Enzyk. xx, 61 sq.; Bayle, Hist. Dict. iii, 970, 971. See ARMINIANISM.

Lyke, Edward, an English philologist and clergyman, was born at Tolness, Devonshire, and was educated at Hertford College, Oxford; took holy orders in 1719; was presented to the living of Haughton Parva, Northamptonshire; in 1750 became vicar of Yardley Hastings, and died in 1787. He acquired distinction by his researches in the Saxon language and literature. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, vol. ii, s. v. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. of Engl. (Church Restoration), i, 278.

Lyell, Thomas, D.D., a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Richmond County, Va., May 13, 1775. Though educated in the Protestant Episcopal Church, he became in early life a Methodist, and officiated on the Frederick Circuit, Va., also in Providence, R. I., and was chaplain to Congress. In 1804, however, he became rector of Christ's Church, N. Y., and remained ever after in that connection. In 1833 he was made A.M. by Brown University, and in 1822 D.D. by Columbia College. Through a long ministry he held on the even tenor of his way, and was an active member of almost every institution connected with the diocese of New York. He died March 4, 1848. Sprague, Annals, v, 495.

Lyford, William, an English theologian and zealous Calvinist, was born in 1598 at Perpeme (Berkshire); graduated at Oxh-vid; became a fellow of Magdalen College; entered the Church; became vicar of Sherborne, Dorsetshire, and spent the remainder of his life there. He died in 1558. Among other sermons and treatises are published, Cases of Conscience proposed in the Time of Rebellion (which pretences toleration to all parties)—Principles of Faith and of a good Conscience (Lond. 1642; Oxford, 1622. 8vo) A New Apology for our Public Ministry and Infant Baptism (Lond. 1652, 1658, 4to).—The plain Man's Senses exercised to discern both good and evil (ibid. 1655, 4to). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, vol. xxxii, s. v.; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s. v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, s. v.

Lyman, John, A.M., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Rockbridge County, Va., October 20, 1769, and graduated at Liberty Hall in 1794. Soon after he was employed in teaching, pursued his theological studies, and was licensed in 1797. He was ordained in 1799, and in 1800 took charge of the churches of Salem and Sugar Ridge, in Rockbridge County, Va. In 1805 he was appointed missionary within the bounds of the Cumberland Presbytery, and subsequently a commissioner of the General Assembly. He removed to Paris, Bourbon Co., Ky., in 1807, established an academy, and at the same time preached to the churches of Cave Ridge and Concord. He next supplied the church of Mount Pleasant, in Cynthiana, Harrison County, and passed the summer of 1814 in the counties of Bourbon, Harrison, Nicholas, and Fayette, preaching chiefly to the colored people. Having been elected his church at 1815, and in 1816, president of ministers on the field of his own labors, he devoted the rest of his life to missionary service, in which he was successfully engaged till his death in Paris, Ky., July 22, 1825. He published Contributions to Periodicals:—A New American English Grammar (1804):—A Sermon on the Qualifications of the Gospel Ministers (1821).—Sprague, Annals, i, 178.

Lyman, Henry, an American missionary, was born at Northampton, Mass., Nov. 23, 1809, and graduated at Amherst College in 1829. He went as a missionary to Sumatra, and was killed there by the Batahs, with Mr. Munson, Jan. 28, 1834. He published Condition of Females in Pagan Countries.

Lynn, Joseph, L., a Congregational minister, was born April 14, 1749, at Lebanon, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1767, was chosen tutor in 1770, in which position he remained two years, and was installed pastor in Hatfield, Mass, March 4, 1772, where he died March 27, 1828. He was elected president of the Hampshire Missionary Society in 1791, and vice-president of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in 1819, and president in 1823. Dr. Lyman published several occasional Sermons (1787-1821).—Sprague, Annals, ii, 10.

Lyman, William, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born about 1765, and was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1784. He was pastor at Haddam, Conn., and China, N.Y., and died in 1834. The College of New Jersey honored him with the doctorate in divinity in 1806. Dr. Lyman published four Occasional Sermons (1806, 1807, 1810). See Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. p. 570; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Am. Authors, ii, s. v.

Lynch, Thomas M., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Wilkeson County, Miss, August 1, 1826, was converted at Oxford, Ga., while a student at the university, at once joined the Church, and was licensed to preach in 1847, and shortly after was admitted to the Alabama Conference. His cultivated mind, his rare gifts in oratory, and his deep piety at once commended him to the love and confidence of the Conference. The Enon Circuit was his birthplace, and Marianna and Appalachian his second appointment, when, in 1849, his health failed, and it became necessary for him to locate. By 1858 he had sufficiently recovered to re-enter upon his life-work, and he now consecutively served in the Circuits of New Madrid, Pine Bluff, and the Sopacoty Circuit. In the last-named place his health was again affected by the extent of the work and arduousness of its duties, and he retired from active work. He died in Coweta County, Ala., April 16, 1867. In all the relations of life he sustained the character of a gentleman of the highest type. Possessing a rich fund of knowledge, and gifted with conversational powers that statesmen and courtiers might envy, he ever drew around him, by the affability of his manners and sweetness of his spirit, a large circle of friends, and held them by an indissoluble cord. As a preacher his word had power and unction. See Minutes of Conference of M. E. Church South, iii, 128.

Lynde, Sir Humphrey, an English writer of note, was born in 1579, and was educated first at Westminster School, and then at Christ Church, Oxford; was made bachelor of arts in 1600. He was a member of several Parliaments, and wrote other national histories, but he preserves a place here only on account of his works, among which are Via tuta (Lond. 1628, 8vo, and often) and Ancient Characters of the Visible Church, etc. He died June 14, 1686. See Gen. Biog. Dict. s. v.

Lyon, A.A., a Congregational minister, was born at Pomfret, Conn., Dec. 31, 1864, and graduated at Dart-
mouth College in 1790. He was pastor of the Congregational Church at Sunderland, Mass., from Oct. 4, 1795, to Sep. 23, 1798, at South Haddam, Vt., from Dec. 21, 1892, to March 15, 1840; and was a member of Congress from Vermont from 1815 to 1817. He was appointed chief judge of Grand Isle County in 1805, 1806, 1808, and 1815; and was during nine years a state representative. He was a able preacher. His published sermons and patriotic addresses show a high order of talent and scholarship.

Lyons, Horsey, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Walden, N.Y., Jan. 18, 1800, and was educated at Union College, pursued a course of theology at Princeton, N.J., and soon after removed to Ohio. Here, in 1820, he was ordained as preacher of the Presbyterian Church of Huron, and ordained pastor of the Church in Vermilion. In 1830 he removed to Brownhelm, Ohio, and engaged in the occupation of teaching at the academy in Richfield, Ohio. He died March 7, 1863. Mr. Lyon was a superior teacher, and much beloved by his pupils; as a Christian, he enjoyed an unmerited remarkable for depth and intensity. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 309. (J. L. S.)

Lyons, John C., a noted German minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Leobsberg, in the kingdom of Wuerttemberg, Germany, Feb. 11, 1802. In 1827, he was licensed by the Lutheran church, and John received a Christian training. In 1817 he emigrated to this country, and some nine years later was brought nearer the cross, at once joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and, after due preparation, entered the ministry, in which he continued for thirty-four years, preaching both in English and German congregations with great acceptance. He received consecutively the following appointments: 1828, Baltimore Conference, Huntington; 1829, Gettysburgh; 1830, Carlisle Circuit; 1831, Baltimore; 1832-33, Baltimore, Sharp Street, and Asbury; 1834, he was licensed to preach; 1835, Lexington; 1836, Lewish Circuits; 1837-38, Rockingham; 1839-40, Augusta; 1841, York; 1842-45, New York Conference, Second Street German Church; 1846-48, Philadelphia; 1849-52, presiding elder of New York German District; 1853-54, East Baltimore; 1855-56, New York, Second Street; 1857, Fortieth Street; 1858-59, Philadelphia; 1860, Frederick City; 1861, East Baltimore. In 1862 he was superannuated, and died May 16, 1868. "Brother Lyon was an earnest, faithful worker in the Gospel, never tiring, esteeming all labor which served to advance his Master's glory... He was a devout and holy man in life, a pleasant companion, a kind husband, a good father, a sweet singer in Zion, a useful laborer, turning many to righteousness."—Conf. Minutes, 1869, p. 108.

Lyons, Mary, a teacher and female philanthropist, born in Buckland, Mass., Feb. 28, 1797, is noted as the founder of the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary in South Hadley, over which she presided until her death, March 5, 1849. A feature of her plan (at first much opposed) was the performance of the institution's domestic labor by teachers and pupils, intending to give them independence of servants, self-denial, health, and interest in domestic duties. She set forth her views in Tendencies of the Principles embraced and the System adopted in the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary (1840), and in the Missionary Offering (1845). See Hitchcock, Life and Labors of Mary Lyon (1861); Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biography, 12 v.

Lyons, a city of France, situated on the Rhone, 316 miles by railway south-east of Paris, is noted in ecclesiastical history for two ecumenical councils which were held there:

1. In 1245, consisting of 140 bishops, and convened for the purpose of promoting the Crusades, restoring ecclesiastical discipline, and determining the question of the II. emperors of Germany. It was also decreed at this council that cardinals should wear red hats.

2. In 1274. There were 500 bishops and about 1000 inferior clergy present. Its principal object was the reunion of the Greek and Latin churches.—Hook, History of the Later Roman Church; Smith, Tables of Church History; Landon, Manual of Councils, A.D.

Lyons, Israel, a noted English scholar of Jewish parentage, was born at Cambridge in 1709; and after the completion of his studies, mainly dependent upon his own efforts, he became instructor of Hebrew at the University in Cambridge. He died in 1776. Besides valuable contributions to mathematical science, he wrote The Scholar's Instructor, or Hebrew Grammar (1735, 9vo; 2d ed., greatly enlarged, 1757); Observations and Inquiries relating to various Parts of Scripture History (1761). His entire life's work has, however, been written, however, by his father. See General Biographical Dictionary, A.D.

Lyons, James Gilbourne, D.D., LL.D., an episcopal clergyman and educator, a native of England, emigrated to America in 1844, and began his clerical labors at St. Mary's Church, Burlington, N.J. In 1846 he removed to Philadelphia, and established himself as a teacher of the classics. His educational success secured him the position of principal of Haverford Classical School, which he held until his death, Feb. 5, 1868.

Lyra (also Lyrunmus), Nicholas DE, so called from Lyra, in Normandy, the place of his nativity, was born about 1150. He was entered in the Order of the Preachers at Verneuil in 1219, and completed his studies in Paris. Here he studied successfully, was admitted to the degree of doctor, and became a distinguished lecturer on the Bible. Besides his studies at the university, he privately devoted himself to the acquisition of a thorough knowledge of Hebrew, and his association with converts of Jewish faith at this time has probably given rise to the opinion, even now held by some, that Nicholas de Lyra was born of Jewish parents, and was himself a convert to Christianity. His own writings, however, flatly contradict this report, as has been shown by Wolf (Bibliotheca, i and iii, s. v.); and Nicholas himself tells us, in one of his works (the polemical treatise), that he had but little association with Jews, and depended mainly upon the experience of other Christians for his delineation of Jewish characters of the period (Paris, GrRch. d. Juden, vii, 513). His great learning, refined taste, and eminent worth, raised him to the principal offices of his order, and secured him the friendship of the most illustrious persons of his age. He died at Paris October 29, 1401. It is especially as a writer that Lyra is justly celebrated, and, as has been frequently asserted, he became, by his thorough expositions of the Scriptures, one of the greatest aids of the reformers of the 16th century, whence the couplet on Luther's exegetical labors by the enemies of the great German reformer: "Si Lyra non lyricet Luthernam non saltasset." Nicholas de Lyra's chef d'œuvre is his Postilla perpetua in usseribus Biblic (Rome, 1471-72, 5 vols. fol.; best edit. Antw. 1634, 6 vols. fol.), which brought him the title of "doctor planus et utilissimus"—or, better which immortalized the name of Lyra. The great merit of this commentary consists in the embodiment of the sober-minded and ingenious explanations of Rashi, whose mode of interpretation Lyra regarded as his model, as he frankly states, "Similiter intendere non solum dictum corollarium Sarcorum, sed etiam Hebraeorum maxime raui, frequenter requele Lyra, qui inter docbros Hebraeos locutus est rationalibus, ad declarationem sensus literalis inducere." De Lyra even adopts the well-known Jewish four modes of interpretation denominated דַּאֲרָם יָדָא, mystical, יָדָא, allegorical; יָדָא, spiritual; יָדָא, literal, which he thus expresses in verses in the same prologue (i. e. the first), from which the former quotation is made:

"Liber Lyri Doctoris; Lyrae, fidei, et scholas Moralis quid agas, quo tendas anaqogia." He gives, however, the preference to the literal sense.
LYRAS
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LYSIANAS

tory to the restless critics of Germany. Strauss and
others (whose names are mentioned by Bleek, Synopt.
Erkl. i, 156, and Meyer, Komment. ii, 289) charge
the evangelist with "a gross chronological error;" a charge
which they found on the assumption that the Lysianas of
Chalcis mentioned by Josephus is identical with the
Lyssias of Ephesus, whom Luke mentions. This mistaken
assumption is supported by a hypothesis which is incap-
able of proof, namely, that Abilene, being contiguous to
Chalcis, was united to the latter under the rule of Lysi-
adas, the son of Ptolemy. It must, however, be borne
in mind that Josephus nowhere speaks of Abilene in
connection with this Lysianas; nor, indeed, does he men-
tion it at all until many years after the notice by Luke.
He calls Antony's victim simply ruler of Chalcis. More-
over, it is of importance to observe that the tetrarchal
division of Palestine and neighboring districts was not
made until after the death of Herod the Great; and,
in his haste to inculcate the evangelist, Strauss, in ef-
fect, attributes to the historian, whom he invidiously
opposes to Luke as a better authority, an amount of in-
corect and inaccurate statement which, if true, would destroy all re-
liance on his history; for we have already seen that Jo-
sephus mentions a "tetrarchy of Lysiadas, Lyssias, or
Lysianas," whereas there were no "tetrarchies" until some
thirty years after the death of Ptolemy's son Lysianas.
It is, therefore, a juster criticism to conclude (against
Strauss, and with the earlier commentators) that in such
passages as the one quoted above, while the evangelist
speaks of "Abila of Lysianas" and the "tetrarchy of
Lysianas," that a later Lysianas is certainly meant;
and that Josephus is not only accurate himself, but a
voucher also for the veracity of Luke. But there is yet
stronger evidence to be found in Josephus of the unten-
ability of Strauss's objection and theory. In his Jose-
phus War (ii, 12, 8) the historian tells us that the em-
peror Claudius "removed Agrippa [the second] from Chal-
cis [the kingdom, be it remembered, of Strauss's Lysi-
adas] to a greater kingdom, giving him in addition the
kingdom of Lysianas" (in έτι της Χαλκηδος Ἀργίππου της
μεταλλαχημείας. Αὐτόν ἔδωκεν δὲ Καίσαρ την
την της Λυσιάνας βασιλείαν). Ebrard exposes the ab-
surdity of Strauss's argument by drawing from these
words of Josephus the following conclusion—incredible,
indeed, on the terms of Strauss—that Agrippa was de-
prived of Chalcis, receiving in exchange a larger king-
80 dom, and also Chalcis! (See Ebrard's Gospel Hist.
[Clark], p. 145, 146) The effect of this redaction ad
absurdum is well put by Dr. Lee (Inspiration [1st ed.], p.
894, note), "Hence, therefore, Josephus does make men-
tion of a later Lysianas [on the denial of which Strauss
has found fault against Luke], and on Luke [1], and the
name is corroborated or supports the theory of the evan-
gelist's intimate acquaintance with the tanged details of
Jewish history in his day." Many eminent writers have expressly ac-
cepted Ebrard’s conclusion, including Meyer (loc. cit.)
and Bleek (loc. cit.). Patruilius concludes an elaborate
examination of the entire case with the discovery that
the "later Lysianas, whom Luke mentions, was known
to Josephus also, and that, so far from any difficulty ac-
cruing out of Josephus to the evangelist's chronology,
as alleged by objectors to his veracity, the historian's
statement rather confirms and strengthens it" (De Evang.
elica, iii, 42, 25). It is interesting, also, to remark that,
if the sacred writer in this matter made use of the Jewish
historian in this matter, he also repays him the favor,
by helping to clear up what would otherwise be un-
telligible in his statement; for instance, see Josephus
(Ant. xvii, 17, 4) mentions "Batanea, with Tra-
conitias and Auranitis, and a certain part of what
was called the 'house of Zenodorus,' as paying a certain
tribute to Philip" (σὲ της Ζένωδου λαούς καὶ τον
Ζενοδότον λαούς). And when it is remembered that "the
'house of Zenodorus' included other territory besides
that of Auranitis (comp. Ant. xv, 10, 8, with War, i, 20, 4),
we cannot but admit the force of the objection advanced by Grotius (as
quoted by Dr. Hudson, On the Antiq. xvii, 11, 4), that

1. According to Eusebius (whom others have followed,
such as Bede and Adrachmius; see Corn. l. Lapid. in Luc. iii, 1), Lysianas was a son of Herod the Great.
This opinion (the tenability of which is shown by
Valexis, on Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. i, 5, and by Scaliger,
Ammader, on Euseb. Chron. p. 178) has no other foun-
dation than the fact that the evangelist mentions Lysi-
adas with Herod Antipas and Philip.

2. To the other commentators, such as Casaubon (On
Borrom. Ann. xxxiv, Num. 4), Scaliger (loc. cit.), and others (see Corn. l. Lap. and Grotius, ad loc.), the dif-
fERENCE OF dates presented no difficulty.

3. This reasonable solution, however, was unsatisfac-
when Josephus says some part of the house or possession of Zemodorus was allotted to Philip, he thereby declares that the larger part of it belonged to another. The other - sentence when Luke mentions (see also Krebsius, Obererat. p. 112).

4. It is not irrelevant to state that other writers besides Strauss and his party have held the identity of Luke's Lyssias with Josephus's son of Ptolemy, and have also believed that Josephus mentioned but one Lyssias. But (unlike Strauss) they resorted to a great shift rather than assail the veracity of the evangelist. Valesius (on Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. i, 10), and, more recently, Paulus (Comment. ad loc.) supposed an alteration of Luke's text, either by an erasure of ετερωργονος after Αβλινας, or retaining the participle and making the word Αβλινας a genitive with the article, in the Greek. As in the case of Lukan ιεράι, the name of God is used to denote the house in which he wrote his works should be torn down. The sentence was afterwards altered, and he was beheaded before being burned, March 31, 168. See C. F. Ammon, C. Lyseias, en Beitrags z. Gesch. d. ideenle Athesmens (Göttingen, 1802); Herzog, Real-Encyclop. viii, 628. (J. N. P.)

Lyser (also Leiber or Lyster), an eminent Lutheran theologian, was born at Winnenden, in Wittenberg, March 18, 1552, and was educated at the University of Tübingen. In 1578 he became pastor at Gellersdorf, in Austria, which office he retained till 1586, when he left it to become bishop of Wiener. He often preached also in Vienna, and thus became acquainted with the emperor Maximilian II. He was made D.D. by the University of Tübingen July 16, 1576, being then under 25 years old. After remaining for two years at the court of the elector August of Saxony, he became pastor and professor at Wittenberg. After the adoption of the "Formula Concordiae," he and J. Andrea devised a new organization for the university; he was also commissioned to revise the text of the Lutheran translation of the Bible, etc. After the death of the Elector August (1586), Charles of Lorraine was elected August of Saxony, and Lyser, at the ascendency in Saxony, left Wittenberg, generally regretted by the university and the community, to accept a call to Brunswick as coadjutor or vice-superintendent. He, however, returned to Wittenberg in 1592, and this time became prior of the celebrated Monastery of Dresden. Here he continued in the faithful discharge of his arduous duties, honored not only by the prince, but also by the emperor Rudolph. He died February 22, 1610. His principal works are a continuation of Chemnitz's Harmonia IV. Evangelistarum (which was completed by John Gerard), Erklärungen u. Worte Predigt (1598), and a number of Predigten, particularly Vier Landt- predigten (1605). See Polyc. Lyster III, Officiwm pietatis, quod C. D. Polyc. Lystero debuit et persoluit pro nepos (Lpz. 1706); Gleich, Annoles ecclesiastic.; Adami, Vit. theol.; Spazell, Temp. hom.; Erismann, Lebensbesch. d. Wittenb. Theol. etc.; Herzog, Real-Encycl. viii, 628 sq.

Lyssias (Athen, a common Greek name), the name of two men, mentioned one in the Apocalypse, and the other in the New Testament.

1. A Syrian "nobleman of the blood royal" whom Antiochus the Great, when setting out for Persia, appointed guardian of his son, and regent of that part of his kingdom which extended from the Euphrates to the borders of Egypt (1 Macc. iii, 82; 2 Macc. x, 11; compare Josephus, Ant. xii, 7, 2; Appian, De rebus Scy. 46). In the following year, Antiochus, Acting under the influence of the Greek Dionysius, selected a large force for the purpose of carrying on a war of extermination against the Jews. This army, under the command of the generals Ptolemy, Nicander, and Gorgias, was surprised and put to flight by Judas Maccabeus near Emmaus (1 Macc. iii, 38-41; Josephus, Ant. xii, 7, 3, 4). In the following years, B.C. 165, Lyssias himself invaded Judea with a still larger army, and joined battle with Judas in the neighborhood of Bethura. The Syrians were again defeated, and so decisively that Judas was able to accomplish his great purpose, the purification of the temple, and the re-establishment of divine worship at Jerusalem (1 Macc. iv, 28-61; Josephus, Ant. xii, 7, 5-7). Lyssias retired to Antioch, and, while preparing for a fresh campaign, the death of Epiphanes left him in virtual possession of the supreme power. Shortly afterwards (probably B.C. 163), with an army equal in number to the two thousand war-chariots and two-and-thirty elephants, and accompanied by the young king Antiochus Eupator, he again entered Judea from the side of Idumea. Having taken the fortified city of Bethaura, he advanced to Jerusalem and laid siege to the Temple. Meeting here with a stouter resistance than he had anticipated, and perishing
that Philip, a rival claimant to the guardianship of the king, was returning from Persia, he hastily concluded a peace with the Jews, and set out for Antioch. On reaching this city he found in it the possession of his rival, in the engagement which followed Philip was defeated and slain. Another and more formidable opponent, however, soon appeared, in the person of a certain young king, the first cousin of the king, who, escaping from Rome, landed at Tripolis, and laid claim to the throne. The people rose in his favor, and Antiochus and Lydia were seized and put to death (1 Macc. vii. 20, 22; 2 Macc. xiii. 20, 21; Joseph. Ant. xii. 9, 10: Apian. De rebus tyr. 47).

In the severe contest between the Greeks and Romans, the latter was given at some length an invasion of Judaea by Lydias, made before the final invasion, but after the death of Ephiphanes (2 Macc. xi). It is scarcely possible to reconcile this view with the more trustworthy narratives of the first book, and it is clear from 2 Macc. ix. 28-30, 52, that the writer is not following a strictly chronological order in this part of his history. Internal evidence seems to favor the opinion that this narrative has been compiled from separate and partial accounts of the two invasions referred to in 1 Macc. iv-vi, the writer too hastily inferring that the event was of the date of the second invasion, and consequently offering it as the more authentic (ver. 18). The apocrypha rejects this worship with horror (ver. 14), and Paul addressed a speech to them, turning their minds to the true Source of all the blessings of nature. The distinct proclamation of Christ's doctrine is mentioned, but it is implied, in General terms, and the Church was founded at Judea as a Church with wisdom. In post-apostolic times it was important as a Church to seed its bishops to the ecclesiastical councils (Hierocles, Synecd. p. 675). The adoration of the Lydians was rapidly followed by a change of feeling. The persecuting Jews who came from Antioch in Pisidia, and had such influence that Paul was stoned and left for dead (Acts xiv. 19). On his recovery, he withdrew, with Barnabas, to Derbe (ver. 20), but before long reentered his steps through Lystra (ver. 21), encouraging the new disciples to be steadfast. It is not absolutely stated that Paul was in Lystra, but, from the general description of the route of the third missionary journey (xviii, 23), it is almost certain that he was. See Paul.

It is evident from 2 Tim. iii. 10, 11, that Timothy was one of those who witnessed Paul's sufferings and courage on the above occasion; and it can hardly be doubted that his conversion to Christianity resulted partly from these circumstances, combined with the teaching of his Jewish mother and grandmother, Eu­nice and Lois (2 Tim. i. 5). Thus, when the apostle, accompanied by Silas, came on his second missionary journey, to the Gentile world (there we should notice how accurately Derbe and Lystra are here mentioned in the inverse order), Timothy was already a Christian (Acts xvi. 1). Here he received circumcision, "because of the Jews in those parts" (ver. 3); and from this point his connection with Paul's travels.

We are doubly reminded here of Jewish residents in and near Lystra. Their first settlement, and the ancestors of Timothy among them, may very probably be traced to the establishment of Babylonian Jews in Phrygia by Antiochus three centuries before (Josephus, Ant. xii. 3, 4). Still it is evident that there was no influential Jewish population at Lystra: no mention is made of any synagogue, and the whole aspect of the scene described by Luke (Acts xiv) is thoroughly heathen. As to its condition in heathen times, it is worth while to notice that the words in Acts xiv. 13 (τοις Δαυ­δος εν αυτη τη ερμηνευς την αμφιβολο­σπη) would lead us to think that it was under the tutelage of Jupiter. Walch, in his Spicilegium Antiquitatum Lystraeorum (Dissert. in Acta Apostolorum, Jena, 1766, vol. iii), thinks that in this passage a statue, not a temple, of the god is intended. Pliny (v. 4, 8) states that St. Lystra in Lycaonia, and St. Timothy (v. 4, 12) in Issaure; but these statements are quite consistent with their being placed in Lycaonia by Luke, as it is by Hierocles (Synecd. p. 675). This
city was south of Ioucon, but its precise site is uncertain, as well as that of Derbe, which is mentioned along with it. Col. Leake remarks that the sacred text appears to place it nearer to Derbe than to Ioucon; for Paul, on leaving that city, proceeded first to Lystra, and thence to Derbe; and in like manner to Lystra, Isauria, and to Antioch of Pisidia. He therefore remarks in the Acts (xv. 29, 32; xx. 4, 12), who places Lystra in Isauria, and near Isaura, which seems evidently to have occupied some part of the valley of Idas Shebhr, or Bey Sheh. Under the Greek empire, Honomada, Isaura, and Lystra, as well as Derbe and Laranda, were all included in the consular province of Lycocia, and were bishops of the metropolitan see of Ioucon. Considering all the circumstances, Col. Leake inclines to think that the vestiges of Lystra may be sought with the greatest probability of success at or near Wirron Khatun, or Khutun Serai, about thirty miles to the south of Ioucon. "Nothing," says this able geographer, "can more strongly show the little progress that has hitherto been made in a knowledge of the ancient geography of Asia Minor than that of the cities which the journey of St. Paul has made so interesting to us, the site of one only (Ioucon) is yet certainly known" (Tour and Geogr. of Asia Minor, p. 102).

Mr. Arundell supposes that, should the ruins of Lystra not be found at the place indicated by Col. Leake, they may possibly be found in the remains at Karamisher, near the lake Bey-ahsheh (Discoveries in Asia Minor.) Still more lately, Mr. Hamilton (Researches in Asia Minor, ii. 319) identifies its site with the ruins called Biur-bir-Kilisek ("one thousand and one churches"), at the base of a conical mound of volcanic structure named the Karadagh (generally thought to be those of Derbe, but which, according to his arguments, must be sought elsewhere, perhaps at Divle), as being more considerable (a bishop of Lystra sat in the Council of Chalcedon, according to Eusebius, Synec., p. 675), and on the direct road from Ioucon to Derbe. Another traveller ascended the mountain, and says, "On looking down I perceived churches on all sides of the mountain, scattered about in various positions. . . . Including those in the plain, there are about two dozen in tolerable preservation, and the remains of perhaps forty may be traced altogether" (Falikner in Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, i, 292).

Comp. Mannert, Geogr. VI, ii, 189 sq.; Forbiger, Handb. ii, 322.

Lyttelton, Charles, LL.D., an English divine, born at Hagley, Worcestershire, in 1714, was educated at Eton and at University College, Oxford; rector of Aivelochurch, Worcesters, in 1742; dean of Exeter in 1748; bishop of Carlisle in 1762, and president of the Society of Antiquaries in 1765. He died Dec. 22, 1768. He published one sermon (Lond. 1765, 4to), and left various interesting scientific works. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.

Lyttelton, George, Sir, an English peer and celebrated politician, who was born in Worcestershire in 1708-9, and educated at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford; entered Parliament in 1738, held several high political offices, was raised to the peerage in 1759, and died in 1778, is noted also as the author of Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of St. Paul (1747, 8to, and often; last edit. 1804, 12mo), a work which elicited much praise for the able defence it furnishes for the truths of Christianity, or, as Leland (Deiatic Writers, p. 156 sq.) says, constitutes of itself "a demonstration sufficient to prove Christianity to be a divine revelation." Another work of Lord George Lyttelton of interest to us is his Dialogues of the Dead (1760). He had a son, Thomas, who died young, and who was as conspicuous for profligacy as his father for virtue. See Johnson, Lives of the Poets, iii, 281-400; Phillimore, Life of Lord Lyttelton (1843); Lond. Quart. Rev. 1848 (June); Monthly Review, 1772 (April and May); 1774 (December): Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, ii, 1150.

Ma'achah (Heb. Middah, מִדָּה, oppression, Sept. Mea'ui, but in Gen. xxii, 24, Mu'ay; in 1 Chron. i, 48; ii, 3; Ma'ui, in 1 Chron. vii, 15, 16, Ma'ay; in 1 Chron. ix, 55, Muy'ah; in 1 Chron. xi, 48, Mu'ay'; Vulg. Macc'h; Auth. Vers. "Ma'achah" only 2 Sam. iii, 3; x, 6, 8), the name of a place and also of nine persons. See also Beth-Ma'achah.

2. A city and region at the foot of Mount Hermon, now in Syria. It was a district of Syria (Josh. xiii, 13; 2 Sam. x, 6, 8; 1 Chron. xix, 7). Hence the adjacent portion of Syria is called Aram-Ma'achah, or Syria of Ma'achah ("Syria-Ma'achah," 1 Chron. xix, 6). It appears to have been situated at the southern juncture of Cœle-Syria and Damascus-Syria, being bounded by the kingdom of Rehob on the north, by the kingdom of Geshur on the south, and by the mountains on either side of the Upper Jordan, on the east and west. See GISHER. The little kingdom thus embraced the southern and eastern dependencies of Hermon, and a portion of the rocky plateau above it, which was separated from the plain by the river, as seen, of Stat. Is. July, 1854, p. 310). The Israelites seem to have considered this territory as included in their grant, but were never able to get possession of it (Josh. xiii, 13). In the time of David this petty principality had
written in the original Macaath (Hebrew Mebaalhah'), מֶבַלְחָה, Sept. Mo'agun, Vulg. Macaath, Auth. Vers. "Macaathâtes"). The identification of the Chaldee version with the district of Epicles (Ezra 7:27), mentioned by Polemy (v, 16, 9) as lying between Callichrioi and Lirias, as also that of the Syriac (on 1 Chron.) with Charan, according to Rosenmuller (Alberth. I, ii a tract in the district of the Ledja (Burckhardt, i, 580), is merely traditional (Hendel, Palesit, p. 110).

2. The last named of the four children of Nahor by his concubine Reumah, probably a son, although the sex is uncertain (Gen. xxii, 24). B.C. cir. 2040. Ew. add arbitrarily connects the name with the district of Macaath in the Hermon range (Gene. i, 414, note 1).

3. The sister of Hupham (Heb. Hupham, Hupham or Shuppim,) and consequently granddaughter of Benja-
imis; she married Machir, by whom she had two sons (1 Chron. vii, 15, 16). B.C. post. 1656. See Gilead.

4. The second named of the concubines of Caleb (son of Hezon), by whom he had several children (1 Chron. ii, 9). B.C. ante 1658.


6. A daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur: she became the wife of David, and mother of Absalom (2 Sam. iii, 8). B.C. ante 1010. In 1 Sam. xviii, 8, we read of David's invading the land of the Geshurites, and the Jewish commentators (in Jerome, ad Rog.) allege that he then took the daughter of the king captives, and, in consequence of her great beauty, married her, after she had been married previously to the king of Geshur. But this is a gross mistake, for the Geshur invaded by David was to the south of Judah, whereas the Geshur over which Talmai ruled was to the north, and was regard as part of Syria (2 Sam. xv, 8). See Geshur.

The fact appears to be that David, having married the daughter of this king, contracted an alliance with him in order to strengthen his interest against Ishbosheth in those parts. Josephus gives her name Moaqoum (Ant. vii, 1, 4).

7. See David.

8. The father of Hanan, which latter was one of David's famous body-guard (1 Chron. xi, 48). B.C. ante 1046.

9. The father of Shephatiah, which latter was the military chief of the tribe of Simeon under David and Solomon (1 Chron. xxvii, 16). B.C. ante 1014.

10. The father of Achish, which latter was the king of the Philistines, who, it seems, returned to Shimei in the time of Absalom's rebellion when the latter was out of his way, and not in pursuit of David, and thus forfeited his life by transcending the bounds prescribed by Solomon (1 Kings ii, 89). B.C. ante 1010. He appears to have been different from the Mach 1 Sam. xxvii, 2. See Achish.

11. A daughter of Absalom, the son of Rehoboam and mother of Abijam (1 Kings xv, 2). B.C. 975-955.

In verse 10 we read that Asa's mother's name was Macaath, the daughter of Absalom. It is evident that here "mother" is used in a loose sense, and means "grandmother," which the Macaath named in verse 2 must have been to the Asa of verse 10. It therefore appears to be a great error to make two persons of them, as is done by Calmet and others. The Abishalom who was the father of this Macaath is called Absalom in 2 Chron. xi, 20-22, and is generally supposed to be the same as the Shimei of the N.T., who was the son of David; which seems not improbable, seeing that Rehoboam's two other wives were of his father's family (2 Chron. xi, 18). In 2 Chron. xii, 2, she is called "Michaiah, the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah." But Josephus says that she was the daugh-
ter of Tamar, the daughter of Absalom (Ant. vii, 10, 1) who was the son of Shimei (2 SAM. 13:31), which is not unlikely, and in that case this Tamar must have been the wife of Uriel. See ABISHA. It would appear that Asa's mother was dead before he began to reign; for Macaath bore the rank and state of queen-mother (resembling that of the mahanissi Valide among the Turks), the persons of which she was the mother, her encouragement of idolatry, that Asa commenced his re-
forms by "removing her from being queen, because she had made an idol (lil. a 'frigah) in a grove" (1 Kings xv, 10-18; 2 Chron. xvi, 16).

Macaath. See MACAATH, 1.

Ma'íchchah (Gen. xxii, 24; 1 Kings ii, 89; xv, 2, 10, 13; 1 Chron. ii, 48; iii, 2; vii, 15, 16; viii, 29; ix, 35; xi, 48; xii, 6, 7; xxvii, 16; 2 Chron. xi, 20, 21, 22, xv, 16). See MACAATH.

Maach'ath (Deut. iii, 14). Maich'athites (Josh. xii, 5; xili, 15, 18) in the second occurrence it should be Macaath; 2 Sam. xxiii, 34; 2 Kings xviii, 23; 1 Chron. iv, 19; Jer. xi, 8). See MACAATH.

Ma'īdāl (Heb. Medad, מֶדָד, ornamental; Sept. Mediōn), one of the "sons of Bani who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 34). B.C. 459.

Mal'dāi'ah (Heb. Medadah, מֶדָדָה, ornament of Jehoreph; Sept. Medida, Vulg. Medidahu), one of the priests who returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 5); evidently the same with the Moaddah (Heb. Medadah, מֶדָדָה, feticular of Jehoreph; Sept. Maddai, Vulg. Medida), whose son Pitali is mentioned in verse 17 (where some connection with one Miemini is obscurely noted); the true pointing being perhaps מֵעָדָה, Medadah, which will make both forms coincide. B.C. 556.

Ma'ā' (Heb. Maay,' מָע, perhaps conquesteate; Sept. has two names, 'l̄uyq, 'Aen, the first syllable of the former being apparently taken from the last of the preceding name Gidah; Vulg. Maai), one of the priests appointed to the music at the celebration of the completion of the walls of Jerusalem after the captivity (Neh. xii, 36). B.C. 446.

Ma'le'h-acrab'ām (Heb. Meqbalh'-A'krab'im, מַכְּלֶה-אָכְרֹבִּים, the ascent of the scorpians, i.e. scorp-ion-hill; in Numb. xxxiv, 4, Septus. anibamis A'robind, Auth. Vers. "the ascent of Akrabim") in Jos. xv, 5, ἀνιβασίας Ἀσκόρβιος, in Judg. i, 36, ἀνιβασίας Aσκόρβιος, on the going up to Akrabim; Vulg. every-where ascensio scorpiones, a pass on the southeaster border of Palestine. See ACRABIM.

Ma'le'h-adum'mim (Heb. Meqbalh'-A'dum'mim, מַכְּלֶה-אפִּדָמִים, ascens of Adummin; Sept. ἀνιβασίας Αφαδομίμ, [also ἀφαδομίς and ἀφανομίδαις] Adum'im, Vulg. ascens Adummin, Auth. Vers. "the going up of Adummin", a dangerous pass near Gildad (Jos. xv, 7; xviii, 17). See Adummin.

Ma'an, John, a French historian and theologian, was born at Mâa-k near the opening of the 17th century; was prebend of Tours in 1648; official and grand-vicar to the archbishop of Tours in 1651, and died about 1667. His works are Antiquis Casibus reserati in diecis Tu-ronaenis (1648, 4to), written by order of the bishop of Tours: Sancta et Metropolitana Ecclesia Turonensis, nucleum pontificum suorum ornatn virtutibus, etc. (1667). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, n. v.

Ma'ani (Maasv v. r. Bous), the ancestor of sev-
eral who had married Gentile wives after the captivity (1 Esdr. ix, 34); evidently the Bashi (q. v.) of the Heb. list (Ezra x, 39).

Ma'arakh (Heb. Maarakh, מָרַּך, desolation; Sept. Maroņņ̄s, Vulg. Mararch), a place in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Gedor and Beth-anath (Jos. xv, 59). De Sauley suggests a place which he calls Kharetel-Merassas, south-east of Jerusalem (Narrati-
tes, ii, 17); and Schwarz declares it is a village called 'Marur, west of Jerusalem (Polem, p. 107); both far from the indications of the text, which require a locality north of Hebron (Keil's Comment., ad loc.). It may be represented by the ruins marked as Mrsa'is on Van de Velde's Map (1658), on the road from Hebron to Bethlehem, about half way between Bethany and Solomon's Pool at Urtas; but on the second edition of his Map (1665) this place disappears, and we have in the required re-
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gion unappropriated only the ruins Misiron, on a little stream just north of Kutin, evidently the "ruined tower called Merrina, seen by him on the high ground south of wady Arabu" (Memoriam, p. 247).

Maaseiah (Heb. Moseyjush, מְזוֹשְׁעָה, or [1 Chron. xv, 18, 20; xxi, 1; 2 Chron. xxvii, 7; xxxiv, 8; Jer. xxv, 4], Moseyjush'ka, מְזוֹשְׁעָה'ק, the work of Je- koreah; Sept. Manass, with many slight various readings), the name of several men.

2. One of the Levites of the second class, appointed porters of the Temple under David (1 Chron. xxv, 18), and also musicians "with psalteries upon Alamoth" (ver. 20).
B.C. 1043.

3. A chieftain in the time of Uzziah, who had charge of the military in a subordinate rank (2 Chron. xxvii, 11).
B.C. 806.

4. The "king's son," killed by Zichri, the Ephraim- itiah hero, in the invasion of Judah by Pekah, king of Israel, during the reign of Ahaz (2 Chron. xxviii, 7). The personage thus designated is twice mentioned in connection with the "governor of the city" (1 Kings xxii, 26; 2 Chron. xxviii, 29), and appears to have held an office of importance at the Jewish court (perhaps acting as an aide-de-camp during the kingship), just as the queen dowager was honored with the title of "king's mother" (compare 2 Kings xxiv, 12 with Jer. xxxix, 2), or gebirâ, i.e. "mistress," or "powerful lady." See MAACHAI. For the conjecture of Geiger, see JOASH, 4. Perhaps, however, the individual here referred to was literally one of the sons of Ahaz. B.C. c. 778.

5. The "governor of the city," one of those sent by king Josiah to repair the Temple (2 Chron. xxxix, 8).
B.C. 623. The date and rank render it not improbable that he was the Maaseiah (Heb. Meshchechok, מֶשְׁכֵּהוֹק, whose name is Jehdorek, Sept. Manosan, v. r. Manos, etc.), the father of Neriah, and grandfather of Baruch and Seraijah, which latter were two persons of note to whom Jeremiah had recourse in his divine communications (Jer. xxxii, 12; li, 59); and in that case he is likewise probably identical with MAALCHI, the son of Azzai, father of Ner, in Christ's maternal genealogy (Luke iii, 28).

6. The son of Shallum, apparently a priest, since he had a chamber in the Temple, and was one of its custodians (Jer. xxxiv, 4).
B.C. 606.

7. The father of the priest Zephaniah or Zebediah, which latter was twice sent by the king with a message of inquiry to Jeremiah, and was denounced by the prophet for falsely encouraging the people (Jer. xxxii. 12; li, 59): and in that case he is likewise probably identical with MAALCHI, the son of Azzai, father of Ner, in Christ's maternal genealogy (Luke iii, 28).

8. Son of Ithiel and father of Kolaijah, a Benjamite, one of whose descendants resided at Jerusalem after the exile (Neh. xi, 7).
B.C. long ante 586.

One of the descendants of Judah who resided at Jerusalem after the captivity: he was the son of Baruch, and his genealogy is traced back to one Shilioni (Neh. xi, 5).
B.C. 586. In the corresponding narrative of 1 Chron. ix, 5, apparently the same person is called MAALCHI.

9. One of the priests of the kindred of Jeshua, who agreed to divorce their Gentile wives after the captivity (Ezra x, 18).
B.C. 459.

10. Another priest, one of the "sons" of Harim, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 21). B.C. 586. The name is that of a priest (apparently a Levite) who formed one of the chorus that celebrated the completion of the new city walls (Neh. xii, 42).
B.C. 446.

11. Still another priest, of the "sons" of Pashur, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezra x, 22).
B.C. 459. Perhaps the same with one of the priests who celebrated with trumpets the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 41).
B.C. 446.

12. An Israelite, of the "sons" of Pashath-woah, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Babylonian captivity (Ezra x, 30).
B.C. 459.

13. The son of Ananiah, and father of Azariah, which last name is not found among the usual names of the priests resident at Jerusalem after the exile (Neh. iii, 28).
B.C. ante 446.

14. One of the principal Israelites who stood on Ezra's right hand while he read and expounded the law to the people (Neh. viii, 4). B.C. cir. 410. He is perhaps identical with one of the popular priests who joined in the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. xii, 25).
B.C. 410.

15. One of the priests who assisted the Levites in expounding the law to the people as it was read by Ezra (Neh. viii, 7).
B.C. cir. 410.

Mallela'el (Heb. Masse, מַשֶּה, or, as it probably should be pointed, Masse'el, מַסֶּה, worker, or perhaps contracted for Masseiah; Sept. Manas v. r. Manesia; Vulg. Massore), the son of Adiel, a descendant of Immer, and one of the priests resident at Jerusalem at or after the captivity (1 Chron. ix, 12).
B.C. prob. 586.

Mal'chias (Manasse, the son of Sedeck and father of Baruch (Bar. i, 1); evidently the same as MAASEIAH (Jer. lii, 59), i.e. q. v.)

Mal'ath (Mola'd, of unknown, but prob. Heb. origin), a person named as the son of Mattathias and father of Naggai (Nagai, Mattathias' brother-in-law, Luke iii, 26); but, as no such name occurs in the pedigree in the O. T., and as it would here unduly extend the time of the lineage, we may reasonably conjecture this name has been accidentially interpolated from the Mattath of ver. 24. (See Dr. Barrett, in Clarke's Commentary, ad loc.)

Mal'che (Heb. Mele, מֶלֶךְ, westph; Sept. Mas, the first named of the three sons of Ram, the son of Jerahmeel, of the descendants of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 5).
B.C. post 658.

Mal'chus (Heb. Mosesj, מְזוֹשְׁעָה, Neh. x, 8, or Moseyjush, מְזוֹשְׁעָה, 1 Chron. xxiv, 18, strength [or perch. rather consolation], from the Arabic] of Jekoreh; Sept. respectively Maaazin and Mazzaâk [v. r. Massan; Vulg. respectively Massius and Massius], the name of two priests.

1. The head of the last of the twenty-four sacerdotal "courses" as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxiv, 18).
B.C. 1014.

2. One of the priests who signed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. vi, 8). B.C. cir. 410. "From the coincidence between many of the names of the priests in this as in the earlier twenty-four courses established by David, of those who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. xii), it would seem either that these names were hereditary in families, or that they were applied to the families themselves. This is evidently the case with the names of the 'heads of the people' enumerated in Neh. x, 14-27."

Mab'dal' (Muff deviations), one of the "sons of Mazon" who divorced their Gentile wives after the captivity (1 Esdr. ix, 34); evidently the BESALAH (q. v.) of the hew list (Ezra x, 35).

Mabillon, Jean, a celebrated Benedictine prebendary, and one of the most distinguished men of the 17th century, was born at St. Pierre-mont, in the diocese of Rheims, Nov. 28, 1602, studied at the college of Rheims, and joined the congregation of St. Maur in 1651. He began his literary career by assisting D'Achery in his labors upon his vast historic recueil entitled Spicilegium, and by an edition of the works of St. Bernard, "which attracted the notice of ecclesiastical scholars, and furnished a sure pledge of the value of his future labors" (Dowling). In 1668 he came forward with a part of his original production, Acta Scriptorum Ordinis S. Franchii (completed in 1702), one of the greatest historical works.
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extent. He now became the general favorite of eccle-
siastic students, and soon was brought to the notice also
of his sovereign, Louis XIV, who sent him on literary
missions, as the result of which we have from him Muse-
um Italicum (1689), a kind of antiquarian itinerary of
Italy. Besides descriptions of the towns and their at-
tractions, it contains a detailed account of the ecclesi-
astical history and paleography; also a very explicit com-
mentary on the ritual of the various services, or liturgy,
and rites of the Roman Church. (He had previously
published De Liberis Gallorum Libri tres [1685], in
which he compares the Gallican with the Mozarabic lit-
urgy). Another work of great importance from the pen
of Mabillon is the Lettres et Écrits sur les Études Monas-
tiques, containing a curious controversy between the
abbe De Rancé, the founder of the order of the Trappists
(p. v.) and the Benedictines. De Rancé, in his ascetic
enthusiasm, had forbidden his monks all monastic studi-
es, and, indeed, all reading except the Breviary and a
few monastic tracts. The rest of the clergy, both secu-
lar and regular, took the alarm, and Mabillon was re-
quested to defend monastic studies and learning as per-
fectedly compatible with piety and religious discipline,
as the Benedictine order had fully proved. Mabillon
promptly complied with the request, and published his
Traité in 1691. It was received with great applause, and
was at once translated into Latin and other languages.
See Rancé for the reply. His fame spread rapidly, and he
was made a canon of the royal church in 1691, and a
member of the French Academy in 1701. He was chosen
member of the Academy of Inscriptions. In 1703 he came
before the public with the first volume of his chef-d'oeuvre,
Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti. Henceforth, until the day
of his death (Dec. 27, 1707), Mabillon faithfully applied himself
to the completion of this work, which all critics are agreed
is "among the most important works which have been
written on the history of the Church" (Dowling). It
should certainly be found on the shelves of every real
student of Church History. It commences with the
year 490—that of the birth of St. Benedict—and goes
down to 1157 (covering in all 6 vols. folio. Mabillon
himself completed vols. i.-iv., extending to 1066; Mas-
set completed vol. v [published in 1718], and Martene
vol. vi [published in 1789]; for the different editions,
see Cellerier, Histoire des Actaures sacrees, iv, 498). It
contains an account of St. Benedict, discusses his rules, and
everything in any way pertaining to the order.
The work, besides including a somewhat complete history of
the secular affairs of the times, contains a minute ac-
count of the doctrines, the ceremonies, the controversies of
the Church, the liturgy, the writings of each individual whose life is depicted. Of the
manner in which the work is done we will let Dowling
(introd. to the Curs. Study of Eccles. History, p. 144 sq.)
speak. "His (Mabillon's) unbounded learning, and his
perspicacity and comprehensive mind, enabled him to
discover new truths, and detect and expose inveterate
errors. His amiable moderation and unaffected candor
introduced into the discussion of ecclesiastical subjects a
better tone and spirit. But this was not the full extent
of the services which he rendered to Church History.
The monastic spirit could not rest on the imitation of inde-
pendence, nor his religious peculiarities make him feel as
a vulgar controversialist. He was the most promi-
nent of a new race of scholars, who communicated to
the whole subject a different character; who separated it
from polemical theology, and assumed as a first principle
that its subject-matter was not controversy, but facts.
It was a new thing to see a congregation of monks tak-
ing a lead in a literary movement; but such was the
case. The genius of Mabillon did much to purify and en-
able Church History. Excited by his example and
precepts, the French Benedictines devoted themselves
in an admirable spirit to the cultivation of ecclesiastical
learning, and distinguished themselves in the republic
of letters by the publication of a number of critical,
philological, and antiquarian works connected with such
studies, not more remarkable for their erudition than
for their moderation and candor."

Mabillon, by the intended publication of a treatise, De
Cultu Sanctorum ignotorum, came near being involved in
a hot controversy with the authorities of his Church.
The book, which aimed to point out some abuses con-
trary to the worship of relics, was to have been published
imminently, and when it was secured by the Congrega-
tion of the Index, and placed among the forbidden ones.
He quietly submitted to the exceptions of the authorities,
and prepared a new edition purged from the objection-
able passages. It is said that his new publisher, whose
editio non temere nec proprio arbitrio a me facta est, sed
ad Eius nutum et imperium, penes quem residet summa
principendi auctoritas", in return for his ready sub-
mission was he to be rewarded by the cardinal's hat, but
the intended honor due to too long a term of any service in
Mabillon's terrestrial course. Mabillon wrote also De
Re Diplomatica libri sex, accedunt Commentarium de criti-
quis Regum Francorum Palatii: Veterum Scripturum
varia Specimina, etc., a work much esteemed.

These and other later works were collected under the

Mabon, John Scott, an eminent educator of the
(Dutch) Reformed Church, was born in Scotland in 1784.

Macon, whose fame is that of a literary man of the
same age as the former, was graduated with high honors at Union
College (1806), and at the theological seminary in New Brunswick (1812)

Mabon, a frequent initial of Scottish and Irish names,
being the Gaelic for son. Those in which it is thus
written in full are given below in order. For others,
see under the abbreviated form Mc- or Mc—

Macleod, a place whose natives to the number of 122 returned from the
captivity (1 Eadhr. v, 21); evidently the Michmash (q. v.) of the Hebrew
lists (Ezra ii, 27; Neh. vii, 81).

Macarius is the name of several distinguished
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Christians of the early centuries. Among them the most important are:

1. **MACARIUS EGYPTIUS**, or, as he is sometimes sur-
named, the Great, or the Elder, was born, according to
Eusebius, in Upper Egypt, about the year 300. He was
a disciple of St. Antonius (some say of St. Ephrem), and
while yet a youth, in accordance with his asceticism,
which won for him the surname of ἄγιοςγύρως.
At the age of thirty he entered upon a life of asceticism,
in the wilderness of Scete or Scetis, a part of the great
Libyan desert, and there he remained until about 340,
when he was called to Syria. He died about 390. Pall-
ladius relates several extraordinary miracles said to have
been performed by this saint; among others, a resur-
rection which he accomplished for the purpose of confound-
ing a heretic. During the persecution of the Egyptian
monks by the Arian bishop Lucas of Alexandria, in the
reign of Valens, Macarius was banished to an island of
the Nile, but allowed to return afterwards. There is
yet in Libya, according to Tischendorf (Reise in d. Ori-
lent), a convent which bears his name. He left 50 hom-
ilies (Greek ed. Morel, Paris, 1539; J. G. Frutius, Leipzig,
historum, collecta a rectori Benedicto Aseniiis, quatuor
Hactenus (Rome, 1661, 2 vols. 4to); and a homily, ἡμnums
οἰλοκρίνειας εὐαγγελίων καὶ ἀποκρίνων (J. Tottius, Lit-
erar. Ital. Traj. 1696; Cave, Hist. Lit. i.; Gallandii, vii),
which latter, however, is by some ascribed to a monk en-
titled Monseme (Federic. Monseme, De ecclesia. II, cent.
vit, p. 2, chap. iii.) says of him and his work: “Perhaps,
before all others who wrote on practical piety, the pre-
ference is due to Macarius, the Egyptian monk; from
what, after deducting some superstitious notions, and
what savors too much of Origenism, we may collect a
beautiful picture of real piety.” He is commemorated
by the Romish Church Jan. 12, and by the Greek Jan.
19. See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biog. and My-

2. **MACARIUS OF ALEXANDRIA**, also called ὁ πρωτοτι-
θητος, was a contemporary of the preceding, was by
trade a baker, but became subsequently a disciple of St.
Antonius, having been baptized when about forty years
of age. He also embraced an ascetic life, and became
the spiritual adviser of over 5000 monks. Palladius
relates a number of miracles said to have been wrought
by him. He was likewise one of the victims of the per-
secution instituted by Valens, and died, according to Ti-
lemont (Mémoires, viii, 626), in 894, but according to Fa-
briacus (Bibluth. Graec. viii, 865), in 404, aged nearly
a hundred years. He is said to have been the author of
some regulations for monks contained in the Codex reg-
ulorum ecclesiae, or rule of the Egyptian monks (Rome,
1661, 2 vols. 4to); and a homily, ἡμνοὺς ὀιλοκρίνειας
eὐαγγελίων καὶ ἀποκρίνων (J. Tottius, Histor.
erar. Ital. Traj. 1696; Cave, Hist. Lit. i.; Gallandii, vii),
which latter, however, is by some ascribed to a monk en-
titled Monseme (Federic. Monseme, De ecclesia. II, cent.
vit, p. 2, chap. iii.) says of him and his work: “Perhaps,
before all others who wrote on practical piety, the pre-
ference is due to Macarius, the Egyptian monk; from
what, after deducting some superstitious notions, and
what savors too much of Origenism, we may collect a
beautiful picture of real piety.” He is commemorated
by the Romish Church Jan. 12, and by the Greek Jan.
19. See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biog. and My-

3. **MACARIUS OF ANTIOCH**, a patriarch in the Church
of Antioch in the 7th century, is noted for his apos-
thema at the third Constantinopolitan Council (A.D. 680-81).
Of his belief in the doctrine “that Christ’s will was that
of a God-man (οἱδαντικρύπτης).” See Monothelites.
He and his followers (known as Macariani) were banished
on this account. His travels were written down by his
attendant archdeacon, Paul of Apello, in Arabic, and
were published in an English dress in 1829-37, in 2 vols.
4to. See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Myth.-
oloi, ii, 875 (4); Milman’s Gobion, Decline and Fall of
the Roman Empire, iv, 555.

4. **MACARIUS OF IRELAND** flourished about the close
of the 9th century. He is said to have propagated in
France the tenet, afterwards maintained by Averroes,
that one individual intelligence or soul performed the
spiritual and rational functions in all the human race.

5. **MACARIUS OF JERUSALEM**, There were two bish-
ops by this name; one flourished in the 4th century, the
other in the 6th. The former became bishop A.D. 313
or 314, and died in or before A.D. 333. He was present
at the Council of Nice, and is said to have taken part
in the disputations against the Arians. The latter was
elected bishop A.D. 544, and was appointed by the
emperor Justinian I, because he was accused of
avowing the obnoxious opinions of Origen, and Eutych-
ianus was appointed instead. Macarius was, however,
after a time, reinstated (about A.D. 564), and died about
574. In his De incarnatione Corpus Praevelia,
he extant in Ms. See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Ro-
man Biog. i, 876.

**Macasar**, the most southern portion of Cebes, situated
in lat. 4° 35′—5° 50′ S., and long. 119° 25′—
120° 30′ E., and traversed by a lofty chain of
mountains, formerly the greatest naval power among the
Malya states, is divided into the Dutch possessions and Malya
proper; the latter, of little importance, is governed
by a native king, who pays tribute to the Netherlands.
The Portuguese were the first Europeans to form a set-
tlement in Macasar, but they were supplanted by the
Dutch in 1641. There are many cotton factories there;
their industry attained to supreme power. In 1811 it fell
into the hands of the British, who in 1814 defeated the king
of Boni, and compelled him to give up the regalia of
Macasar. In 1816 it was restored to the Dutch, and con-
tinues to enjoy a fair share of the mercantile prosperity of
the East Indies, the distinguished Dutch missions in the East
Asia, and Christian missions, have been largely
sustained. The natives are among the most civilized and enter-
prising, but also the most greedy of the Malay race.
See Malay. They carry on a considerable trade in
tortoise-shell and edible nuts, grow abundance of rice,
and raise a great number of horses, cattle, sheep,
and goats; fishing is also one of the principal employments.
They are chiefly adherents to Mohammedanism, which
secured its hold in the Malay Archipelago in the 18th
century, and to this day continues to proselyte the
Maccasars for the religion of the Crescent. For the
difficulties in the way towards Christianizing the Malay
race, see Malay Archipelago.

**Macaulay, Aulay**, an English divinity, was born near
the opening of the 18th century, and was educated
at the University of Glasgow. He was minister of the
church and parish of Carroz, Dunbartonshire, and
died May 28, 1689. He published a sermon on the Perpetu-
Advantages of Sunday Schools (1792, 8vo); also other

**Macaulay, Zachary, F.R.S.**, an English philoso-
physicist, of Scottish descent, born in 1758, father of
the historian, a merchant, fought forty years with William
Wilberforce in the promotion of the British Emancipa-
tion movement. He died May 13, 1838. See Lond. Gent.
Mag. (March, 1838, p. 825; Dec. 1838, p. 478); Thomas,
Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s. v.

**Macaulay, Thomas, D.D., LL.D.,** a Presbyterian
minister of note, was born in 1771, and was educated at
Union College, where he afterwards filled a professor’s
chair. He subsequently entered the ministry, and died
May 11, 1852, while pastor of the Murray Street Church
in New York City.

**Macbride, John David, D.C.L., F.S.A.,** an emi-
tent English Oriental scholar and author, was born
in Norfolk, England, in 1786, and was educated at Ex-
er College, Oxford, where he became a fellow. He was
in 1818 appointed principal of Magdalen Hall, and nomi-
nated to the readership in Arabic, and kept these posi-
tions until his death in 1868. His principal works are,
Pistachëm, or Harmony of the Gospel (used in Oxford
University): Oriental Meditations.—Lectures on the Arti-
cles of the United Church of England and Ireland (1853):
Annual for 1868, p. 443.

**Mac’Cabeae (MacCabeae)**, a title (usually in the plural
οἱ διαφόροι, “the MacCabees”), which was
originally the surname of Judas, one of the sons of Matthias (see below, § iii), but was afterwards extended to the heroic family of which he was one of the noblest representatives, and in a still wider sense to the Palestinian martyrs in the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes [see 4 Maccabees], and even to the Alexandrine Jews who suffered for their faith at an earlier time. See 3 Maccabees. In the following account of the Maccabean family and revolution we shall endeavor to fill up this interesting interval of inspiration.

I. The Name.—The original term Maccabœus (Μακκαβαῖος) has been variously derived. Some have maintained that it was derived from the banner of the tribe of Dan, which contained the last letters of the names of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Others imagine that it was formed from the combination of the initial letters of the Hebrew sentence, "Who among the gods is like unto thee, Jehovah?" (Exod. xv, 11; Hebrew יְהֹוָה, יְהֹוָה, יְהֹוָה), which is supposed to have been inscribed upon the banner of the patriots; or, again, of the initials of the simply descriptive title, "Matthathias, a priest, the son of Johanan." But, even if the custom of forming such words was in use among the Jews at this early time, it is obvious that such a title would not be an individual title in the first instance, as Maccabee undoubtedly was (1 Macc. ii, 3), and still remains among the Jews (Raphail, Hist. of the Jews, i, 249). Moreover, the orthography of the word in Greek and Syriac (Ewald, Geschicht. iv, 852, note) points to the form מַכַּבָּא, and not מַכַּבָּא. Another derivation has been proposed, which, although direct evidence of wanting, seems satisfactory. According to this, the word is formed from מִלְכָּה, "a hammer" (like Malachi, Ewald, iv, 853, n.), giving a sense not altogether unlike that in which Charles Martel derived a surname from his favorite weapon, and still more like the Mallois Scotorum and Mallois Hereticorum of the Middle Ages.

Although the name Maccabee has gained the widest currency, that of Amonomaun, or Amonomus, is the proper name of the family. The origin of this name also has been disputed; but the obvious derivation from Chasmon, (Amonomaus; comp. Genenius, Theol. p. 554 c), great-grandfather of Matthias, seems certainly correct. How it came to pass that a man, otherwise obscure, gave his name to the family, cannot now be discovered; but no stress can be laid upon this difficulty, nor upon the fact that in Jewish prayers (Hersfeld, Geschicht. J u d. i, 264) Matthias himself is called Hasmoneus. In Psa. lxxv, 29 we meet with a word מַכַּבָּא, to the supposed singular of which, מָכַבָּא, the name in question is commonly referred. In this case it might have been given to the priest of the course of Joarib to signify that he was a wealthy or a powerful person. In Josh. xv, 27 we find a town in the tribe of Judah called מַכַּבָּא, from which this name might equally be derived. Hersfeld's proposed derivation from מַכַּבָּא, "to temper steel," is fanciful and groundless. The word in the first instance appears more like a family than a personal name. The later Hebrew form is מַכַּבָּא, See Zipper, Benennung der Makkabäer (in the Rom-Chananiah, 1860). See Amonomaun.

II. Pedigree.—The connection of the various members of the Maccabean family will be seen from the table given below.

III. History of the War of Independence, involving that

THE ASMONÆAN FAMILY.

Chasmon ("of the sons of Joarib," comp. 1 Chron. xxiv, 17).

Johanan (Iudæus).

Simion (Syriæus, Simon. Comp. 9 Pet. i, 1).

Matthathias (Matthias, Joseph. War, i, 1, 8).

Johanan (Johannes) (Gadiss) ("Joseph" in 2 Macc. viii, 92).

Simon (Thasi) (Maccabæus).

Judas (Maccabæus).

Johannes Hyrcanus I. (Maccabæus).

Judas. (Maccabæus).

Hyrcanus II. (Maccabæus).

James, Alexander to Aristobulus I. (Maccabæus).

Antigonus, (Maccabæus).

Jannæus Alexander to Alexander, (Maccabæus).

Antigonus (Maccabæus).

Maryanes to Herod the Great, (Maccabæus).

of the individuals of the Family.—1. The first of this family who attained distinction was the aged priest Matthathias, who dwelt at Modin, a city west of Jerusalem and near the sea, of which the site has yet been but partly identified by modern research. He was the son of John, the son of the family of Asmonæus, as Josephus tells us, and was himself the father of five sons—John, otherwise called Gadiss; Simon, called Thasi; Judas, called Maccabæus; Eleazar, called Avram; and Jonathan, surnamed Apphus. Ewald remarks that Simon and John were the heads of the family. After the expulsion of Antiochus Epiphanes from Egypt, the Romans, that monarch proceeded to vent his rage and indignation on the Jews. B.C. 168. See Antiochus. He massacred vast numbers of them in Jerusalem on the Sabbath, took the women captives, and built a fortress on Mount Zion, which he used as a central position for harassing the people around. He ordered one Athenæus to instruct the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Samaria in the rites of the Grecian religion, with a view to abolishing all vestiges of the Jewish worship. Having succeeded in bringing the Samaritans to renounce their religion, he further went to Jerusalem, where he compelled the observance of all Jewish ceremonies. He obliged the people to eat swine's flesh and wear the Sabbath, and forbad circumcision. The Temple was
dedicated to Olympian Jove, and his altar erected upon the altar of burnt-offering, which the first book of Maccabees mentions, setting up of the abomination of desolation. When, therefore, Apelles, the king's officer (Josephus, Ant. xii, 6, 2), came to Modin to put in force the royal edict against the national religion, he made splendid offers to Mattathias if he would comply. The old man, however, not only refused, but publicly declared his determination to live and die in the religion of his fathers; and when a certain Jew came forward openly to sacrifice in obedience to the edict, he slew him upon the altar. He slew, moreover, the king's commissioner, and destroyed the altar. Then, officers intrusted with the task of securing peace with a view to recruiting his exhausted finances (1 Mac. iii, 27-31). He therefore left Lyasias, one of his highest lieutenants, to take charge of his kingdom, from the River Euphrates to the confines of Egypt, and having intrusted Antiochus with the task of securing peace with Lyasias to conquer Judea and destroy the nation of the Jews, he went into Persia. The successes of Judas called for immediate attention. The governor of Jerusalem was urgent in his entreaties for assistance; Lyasias therefore sent an army of 20,000 men, under the command of Nicanaus and Gorgias, into Judea. It was followed by another of the same number, with an addition of 700 horses, under Ptolemy Macron, the son of Dorymenes, as commander-in-chief. The united forces encamped in the plains of Emmaus. To oppose this formidable host, only a thing was done by the Jews. Judas, as Samuel had done a thousand years before at a like period of national calamity, hastened and prayed, and, in compliance with the Mosaic injunction, advised those who were newly married, or had built houses, and the like, to return to their homes. This reduced his number to one half. The heroic spirit of Judas, however, rose against every difficulty, and he marched towards Emmaus. B.C. 166. Having heard that Gorgias had been dispatched with a force of 6000 men to surprise him in the passes by night, he instantly resolved to attack the encampment with all his forces, and expected, not unexpectedly, and completely routed them; so that when Gorgias returned, baffled and weary, he was dismayed at finding his camp in flames. In the brief struggle which ensued the Jews were victorious, and took much spoil. The year following, Lyasias gathered together an army of 60,000 chosen men, with 5000 horses, went up in person to the hill-country of Judea, and pitched his camp at a place called Bethsura, the Bethzeu of the Old Test. Here Judas met him with 10,000 men, attacked his vanguard, and slew 6000 of them, whereupon Lyasias retreated with the remainder of his to the city of Jerusalem. After this series of triumphs Judas proceeded to Jerusalem. There he found the sanctuary desolate, shrubs growing in the courts of it, and the chambers of the priests thrown down; so he set to work at once to purify the holy place and restore the worship of God (1 Mac. iv, 36, 41-38). The Jews were now in a position to express their national independence (1 Mac. ii, 66). The energy and skill of "The Maccabees" (6 Macc.36,706), as Judas is often called in 2 Mac. fully justified his father's preference. It appears that he had already taken a prominent part in the first revolution against the mountains (2 Mac. v, 37), where Mattathias is not mentioned at all, and receiving the chief command he devoted himself to the task of combining for common action those who were still faithful to the religion of their fathers (2 Mac. viii, 1). His first enterprises were night-attacks and sudden surprises, which were best suited to the troops at his disposal (2 Mac. viii, 6, 7), and, when his men were encouraged by these means, he ventured on more important operations, and met Apollonius (1 Mac. iii, 10-12), the king's general, who had gathered a large army at Samaria, of which place he had been governor, in the open field. He totally defeated him and slew him. He then divided the spoils, and took the sword of Apollonius for a trophy, which he used all his life afterwards in battle. Exasperated at the defeat of Apollonius, Seron (1 Mac. iii, 13-24) who was general of the army of Cote-Syria, got together a large army, composed partly of mercenaries against the Jews as far as Bethoron, where he pitched his camp. This place, which had been rendered memorable many centuries before as the site of Joshua's great victory over the allied forces of the Canaanites, was destined to become the seat of the war, when, by the intervention of a small band of Jews, spent and hungry, against the disciplined troops of Syria. Seron was completely overthrown, and his army scattered. Antiochus, though greatly enraged at this dishonor to his arms, was nevertheless compelled, by the condition of his treasury, to undertake an expedition to Armenia and Persia with a view to recruiting his exhausted finances (1 Mac. iii, 27-31). He therefore left Lyasias, one of his highest lieutenants, to take charge of his kingdom, from the River Euphrates to the confines of Egypt, and having intrusted Antiochus with the task of securing peace with Lyasias to conquer Judea and destroy the nation of the Jews, he went into Persia. The successes of Judas called for immediate attention. The governor of Jerusalem was urgent in his entreaties for assistance; Lyasias therefore sent an army of 20,000 men, under the command of Nicanaus and Gorgias, into Judea. It was followed by another of the same number, with an addition of 700 horses, under Ptolemy Macron, the son of Dorymenes, as commander-in-chief. The united forces encamped in the plain of Emmaus. To oppose this formidable host, only a thing was done by the Jews. Judas, as Samuel had done a thousand years before at a like period of national calamity, hastened and prayed, and, in compliance with the Mosaic injunction, advised those who were newly married, or had built houses, and the like, to return to their homes. This reduced his number to one half. The heroic spirit of Judas, however, rose against every difficulty, and he marched towards Emmaus. B.C. 166. Having heard that Gorgias had been dispatched with a force of 6000 men to surprise him in the passes by night, he instantly resolved to attack the encampment with all his forces, and expected, not unexpectedly, and completely routed them; so that when Gorgias returned, baffled and weary, he was dismayed at finding his camp in flames. In the brief struggle which ensued the Jews were victorious, and took much spoil. The year following, Lyasias gathered together an army of 60,000 chosen men, with 5000 horses, went up in person to the hill-country of Judea, and pitched his camp at a place called Bethsura, the Bethzair of the Old Test. Here Judas met him with 10,000 men, attacked his vanguard, and slew 6000 of them, whereupon Lyasias retreated with the remainder of his to the city of Jerusalem. After this series of triumphs Judas proceeded to Jerusalem. There he found the sanctuary desolate, shrubs growing in the courts of it, and the chambers of the priests thrown down; so he set to work at once to purify the holy place and restore the worship of God (1 Mac. iv, 36, 41-38). The Jews were now in a position to express their national independence (1 Mac. i, 59; Grimm on 1 Mac. iv, 59). In commemoration of this cleansing of the Temple, the Jews afterwards kept for eight days annually a festival which was called Lights, and was known as the Feast of Dedication (John x, 22, 23). Settled, therefore, Judas, in the year of the jubilee; having fortified the city of Mount Zion, and placed a garrison at Xuthrasa, made an expedition into Idumea. The Syrians meanwhile, frustrated in their efforts against Judas, turned their attention to Galilee and the provinces beyond Jordan. A large army from Tyre and Ptolemais attacked the north, and Timotheus laid waste Gilgal, whereupon Judas determined to divide his army into three. He himself, with Jonathan, led 8000 men across the Jordan into Gilgal; his brother Simon he sent with 8000 into Galilee; and the rest he left behind under the command of Joseph, the son of Zacharias, and Azarias, for the protection of Judea, with strict injunctions to act only on the defensive. These orders, however, they improvidently violated by an attack upon the sea-port Jamnia, where they met with a signal repulse. But the Maccabees in Gilgal and Galilee with difficulty put out the flame, and saved the cities. Antiochus Epiphanes, meanwhile, had died in his Persian expedition, B.C. 164, and Lyasias immediately pro-
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called his son, Antiochus Eupator, king, the true heir, Demetrius, the son of Seleucus, being a hostage at Rome. One afternoon, in the middle of the siege, a messenger from the Jews. He assembled an enormous army of 100,000 men and 82 elephants, and proceeded to invest Bethsura. The city defended itself gallantly. Judas marched from Jerusalem to relieve it, and slew about 6000 of the Syrac- sian army. He was joined by Jonathan and Simon, sons of his father, who sacrificed himself by rushing under an elephant which he supposed carried the young king, and stabbing it in the belly, so that it fell upon him. The Jews, however, were compelled to retreat to Jerusalem, whereupon Bethsura surrendered, and the royal army advanced. The hero, however, the siege was re-စိန့်း with vigor, but the defenders of the city suffered from strictness of provisions, because of its being the sabbatical year. They would therefore have had to surrender; but Lysias was recalled to Antioch by reports of an insurrection under Philip, who, at the death of Antiochus, had been appointed guardian of the young king. He was consequently glad to make proposals of peace, which were readily accepted by the Jews. He had no sooner, however, effected an entrance into the city than he violated his engagements by destroying the fortifications and immediately set out a great army for the north. There Demetrius Soter, the lawful heir to the Syrian throne, encountered him, and, after a struggle, Antiochus and Lysias were slain, leaving Demetrius in undisputed possession of the kingdom.

Meneaus, the high-priest at this time, had purchased his elevation to that rank by selling the sacred vessels of the Temple. Hoping to escape with his own life, he joined himself to the army of Lysias, but was slain by com- mander of Antiochus. Onias, the son of the high-priest whom Meneaus had supplanted, fled into Egypt, and Alexius or Jacinthus, not of the high-priestly family, was raised to the dignity. Shortly after, by taking this man under his protection, Demetrius hoped to weaken the power of the Jew. He dispatched Bacchides with Alexius to Jerusalem, with orders to slay the Mac- cabees and their followers. Jerusalem yielded to one who came with the authority of the high-priest, but Alexius murdered sixty of the elders as soon as he got them into his power. Bacchides also committed sundry atrocities in other parts. No sooner, however, had he left Judas than Maccabeus again rose against Alexius, and drove him to Antioch, where he endeavored as far as possible to secure the city for the king. When Demetrius sent Nicanor with a large army to reinstate Al- cimus, and when he came to Jerusalem, which was still held by the Syrians, he endeavored to get Judas into his power by stratagem, but the plot being discovered, he was compelled to meet him in the field. They join- ed battle, Nicanor was overthrown, and the multitude of men; the rest fled to the stronghold of Zion. Here he revenged himself with great cruelty, and threatened yet further barbarities unless Judas was delivered up. As the people refused to betray their champion, Nicanor was again compelled to flight. He pitched his camp ominously enough in Bethhoron; his troops were com- pletely routed, and he himself slain. The next act of Judas was to make an alliance with the Romans, who entered into it eagerly; but no sooner was it contracted than the king made one more determined effort for the subjection of Palestine. He withdrew the Maccabees, with all the flower of his army, to a place called Berea or Bethzetho, apparently near Jerusalem. The Roman alliance seems to have alienated many of the extreme Jewish party from Judas (Midr. Hahamah, quoted by Raphall, Hist. of Jews, 1, 325). Moreover, the terror inspired by the defeat at Bethhoron deserted all but 800 followers, who would fare had dismayed him from encountering the enemy. His reply was worthy of him: "If our time be come, let us die manfully for our brethren, and let us not stain our hon- our." He fought with such valor that the right wing, commanded by Bacchides, was repulsed and driven to a hill called Azotus or Azur, but the left wing doubled upon the pursuers from behind, so that they were shot down as they fought. The battle lasted from morning till night. Judas was killed, and his fol- lowers, overborne by numbers, were dispersed. His brothers Jonathan and Simon received his body by a treaty from the enemy, and buried it in the sepulchre of their father at Hebron. B.C. 161.

The history of the Maccabees, a hero worthy of being ranked with the noblest of his country, and conspicuous among all, in any age or clime, who have drawn the sword of liberty in defence of their dearest and most sacred rights.

After the death of Judas the patriotic party seems to have been in a state of confusion. A short time after this it was only by the pressure of unparalleled sufferings that they were driven to renew the conflict. For this purpose they offered the command to Jonathan, su- named Apphbus, or the weary, the youngest son of Mattathias. The policy of Jonathan shows the great- ness of the loss involved in his brother's death. He was glad to seek safety from Bacchides among the pools and marshes of the Jordan (1 Macc. ix, 42), whither he was pursued by him. At the same time, also, his brother John was killed by a neighboring Arab tribe. Jon- athan took occasion to revenge his brother's death upon a marriage-party to which he may in waiting while he pulsed an attack of Bacchides, and slew a thousand of his men. At this point Alcimus died, and Bacchides, after fortifying the strong towns of Judaea, returned to Antioch; but upon Jonathan again emerging from his hiding-place, Bacchides came back with a formidable army, and was for some time exposed to the double attacks of Jonathan, till weary of this mode of fighting, or for other reasons, he thought it fit to conclude a peace with him, and returned to his master. B.C. 158. The Maccabees was thus left in possession of Judaea (1 Macc. ix, 58), and had long enjoyed the hard-earned opportunity of consolidating his position; for there sprang up one Alexander Balas, who was believed to be a son of Antiochus Epiphanes, and laid claim to the throne of Syria. Demetrius and Alexander mutually competed for the alliance of Jonathan, but Alexander was successful, having offered him the high-priesthood, and sent him a purple robe and a golden crown—the insignia of royalty—and promised him exemption from tribute as well as other advantages. Jonathan thereupon assumed the high-priesthood, and became the friend of Alexander, with whom he met in Egypt, where, usurping his crown and allied himself (B.C. 150) in marriage with Cleopatra, the daughter of Ptolemy Philomet- or, king of Egypt. Jonathan was invited to the wed- ding, and was made much of at court. In return, he at- tacked and defeated Appionius, the general of Demet- rius Nicator, and restored Nicanor. Alexander then asked Joppa, captured Azotus, and destroyed the temple of Dagon. The prosperity, however, of Alexander was of short duration, for Ptolemy, being jealous of his power, marched with a large army against him, and after putting him to flight, seized his crown, and gave his wife to Demetrius. On the other hand, the overthrow of Alexander was speedily followed by the death of Ptole- emy, and Demetrius was left in possession of the throne of Syria. Jonathan, meanwhile, besieged Jerusalem, and, leaving it invested, repaired to Antioch. Demetrius not only welcomed, but entered into a treaty with him, upon terms that greatly augmented the power of the Maccabees. After this Demetrius disbanded the greater part of his army and lessened their pay, which being a course contrary to that pursued by former kings of Syria, who kept up large standing armies in time of peace, created great dissatisfaction. This dissatisfaction of Jonathan writing to him to withdraw his soldiers from the strongholds of Judaea, he not only complied, but was glad to ask for the assistance of 8000 men, who were forthwith sent to Antioch. Here they rendered him signal service in resisting him, and of his own citizens which his behavior to them had
arouned. His friendship for Jonathan, however, was soon at an end, and, contrary to his promises, he threatened to make war upon him unless he paid the tribute which previous kings had exacted. This menace might have been carried out had not a formidable antagonist at home arisen in the person of Trypho, who had formerly been a wealthy captain and had espoused the cause of his young son Antiochus Theos. This man attacked Demetrius, defeated him in battle, captured his city, drove him into exile, and placed his crown on the head of Antiochus, B.C. 144. One of the first acts of the new king was to ingratiate himself with Judas, and confirm him in the high priestly office, and appointed him governor over Judea and its provinces, besides showing him other marks of favor. His brother Simon he appointed to be general over the king's forces from what was called the Ladder of Tyre, a mountain lying between the sea-coast between Tyre and Ptolemais, even to the borders of Egypt. Jonathan, in return, rendered good service to Antiochus, and twice defeated the armies of Demetrius. He then proceeded to establish his own power by renewing the treaty with Rome, entering into one also with Lacedaemon, and strengthening the fortifications in Judea. He was destined, however, to fall by treachery, for Trypho, having persuaded him to dismiss a large army he had assembled to support Antiochus, decoyed him into the city of Ptolemais, and then took him prisoner. The Jews immediately accused Simon to the council, and paid a large sum to ransom Jonathan. Trypho, however, took the money, but, instead of releasing Jonathan, put him to death, and then, thinking that the main hindrance to his own ambitious designs was removed, caused Antiochus to be treated in the same manner. Thus fell the third of the illustrious Maccabean race, who distinguished himself nobly in the defence of his country. B.C. 143. When Simon heard of his brother's death he fetched his bones from Baccama, where he had been buried, and had them interred at Modin. Here he erected to his memory a famous monument of a great height, built of white marble, elegantly wrought, near which he placed seven pyramids, for his father and mother and their five sons, the whole being surrounded with a stately portico. For many years afterwards this monument served the purpose of a beacon for sailors, and it was standing in the time of Eusebius. See MOUNT.

4. The last remaining brother of the Maccabae family was thus SIMON, surnamed "Thassi" (Θασσι, Thassic; the meaning of the title is uncertain. Michaelis [Grimm, on 1 Macc. ii.] thinks that it represents the Chaldean θασσω [Thassow], The meaning of the title is uncertain. Michaelis [Grimm, on 1 Macc. ii.] thinks that it represents the Chaldean θασσω [Thassow], Thassos, a city of Thessaly; The meaning of the title is uncertain. Michaelis [Grimm, on 1 Macc. ii.] thinks that it represents the Chaldean θασσω [Thassow], Thassos, a city of Thessaly; as above related, when he heard of the detention of Jonathan in Ptolemais by Trypho, he proceeded hastily to the head of the patriot party who were already beginning to despond, and effectually opposed the progress of the Syracus. His skill in war had been proved in the lifetime of Judas (1 Macc. x. 17-28), and he had taken an active share in the campaigns of Jonathan, when he was intrusted with a distinct command (1 Macc. xi. 59). He was soon enabled to consummate the object for which his family had fought gloriously, but in vain. When Trypho, after having put Jonathan to death, murdered Antiochus, and seized the throne, Simon made overtures to Demetrius II (B.C. 143) against Trypho. He was consequently confirmed in his position of sovereign high-priest. He then turned his attention to establishing the internal peace and security of his kingdom. He fortified Bethsura, Jannia, Joppa, and Gaza, and garrisoned them with Jewish soldiers. The Lacedaemonians sent him a flattering embassage to renew their treaty with him, and sent him a shield of gold of immense value, and ratified his league with that nation. See SPARTAN. He moreover took the citadel of Jerusalem by siege, which up to this time had always been occupied by the Syrian faction; and he had it down, even to the hill on which it was built, with immense labor, that so the Temple might not be exposed to attacks from it. Under the wise government of this member of the Ammesean family Judaea seems to have attained the greatest height of prosperity and freedom she had known for centuries, or even knew afterwards. The writer of the first book of the Maccabees evidently rejoices to remember and record it. "The ancient men," he says, "sat all in the streets, the young woman and the young men put on gorgeous and warlike apparel. He made peace in the land, and Israel rejoiced with great joy. For every man sat under his vine and his fig-tree, and there was none to make them afraid." (xxix, 9, 11, 12). This time of quiet repose Simon employed in administering the government more perfectly, in the high priestly office, and in the judicial law. He also beautified the sanctuary, and refurbished it with sacred vessels.

In the mean time Demetrius had been taken prisoner in an expedition against the Parthians, whereupon his brother Antiochus Sidetes immediately endeavored to overthrow the usurper Trypho. Availing himself of a defection in his troops, he besieged him in Dora, a town upon the sea-coast a little south of Mount Carmel. Simon sent him 2000 chosen men, with arms and money, but Antiochus was not satisfied with this assistance which he remembered the independence of Palestine. He therefore refused to receive them, and dispatched Athenobius to demand the restoration of Joppa, Gaza, and the fortress of Jerusalem, or else the payment of a thousand talents of silver; but when the legate saw the magnificence of the high-priest's palace at Jerusalem, and the Dora, a town upon the sea-coast a little south of Mount Carmel. Simon sent him 2000 chosen men, with arms and money, but Antiochus was not satisfied with this assistance which he remembered the independence of Palestine. He therefore refused to receive them, and dispatched Athenobius to demand the restoration of Joppa, Gaza, and the fortress of Jerusalem, or else the payment of a thousand talents of silver; but when the legate saw the magnificence of the high-priest's palace at Jerusalem, and the rich treasures in his temples, and the cupboards full of gold and silver, he was deeply impressed with the power of Palestine, and as Simon refused to comply with the terms of the king's message, and offered by way of compensation only a hundred talents for the places in dispute, Athenobius was obliged to return disappointed and enraged. Trypho meanwhile escaped from Dora by ship to Othorina, a maritime town in Phoenicia, and Antiochus, having sent a detachment to invade Judea, pursued him in person. The king's armies proceeded to Jannia, and, having seized Cedron and fortified it, Cendebeus made use of that place as a centre from which to annoy the surrounding country. Simon at this time was too old to engage actively in the defence of his native land, and therefore appointed his two eldest sons, Judas and John Hycranus, to succeed him in the command of the forces. They forthwith set themselves at the head of 20,000 men, and marched from Modin to meet the king's general; they utterly discomfited and scattered his host, drove him to Othorina, and thence to Azotus, which they set on fire, and afterwards returned in triumph to Jerusalem. But destruction threatened their house from nearer home; for Pтолемей, the son of Abubus, who had married a daughter of Simon, had obtained the governorship in the district of Samaria, and had plenty of money at his command, aspired to reduce the country under his dominion, and took occasion, upon a visit that Simon paid to that neighborhood, to invite him and two of his sons, with their followers, to a banquet, and then slew them (1 Macc. xvi. 11-18). John alone, whose forces were at Gaza, now survived to carry on the line of the Maccabees, and sustain their glory, B.C. 135. He likewise had been included in the treacherous designs of Ptolomey, but found means to elude them. With the death of Simon the narrative of the first book of the Maccabees concludes.

5. We trace now the fortunes of the next member of the family, JOHN HYCRAUSUS. Having been unanimously proclaimed high-priest and ruler at Jerusalem, his first step was to march against Jericho, and avenge the death of his father and brothers. Ptolomey held there in his power the mother of Hycranus and her sons, the latter of whom he had received in a fortress near Jericho—which Josephus calls Dagon, and Ewald Dokk—he exposed them upon the wall, scourged and tortured them, and threatened to throw them down headlong unless Hycranus would desist from the siege. This had the effect of paralyzing the efforts of Hycranus, and in spite of his heroic mother's entreaties to prosecute it with vigor, and disregard her sufferings, caused him to
protest till the approach of the sabbatical year obliged him to raise the siege. Ptolemy, after killing the mother and brethren of Hyrcanus, fled to Philadelphia ("Rabbath, of the children of Ammon"), which is the last we hear of him. It is not easy to see why Miltimans calls this reason of the sabbatical year, which is far within the forty years of the Temple, impossible. Ewald assigns the approach of that year as a reason for the flight of Ptolemy to Zeno, the tyrant of Philadelphia, because it had already raised the price of provisions, so that it became impossible for him to remain. Antiochus meanwhile, alarmed at the energy displayed by the Jews, concluded his operations, took the city of David, and took out of it 3000 talents, which he used for his present needs and the payment of foreign mercenaries. This story is utterly discredited by Prideaux, passed over in silence by Milman, but apparently believed by a later historian. Antiochus then opened a war of autumn and winter against Judea, and marched against Jerusalem, as he had already done the preceding year, and succeeded in taking the city. Here the prince of his line held their court. It was identical with what Herod afterwards called Antonia. There is some confusion as to the length of his reign. It probably lasted about thirty years. He left five sons. With him terminates the upper house of the Asmoneans or Maccabees, B.C. 107.

6. Aristobulus succeeded his father as high-priest and supreme governor. He was the first, also, after the captivity, who openly assumed the title of king. He threw his mother, who claimed the throne, into prison, and starved her to death. He afterwards disposed of his brothers, who showed signs of ambition, he slew, the other one he left alone. His first military act was the siege of Ptolemais, which was in the hands of the Syrians. The inhabitants sought help from Ptolemy Lathyrus, king of Egypt, but he turned Cyzicus, Phrygia, and brought with him 30,000 men he brought with him, declined to open their gates to him, whereupon he attacked Gaza and Dora. Alexander pretended to treat with him for the surrender of those places, and at the same time sent to Cleopatra, the widow of Ptolemy, for a large army to drive him from Palestine. He defeated the duplicity of this conduct, and took ample vengeance on Alexander by ravaging the country. He also defeated him with the loss of 80,000 men. Judas was saved by a large army from Cleopatra, commanded by Chelicias and Ananias, two Jews of Alexandria. They pursued Ptolemy into Coele-Syria, and besieged Ptolemais, which was reduced. Alexander next invaded the country beyond Jordan. Here, also, he was defeated, but not thereby discouraged from attacking Gaza, which, after some fruitless attempts, he captured and totally destroyed. His worst enemies, however, were the Pharisees, who had great influence with the people, and a sedition arose during the Feast of Tabernacles, in which the troops slew 6000 of the mob. He again invaded the trans-Jordanic country, and was again defeated. The Jews rose in rebellion, and for some years the land suffered great confusion. He was afterwards sent against Demetrius Eucharus, brother of Ptolemy Lathyrus, and king of Damascus, who completely routed Alexander. A sudden change of fortune, however, put him at the head of 60,000 men, and he marched in triumph to Jerusalem, where he took signal vengeance on his subjects. The rest of his life was peaceful. After a reign of twenty-seven years he died, B.C. 79, solemnly charging his wife Alexandra to espoise the Pharisian party if she wished to retain her kingdom. His eldest son, Hyrcanus II, became high-priest. Aristobulus, the younger son, espoused the Pharisian party to his mother, in order to employ his active mind, the queen sent him northwards to check the operations of Ptolemy, king of Chaldea. He got possession of Damascus, and won the affections of the army. After a reign of nine years his mother died, B.C. 79, and Aristobulus entered Jerusalem and besieged his brother in the tower of Bethania. To that height he agreed that Hyrcanus should retire to a private estate, and Aristobulus should be king. This was a fatal blow to the Pharisees. But there was a worse enemy waiting for the conqueror. This was none other than Antipater, the Idumean, who
had been made general of all Idumaea by Alexander Jan-
naeus. He was wealthy, active, and sedulous, and pos-
essed, moreover, of great influence with the deposed
Hyrcanus. Suspicious of the power, successes, and pos-
signs of Aristobulus, he persuaded his brother Hyrcanus
to fly to Petra, to Arabas, King of Arabia, and with his
help an army of 50,000 men was marched against Aria-
tobulus. The Jews were defeated, and the usurper fled
to Jerusalem, where he was closely besieged by Aretas,
Antipater, and Hyrcanus. Here, however, deliverance
was delayed by Sceclus, the general of Pompey, who,
having come to Damascus, and finding that the city
had been taken by Metellus and Lollius, him-
self proceeded hastily into Judea. His assistance was
eagerly sought by both parties. Aristobulus offered him
400 talents, and Hyrcanus the same; but as the former
was in possession of the treasure, Sceclus thought that
his promises were the most likely to be fulfilled, and
consequently made an agreement with Aristobulus,
raising the siege, and ordered Aretas to depart. He then
returned to Damascus; whereupon Aristobulus gathered an
army, defeated and killed Hyrcanus, and slew 6000
of the enemy, together with Phallos, the brother of An-
tipater. Shortly after Pompey himself came to Damas-
cus, when both the brothers eagerly solicited his protec-
tion. Antipater represented the cause of Hyrcanus.
Pompey, however, who was intent on the subjugation of
Egypt, despatched his messengers to Antony, and on his
return from Arabia marched directly into Judea. Aria-
tobulus fled to Jerusalem, but, finding the city too dis-
tracted to make good its defence, offered to surrender.
Gabinius was sent forward to take possession; mean-
while the soldiery had resolved to resist, and when he came
he was surprised to find that the gates were shut
and the walls manned. Pompey, enraged at this ap-
parent treachery, threw Aristobulus into chains, and ad-
vanced to Jerusalem. The fortress of the Temple was
improvable except on the north, and, notwithstanding
his superior numbers, he was unable to force it for three
months; neither could he have done so then had it not
been for the Jewish scruples about observing the Sab-
bath. The Romans soon found that they could prosec-
ute their operations on that day without disturbance,
and after a time the battering-rams knocked down one
of the towers, and the soldiery effected an entrance (mid-
summer, B.C. 63) on the anniversary of the capture of
the city by Nebuchadnezzar. Great was the astonish-
ment of Pompey at finding the Holy of Holies empty,
without an image or a statue. The wealth he found in the
building he magnanimously undertook; Hyrcanus
he elevated in the high-priesthood; the coun-
try he laid under tribute; the walls he demolished;
Aristobulus and his family he carried captives to Rome.
Alexander, the son of Aristobulus, on the journey made
his escape, and, raising a considerable force, garrisoned
Macheraus, Hyrcania, and the stronghold of Alexandri-
on. Gabinius, however, subdued him, but had no sooner
dero so than Aristobulus likewise escaped from Rome,
and intrenched himself in Alexanderion. He was taken
prisoner, and sent in chains to Rome. At the entirety
of his will, which was always absolute, the Roman as the
Antigonus his son was released, but he remained a pris-
oner. Alexander, with 80,000 men, once more tried his
strength with the Romans on the field of battle, but was
put to flight. He was subsequently executed by Me-
tellus Scipio at Antioch, B.C. 49. Thus Hyrcanus re-
tained the sovereignty, but Antipater enjoyed the real
power; he contrived to gratify himself with Cesar,
who made him a Roman citizen and procurator of all
Judea. He began to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem,
and made his eldest son, Phasael, governor of that city;
and his younger son, Herod, governor of Galilee. The
latter contrived to distinguish himself against the band-
ditti that invested the hills. He carefully contrived
also to make friends with the Roman governor of Syria,
as a step to his own aggrandizement. His riches ena-
bled him to do this by means of enormous bribes. He
found, however, a troublesome enemy in Antigonos, the
son of Aristobulus, who allied himself with the Parthi-
s, and for a time held Jerusalem and kept Herod in
check. At Gaza, also, a city on the west coast of the
Dead Sea, Antigonos was nearly successful, until Herol
led against him at last, captured him to raise the siege. He afterwards suffered a defeat by Herod, and was finally vanquished by the Roman general Sosius, who, in derision, called
him by the female name Antigone, and sent him in
chains to Antony, by whom, at the request of Herod,
he was executed at Philippi. Thus fell the last of the
Maccabees, who seemed to inherit something of their
ancient spirit. Hyrcanus, who, before this, had been inca-
pacitated for the priesthood by having his ears cut off,
was subsequently, B.C. 80, in his eightieth year, put
to death by Herod. The latter, meanwhile, by Augustus
and Antony, was made king of Judea, and consolidated
his throne by his marriage with Mariamne, a woman of
incomparable beauty, the daughter of Alexander, son of
Aristobulus, by Alexandra, the daughter of Hyrcanus II,
and therefore granddaughter to both brothers. In her
the race of the Asmonaems came to an end, and by her
marriage passed into the Idumenean line of the Herods.

7. Two of the first generation of the Maccabean fam-
ily still remain to be mentioned. These, though they
did not attain to the leadership of their countrymen
like their brothers, shared their fate—Eleazar, by a so-
cially more unfortunate event, by being murdered by his
brother, by treachery. The sacrifice of the family was
complete, and probably history offers no parallel to the
undoubted courage with which such a band dared to
face death, one by one, in the maintenance of a holy
cause. The result was worthy of the sacrifice. The
Maccabees inspired a subject-people with independence;
they found a few personal followers, and they left a na-
tion.

III. National Effects of the Maccabean Revolutions.—
1. The great outlines of the Maccabean contest, which
ruined half a generation of Israel, are unanswerable for
three
months; neither could he have done so then had it not
been for the Jewish scruples about observing the Sab-
bath. The Romans soon found that they could prosecu-
tion of the second (B.C. 189-182) was the political turning-point of the struggle, which may thus be divided into two
great periods. During the first period (B.C. 188-185)
the patriots maintained their cause with varying suc-
cess against the whole strength of Syria; during the second
period (B.C. 183-181) their resources were dimin-
mized, and the whole of Judea was occupied by the
Romans, and henceforward the independence of Judea
was acknowledged from time to time, though pledges given in times of danger were often broken when the danger was over.

The paramount importance of Jerusalem is conspicuous throughout the whole war. The loss of the Holy City
reduced the patriotic party at once to the condition of mere guerrilla bands, issuing from "the mountains" or
"the wilderness" to make sudden forays on the neigh-
boring towns. This was the first aspect of the war (2 Macc. vii, 1-7; comp. 1 Macc. ii, 45); and the scene of
the struggle in the north-east of Jerusalem, from which he drove the invad-
ing armies at the famous battle-fields of Bethhoron and
Emmaus (Nicoopolis). The occupation of Jerusalem
closed the first act of the war (B.C. 165); and after this
Judaean warfare kept on in different sections—and in Idumaea, Ammon, Gilead, Galilee—but the establishment of a permanent settlement in the countries which he ravaged. Beth-
sura was fortified as a defensive of Jerusalem on the south;
but the authority of Judas seems to have been limited to the immediate neighborhood of Jerusalem, though the lands of the northeastern Galilee. The latter's son John to distinguish himself against the band-
ditti that invested the hills. He carefully contrived
also to make friends with the Roman governor of Syria,
as a step to his own aggrandizement. His riches ena-
bled him to do this by means of enormous bribes. He
found, however, a troublesome enemy in Antigonos, the
son of Aristobulus, who allied himself with the Parthi-
s, and for a time held Jerusalem and kept Herod in
check. At Gaza, also, a city on the west coast of the
Dead Sea, Antigonos was nearly successful, until Herol
led against him at last, captured him to raise the siege. He afterwards suffered a defeat by Herod, and was finally vanquished by the Roman general Sosius, who, in derision, called
him by the female name Antigone, and sent him in
chains to Antony, by whom, at the request of Herod,
he was executed at Philippi. Thus fell the last of the
Maccabees, who seemed to inherit something of their
ancient spirit. Hyrcanus, who, before this, had been inca-
pacitated for the priesthood by having his ears cut off,
was subsequently, B.C. 80, in his eightieth year, put
to death by Herod. The latter, meanwhile, by Augustus
and Antony, was made king of Judea, and consolidated
his throne by his marriage with Mariamne, a woman of
incomparable beauty, the daughter of Alexander, son of
Aristobulus, by Alexandra, the daughter of Hyrcanus II,
and therefore granddaughter to both brothers. In her
the race of the Asmonaems came to an end, and by her
marriage passed into the Idumenean line of the Herods.

7. Two of the first generation of the Maccabean fam-
ily still remain to be mentioned. These, though they
did not attain to the leadership of their countrymen
like their brothers, shared their fate—Eleazar, by a so-
cially more unfortunate event, by being murdered by his
brother, by treachery. The sacrifice of the family was
complete, and probably history offers no parallel to the
undoubted courage with which such a band dared to
face death, one by one, in the maintenance of a holy
cause. The result was worthy of the sacrifice. The
Maccabees inspired a subject-people with independence;
they found a few personal followers, and they left a na-
tion.

III. National Effects of the Maccabean Revolutions.—
1. The great outlines of the Maccabean contest, which
ruined half a generation of Israel, are unanswerable for
in full of echoes of the Old Testament, it is impossible not to feel that it wants something which we find in all the canonical writings. The historical allusions in the Psalms of Solomon are as unequivocal as the description which they give of the state of the Jewish nation. An enemy is about to put an end to the strong walled city of Jerusalem, and "the Gentiles went up to the altar" (Psa. Sol. ii, 1-3; comp. 1 Mac. i, 81). In his pride he was to fight all things in Jerusalem, as the Gentiles in their cities do for their gods" (Psa. Sol. xvii, 18). "Those who loved the assembly fled. (The assembly wandered through the pleasantness of the great oppressor (ver. 86-89), and then his hosts are scattered and the earth (ver. 40-45), and says nothing of the triumph of the Maccabees or of the restoration of the Temple, which preceded the last event by some months. This omission is scarcely intelligible unless we regard the facts as symbolizing a higher struggle—a truth wrongly held by those who from early times referred ver. 46-45 only to Antichrist, the antitype of Antiochus—in which that recovery of the earthly temple had no place. At any rate, it shows the imperfection of that view of the whole character by which it is regarded as a mere transcription of history.

6. The history of the Maccabees does not contain much which illustrates in detail the religious or social progress of the Jews. It is obvious that the period must not only have intensified old beliefs, but also have called up new ones, which crystallized in the doctrine at least, that of a resurrection, and even of a material resurrection (2 Mac. xiv, 46), but was brought out into the most distinct apprehension by suffering. "It is good to look for the hope from God, to be raised up again by him" (2 Mac. xiv, 46), was the substance of the martyr's answer to his judge: "as for thee, thou shalt have no resurrection to life" (2 Mac. xiv, 46). As it was believed that an interval elapsed between death and judgment, the dead were supposed to be in some measure still capable of profiting by the intercession of the living. Thus much is certainly expressed in the famous passage, 2 Mac. xiv, 43-45, though the secondary notion of a purgatorial state is no way implied in it. On the other hand, it is not very clear how far the future judgment was supposed to extend. If the punishment of the wicked heathen in another life had formed a definite article of belief, it might have been necessary to state it somewhere in the famous book of Daniel, or in the Apocrypha, or in the 1 Maccabees (2 Mac. vii, 19, 35, etc.), though the passages in question may be understood of sufferings after death, and not only of earthly sufferings; but for the apostate Jews there was a certain judgment in reserve (vi, 26).

The firm faith in the righteous providence of God shown in the chastening of his people, as contrasted with the neglect of other nations, is another proof of the widening view of the spiritual world which is characteristic of the epoch (2 Mac. iv, 16, 17; v, 19-20; vi, 12-16, etc.). The lessons of the captivity were reduced to moral teaching and to the same way the doctrine of the ministry of angels assumed an importance which is without parallel except in patriarchal times. See 2 Maccabees.

It was perhaps from this cause also that the Messianic hope was limited in its range. The vivid perception of spiritual truths hindered the spread of a hope which had been cherished in a material state of things, as it were, was made, in which men gained new points of sight from which to contemplate the old promises.

7. The various glimpses of national life which can be gained during the period show, on the whole, a steady advance towards a higher character and a nobler life. The external achievements (the capture of Jerusalem) the guarantee of which, or never more rigorously fulfilled. The importance of the Antiochian persecution in fixing the canon of the Old Testament has already been noticed. See CAXON. The books of the law were specially sought out for destruction (1 Macc. i, 56, 57; iii, 45), and their distinctive
value was in consequence proportionately increased. To use the words of 1 Mac. — "the holy books" (τὰ βιβλία τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ,'

3. The strict observance of the Sabbath (1 Mac. ii. 32; 2 Mac. vi. 11; viii. 26, etc.) and of the sabbatical year (1 Mac. vi. 68), the solemn prayers and fasting (1 Mac. iii. 47; 2 Mac. xvi. 23, etc.), and the means we carry us back to early times. The provision for the maimed, the aged, and the bereaved (2 Mac. vii. 28, 30), was in the spirit of the law; and the new Feast of the Dedication was a homage to the old rites (2 Mac. i. 9), while it was a proof of independent life. The interruption of the war and the high claim of the city to the highest importance which it was made, and one which prepared the way for the dissolution of the state. After various arbitrary changes the office was left vacant for seven years upon the death of Alcimus. The last descendant of Josephus (Onias), in whose family it had been for nearly four centuries, fled to Egypt, and established a schismatic worship; and at last, when the support of the Jews became important, the Maccabean leader, Jonathan, of the family of Joash, was elected to the dignity by the nomination of the Syrian king (1 Mac. vii. 8). The councils of the city were conducted in Aramaic, by the voice of the people (comp. 1 Mac. xiv. 35).

8. Little can be said of the condition of literature and the arts which has not been already anticipated. In common intercourse the Jews used the Aramaic dialect with the Persians, but the language of their official and their own language (2 Mac. vii. 8, 21, 27; xii. 37); but it is evident from the narrative quoted that they understood Greek, which must have spread widely through the influence of Syrian offices. There is not, however, the slightest evidence that Greek was employed in Palestinian literature till a much later date. The description of the monument which was erected by Simon at Modin in memory of his family (1 Mac. xiii. 27-30) is the only record of the architecture of the time. The description is obscure, but in some respects the structure appears to have presented a resemblance to the tombs of Porsena and the Curii (Pila, H. N. xxxvi. 13), and perhaps to one still found in Idumea. An oblong basement, of which the two chief faces were built of polished white marble (Josephus, Ant. xiii. 5, 5), supported seven pyramids in a line ranged one against another and connected to the Maccabean family, including Simon himself. To these he added "other works of art (μεγάλα εργατήρια), placing round (on the two chief faces?) great columns (Josephus adds, each of a single block), bearing trophies of arms and inscriptions which might be seen by the eyes of those below." The language of 1 Mac. and Josephus implies that these columns were placed upon the basement, otherwise it might be supposed that the columns rose only to the height of the basement supporting the trophies on the same level as the pyramids. So much, at least, is evident, that the characteristics of this work— and probably of later Jewish architecture generally— bore closer affinity to the styles of Asia Minor and Greece than to that of Egypt or the East, a result which would follow equally from the Syrian dominion and the connections which Simon opened by the Mediterranean (1 Mac. xiv. 5). See More.

9. The only recognised relics of the time are the coins which bear the name of "Simon," or "Simon, prince of Israel," in Samaritan letters. The privilege of a national coinage was granted to Simon by Antiochus IV Epiphanes (164-162 B.C.), and the new type of the Syrian king was adopted by the Herodians. The reign of Antiochus was memorable for the erection of the high places, and the rapid consumption of the city, while after the second year Zion alone is found (Bayer, De Nummis, p. 171). The privilege was first definitely accorded to Simon in B.C. 140, while the first year of Simon was B.C. 143 (1 Mac. xiii. 42); but this is a minor discrepancy, of little difficulty to define, and it is not likely that the concession of Antiochus was made in favor of a practice already existing. No date is given later than the fourth year, but coins of Simon occur without a date, which may belong to the last four years of his life. The emblems which the coins bear have generally a connection with Jewish history—a vine leaf, a cluster of grapes, a vase (of manna?), a trifling flowering rod, a palm branch surrounded by a wreath of laurel, a lyre (1 Mac. xiii. 51), a bundle of branches symbolic of the Feast of Tabernacles. The coins issued in the last war are distinguished by the absence of independent ideas or emblems, and there is considerable difficulty in distinguishing the two series. The authenticity of all the Maccabean coins is impugned by Tychsen (Die Un
dichtheit d. Jud. Münzen ..., Berenbec., O. G. Tych
sen, 1778), but on insufficient grounds. He was answered by Bayer, whose admirable essays (De Nummis Hebr. Samaritani, Val. Ed. 1781; Vindicia ... 1790) give the most complete account of the coins, though he reckons some apparently later types as Maccabean. Eckel (Dorck. Numm. iii. 455 sq.) has given a good account of these coins, and of the various types of which the moneyers were in charge, and of the chief types of the coins. Compare De Saulcy, Numism. Judaicca; Ewald, Gesch. viii. 866, 476. See MONEY.

IV. Literature.—The original authorities for the history of the Maccabees are extremely scanty; but for the composition of the Maccabees, the book of Ezechias is a most trustworthy, if an incomplete witness. See Maccabees, Books of. The second book adds some important details to the history of the earlier part of the struggle, and of the events which immediately preceded it; but all the statements which it contains require close examination, and must be received with caution. Josephus follows 1 Mac., for the period which it embraces, very closely, but slight additions of names and minute particulars indicate that he was in possession of other materials, probably oral traditions, which have not been elsewhere preserved. On the other hand, there are cases in which, from haste or carelessness, he has misrepresented his authority. From other sources little can be gleaned. Hebrew and classical literature furnishes nothing more than a few trifling fragments which illustrate Maccabean history. So long an interval elapsed between the destruction of Jerusalem and the Maccabees. The letter of Josephus quoted above is devoted to writing, that facts, when not embodied in rites or precepts, became wholly distorted. Classical writers, again, were little likely to chronicle a conflict which probably they could not have understood. Of the great work of Polybius alone might it be expected to accumulate the importance of the Jewish war; only fragments remain which refer to this period; but the omission of all mention of the Maccabean campaign in the corresponding sections of Livy, who follows very closely in the track of the Greek historian, seems to prove that Polybius also omitted it. The account of the Syrian kings in Appian is too meagre to make his silence remarkable; but indifference or contempt must be the explanation of a general silence which is too widespread to be accidental. Even when the fall of Jerusalem had directed unusual attention to the past fortunes of its inhabitants,Polybius was able to dismiss the Maccabaean conflict in a sentence remarkable for scornful carelessness. "During the dominion of the Assyrians, the Medes, and the Persians, the Jews," he says, "were the most obnoxious to their dependent subjects. After the Maccabees obtained the supremacy, the king of Syria endeavored to do away with their superstition, and introduce Greek habits, but was hindered by a Parthian war from reforming a most repulsive people." (terrimus gentem, Tacitus, Hist. v. 8).

For a table of contemporary Syrian kings, see Antiochu
cus, Rehoboam, and Solomon, under Syria. See also Milman, Hist. of the Jews, vol. ii. 11; Prideaux, Connection, vol. ii. (Oxford,}
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1885); Ewald, Geschichte des V. Israel, vol. iii, part ii;
Herzfeld, Geschichte d. Volkes Isr.; Raphall, Hist. of the
Jewish People; Luzzatto, Gesch. d. Israelis; Jastrow, Geich.
St. Amsterd.; Cohen, Gesch. d. Israelis; Weber und Holtzmann, Gesch.
d. Volkes Israel (Leipsic, 1867, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. ii, ch. iii.

MACCABEES, BOOKS OF (Maccabaei), β, etc.

Four books which bear the common title of "Maccabaees"
are found in some MSS. of the Sept.; a fifth is found
in an Arabic version. Two of these were included in
the early current Latin versions of the Bible, and
thence passed into the Vulgate. As forming part of the
Vulgata, they were received as canonical by the Coun-
cil of Trent, and retained among the Apocrypha by the
Reformed churches. The two other books obtained no
such wide circulation, and have only a secondary con-
nection with the Maccabean history. But all the books,
though they differ most widely in character, and date,
and worth, possess points of interest which make them
a fruitful field for study. If the historic order were ob-
served, the so-called third book would come first; the
fourth would be an appendix to the second, which would
retain its place, and the first would come last; but it
will be more convenient to examine the books in the
order in which they are found in the MSS., which was
probably determined by some vague tradition of their
relative antiquity. In the following account of these books
we adopt much of the matter found in the dictionaries
of Kittto and Smith.

The controversy as to the mutual relations and his-
toric worth of the first two books of Maccabees has given
rise to much ingenious and partial criticism. The subject
was very nearly exhausted by a series of essays published
in the last century, which contain, in the midst of much unfair reasoning, the substance of what
has been written since. The discussion was occasioned
by E. F. Wermendorf in his Proclus de famulis historiae
Syriae in Libris Marc. (Lipsiae, 1746). Frolich replied to
this essay in another, De famillis hist. Syriae in Libris Marc. proclusio . . . in exequum vocata
(Vindob., 1746), and then the argument fell into other
hands. Wermendorf's brother (Gill Wermendorf) undertook
to support his cause, which he did in a Commentario hi-
toricorum in libro Macchoe (Alciat. 1747) and nothing has been written on the same side which
can be compared with his work. By the vigor and free-
dom of his style, by his surprising erudition and unwav-
ering confidence—almost worthy of Bentley—he carries
his readers often beyond the bounds of true criticism, and
in this he finds too often the distinctions and sophistry of many of his arguments are apparent.
But, in spite of the injustice and arrogance of the book,
it contains very much which is of the greatest value, and
no abstract can give an adequate notion of its power.
The reply to Wermendorf was published anonymously by
another Jesuit: Aurora ueritatis Libri Marc. critic., nonico-historica adserta . . . a quodam Soc. Jesu acere-
dote (Vindob., 1749). The authorship of this was fixed
upon J. Khell (Weltel, Einlad., p. 23, note); and while in
many points Khell is unequal to his adversary, his book
contains some very useful collections for the history of the
canon. In more recent times, F. X. Patritius (an
other Jesuit) has made a fresh attempt to establish
the complete harmony of the books, and, on the whole,
his essay (De Comenio ueritatis Libri Marc. Rome, 1856),
though far from satisfactory, is the most able defence of the
view which has been published.
For a copious list of original editions, translations,
and commentaries on the first three books of Maccabees,
see Fürst, Bibliotheca Judæica, ii, 316 sqq.

MACCABEES, THE FIRST BOOK OF, the most im-
portant of the five apocryphal portions which have
down to us under this common title.

I. Title and Position of the Book.—In the editions of
the Sept. which we follow, this book is called the first
of Maccabees (Maccabaei a'), because in the MSS. it
was placed in the beginning of the scroll, to record the
exploits and merits of the Maccabean family in their
struggles for the restoration of their ancestral
religion and the liberation of their Jewish compatriots
from the Seleucid tyranny. According to Origen,
however (comp. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. vii, 25), the or-
iginal Hebrew title of this book was Zeqeshl Zebqai. Great
difficulty has been experienced in the endeavor to
obtain the exact Hebrew equivalent to these words.
They have been resolved—1. Into הַזְּכֵשׁל הֶזְבָּכָא (P. R. L. Hebrew, History of the Princes of the Sons of God, that
is, of Israel (Michaelis, Orient. Biblioth. xii, 115, and
most modern commentators). 2. Into הַזְּכֵשׁל הֶזְבָּכָא, The Spectre of the Princes of the Sons of God, i.e.
of Simon, who is called prince in 1 Mac. xxii, 31, xiv.
47 (Bochani, Budeeus, and Ewald, Geschichtc d. V. Israel
iv, 528). But this makes chapters xii-xvi the princi-
pal part of the book, and the rest a mere introduction.
3. Into הַזְּכֵשׁל הֶזְבָּכָא, Princeps templi (i.e. pontifex maximus), Princeps filiorum Dei (i.e. dux populi
Judaici), based upon the words סֵמְרָא אֲרָמִים מִנָּהוּ עַל
מַעֲמָא ריֹעָמִים, אָנֹךְ בֵּית רֹעָמִים, 1 Mac.
xxiv, 44 (Bunder, Joch. ibid. xi, 27 (Wermendorf, Comment. de gen. ibid. Mac. p. 178). 4. Into הַזְּכֵשׁל הֶזְבָּכָא,
Spectre rum Dei, i.e. of the Syrian kings, who were regarded
as rebellious against God because they persecuted the
Jews (Junius, Huetita, etc.), or as Herzfeld, who re-
plies this solution of the words, explains it, the chas-
ting rod of the apostates, which he submits is an im-
priatory allusion of the Maccabees (Geschichtc d. V.
Israel, i, 265). We incline to the first explanation because
it escapes the censure which the second incurs, and
is less artificial than the third and fourth. It must,
however, be remarked that this title does not occur in
the Hebrew literature, and that both the ancient and
modern Jews call the book הַזְּכֵשׁל הֶזְבָּכָא. The Book of the Hashmonaens; הַנְּשַמְנָא הָזָא, I. Hash-
monaens; הָזָא הַנְּשַמְנָא הַבָּא, The Scroll of the Fam-
ily of the Hashmonaens, or simply הַנְּשַמְנָא הָזָא, The Scroll of the Hashmonaens, after the title Hashmonaens,
or Ashmonaens, by which the Maccabean family are
denominated. See Maccabees.

Though the book occupies the first position, it ought,
according to the historic order, to be the fourth of Mac-
cabees, as it marks the successive commencements at a less
period than the other three books. Traditions are
rare, in determining the priority of position, was evidently
guided by the age and the intrinsic value of these books
since 1 Mac. is obviously the oldest, and surpasses the
other three books in importance. Cotton, in his trans-
lation of the Maccabees, has departed from this tradition-
al and commonly accepted arrangement, and placed the
first book as second in order.

II. Contents and Division.—This book contains a clear and chronological history of the tyrannical proceedings of Antiochus Epiphanes, commencing with the year B.C. 174, at the head of the series of patriotic heroes against this tyranny, first organized by Mattathias, B.C. 168,
down to settled sovereignty and the death of Simon, B.C.
185, thus embracing a period of forty years.

1. The first part, of which Mattathias is the hero,
comprises chap. i—ii, 70, and embraces a period from
the commencement of Antiochus Epiphanes' reign to the
death of Mattathias, B.C. 175—167.

2. The second part, of which Judas Maccabaeus is the
hero, comprises chap. iii, 1—ix, 23, and describes the
exploits and fame of this defender of the faith, B.C. 167—
160.

3. The third part, of which Jonathan, the high-priest,
surnamed Apphax (Aρχιερενε:erm, the simulator, the
elixy one), is the hero, comprises ch. ix, 23—xii, 58, and re
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cords the events which transpired during the period of his government, B.C. 140–145.

4. The fourth part, of which Simon, surnamed Thassi (Ἰασεί ὁ ποιητής, the flourishing) is the hero, comprises ch. xiii, 1–xvi, 24, and records the events which occurred during his period of government, B.C. 143–135.

5. (Cont. 2, p. 605.) The Books of the Maccabees and Religion in Palestine. There is no book among all the Apocrypha which is distinguished by greater marks of truthworthiness than 1 Maccabees. Simplicity, credibility, and candor alike characterize its description of friends and foes, victories and defeats, hopes and fears. When the hero fails to appreciate the writer's deeper purpose the writer gives expression to his feelings in lyric effusions (e.g. i, 23–28, 37–40; ii, 7–18, 49–68; iii, 3–9, 18–22; iv, 8–11, 30–33, 38; vi, 10–13; vii, 37, 38, 41, 42), no poetic exaggerations and hyperbole deprive the description of its substantially historic character. When recording the victories of his heroes, struggling for their liberties and their religion, he wrests no laws of nature from their regular course to aid the handsful of Jewish champions against the fearful odds of their heathen oppressors; and when speaking of the arch-enemy, Antiochus Epiphanes (i, 10, etc.), he indulges in no unjust and passionate misrepresentations against him. Yet he marks in one expressive phrase (μήπαν διαμακρίνεται) the character of the Syrian type of Antichrist (comp. Isa. xi, 10; Dan. xi, 36). If no mention is made of the reckless profaneroy of Alexander Balas, it must be remembered that no mention was made of the Jews' political and liberal, and these alone fall within the scope of the history. So far as the circumstances admit, the general accuracy of the book is established by the evidence of other authorities; but for a considerable period it is the single source of our information. Even the few historical and geographical inaccuracies in the description of foreign nations and countries, such as the foundation of the Greek empire in the East (1 Macc. i, 5–9), the power and constitution of Rome (viii, 1–16), the "great city Elymais, in the country of Persia" (vi, 1), etc., so far from impairing the general truthfulness of the narrative when it confines itself to home and the immediate past, only show how faithfully the writer has depicted the general notions of the time, and for this reason are of intrinsic value and instructive. The subjugation of the Galatians, who were the terror of the neighboring peoples (Acts xiv, 27), and the defeat of the Tarshish (ch. viii, 3) of Phenician merchants, are noticed, as would be natural from the immediate interest of the events; but the wars with Carthage are wholly omitted (Josephus adds these in his narrative, Ant. vii, 4). The story of the Jews at this period, the Tarshish (ch. viii, 3) of Phenician merchants, are noticed, as would be natural from the immediate interest of the events; but the wars with Carthage are wholly omitted (Josephus adds these in his narrative, Ant. vii, 4). The story of the Jews at this period,

IV. Author, Date, and Original Language.—All that can be said with certainty about the author of this book is that he was a Palestinian Jew. This is indicated by the whole spirit which pervades the book, by the lively sympathies which the writer manifests for the heroes whom he describes, and by his intimate acquaintance with the localities of Palestine.

Not so certain, however, is its date. Prideaux, Michaeles, Hengstenberg, Bertheau, Welte, Scholz, Keil, and others, though discarding the notion of Lapide, Huet, etc., that John Hyrcanus was the author, are yet of opinion that the conclusions of the narrative (xvi, 24), and not the κόσμοι ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν πολίων ἀστῶν . . . ἣδε τάτα γίγαντα ἐπὶ βιβλίων ἡμῶν ἀρχαγγέλων αὐτῶν, ἢ όν ἦν εἰκόνα ἀρχαγγέλων μετά τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ (xvi, 24), plainly show that the book was written during the government of this high-priest, perhaps about B.C. 120–106, inasmuch as this passage of Josephus is found in the geniza of the Dead Sea, ascribing to John Hyrcanus the words of a prophet of the high-priesthood of John, without the terminus ad quem, thus indicating that John was still living, and that his pontificate was not as yet terminated. After the close of the priesthood, or after the death of John, this book would have been called "the history of a great man." The reader could take the words, "diary of his priesthood," in any other sense than that they denote a chronicle of the whole duration of it from the beginning to the end. Nor can the words ἡς τῆς ἡμᾶς ταύτης, in xili, 29, be added as implying a later date; for it was something remarkable that, in those days of war and devastation, the sepulchre which Simon made for his family in Modin remained between twenty and thirty years unhurt. Eichhorn, Berthold, De Wette, Ewald, Grimm, and others, however, maintain that the book was written after the death of John Hyrcanus, oscillating between B.C. 105 and 64.

The language of the book does not present any striking peculiarities. Both in diction and structure it is generally simple and unaffected, with a marked and yet not harsh Hebrew characteristic. The number of peculiar words is slight, and the words considered peculiar are paralleled with those in 2 Maccabees. Some of these are later forms, as γωγύς (ψωγύς), xi, 5, 11; ἵδετεινως, i, 39; ἐκτολογίως, xiv, 22; ἀπεδίογει, iv, 57; ἐκλογαί, iv, 8, 21; ν, 4; ν, 6; ἡμισ, vii, 7; ix, 55, etc.; ἅφωγα, ii, 4, 18, xii, 19; διαφώς, xii, 39; προποστάτης, xiv, 70; ἑπιστρώγος, xiv, 44; ἑπιστρώγος, viii, 15; ν, 15; φανονοσις, i, 24. Other words are used in new or strange senses, as ἀδρέων, viii, 14; παρασάρας, xv, 28; δια-
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V. Canonicity and Importance of the Book.—This book never formed a part of the Jewish canon, and is excluded from the Septuagint version of the Books of Maccabees, issued by the Council of Laodicea, St. Cyril, St. Hilary, St. Athanasius, St. Jerome, etc. In the Chronicle of Eusebius it is included in the same category as the writings of Josephus and Africanus, so as to distinguish it from the inspired writings. Still the book is cited with high respect, and as conclusive to the editor of the Church, at a very early period (August. De Circ. Del. lib. xviii, c. 36). The councils at Hippo and Carthage (A.D. 388 and 397) first formally received it into the canon, and in modern times the Council of Trent has included it in Catholic Church. All disputes about its canonical authority by putting it into the catalogues of inspired Scripture.

But, though the Protestant Church rejects the decisions of these councils, and abides by the ancient Jewish canon, yet both the leaders of the Reformation and modern expositors rightly attach great importance to this book. The great value of it will be duly appreciated when it is remembered that it is one of the very few surviving records of the most important, but very obscure period of Jewish history between the close of the T. and the beginning of the N. T. It is, therefore, not to be underrated at that the few words of other remarks, in his introduction to the translation of this book.—This is another of those books not included in the Hebrew Scriptures, although in its discourses and description it almost equals the other sacred books of Scripture, and would not have been unworthy to be reckoned among them, because it is a very necessary and useful book for the understanding of the prophet Daniel in the eleventh chapter" (Vorrede auf das erste Buch Maccabaurus, German Bible, ed. 1856). It is rather surprising that the Anglican Church has not prescribed any lessons to be read from this book. A reference to 1 Macc. iv, 59, however, is to be found in the margin of the A. V., John x, 22.

VI. Versions and Literature.—The books of Maccabees were not included by Jerome in his translation of the Bible. "The first book," he says, "I found in Hebrew" (Pro. Gal. in Reg.), but he takes no notice of the Latin version, and certainly did not revise it. The version of the two books which has been incorporated in the Romish Vulgate was consequently derived from the old Latin current before Jerome's time. This version was published in 1483, brought from the Greek, and, after the Greek, followed it. Beside the common text, Sabatier has published a version of a considerable part of the first book (cap. i-xiv, 1) from a very ancient Paris MS. (S. Germ. 15) in 1781, which exhibits an earlier form of the Greek text. Malbranq has also published a fragment of another Latin translation, comprising chap. ii, 49-64, which differs very materially from both texts (Speculum Romanae, ix, 60 sq.). The old Syriac version given in the Paris and London Polyglots, and by Delagardes, Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi Syriacae (Lond., 1861), is, like the Latin, made literally from the Greek.
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The date and person of the Greek translator of the first book of Maccabees are wholly undetermined. Book II, according to the order of the Sept., which is followed both by the ancient versions and modern expositors of the Apocrypha.

Some phrases clearly express a Semitic idiom (ii, 48, δεναίον τος ἐν ἑωρασι; vii, 25; x, 62; xii, 26-27); and the Septuagint version of the book is, in essence, totally corruptible (e.g. i, 54; ii, 63; vii, 17; ix, 28; xiv, 9). Josephus undoubtedly made use of the Greek text (Ant. xiii, 5 sq.). That this book, however, was originally written in Hebrew is not only attested by Origen, who gives the Hebrew title of it (see above, § 1), and by St. Jerome, who lists it, and the Catholic Church all disputes about its canonical authority by putting it into the catalogues of inspired Scripture.

As to the Heb. Megillath Antiochus (Στράτος Αντιοχείνων), still existing, which was first published in the editions of the Pentateuch of 1491 and 1506 along with the other Megilloth; is given in the Spanish and Italian Ritual for the Festivals (Συνελεγμένα) of 1555-56, etc.; is inserted, with a Latin translation, in Bartolocci's Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica, 1838; is printed separately, without the translation (Berlin, 1786); and which has recently been republished by Jellinek in his Both Ita-Hidush, i, 142-146—this simply gives a few of the incidents of the Maccabean wars, and makes John, the high-priest who it says slew Nicaior in the Temple, play the most conspicuous part. It tells us that Antiochus began persecutions in the 23rd year of his reign (167 B.C.) and 21st after the building of the second Temple; and that the descendants of the Maccabees, who crushed the armies of this tyrant, ruled over Israel 206 years, thus following the chronology of the Talmud (comp. Aboda Zarm, 9 a; Seder Olam Sutta; De Rossi, Mem. Enqjml, c. xxvi; Zunz, Gesch. d. jüd. Volks, p. 184). That the Aramaic (Chaldee), which was first published by Filipowski, together with the Hebrew and an English version (London, 1861), is the original, and that the Hebrew is a translation, may be seen from a very curious comparison of the two texts. The Hebrew version slavishly imitates the phrases of the Aramaic original, instead of giving the Hebrew idiom. Thus, for instance, the Chaldee רazu נבע is rendered in the Hebrew version by יִשְׂרָאֵל נָבַע, instead of יִשְׂרָאֵל נָבַע or יִשְׂרָאֵל נָבַע, etc. It is perfectly astonishing that this document, which was evidently got up about the 7th century of the Christian era, to be recited on the Feast of Dedication in commemoration of the Maccabean victories over the enemies of Israel, should be regarded as a forgery (Genuz in der Commission der Geschichten aus dem Leben des Maccabäer. des 1 Macc. Bis mit Amerk. (Göttingen and Leipzig, 1778); Eichhorn, Einh. in die apokryphischen Schriften. d. A. T. (Leipzig, 1796), p. 218-248; Hengstenberg, Genunischem Daniel (English transl., Edinburgh, 1847), p. 258-259, 267-270; Cotton, The five Books of Maccabees (Oxford, 1822); Deschutz, Geschichte des ersten Buches der Maccabaeern, Berlin, iv, 256 sq.; the masterly work of Grimm, Ueber das erste Buch Maccab. (Berlin, 1857), p. 206-219. See APOCYPHRA.
I. Position. — This book ought, according to the historical order, to be the first of the Maccabees, because its narrative begins with an event which occurred in the reign of Seleucus Philopator, about B.C. 180, i.e., four years earlier than the preceding book. Its being placed second in order is evidently owing to the fact that it is brought together with the later events under the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164 B.C.). The one denominated the first of the Maccabees. Cotton, in his translation of the Maccabees, has put this book as the third of Maccabees.

II. Design, Contents, and Division. — The design of this book is to admonish and encourage the Jews to keep the religion of their fathers, and especially to inculcate in the Jewish exiles resident in Egypt the necessity of visiting the Temple in Jerusalem, urging them to take part in the celebration of the festivals instituted to commemorate the dedication of the Temple as the sacred and legitimate place for divine worship (x, 6), and the defeat of Nicanor (x, 86). To effect this design, the writer gives a condensed history of the Maccabees' struggles for their religion and sanctuary, beginning with the attempts of Heliodorus to plunder the Temple, cir. B.C. 180, and terminating with the victory of Judas Maccabaeus over Nicanor, B.C. 161. The whole narrative, therefore, which is compiled mostly from 1 Macc., partly from 2 Macc. (iv, 7—vii, 42), supplemented by references to the foreign sections of 1 Macc. (i, 9—x, 64), and partly (v, 1—xv) parallel with 1 Macc. (i, 9—vii, 38), embraces a period of about nineteen years, and is divided into three sections, each of which is made to terminate with the great event commemorated by the festival which the writer is anxious that his Egyptian brethren should celebrate.

1. The first section (i—ix, 82) comprises two epistles, the relation of which to the substance of the book is extremely obscure. The first (i, 1—9) is a solemn invitation to the Jewish exiles to celebrate the feast of tabernacles in the month Caslaim (i.e., the feast of the dedication, i, 9), as before they had sympathized with their brethren in Judaea in "the extremity of their trouble" (i, 7). The second (i, 10—11, 18, according to the received division), which bears a formal salutation from "the council and Judas" to "Aristobulus... and the Jews in Egypt," is a strange, rambling collection of legendary stories of the death of "Antiochus," of the preservation of the sacred fire and its recovery by Nehemiah, of the hiding of the vessels of the sanctuary by Josephus, etc. And, indeed, the letter can be said to have any end—with the same exhortation to observe the feast of dedication (ii, 10—18). Then follows an account given by the writer of this book of the sources from which he derived his information, and of the trouble he had in compiling it (ii, 18—22).

2. The second section (ii, i—x, 6) contains important information about the origin of the persecutions (ii, 1—vii, 42), which is simply hinted at in 1 Macc., and then describes and supplements (in v, i—x, 29) the events recorded in 1 Macc., concluding with the dedication of the temple (x, 1—9), which is the great object of the book, cir. B.C. 180—163.

3. The third section (x, 10—xv, 37) records the various victories of the Jews, terminating in the crowning success of Judas Maccabaeus and the death of Nicanor, which led to the institution of the feast commemorating the victory over him, B.C. 164—161.

This is followed by an epilogue (xxv, 38—40) which is wanting in Conder's (after the Zurich Bible) in Matthew's, 1587; in Cranmer's, 1539; and in the various reprints of these editions; and which the Geneva Bible, 1560, followed by the Bishop, 1668, was the first to insert.

The latter two of the above sections, taken together, present several natural subdivisions, which appear to coincide with the "five books" of Jason on which it was based. The first (ch. iii) contains the history of Heliodorus, beginning with the setting out of the schism and apostasy of part of the nation (cir. B.C. 180). The second (ch. iv—vii) gives varied details of the beginning and course of the great persecution—the murder of Onias, the crimes of Menelaus, the martyrdom of Eleazar, and of the mother with her seven sons (B.C. 175—167). The third (ch. vii—ix) follows the fortunes of Judas to the triumphant restoration of the Temple service (B.C. 166, 165). The fourth (x—xiii) includes the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (175—164 B.C.). The fifth (ch. xiv, xv) records the treachery of Alcimus, the mission of Nicanor, and the crowning success of Judas (B.C. 162, 161). Each of these divisions is closed by a phrase which seems to mark the end of a definite subject (iii, 40; vii, 42; x, 9; xii, 26; xv, 37), and they correspond, in fact, with distinct stages in the national struggle.

III. Author, Date, and Original Language. — The compiler of this book distinctly declares that the original author of it, or of the "five books" from which he condensed the chief facts, was Jason of Cyrene (i, 23). Herzfeld thinks that this Jason is the same as Jason, the son of Eleazar, whom Judas Maccabaeus sent with Eupolemus as envoy to Rome after the defeat of Nicanor to conclude a treaty with the Romans (1 Macc. viii, 17; Josephus, Ant. xii, 10, 6); because it is only a Hellenized master of the Greek language, would be qualified for such a mission to a foreign court. This hypothesis, moreover, explains the otherwise anomalous circumstance that this book, which records the Maccabean struggles, goes no further in its history than the death of Nicanor over Nicanor; whereas, according to this point, Jason was an eye-witness to the exploits of Judas, and was sent to Rome after this most important event; and it is confirmed by the accurate knowledge which the writer displays of the events (iv, 21 sq.; viii, 1 sq.; ix, 29 sq.; x, 12; xiv, 1; Herzfeld, Geschichte d. Volkes Israel, 445 sq.). Accordingly, the original work must have been written about B.C. 160, immediately after the victory over Nicanor, and prior to the defeat and death of Judas (1 Macc. ix, 16—18), which brought new calamities upon the Holy City, and again transferred the power to the heathenishly-inclined Jews under the pontificate of Alcimus (1 Macc. ix, 23—29).

The errors in the order of the events and of history must be ascribed to the epitomator, whose great object was not to narrate history faithfully, but to make the facts harmonize with his design.

As a Cyrenian Jew, Jason most naturally composed his work in Greek; and Jerome's testimony, "Secundus [Machabaeorum liber I] Grecus est, quod ex ipsa quoque phrasii probati potest" ("Proleg.""); is fully borne out by the style of the epitome. (See below.) The epitomator or compiler of the present book was a Jew, resident in Alexandria, and must have lived a considerable period after the events transpired. The date of the compilation is put within the limits B.C. 150—124. The two epistles with which the book begins do not proceed from Jason, and are of a much later date, though the first purports to have been written B.C. 134, or 188 of the Seleucid; and the second, by mentioning a recent deliverance from great perils, evidently implies that it was written after the news of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, i.e., 148 of the Seleucid. The original language of the letters seems to have been Greek. Indeed, Geiger shows that the difficult passage, "α'στον αγαθον αριστον στην αγαθην γη και την βασιλειαν" (i, 7), which is ambiguous, and, as commonly understood, represents Jason and his companions as apostatizing from the law and the kingdom, is, when retranslated into Hebrew, תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, shown to mean, from the time that Jason and those who sided with him from the heathen kingdom, apostatized either standing for תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, royal descend (comp. 2 Kings xxv, 25; Jer. xii, 1; Ezek. xlviii, 13; Dan. ii, 8), or referring back to תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא in the sense of תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, either standing for תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, or referring back to תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, either standing for תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, or referring back to תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, or referring back to תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, or referring back to תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, or referring back to תعشまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, or referring back to תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, or referring back to תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, or referring back to תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, or referring back to תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, or referring back to תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, or referring back to תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, or referring back to תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, or referring back to תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, or referring back to תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך והנשיא, or referring back to תעשまでの משלג שמישהו הבטחתו המלך ו...
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case with, i, 18, where the Feast of Dedication is most extraordinarily called the Feast of Tabernacles, which can only be explained when the passages are retranslated into Hebrew. Now the Hebrew for ִּפְּנֵי הָעָרֹבָּה which is generally translated as the feast of the Tabernacles (I Kings viii, 2; 2 Chron. v, 8; Josephus, Ant. viii, 4, 1), it will at once be seen that the translator of these epistles, instead of rendering the word in question simply by ִּפְּנֵי חַגָּה, attached to it the specific reference to the specific festival, which he was evidently led to do by the fact that both these festivals are of eight days' duration, and that the feast of tabernacles is mentioned in, x, 6. So also διανοήσει τῆς εἰσαρχίας ὑμῶν in the σημάδι τούτου (i, 4) is a translation of בִּין הַחָלֹת וְהָעָרֹבָּה.

The style of the book is extremely uneven. At times it is elaborately ornate (iii, 15-29; vii, 20; vi, 12-16, 23-28; vii, etc.), and, again, it is so rude and broken as to seem more like notes for an epitome than a finished composition (xiii, 19-26); but it nowhere attains to the simple energy and pathos of the first book. The vocabulary is generally more appropriate to the theme of this new and unusual words. Many of these are forms which belong to the decay of a language, as ἀλλοφθορος, iv, 18; vi, 24; ΄Ελληνικός, vi, 6 (Ἐξερέας, iii, 9); ἐφιγμός, vii, 37; ἔκαστος, vi, 8; σπλαγχνιζόμενον, vii, 21, vii, 42; or compounds which betray a false pursuit of emphasis or passion: δυσῆςجم, iv, 40; ἐνυπνήσας, xiv, 18; κατευθυνόμενον, xiii, 43; προσκαλείοντας, xiv, 19; προτότοκοςμόν, xv, 9; συνεκτίκισις, xvi, 17.

Other words are employed in novel senses, as ἀντευθέντης, xiii, 22; τέσσαρες εἰς τι, vii, 24; ἔναυστος, vii, 9; προτρυπωμένος, xi, 4; φυσικῶς, vii, 27; xiv, 26. Others bear a sense which is common in late Greek, as ἀλέξω, xiv, 8; ἀνάγεσθαι, ix, 2; xiii, 26; ἀπλήρωμα, iii, 22; ἀνέπτειρω, iv, 4; φυλάσσω, vii, 34; ἀνισότικος, vii, 4. Others appear to be peculiar to this book, as διάπερ, xii, 23; διστάστωμα, vi, 20; προτρύπωμα, xiv, 11; πολιμπρωτόμος, x, 14; διάλογος, xiv, 8; διαλέγεσθαι, xiv, 27; ἀπεκφυγέντας, vi, 28; ἔξοδος, vii, 55; ἀνεμόλογος, xii, 43. Hebrewisms are very rare (viii, 10; ix, 5; xiv, 24). Idiomatic Greek phrases are much more common (iv, 20; xii, 22; xv, 12, etc.), and the writer evidently had a considerable command over the Greek language, though his taste was deformed by a love of rhetorical effect.

IV. Historical and Religious Character. - As the avowed design of the book is religio-didactic and polemical, the aim of the writer was not to recite a series of dry facts in chronological order, but rather to select such events from the period on which he treats, and arrange, embellish, and comment upon them in such a manner as should most strikingly set forth to his Egyptian brethren the marvellous interposition of God to preserve the only legitimate and theocratic sanctuary in Israel, and at the same time to point out the signal punishment of the wicked according to the principle in eo genere quiesque punitur, in quo peccavit (v, 9, 10; ix, 5, 6; xiii, 8; xv, 32, 33); the moral reflections (v, 17-20; vi, 12-16; ix, 8-10; xii, 43-46); the colored descriptions (iii, 14-23; vi, 11-20); the exaggerated account of the martyrdom of the seven brothers and their mother, which king Antiochus, for the sake of effect, is made to witness in Jerusalem (vi, 18-22); the enormous numbers of the enemy slain by a handful of Jews (vii, 24, 30; x, 23, 31; xi, 11; xii, 16, 19, 25, 29, 39; xv, 10, 35, 36, etc.); the exaggerated description of the three of them (iii, 28 of them; iv, 2, 3; x, 3; 29-31; xi, 8-10; xv, 12, etc.); the historical and chronological inaccuracies, e. g. making Antiochus witness the death of the Jewish martyrs (vii, 8); the death of Antiochus (ch. ix.); the representing of the sacrifices as having been renewed after two years' intermission (2 Macc. x, 3, comp. with 1 Macc. iv, 52, 54; i, 54, 59); the description of the different battles which the Jews fought between the purification of the Temple and the death of Antiochus (2 Macc. vii, 15-38; xii, 43, comp. with 1 Macc. v); the campaign of Lyssias (2 Macc. xi, 12, comp. with 1 Macc. iv, 26-32); etc. But apart from these embellishments, traditional stories, inversions of events, etc., which, in accordance with ancient usage, the author adopted in order to carry out his design, and in spite of the fact that the two letters with which the book begins are now generally given up as spurious, the best critics accept the groundwork of the facts as true. Grimm, whose elaborate, thorough, and impartial comment on this book is unparalleled, has shown that there is no ground to question the historical import of the most important section (chap. iv-vi, 10), which is not only most consistent in itself, but fits most appropriately the space of 1 Macc. i, 10-64; or the truthfulness of ch. iii, when stripped of the miraculous.

He says of its truthfulness, within the mentioned limits, is supported by the fact that, 1. Notwithstanding the many differences, it agrees in not a few portions with 1 Maccabees, though both these books are perfectly independent of each other; and, 2. In four events which it records anterior to 1 Maccabees, it agrees with Josephus, who is independent of it, vii, 11, the festival of the Temple at Gerizim (vi, 2, comp. with Josephus, Ant. xi, 5, 5); the execution of Menelaus at Berea (xii, 3, 8, comp. with Josephus, Ant. xii, 9, 7); the landing of Demetrius at Tripolis (xiv, 1); and of the priestly ingenuities (ch. iv) which were the cause of the protracted series of struggles between the Jews and the Syrian monarchs.

The religious character of the book is one of its most important and interesting features. God is throughout recognised as ordaining even the most minute affairs of his people, and to actions which before this book would have been regarded as being done upon by the Jews as a temporary visitation for their sins (iv, 16, 17; v, 17-20; vi, 12-17; vii, 32, 83; xii, 40); and the sufferings which come upon the righteous in this common visitation are regarded as storing for the sins of the rest of the people, and staying the anger of God (xii, 56). The book, moreover, shows a wonderful interposition of angels for the salvation of the people (x, 29, etc.; xiii, 2, etc.), and supernatural manifestations (iii, 29; vi, 2, etc.; xii, 5, etc.), which play a very important part in the N. T., were of no common occurrence.

What has been said of striking, is, on the one hand, the hard lot of the Jews which led them to flee, and on the other hand, the belief or not the belief in the Jews that they the Jews then believe in the surviving of the soul after the death of the body, in the resurrection of the dead, and in their reunion with those near and dear to them (vii, 5, 6, 9, 11, 14, 23, 29, 36), but that God does not irreversibly seal the eternal doom of man immediately after his departure, and that the decision of our heavenly Father may be influenced by the prayers and sacrifices of the surviving friends of the departed (xii, 40-48).

This passage also shows that the offering of sacrifices for the dead must have been common in those days, instead of as it is spoken of in very commendable terms. The striking distinction between the religious sentiments of this book and those of the former goes far to justify Geiger's conclusion that "the two books of Maccabees are party productions; the author of the first was a Sadducee, and a friend of the Maccabean dynasty, while the truth or epimistic of the second was a Pharisee, who looked upon the Maccabees with suspicion" (Urvächung, p. 206). Still the second book, like the first, contains no hopes of the coming of a Messiah.

V. Conocmity. — Though portions of this book are incorporated in the Jewish writings, and form a part of the religious catechism of the priests and their mother (ch. vi, 1-42), which is not only mentioned in the Talmud (Gitt. 57, b), the Midrash of the ten commandments (ed. Jellinek, Beth Ha-Midrash, 1
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70, etc.), Midrash Jalkut (On Deut. section נַגֵּר, 801, b), etc., but is interwoven in the service for the Feast of Dedication (compare The Joser, פְּנֵן כְָּנָנָה; the martyrdom of Eleazar (ch. vi. 18-81), also embodied in the same service, and described by Josippon, who also speaks of the Holiness of the peculiarly apostate congregation and other circumstances narrated in 2 Macc. (compare Josippon, lib. ii. c. iv, ed. Breithaupt, p. 172 sq.), yet the book was never part of the Jewish canon. Hence even if it could be shown more unquestionably that the apparent parallels between 2 Macc. and diverse passages in the Talmud are composed 2 Macc. i. 4, 14; 13 Macc. v. 19, with Mark ii. 27; 2 Macc. vi. 19; vii.2, etc., with Heb. xi. 35; 2 Macc. vii. 19, with John v. 28; 2 Macc. vii. 22, etc.; xiv. 46, with Acts xvii. 24-28; 2 Macc. vii. 36, with Rev. vi. 9; 2 Macc. viii. 2, with Luke xxi. 24; Rev. vi. 2; 2 Macc. x. 7, with Rev. viii. 9; 2 Macc. xv. 3-5, with Eph. vi. 9) are actual quotations, it would only prove that the apostles, like the rest of their Jewish brethren, alluded to the incidents recorded in this book without regarding the book itself as canonical. The only references, however, to be found in the A.V., are from Heb. vi. 35, 36, to 2 Macc. vi. 18, 19; vii.7, etc.; and vii. 1-7; but even these are disputed, and it is quite possible that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews refers to the sufferings of the Essenes (compare Ginsburg, The Essentials, etc., Longman, 1864, p. 360). However, the fact that the death of the last of the Jewish Church, this book is excluded from the canon of sacred books in the catalogues of Melito, Origen, the Council of Laodicea, St. Cyril, St. Hilary, etc. (compare Du Pin, History of the Canon, London, 1699, i, 12). Jerome emphatically declares: "Maccabaeorum libros lege quidem ecclesiae, sed eis inter canonicas scripturas non recipit" (Proef. in Proc.). and Augustine, though stating that this book, like 1 Macc., was regarded by the Christians as not unused, yet expressly states that the Jews did not receive it into the canon (Contr. ep. Gaudeni, l, 81), and draws a distinction between it and the canonical Scriptures (De Cíc. Dei, xviii. 86). The Council of Trent, however, has settled (April 8, 1646) the canonicity of it for the Roman Church. The Protestant Church generally agrees with Luther, who remarks, "We tolerate it because of the beautiful history of the Maccabean seven martyrs and their mother, and other pieces. It is evident, however, that the writer was not a great master, but produced a patchwork of various books; he has likewise a perplexing knot in ch. xiv., in Rasius, who committed suicide, which was also troublesome to Augustine and other fathers. For such example is of none, and it is not to be considered even though it may be tolerated and charitably explained. It also describes the death of Antiochus, in ch. i., differently from 1 Macc. To sum it all up: Just as 1 Macc. deserves to be adopted in the number of sacred Scriptures, so 2 Macc. deserves to be thrown out, though there is something good in it" (Vorrede auf das Zweyte Buch Maccabaeorum, in the German Bible, ed. 1586).

VI. Versions and Literature.—There are two ancient versions of this book, a Latin and a Syriac. The Latin, which was current before Jerome, and does not always follow closely the Greek, is now incorporated in the Roman Vulgate, which is still literal, is given both in vol. iv. of the London Polyglot and by De Lagarde, Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi Syriaci (London. 1861). The Arabic so-called version of 2 Macc. is really an independent work. See Maccabees, Fifth Book 5.

Of commentaries and exegetical helps, we may mention Whitaker, A Disputation on Holy Scripture, Parker Society (Cambridge, 1849), p. 93-102; Whitson, A Collection of Authentic Records (London, 1727), l, 200-232; Hauser, Das ausl. Buch der Makk. neu ubr. m. Anmerk. (Jena, 1813); Ciebathorn, Einleitung zu den Schriften d. Alten Test. (Leipzig, 1790), p. 249-278; Benthien, De Secundo Maccabaeo, libro (Gotting. 1829); Cotton, The

Five Books of Maccabees (Oxford, 1882), p. 148-217; Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, iv, 530 sq.; Schlitt, Epitasis, qua Secundo Maccab. libro, cap. i-ii, 9, legum explicatio, commentaria (Colun., 1644); Havernick, Geschichte des Volkes Israel (Northaumen, 1854), i, 445-456; Patriziù, De Consensu utriusque libri Maccabaeor. (Rom. 1685); Geiger, Ueberschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel (Breslau, 1857), p. 218-230; and, above all, the valuable work of Grimm, Kurzgefasste exegetische Handschr. zu d. Apokryphen d. Arent Testamentes, pt. iv (Leipa. 1857). See APOCRYPHA.

MACABBEES, THE THIRD BOOK OF, not given in the Romish Vulgate, the Apocrypha of the A.V., nor in Protestant versions generally, but still read in the Greek Church.

I. Title and Position.—This book is improperly called the "third of Maccabees," since it does not at all record the exploits of the Maccabean heroes, but narrates events of an earlier date. It, however, derives its name from the fact that this apellation, which originally belonged to Judas, was afterwards used in the sense of martyrs, and was extended to the Alexandrian Jews who suffered for their faith's sake either immediately before or after the Maccabean period. In the Synopsis of the Pseudo-Athanasius, it is apparently also called of Polemaceos, a name which is derived from the name of the country of Polemaeia, Πολεμαία, εβδομαδος του Πολεμαίου, p. 492, ed. Migne, for which Credner, Grimm, etc., suggest that the true reading is Πολεμαεια ετοι Πολεμαιεια, and that this book is to be understood by Πολεμοι. -Grimm, Comment. p. 200). From the polemic part, this book is spoken of, upon the two former productions, and occupy the first position, since it is prior in time to both the first and second Maccabees. But tradition has assigned to it a third position, because it came into circulation later than the others, and was regarded as being of third-rate importance. Cotton, in his edition of the Five Books of Maccabees, has placed it as "1 Maccabees."
men, were imprisoned with them, and the king ordered the names of all to be taken down preparatory to their execution. Here the first marvel happened: the serpent to whom the task was assigned tormented for forty days from morning till evening, till at last the ants and paper failed them, and the king's plan was defeated (ch. iv.). However, regardless of this, the king ordered the keeper of the elephants, an aedile, to prepare, so that the execution was deferred. The Jews still prayed for help; but when the dawn came, the multitudes were assembled to witness their destruction, and the elephants stood ready for their bloody work. Then was there another marvel: the king was visited by deep forgetfulness, and chided the keeper of the elephants for the preparations which he had made, and the Jews were again saved. But at the evening banquet the king recalled his purpose, and with terrible threats prepared for its immediate accomplishment at daybreak (ch. v.). Elymas, an aged priest, earnestly prayed for his people (vi, 1-15), and, just as he finished praying, the royal train and the elephants arrived at the Hippodrome, when suddenly two angels appeared in terrible form, visible to all but the Jews, making the afrightened spectators go back with the soldiers (ver. 16-21). This changed the king's anger into pity, and, with tears in his eyes, he at once "set free the sons of the Almighty, heavenly, living God," and made a great feast for them (ver. 22-30). To commemorate this marvellous interposition of their heavenly Father, the Jews instituted an annual festival to celebrate "through all the dwellings of their pilgrimage for after generations" (ver. 31-41). The faithful Jews had not only their mourning turned into joy, and the royal protection for the future, but were permitted by the king to inflict condign punishment on those of their brethren who had forsaken the religion of their fathers in order to escape the temporary sufferings; "thus the most high God worked wonders throughout for their deliverance" (vii, 1-28).

III. Historical Character.—Though the narrative design of the writer may modify and embellish the facts which he records as to render them more subservient to his object, yet the assertion of Dr. Davidson, that "the narrative appears to be nothing but an absurd Jewish fable" (Introduction to the O. T. iii, 454), is far too sweeping. That the groundwork of it is true, as Dr. Davidson very rightly says (Introduction, part ii, book ii, anno 216), is attested by collateral history. 1. The account it gives of Ptolemy's expedition to Cæle-Syria, and his victory over Antiochus at Raphia (1, 1-7), is corroborated both by Polybius (v, 40, 58-74, 79-87) and Justin (xxx, 1). 2. The character which it ascribes to Ptolemy—that he was cruel, vicious, and given to the orgies and mysteries of Bacchus—is literally confirmed both by Plutarch, who, in his essay How to distinguish Flatterers from Friends, says, "Such praise was the ruin of Egypt, because it called the effeminacy of Ptolemy, his wild extravagances, loud prayers, his marking with an ivy leaf (καυσίμῳ), and his drums, πυτα" (cap. xii; compare also In Cleomenes, cap. xxxiii and xxxvii), and by the author of the Greek Eymologoi, who tells us that Philopator was called Gallus because he was marked with the leaf of an ivy, like the priests called Galli; for in all the Bacchanalian solemnities they were crowned with ivy (Τάλλας ὁ φιλο-πατορ Πτολεμαῖος διὰ τὸ φύλλα καυσίμω σατασαίγα ὡς οἱ Γάλλοι, etc.). 3. Josephus's deviating account (Apion, ii, 5) of the events here recorded, which shows that he had insituted his own Ion from doubles, and this he confirms by comparing it with that of Ptolemy's general, whose name he has altered to Πυργία (Apion, ii, 5). 4. The statement in vi, 56, that they instituted an annual festival to commemorate the day of their deliverance, to be celebrated in all future time, the fact that this festival was actually kept in the days of Josephus (comp. vii, ii, 5), and the consecration of a pillar and synagogue at Ptolemais (vii, 29), are utterly unaccountable on the supposition that this deliverance was never wrought. The doubts which De Wette (Einleitung, sect. 305), Ewald (Gesch, d. v. I. v. iv, 585 sq.), Grimm (Comment. p. 217), and Davidson (Introduction, 455) raise against the historicalground of the narrative, are chiefly based upon the fact that Dan. xi, 11, etc., does not allude to it. Those critics, therefore, submit that the book typically portrays Caligula, who commanded that his own statue should be placed in the Temple, under the guise of a current tradition respecting the murder of Jesus by Pilate against the Jews, transferred by mistake to Ptolemy Philopator. If it be true that Ptolemy Philopator attempted to enter the Temple at Jerusalem, and was frustrated in his design—a supposition which is open to no reasonable objection—and if Josephus, in placing this incident, has assigned to him the impious design of his successor, or the author of 3 Maccabees may have combined the two events for the sake of effect. The writer, in his zeal to bring out the action of Providence, has colored his history, so that it has lost all semblance of truth. In this respect the book offers an instructive contrast to the book of Esther, with which it is closely connected both in its purpose and in the general character of its incidents. In both a terrible calamity is averted by faithful prayer; royal anger is changed to royal favor, and the point turned from the innocence of the innocent to the guilt. But here the likeness ends. The divine reserve, which is the peculiar characteristic of Esther, is exchanged in 3 Maccabees for rhetorical exaggeration, and once again the words of inspiration stand emboldened by the presence of their later counterpart.

How to distinguish Flatterers from Friends, and Date.—It is generally admitted that the author of this book was an Alexandrian Jew, and that he wrote in Greek. This, indeed, is evident from its ornate, pompous, and fluent style, as well as from the copious command of expression which the writer possesses, though this book resembles 2 Maccabees in the use of certain expressions (e. g. ἀδιψος, 3 Macc. i, 25; ii, 8, comp. with 2 Macc. ix, 7) in the employment of purely Greek proper names to impart a Greek garb to Jewish things and ideas (3 Macc. v, 26, 42; vi, 5, comp. with 2 Macc. iv, 47), etc., yet the commands of the two books is so different that it is impossible to claim for them the same author. The author of this book surpasses 2 Maccabees in offensively seeking after artificial, and hence very frequently obscure phrases (e. g. ἡ παρθένος ἐπιφάνεια, ἡ ἐπιφάνεια, etc.), in rare words or such as occur nowhere else (e. g. 20, ii, 29; 20, v; yet the two books are so different that it is impossible to claim for them the same author. The author of this book surpasses 2 Maccabees in offensively seeking after artificial, and hence very frequently obscure phrases (e. g. ἡ παρθένος ἐπιφάνεια, ἡ ἐπιφάνεια, etc.), in rare words or such as occur nowhere else (e. g. 20, ii, 29; 20, v; yet the two books are so different that it is impossible to claim for them the same author. The author of this book surpasses 2 Maccabees in offensively seeking after artificial, and hence very frequently obscure phrases (e. g. ἡ παρθένος ἐπιφάνεια, ἡ ἐπιφάνεια, etc.), in rare words or such as occur nowhere else (e. g. 20, ii, 29; 20, v; yet the two books are so different that it is impossible to claim for them the same author.
book (e.g. its beginning with Ἰδὲ Φωτιώτης, and its reference, in τῶν προσωδολογίων, ii, 25, to some passage not contained in the present narrative), which has led to the supposition that it is either a mere fragment of a larger work (Ewald, Davidson, etc.), or that the beginning only has been lost (Grimm, Keil, etc.). Against the latter view, Gritz rightly urges that it most thoroughly and in a most complete manner carries through its design.

All the attempts to determine the age of the book are based upon pure conjecture, and entirely depend upon the views entertained by the editors, as may be seen from the two extremes between which its date has been placed. Thus Allin (Judgment of the Jewish Church, p. 67) will have it that "it was written by a Jew of Egypt, under Pontius Pilate, it. e. about B.C. 200;" while Grimm places it about A.D. 39 or 40.

V. Canonicity.—Like the other Apocrypha, this book was never part of the Jewish canon. In the Apostolic canons, however, which are assigned to the 3d century, it is considered as sacred writing (Clem. 85); Theodoret, too (die cir. A.D. 437), quotes it as such (in Dan. xi, 7). It was never accepted in the Western churches, and formed no part of the Roman Vulgate; it was therefore not received into the canon of the Catholic Church, nor inserted as a rubric in the Apocrypha contained in the translation of the Bible made by the Reformers.

VI. Versions and Literature.—The Greek is contained in the Athens papyrus, discovered in 1844; it is given in the London Polyglot, and has lately been published by De Lagarde, Codex Vetus Testamenti Apocryphi (London, 1861). It is the Latin version of it given in the Complutensian Polyglot; another Latin version, by F. Nubilus, is given in the London Polyglot; the first German translation, as far as we can trace it, is given in the Zurich Bible printed by Froescher (1801); another, by Joachim Crenberger, appeared in Wittenberg (1534); De Wette, in the first edition of his translation of the Bible, made conjointly with Auguste (1809-14), also gave a version of this book, which is now excluded from his Bible; and another German version is given in Guttmann’s translation of the Apocrypha (Altna. 1811). The first English version was published by Walter Lyneus in 1550, which was appended with some few alterations, to the Bible printed by John Daye (1551), and reprinted separately in 1568; a new and better version, with some notes, was published by Whitton, Authorick Records (London. 1727), i, 162-208; a third version, in the Bible printed by John Hussey (1680); Notes (Bath, 1785); and a fourth version, with brief but useful notes, was made by Cotton, The Five Books of Maccabees (Oxford, 1832).


MACCABEES, THE FOURTH BOOK OF (a), though not given in the Roman Vulgate, and therefore not inserted in the Apocrypha contained in the Bibles translated by the Reformers, yet exists in Greek in two leading manuscripts. One of them is the text of its most authentic narrative circulation, may be called the received or common text, is contained in the early edition of the Sept. printed at Strasburg, 1526, Basel, 1545 and 1550, Frankfurt, 1597, Basel, 1689, and in the editions of Josephus's work, and is given in the purest form in Bekker's edition of Josephus (Leips. 1856-56, 6 vols.). The other is the Alexandrian, or that of the Codex Alexandrinus, and is the more ancient and preferable one; it is contained in the editions of the Sept. by Grafe and Breitinger, and is adopted, with some few alterations after the common text, in Apel's edition of the Apocrypha (Leips. 1837). See Schaack, De libro sic Maccabaeorum qui Josepho tribuit (Kopenagen, 1814).

1. Title.—This book is called 4 Maccab. (Μακκαβαίων ἢ τιτάραγμα τῶν Μακκαβαίων βιβλίον) in the various MSS. in the Codex Alexandrinus and Synecdotus (p. 529, 9, and 580, 17, ed. Dind.); in Cod. Paris. A, it is denominated 4 Maccob, a Treatise on Reagon (Μακκαβαίων τίταραγμα περὶ σωφρός λογος), by Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiast. iii, 10, b) and Jerome (Collat. Sacr. i, 10). It is called on the dspeurovtpa of Reagon (περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογοῦ), and in the editions of Josephus's works, Josephus's Treatise on the Maccabees (Φαλαβ. Ἰσχυρὸς τοῖς Μακκαβαίοις λόγος). 2. Design, Division, and Contents.—The design of this book is to encourage the Jews, who—being surrounded by a philosophic heathenism, and taunted by its moral and devout followers with the trivial nature and apparent absurdity of some of the Mosaic precepts—were in danger of being led astray from their faith, to abide faithfully by the Mosaic law, and to stimulate them to observe it in a manner not akin to that of the heathen, by convincing them of the reasonableness of their divine law, and its unparalleled power to control the human passions (comp. xviii, 1). To carry out this design the book is divided into two parts, opening with an introduction, as follows:

1. The first part, comprising ch. i, 1-12, contains the summary of the whole book, and the grand problem for discussion, viz. whether the rational will, permeated and regulated by true piety, has perfect mastery over the passions (σὺν αὐθεντικῶς τοῖς παθήσεσι); an advocate of the character and conduct of these martyrs (xvii, 1-21, 23), showing that the Israelites alone are invincible in their struggles for virtue (ὅπη μείζος μισεῖ τοὺς Ἰσραήλιτας τιράννοις τῶν Ἰουδαίων νύν άναγινώσκειν). Ch. xviii, 21-23, is evidently a later addition.

3. The second part, comprising chap. iii, 20-xxvii, 20, demonstrates the proposition that sanctified reason has the mastery over the passions, and that by the example of the Maccabean martyrs (iii, 20-iv, 26) narrated in the book. It comprises 2 Macc. iii. iv, 17-17, 1, 5, 5-11; describes the martyrdom of Eleazar (v, 17-19), and the seven brothers (v, 11-18), with moral reflections on it (xvii, 1-21, 23), as well as the virtuous life of Judith (xviii, 1-13, 20). It contains a noble account of the death of their mother (xviii, 11-xxvii, 6), and then deduces the lessons to be learned from the character and conduct of these martyrs (xvii, xxvii, 2), showing that the Israelites alone are invincible in their struggles for virtue (ὅπη μείζος μισεῖ τοὺς Ἰσραήλιτας τιράννοις τῶν Ἰουδαίων νύν άναγινώσκειν). Ch. xviii, 21-23, is evidently a later addition.

3. Author, Date, and Original Language.—In harmony with the general tradition, Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiast. iii, 10, Jerome (Catalog. Script. Eccl. a. Χριστοῦ, Photius (ap. Photostorgiu, Hist. Ecc. i), Suidas (s. v. καθενή), the Church Fathers, and the MSS., and Handbuch zu den Apokryphen d. A. T. (Leips. 1857), p. 218 sq., as well as the editions of Josephus's works, ascribe the authorship of this book to the celebrated Jewish historian Flavius Josephus. But this is utterly at variance with the style and structure of the book itself, and has most probably arisen from a confusion of the name Josephus, which may have been written by some one of the name of Josephus, or from the fact that it was regarded as supplementary to this historian, and hence was appended to his writings. Not only is the language quite different from that of Josephus's writings, but—1. In 4 Macc. all the proper names in the Bible, except Ἱεροσολύμων and Ἐλασσάρας, are retained in their Hebrew form, and treated as indeclinable (e.g. Αβραάμος, Ισαάς, Ноης), whereas Josephus gives them a Greek termination. 2
Maccabees, Books of 614 Maccabees, Books of

Fourth Macc. derives its historical matter from 2 Macc., as we have seen in the preceding section, or perhaps from the original work of Jason; while Josephus manifests utter ignorance about the existence of this work. 8. The historical blunders contained in this book (iv, 15, 26; v, x, xi; xxii, 22, 23, etc.) are such as demonstrate that they never have committed. 4. The form and tone of the book unquestionably show that the writer was an Alexandrian Jew, who resided in Egypt or somewhere far away from the Holy Land—comp. iv, 5, 20, etc., where the writer speaks of 'our fatherland' i. e. the Holy Land far away. From this and other passages in which the Temple is spoken of as still existing, and from the fact that xiv, 9 speaks of the Egyptian Jews as having enjoyed external peace and security at the time when this book was written, Grimm dates it before the fall of Jerusalem and the persecutions of the Egyptians by the Jews of Caligua, i. e. B.C. 89 or 40.

That the Greek is the original language of the book requires no proof. The style is very pompous, flowery, vigorous, and truly Greek. The author's eloquence, however, is not that of a sudden burst of a heart inspired with the grandeur of the divine theme (sacellum) upon which he discourses, but is produced artificially by resorting to exaltations and apostrophes (v, 33, etc.; vii, 6, 9, 10, 15; viii, 15, 18, xi, 14, etc.), dialogues and monologues (viii, 16-19; xvi, 5-10), etc. Such a style is found in the History of Polybius (ii, 27, 28, 35, 5, 7), and the author abounds in έν θείᾳ γένεσι (i, 27, 29; ii, 9; iv, 18; xi, 16; vii, 17; xii, 15; xii, 4; xiii, 24; xiv, 15, 18, xvi, 26; xvii, 5).

IV. Canonicity and Importance. Among the Jewish books of the Old Testament, and those of the first century, writers were acquainted with it, and Gregory of Nazianzen, Augustine, Jerome, etc. quoted with respect its description of the Maccabean martyrs; yet it was never regarded as canonical or sacred. As a historical document the narrative is of no value. Its interest centres in the accounts of Alexander's death, and the unique example of the usage which the Jews made of their history. Ewald (Geschichte, iv, 556) rightly compares it with the sermon of later times, in which a scriptural theme becomes the subject of an elaborate and practical comment. The philosophical tone of the book is essentially stilted, but the story is that of a stirring and bloody war. The dictates of reason are supported by the remembrance of noble traditions, and by the hope of a glorious future. The prospect of the life to come is clear and wide. The faithful are seen to rise to endless bliss; the wicked to descend to torment. But in all this, while the writer shows, in this respect, the effects of the full culture of the Alexandrian school, and in part advances beyond his predecessors, he offers no trace of that deep spiritual insight which was quickened by Christianity. The Jew stands alone, isolated by character and by blessing (comp. Gfror. Philo, etc., ii, 176). Still the book is of great importance, inasmuch as it illustrates the history, doctrines, and moral philosophy of the Jewish people prior to the advent of Christ. It shows that the Jews believed that human reason, in its natural state, has no power to subdue the passion of the heart, and that it is only able to do it when sanctified by the religion of the Bible (v, 21, 29; vi, 17, 18); that the souls of all men continue to live after the death of the body; that all will rise, both righteous and wicked, to receive their judgment for the deeds done in the body (v, 85; ix, 8; xii, 13, 14; xvi, 22, 27, 17, 18); that this is taught in the Pentateuch (comp. xviii, 18, with Deut. xxi, 3); and that the death of the righteous is a vicarious atonement (vi, 29). Allusion seems also to be made in the N. T. to some passages of this book (2 Cor. xi, 9; Rev. xiv, 2; Matt. xi, 26; Rom. vi, 10; xiv, 8; Gal. xi, 19; 4 Macc. xii, 11, with Acts xxiv, 27; xvi, 26: 4 Macc. xii, 14, with Luke xvi, 22, 23: 4 Macc. xvi, 22, with Luke xx, 87).

V. Versions and Exegetical Helps. — The book was translated into Syriac, the MS. of which is in the Am-
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period, is to a great extent parallel with 1 and 2 Macc., whilst the second part, which records the post-Maccabean history down to the birth of Christ (xxi-lix), is parallel with Josephus, Ant. xiii, 15-17; War, i, 3-17. The historical worth of 5 Macc. is therefore easily ascertained by comparing its narrative with that of 1 and 2 Macc., and with the corresponding portions of Josephus. By this means it will be seen that, notwithstanding its several historical and chronological blunders (compare 5 Macc. x, 16, 17, with 2 Macc. x, 29; 5 Macc. ix, with 1 Macc. vii, 7; 5 Macc. viii, 1-3, with 1 Macc. ix, 78; xii, 49; Joseph. Ant. xiii, 11; 5 Macc. xx, 17, with 1 Macc. xiv, 15; 5 Macc. xx, 1-8, with 1 Macc. xix, 12), especially when recording foreign history (comp. 5 Macc. xiii), it is a trustworthy and valuable narrative. There can be no question of its being a new attempt or a mistake committed by transcribers (e.g., the name Felix, which stands five times for three different persons, 5 Macc. iii, 14; vii, 8, 34, comp. with 1 Macc. iii, 10; 2 Macc. v, 22; viii, 33; the name Gorgias, 5 Macc. x, is a mistake for Timotheus), as is evident from 2 Macc. x; Joseph. Ant. xii, 11; so also two for nine, 5 Macc. vi, 9); and that, as a whole, it is far more simple and natural, and far less blundering and unscrupulous, and therefore more credible than 2 Macc. As to its religious character, the book shows most distinctly that the Jews of those days firmly believed in the survival of the soul after the death of the body, in a general resurrection of the dead, and in a future judgment (v, 12, 13, 17, 22, 43, 48-51; lix, 14, etc.).

IV. Author, Date, and Original Language.—This book is a compilation, made in Hebrew, by a Jew who lived after the destruction of Jerusalem, from ancient Hebrew memoirs or chronicles, which were written shortly after the events transpired. This is evident from the whole complexion of the document, even in the translation— for the original has not as yet come to light—as may be seen from the few features here offered for considerations: 1. When speaking of the dead (xx, 11, 15; xii, 1; xxi, 17) the compiler uses the well-known euphemism, God be merciful to him in Hebrew עתיר ליה ותיר, to whom be peace ותיר ליה ותיר, which came into vogue among the Jews in the Talmudic period (comp. Toseph. Chal. 100, 4; Zunz, Zur Geschichte, p. 888), and are used among the Jews to the present day, thus showing that the compiler was a Jew, and lived after the destruction of the Temple. 2. He calls the Hebrew Scriptures (iii, 5, 9) the twenty-four books =-twenty-four books =-twenty-four books =-twenty-four books, a name which is thoroughly Jewish and was used very long after the close of the Hebrew canon; leaves Tobit (Tob.), the Hebrew name for the Pentateuch, untranslated (xxi, 9), in accordance with the Jewish custom; speaks of the deity as the great and good God יְשׁוּעַ וַתִּיָּרְסַל, and names Jerusalem the holy of holies בֵּית הַיָּרְסָל וֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל. In conclusion, the book is a Hebrew composition, not in any sense a compilation from Gentile sources.
MACEDONIA


Macedo, Antonio de, a Portuguese Jesuit and writer, was born at Coimbra in 1612. He was regent and instructor among the Jesuits, and passed two years in the African missions. He had charge of the confessional of the Vatica

n Church until 1671, from which time he directed the College of Evora, and afterwards that of Lisbon. He died at Lisbon in 1688. His works are, among others, Elogia normallia et descriptio Coronationis Christianae, regna Suecia (Stockholm, 1650): —

Lusitania infulata et purpurata, seu pontificii et cardinalibus illustrata (Paris, 1668, 1673, 4to). De Vida et Mortuis Joannis de Almeida (Padua, 1669; Rome, 1671): —

Dei tutela orbis Christiani (Lisbon, 1687).

Macedo, Francisco de, a Portuguese Jesuit and prolific writer, was born at Coimbra in 1596, entered the Jesuit order at fourteen, and became successively teacher of rhetoric, philosophy, and chronology. In 1630 he left the Jesuits and entered the order of Cordeliers, with the surname François de Saint-Augustin, under which most of his works are published. He was called to the professorship of polemic theology in the College of the Propaganda at Rome, and afterwards (1657) visited Venice, lecturing de omni re scibili. He occupied the chair of moral philosophy at the University of Padua from 1667 until the time of his death in May, 1680. In 1673 he had composed 53 panegyrics, 60 Latin discourses, 82 funeral orations, 123 elegies, 115 epitaphs, 212 dedicatory epitaphs, 700 familiar epistoles, 2690 epic poems, 110 odes, 3000 epigrams, 4 Latin comedies, 2 tragedies, and 1 Spanish satire. He had a sharp discussion with cardinal Bona on the subject of subdissociation, and with cardinal Noris on the monachism of St. Augustine. Among his writings are Apologia S. Francisci Xaverii (Lisbon, 1620, 8vo), an epic poem; — Theorcuria Eruditionis pro sole, Viridarium eloquentiae (denoting the author's title of '... Professor of Eloquence in St. Augustine's Benedictine...') (Paris, 1648, 4to; 8th edit. Lond, 1654): — Controversia ecclesiastica inter F. P. Minores (1653, 8vo): — Lexicon Lusitanum, contra tubum Anglicum (Lond, 1652, 4to): — Encyclopedias in Agonem literarum prodita (Rome, 1657): — De clavis Patris, iv lib. (Rome, 1660): — Theatrum Meteorologicum (Rome, 1661, 8vo): — Scholae Theologiae positionis (Rome, 1664): — Medulla historiae ecclesiasticae emaculata: — Collectiones doctrinæ S. Thomæ et Scoti, cum differentiis inter utrumque (Padua, 1671, 2 vols.); — Joannis Bonæ Doctrinae de usu fermenti in sacrificiis manis (Innsbruck [Venice], 1673, 8vo); — Digestus divi Augustini sive et fermentati (Verona, 1673, 4to): — Myrothecium morale documentarum xii (Padua, 1675, 4to): — Schema Congregationis S. Officii Romani cum elogii cardinalium et cordinarum de insuffici et autoritate summi pontificis in mysteria fidelis professedorum (Padua, 1676, 4to): — Elogia poetarum in Resp. Venedicorum cum iconibus (Padua, 1680): — De Incarnationis Mysterio (Padua, 1681), containing also Itinerarium sancti Augustini. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, s. v.; Wetzer und Wester, Kirchen-Lexikon, xii, 749.

Macedonia (Macedonía, from a supposed founder Macedos or Macedon), a people originally confined to the district lying north of Thessaly, east of the Macedonian mountains (a prolongation of Mount Findus), and west of the River Axios; but afterwards extended to the country lying to the north of Greece Proper, having, on the east Thrace and the Egean Sea, on the west the Aegean Sea, the Illyria, on the south the Peloponnesus and Messenia, and on the south Thessaly and Epirus. "In a rough and popular description it is enough to say that Macedonia is the region bounded inland by the range of Haemus or the Balkan northwards and the chain of Findus westwards, beyond which the streams flow respectively to the Danube and Adriatic; that is separated from Thessaly on the south by the Cambunian hills, running easterly from Findus to Olympus and the Egean; and that it is divided on the east from Thrace by a less definite mountain boundary running southwards from Haemus. Of the space thus inclosed, two of the most remarkable physical features are two great plains, one watered by the Axios, which comes to the sea at the Thermic Gulf, not far from Thessalonica; the other by the Strymon, which, after passing near Philippi, flows out below Amphipolis. Between the mouths of these two rivers a remarkable peninsula projects, dividing itself into three points, on the farthest of which Mount Athos rises nearly into the region of perpetual snow." The whole region was intersected by mountains (among those were the famous Olympus and Athos), which supplied numerous streams (especially the Strymon and Axios), rendering the intervening valleys and plains highly fruitful (Pliny, iv, 17; Mela, ii, 8; Psol. iii, 13). The natives were celebrated from the earliest times for their hardy independence and military discipline. The country is supposed to have been first peopled by Chittim or Kittim, a son of Javan (Gen. x, 4), and in that case it is probable that the Macedonians are sometimes intended when the word Chittim occurs in the Old Testament. Macedonia was the original kingdom of Philip and Alexander, by means of whose victories the name of the Macedonians became celebrated throughout the East. The rise of the great empire formed by Alexander is described by the prophet Daniel under the emblem of a goat with one horn (Dan. viii, 5—8). As the horn was a general symbol of power, the oneness of the horn implies merely the unity of that power. It is, however, curious and interesting to know that Daniel did describe Macedonia under its usual symbol, as gems and other antique objects still exist in which that country is represented under the figure of a one-horned goat. (See Murray's Truth of Revelation Illustrated, and the art. Macedonia, in Taylor's Calmet.) See GOAT. Monuments are still extant in which this symbol occurs, as one of the pilasters of Persepolis, where a goat is depicted with one immense horn on his forehead, and a Persian holding the horn, by which is intended the subjection of Macedon by Persia. In Eath. xvi, 10, Haman is described as a Macedonian,
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and in xvi, 14 he is said to have contrived his plot for the purpose of transferring the kingdom of the Persians to the Macedonians. This sufficiently betrays the late date and spurious character of these apocryphal chapters; but it is curious thus to have our attention turned to the early struggle of Persia and Greece. Macedonia played a great part in this struggle, and there is little doubt that Achaemenus is Xerxes. The history of the Macedceans opens with vivid allusions to Alexander, the son of Philip, the Macedonian king (Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ τοῦ Φίλιππου ὁ βασιλεύς ὁ Μακεδών), who came out of the land of Chettim and smote Darius, king of the Persians and Medes (1 Mac. i, 1), and who reigned first among the Grecians (ib. vi, 2). A little later we have the Roman conquest of Perusia, “king of the Citimna,” recorded (ib. viii, 5). Subsequently in these Jewish annals we find the term “Macedonians” used for the soldiers of the Seleucid successors of Alexander (2 Mac. viii, 20). In what is called the Fifth Book of Maccabees this usage of the word is very frequent, and is applied not only to the Seleucid princes at Antioch, but to the Ptolemies at Alexandria (see Cotton’s Fire Books of Maccabees, Ox. 1632). When subdued by the Romans (Livy, xlv) under Paulus Emillius (B.C. 169), Macedonia was divided into four provinces (Livy, xlv, 29). Macedonia Prima was on the east of the Strymon, and had Amphipolis for the capital. Macedonia Secunda was stretched between the Strymon and the Axios, with Thessalonica for its metropolis. The third and fourth districts lay to the south and the west. Of two, if not three of these districts, coins are still extant (Akerman, Numismatic Illust. of the N. T. p. 48). Afterwards (B.C. 142) the whole of Greece was divided into two great provinces, Macedonia and Achaia. See ACHAIAS; GREECE.

Macedonia therefore constituted a Roman province, governed by a procurator, with the title of proconsul (provincia proconsularia; Tacit. Annal. i, 76; Sueton. Claud. 20), in the time of Christ and his apostles. (See finally in Smith’s Dict. of Christ. Geog. a. v.) The apostle Paul being summoned in a vision, while at Troas, to preach the Gospel in Macedonia, proceeded thither, and founded the churches of Thessalonica and Philippi (Acts xvi, 9). A.D. 48. This occasions repeated mention of the name, either alone (Acts xvi, 5; xix, 21; Rom. xv, 26; 2 Cor. i, 16; xi, 9; Phil. iv, 15), or along with Achaia (2 Cor. ix, 2; 1 Thess. i, 5). The principal cities of Macedonia were Amphipolis, Thessalonica, Pella, and Pelagonia (Livy, xiv, 29); the towns of the province named in the New Testament are Philipopolis, Nicopolis, Apollonia, and Berea.

When the Roman empire was divided, Macedonia fell to the share of the emperor of the East, but in the 16th century it fell into the hands of the Turks. It now forms a part of Turkey in Europe, and is called Ottoman Macedonia. It is inhabited by Albanians, Vlachs, Turks, Greeks, and Albanians. The north-eastern part is under the pasha of Salonika; the southern under beys or agas, or forms free communities. The capital, Salonika, the ancient Thessalonica, is a commercial town, and the only one of any consequence, containing about 70,000 inhabitants. (See Cellari, Notiz. ii, 828 sq.; Mannert, vii, 420 sq.; Conybeare and Howison, i, 115.) On the question whether Luke includes Thrace in Macedonia, see Thrace.

“Nothing can exceed the interest and impressiveness of the occasion (Acts xvi, 9) when a new and religious meaning was given to the well-known Provincia Macedonia. Then this part of Europe was designated as the first to be trodden by an apostle. The account of St. Paul’s first journey through Macedonia (Acts xvi, 10–xvii, 15) is marked by copious detail and well-defined incidents. At the close of this journey he returned from Corinth to Syria by sea. On the next occasion of visiting Europe, though he both went and returned through Macedonia (Acts xx, 1–6), the narrative is a very slight sketch, and the route is left uncertain except as regards Philippi. Many years elapsed before St. Paul visited this province again; but from 1 Tim. i, 8, it is evident that he did accomplish the wish expressed during his first imprisonment (Phil. ii, 24). The character of the Macedonian Christians is set before us in Scripture in a very favorable light. The candor of the Bereans is highly commended (Acts xvii, 11); the Thessalonians were evidently objects of St. Paul’s peculiar affection (1 Thess. ii, 8, 17–20; iii, 10); and the Philippians, besides their general freedom from blame, are noted as remarkable for their liberality and self-denial (Phil. iv, 10, 14–19; see 2 Cor. ix, 2; xi, 9). It is worth noticing, as a fact almost typical of the change which Christianity has produced in the social life of Europe, that the female element is conspicuous in the records of its introduction. The Gospel was first preached there to a small congregation of women (Acts xvi, 14); the first convert was a woman (ib. ver. 14); and, at least at Philippi, women were prominent as active workers in the cause of religion (Phil. iv, 2, 3). It should be observed that, in St. Paul’s time, Macedon was well intersected by Roman roads, especially by the great Via Egnatia, which connected Philippi and Thessalonica, and also led towards Illyricum (Rom. xv, 19).” For the antiquities of this region, see Consid, Voyage dans le Macedoine (Paris, 1861); Leake, Travels in Northern Greece (London, 1855); compare also Holland, Travels in the Ionian Isles, etc. (Lond. 1812–18).

Maced’onian (Μακεδόνιος) occurs in the A.V. of the N. T. only in Acts xxvii, 2. In the other cases (Acts xvi, 9; xix, 29; 2 Cor. ix, 2, 4) our translators render it “of Macedonia.” The “Macedonians” are also mentioned in the Apocrypha (Esth. xvi, 10, 14; 1 Mac. i, 1; 2 Mac. xv, 20). See MACEDONIA.

Macedonians. See MACEDONIUS.

Macedonius, a patriarch of Constantinople, flourished in the 8th century. After the death of Emperor Constans, in 886, Macedonius and Paulus became candidates for his succession. The latter was elected by the Athenasian party, but was soon after (888).
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deposed by the emperor Constance, who put Eusebius of Nicomedia in his place. Upon the death of Euse-
bius, Paulinus was reinstated, but was again deposed by the Semi-Arian emperor, who in 342 pronounced Ma-
decius patriarch, notwithstanding the opposition of the presbyter Quinis. Paulinus, in insurrection, resulting in a
bloody bloodshed (comp. Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire [Milman's ed., ii], 387 sq.). The orthodox rivals,
however, succeeded, after a time, in making his influence felt throughout the country, and Macedonius was finally
ousted to yield him the patriarchal throne, after having thoroughly reorganized his party, Macedonius returned,
and by the aid of the civil authorities regained
the监督推翻的教会。
His decided connection with the Semi-Arians, and the widening of the
gulf between the Arians and Semi-Arians, proved, however, fatal to his credit, and in 386 his enemies suc-
ceeded in securing his deposition by a synod at Con-
stantinople. He is supposed to have died soon after.
His followers at once adopted his name. The Macedo-
ni-ans are generally regarded as Semi-Arians of that
period, especially those in and around Constantinople,
in Thrace, and in the surrounding provinces of Asia
Minor (Sozomen, iv, 27). There is, however, one point
in which the Macedonians, although not opposed to, are
yet distinguished from the Semi-Arians; it is their idea
of the antagonism of the divinity and the homoousia of
the Holy Ghost. On this point the Macedonians are
identical with the Pneumatomachians, and therefore the
latter finally joined the former. They professed that
the Holy Spirit is a divine energy diffused throughout
the universe, but denied its being distinct, as a person,
from the Father and the Son (Ephraem, Harv. 74: Augustin,
De Hare, c. 52). In 381 Theodosius the Great
assembled a council of one hundred and fifty bishops at
Constantinople (second ecumenical), which condemned
this doctrine, and the Macedonians soon after disappear-
ed. See Mosheim, Eccle. Hist. i, 803 sq. (N. Y. 1854, 3
vol., i, 293); Ellicott, Hist. of the Greek Church, ii, 115 (N.
York, 1856); Basilius, De Spiritu S. opp. (ed. Gars.), iii,
1 sq.; Thilo, Bibl. pp. Gr. dogm. i, 606 a; ii, 182 a; A.
Mai, Nov. pastr. bibl. t. iv (Rom. 1847); Didymus, De Spirit.
Solo. interpr. Hier. (in Opp. Hier. ed. Mart. iv, i, 494 sq.);
Walch, Ketzergeschichte, vol. iii; Bauer, Dreissigkate-
llekere, vol. i; Neander, Hist. of Christ. Dogm. i, 356 sq.;
Milman, Lat. Christianity, i, 384, 388 sq. (J. H. W.)

MAC GILL, STEVENSON, D.D., a Scotch divinity of con-
siderable note, was born at Port Glasgow Jan. 19, 1765,
of pious parents. He early chose the service of his
Master, and conducted all his studies with a view to the
ministry. He was educated at the University of Glas-
gow, and was licensed to preach in 1780; was appoint-
ed minister at Eastwood in 1791; was transferred in 1797
to the Tron Church, Glasgow, and later (1814) was also
made a professor of theology in his alma mater. He
died Aug. 18, 1839. Dr. Mac Gill "commended himself
to every man's conscience" not only by his ability in
the pulpit, and his laborious visits of his congrega-
tion and parish, but by the Christian interest he took in
the public institutions and charities of the city—in
the active direction he assumed of the Infirmary, the Pris-
ons, the Mechanics' Village, the Lunatics' Asylum, and its
services were also most zealous and actively rendered to "the
Society for benefiting the Highlands and Islands of
Scotland by means of Gaelic Schools," "the Propaga-
ent of the Gospel in India," and "the Missions on be-
half of India." In 1805 he organized a clerical literary society,
which for many years he act-
ed as secretary. It was after receiving the full ap-
probation and friendly criticism of this literary society that
he favored the world with Considerations addressed to a
Young Clergyman (1803, 12mo), a work which, on its first
appearance, obtained an extensive circulation, and from
the perusal of which no young minister can fail to de-
vote great and permanent advantage. His sermons were
published in 1809. See Bebb, Burns, Memoir of Dr. Mac
Gill (Edinb. 1842, 12mo); Jamieson, Dictionary of Ele-
"ious Biography, s. v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer.
Authors, s. v.

Macherus (Makriopou), a strong fortress of Pe-
rea, first mentioned by Josephus in connection with Al-
exander, the son of Hyrcanus I, by whom it was built
(Ant. xxii, 16, 5; War, vii, 6, 2). It was delivered by his
widow to her son, Aristobulus, who first found his
opponents in Gabinus (Ant. xiv, 5, 2), to whom it afterwards surren-
dered, and by whom it was dismantled (ib. 4; compare
Strabo, xvi, 762). Aristobulus, on his escape from Rome,
again attempted to fortify it, but it was taken after two
days' siege (War, vii, 6). In his account of this last
capture by the Romans, Josephus gives a detailed descrip-
tion of the place. It was originally a tower built by Alex-
ander Jannæus as a check to the Arab marauders.
It was on a lofty point, surrounded by deep valleys,
and of immense strength, both by nature and art (compare
Pinax, Hist. Nat., v, 15). After the fall of Jerusalem it
was occupied by the Jewish banditti. The Jews say
that it was visible from Jerusalem (Schwarz, Palestine,
p. 54). Its site was identified in 1806 by Seetzen with
the extensive ruins now called Marawer, on a rocky
spur jutting out from Jebel Attaraya to the north,
and overlooking the valley of Zedek Maar (Reiss, i, 380-4).
Josephus expressly states that it was the place
of John the Baptist's beard (Ant. xviii, 5, 2), al-
though he had said immediately before (ib. 2) that it
was at the time in the possession of Aretas. See John the Baptist.

Machar, John, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was
born in Brechin, Scotland, in 1796. He was educated at
King's College, Aberdeen, and afterwards at the Uni-
versity of Edinburgh. On receiving license to preach,
he became assistant to the parish minister, and in 1828
emigrated to Canada, and took charge of the Church
in Kingston, Upper Canada. In 1836 he was made mem-
ber of the synod; and at a meeting of lay delegates, as-
sembled from all parts of the province, he was nominated
commissioner to proceed to Britain, and attend to the
interests of the Canadian branch of the Church of Scotland
in one of the next Assembly meetings. From 1846 to 1858
he was acting principal of Queen's College, Kingston,
in which institution, during several sessions, he taught
the Hebrew classes, and examined the candidates for license
in the Oriental tongues. He died Feb. 7, 1863. Dr.
Machar's attainments both in sacred and secular learn-
ing were extensive and varied; he was familiar with
both Hebrew and Greek literature, and could read with
ease Hebrew, Greek, and the modern languages. He
was always a close student, an earnest preacher, and a faithful pastor. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 588.

Machault, Jacques, a French Jesuit, was born at Paris in 1568; entered the order at eight years, and
afterwards taught ethics and philosophy, and was rector at
Alencon, Orleans, and Caen. He died in 1680 at
Paris. His works are, De Missionibus Paragrigiae et
alia in America meridionalia (Paris, 1638, 8vo)—De Re-
bus Japonicis (Paris, 1646, 8vo)—De Regno Cochins-
hesni (Paris, 1652, 8vo)—De Missionibus in India (Paris, 1659, 8vo)—De Missionibus religiosorum Soc. Jesu
in Persida (Paris, 1659, 8vo)—De Regno Maduraensi (Paris,

Machault, Jean de, a French Jesuit, was born
at Paris Oct. 25, 1651; was admitted into the order in
1579; became professor of rhetoric at the College de
Clermont, Paris, and afterwards rector of the College
of Rouen. He died as provincial of Champagne March
25, 1619, at Paris. He published In Jacobis Thucani
historiarum libros notationes lectoribus utiles et necessasria
(Ingolstadt, 4to), which was condemned to be burned.
See Hoefer, Bk. Geneal., s. v.

Machault, Jean-Baptiste de, a French schol-
ar and Jesuit, nephew of the foregoing, was born at Paris
in 1591. He taught rhetoric at Paris, and directed suc-
cessively the colleges of Rouen and Nevers. He died
at Pontolese May 22, 1640. His works are, among others,
S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiep. de Fidelitate Sancto-
rum Dixit, ex scriptura Eusebii Angelo, canon. reg-
ularii (Paris, 1639, 8vo) — Histoire des évêques d'Evreux:
— Gesta a Soc. Jes. in Regno Sinaem, Aethiopiaco, et Ti-

Mach'banai (Heb. Makbēnāy, מַ֣כְבֶּןָי, binding, or perhaps clad with a mantle; Sept. Μακβασσαβαν v. r. Μακβα-
σαβαν; Vulg. Machbanai), the eleventh of the Gadite braves who joined David's troop in the wilderness of Adullam (1 Chron. xii, 18). B.C. cir. 1061.

Mach'benah (Heb. Makhībān, מַכִּבְנָה, something bound on, perh. a cloak; Sept. Maphiaspavai v. r. Maphia-
spavan; Vulg. Machbanai), apparently native in the tribe of Judah founded by (a person of that name, the son of) Sheva (1 Chron. ii, 49), and probably situated in the vicinity of Gibeah, in connection with which it is mentioned. It is thought to have been the same with Can-
bas (Josh. xv, 40).

Machet, GERARD DE GIRARD, a French cardinal, confessor of Charles VII, he was born at Blois in 1390; en-
tered the College de Navarre, Paris, in 1391; was made doctor of divinity in 1411; attached himself to the Col-
lege de Navarre as professor, was made vice-chancellor of that institution, and as such addressed the emperor Sigis-
mond in 1416. Driven from his college by the Burgund-
ian invasion (3 May, 1418), he became the confessor of his pupil, the future emperor, Charles VII. He lived a while at Lyons. Machet was one of the clergy who conducted the examination of the Maid of Orleans. His influence in Troyes, Champagne, was powerful in open-
ing the city and province to the army of Charles VII. Machet was successively canon of Paris, Chartres, Tours, and in 1432 bishop of Caen. He died at Tours July 17, 1448. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Ma'chhi (Heb. Makhi, מַקְחִי, milking; Sept. Marxayi, Vulg. Machi), the father of Geuel, which latter was the commissioner on the part of the tribe of Gad to explore Canaan (Num. xiii, 15). B.C. ant. 1657.

Ma'chir (Heb. Makhīr, מַכִּיר, sold; Sept. Mayyip and Mophi), the name of two men.

1. The oldest son of Manasseh (Josh. xvii, 1), who even children born to him during the lifetime of Jo-
seph (Gen. i, 22). B.C. 1907. His descendants were
called Machrites (מערות, Sept. Mayyyioph, Numm. xxvi,
29), being the offspring of Gilead (1 Chron. vii, 17), whose posterity settled in the land taken from the Amorites (Numm. xxxiii, 39; Deut. iii, 18; Josh. xiii, 81; 1 Chron. ii, 23), but required a special enactment as to the right of owning to the fact that the grandson Zelophehad had only daughters (Numm. xxxvi, 1; xxvii, 1; Josh. xvii, 8). One of the name of Machir is put po-
etically as a representative of the tribe of Manasseh east (Judg. v, 14). His daughter became the mother of Se-
gub by Hezron in his old age (1 Chron. ii, 21). The mother of Machir was an Armitite, and his father was Ma,
chah, the granddaughter of Benjamin, by whom he had several sons (1 Chron. vii, 14-16). "The family of Machir come forward prominently in the history of the conquest of the trans-Jordanic portion of the Promised Land. In the joint expedition of Israel and Ammon, their warlike prowess expedited the Amoritis inhabitants from the rugged and difficult range of Gilead, and their bravery was rewarded by Moses by the assignment to them of a large portion of the district, 'half Gilead' (Josh. xiii, 31), with its rich mountain pastures, and the towns of Ajalon and Edrei, the capital of Gilead's king-
dom (Numm. xxxii, 39; Deut. iii, 15; Josh. xiii, 31; xvii, 1). The warlike renown of the family of Machir is given as the reason for this grant (Josh. xvii, 1), and we can see the sound policy of assigning a frontier land of so much importance to the safety of the whole coun-
try. The next time to the eastern slope of the Syrian and Assyrian invasions, and to the never-ceasing predatory inroads of the wild desert tribes, to a clan whose prowess and skill in battle had fully proved in the subjugation of so difficult a tract (i.e., Assy-
ria, S. and Pol. p. 327)." "The connection with Ben-
jamin may perhaps have led to the selection by Abner of Mahanaim, which lay on the boundary between Gad and Manasseh, as the residence of Ishbosheth (2 Sam. ii, 8), and that with Judah may have also in-
fluenced his choice to go so far north when driven out of his kingdom."

2. A descendant of the preceding, son of Ammiel, re-
siding at Lo-debar, who maintained the lance son of Jonathan until provision was made for him by David's care (2 Sam. ix, 4, 5), and afterwards extended his hos-
bandly care to the sons of Shimeah (2 Sam. xxiv, 27). B.C. 1087-1023. Josephus calls him the chief of the country of Gilead (Ant. vii, 9, 8). See David.

Ma'chirite (Numm. xxvi, 29). See Machir, 1.

Ma'chmas (Maayyaa), 1 Masc. ix, 73; elsewhere Michmagh (q. v.).

Machnad'obal (Heb. Maktobalīy, מַכְּנוֹדָבָל, perh.
what is like the liberal? other copies read Maktobalāy, Maktobalay; Sept. Mayyaddasbo v. r. Mayyaddasbo; Vulg. Methucbediobos, an Israelite of the sons of Bani who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile ( Ezra x, 40). B.C. 459.

Macheple'lah (Heb. Maphelāh, מַפְּהֶלָה, probably a por-
tion, but, according to others, double, and so the Sept.
Av, Vulg. B.C.), the name of the town in Edom to which
hebron containing the cave which Abraham bought of Eprhon the Hittite for a family sepulchre (Gen. xxiii, 9), where it is described as being located in one extremi-
ty of the field, and in ver. 17 it is stated to have been
situated "before Mamre," and to have likewise contain-
ted trees. See Mamre. The only persons mentioned in Scripture as buried in this cemetery are Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with their wives Sarah, Rebekah, and Leah (Gen. xxiii, 19; xxxv, 9; xlix, 30; i, 13). "Beyond the passages already cited, the Bible contains no mention either of the name Machpelah or of the sepulchre of the patriarchs. Unless this was the sanctuary of Jebeorah to which Absalom had vowed, or pretended to have vowed, a pilgrimage, when absent in the remote Geshur (2 Sam. xv, 7), no allusion to it has been discovered in the records of David's residence at Hebron, nor yet in those of the Macabees, so many of the sepulchres of the is-
ties were fought in and around it" (Smith). "It is a re-
markable fact that none of the sacred writers refer to this celebrated tomb after the burial of Jacob, though it was unquestionably held in reverence by the Jews in all ages. ... In the time of Josephus, it is observed that 'besides Abraham and his descendants built themselves sepulchres at Hebron (Ant. i, 14), and in another passage he states that the monuments of the patriarchs are 'to this very time showed in Hebron, the structure of which is of beautiful marble, wrought after the most elegant manner' (War, iv, 7, 7). Jerome men-
tions the mausoleum of Abraham at Hebron as standing in his day (Onomast. s. v. Arboch); and in the Jera-
alem Itinerary, a work of the 4th century, it is described as a quadrangular structure built of stones of wonderful beauty (Itin. Hieros. ed. Wessell, p. 599). It is also men-
tioned in Antonius Martyris in the beginning of the 7th century (Itin. 30); by Arculf towards its close (Ear-
ly Travels in Pala, Bohn, p. 7); by Willibald in the 8th (ib. p. 29); by Susewil in the 12th (ib. p. 45); and by numerous others (see Ritter, Pal. and Sgr. iii, 257 sq.)." From these notices, it appears to be certain that the ve-
nerable building which still stands is the same which Josephus describes. Hebron lies in a narrow valley which runs from north to south between low ridges of rocky hills. The modern town is built partly in the bottom of the vale and partly along the lower slope of the eastern ridge. One of the most noticeable of the villages above the latter section of the town, rise the massive walls of the Haram, forming the one distinguishing feature of Hebron, cor-
spacious from all points. The building is rectangular, about 200 feet long by 115 wide, and 50 high. The walls are constructed of massive stones varying from 12 to 20 feet in length, and from 4 to 6 in depth. Dr. Wilson mentions one stone 38 feet long and 3 feet 4 inches in depth, of ancient workmanship (Lands of the Bible, i, 366). The edges of the stones are ground to the depth of about two inches, so that the whole wall has the appearance of being formed of raised panels, like the Temple-wall at Jerusalem. See Masonry. The exterior is further ornamented with pilasters, supporting without capitals a plain moulded cornice. The building is thus unique; there is nothing like it in Syria. The style of its architecture, independent even of the historical notices above given, proves it to be of Jewish origin; and it cannot be much, if at all, later than the days of Solomon. The interior of this massive and most interesting building was described about fifty years ago by a Spaniard, who conformed to Islamism and assumed the name of Ali Bey (Travels, i, 292). The Rev. J. L. Porter was assured when at Hebron, and subsequently by a mollah of rank who had visited the tombs of the patriarchs, that there is an entrance to the cave, which consists of two compartments, and that the guardian can on special occasions enter the outer one (Handbook, p. 69). With this agree the statements of M. Pierotti, of Benjam of Tudela, who gives a description of the caves (Ibis, by Asher, p. 76 sq.), and of others (Wilson, Lands of the Bible, i, 364 sq.). We cannot doubt that the cave of Machpelah, in which the patriarchs were buried, is beneath this venerable building, and that it has been guarded with religious jealousy from the earliest ages; consequently, it is quite possible that some remains of the patriarchs may still lie there. Jacob was embalmed in Egypt, and his body deposited in this place (Gen. i, 2-13). It may still be there perfect as an Egyptian mummy. The Moslem traditions and the cenotaphs within the Haram agree exactly with the Biblical narrative, and form an interesting commentary on Jacob’s dying command — “And be charged them . . . bury me with my fathers . . . in the cave which is in the field of Machpelah, which is before Mamre. . . . There they buried Abraham, and Sarah his wife; there they buried Isaac, and Rebekah his wife; and there I buried Leah” (Gen. xlix, 29-31). There also they buried Jacob. Now within the enclosure are the six cenotaphs only, while the belief is universal among the Mohammedans that the real tombs are in the cave below. Projecting from the west side of the Haram is a little building containing the tomb of Joseph — a Moslem tradition states that his body was first buried at Shechem, but was subsequently transferred to this place (Stanley, Jewish Church, i, 498). The Jews cling around this building still, as they do around the ruins of their ancient Temple — taking pleasure in its stones, and burying its very dust. Beside the principal entrance is a little hole in the wall, at which they are permitted at certain times to pray.” “A belief seems to prevail in the town that the cave communicates with some one of the modern sepulchres at a considerable distance outside of Hebron (Lowe, in Zeitung des Judentums, June 1, 1839). The ancient Jewish tradition ascribes the erection of the mosque to David (Jichus ha-Abodah in Hottinger, Cippi Hebr., 30), thus making it coeval with the pool in the valley below; but, whatever the worth of this tradition, it may well be of the age of Solomon, for the masonry is even more antique in its character than that of the lower portion of the south and south-western walls of the Haram at Jerusalem, which many critics ascribe to Solomon, while even the severest allows it to be of the date of Herod. The date must always remain a mystery, but there are two considerations which may weigh in favor of fixing it very early. 1. That, often as the town of Hebron may have been destroyed, this, being a tomb, would always be spared. 2. It cannot, on architectural grounds, be later than Herod’s time, while, on the other hand, it is omitted from the catalogue given by Josephus of the places which he rebuilt or adorned.” The fullest historical notices of Machpelah will be found in Ritter, Pal. und Syr. vol. iii, and Robinson, Bib. Rev. vol. ii. The chief authorities are Arculf (A.D. 790); Benjam of Tudela (A.D. cir. 1170); the Jewish tract Jichus ha-Abodah (in Hottinger, Cippo Hebraici; and also in Wilson, i, 365); Ali Bey (Travels, A.D. 1807, ii, 232, 233); Giovanni Finati (Life by Bancks, ii, 238); Monro (Summer Rambles in 1833, i, 243); Lowe, in Zeitung des Judentums, 1839, p. 272, 288. In a note by Asher to his edition of Benjamin of Tudela (ii, 92), mention is made of an Arabic MS, in the Bibliothèque Royale at Paris, containing an account of the condition of the mosque under Saladin. This MS has not yet been published. The travels of Ibrahim el-Khijari in 1669-70, a small portion of which, from the manuscript in the Ducal Library at Goa, has been published by Tuch, with translation, etc. (Leipzig, 1850), are said to contain a minute description of the mosque (Tuch, p. 2).
MACHZOR

The best description of the interior is that of Stanley, Jewish Church and Sermons in the East (the two are identical), in which he gives the singular narrative of rabbi Benjamin, and a letter of M. Pierroti, which appeared in the Times immediately after the prince of Wales visit. A plan of the mosque is attached to Stanley's narrative. The description given by Ali Bey (Travels, vol. ii) is substantially the same as that of Dean Stanley. A few words about the exterior, a sketch of the mosaic, and a view of the town, showing the inclosure standing prominently in the foreground, will be found in Bartlett's Guide, etc., p. 216-219. A photograph of the exterior, from the East (?), is given as No. 63 of Palestine as it is, by Rev. G. W. Bridges. A ground-plan exhibiting considerable detail, made by two modern architects who lately superintended some repairs in the Edim, and given by them to Dr. Baron de Jerusalem, is engraved in Osmar's Palestine, Past and Present, p. 364. Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 385 sq., gives some additional particulars; also Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 383 sq. See HIBBON.

Machzor (מקזר, i.e. cycle) is the title of that part of Jewish liturgy which contains generally the prayers used in the synagogues on the Sabbath and feast-days, but particularly those of the three most important Jewish festivals. They are usually rhymical, and are the productions of the most eminent Jewish writers. Unfortunately, many of the modern Jews cannot understand them in the original, and are obliged to have recourse to translations. The art of making such a collection of Sabbath and feast-day prayers, Psiutim (פשטים), is E. Eleazar ben-Jacob Kalir, usually known only as Kalir (ףטיט), who lived in the second half of the 10th century. This was followed by others (Feitanim, פֶּטְטַנִים, פֶּטְטַנִים). The time of the Feitanim really closes with the 12th century, although fragmentary works still appeared in the 18th and 19th centuries. These collections vary generally according to the nationality of the author, as are the liturgies obtained in the synagogues of different countries. Thus there are Machzors according to the rites of the German, Polish, Spanish, and Italian Jews, and also translations from the Hebrew into the different languages, the use of which translations in the synagogues is, however, not general. The first scientific work on the Machzor is that of W. Heidenheim, published in 1800. This author corrected the text by means of ancient MSS., according to the German and Polish rites, and added to it a commentary and a historical introduction. His work gave rise also to further researches on the Hebraic and liturgies by other modern Jewish writers, among whom may be mentioned Rapport (Abgaffische Kalir, etc., in Bibbula Halittra, Vienna, 1829-32, Zunz (Gottesdienst, Vorträge d. Juden, p. 880-295), S. D. Luzzatto (לובּצֶatto, על מְצוּר), Eikele, z. Machzor nach röm. Ritual, Lissa, 1806, and L. Landshut (לְנֶסֶזְתו, אוןומאוסק אָאָתְום ליִיאוּב), Onomasticon auctorum hymnorum Hebraeorum erogam carminum, fasciculus i. Berlin. 1657). There is a beautiful edition of the Machzor, and a masterly version of it by W. Raeburn, ed. by Dr. Sachs, of Berlin. See Bartolocci, Biblioth. Magna Rabbin. i, 672; iv, 307 sq. 822 sq; Wolf, Bibel, Hebr. ii, 1834-49; iii, 1200 sq; iv, 1049 sq. See Liturgy.

Mac Ivains. See MccLYVAIN.

Mackee, C. R., a Presbyterian minister and educator, was born in Indiana County, Pa., March 29, 1792, was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, studied theology in the Seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and was licensed by the Philadelphia Presbytery in 1815, and ordained in 1821. By uniting self-application he made himself a thorough and critical scholar, especially in the ancient classics, ecclesiastical history, Biblical literature, and theology. In 1824 he was chosen professor of languages in Cincinnati College, Ohio, which position he held until 1855, when he accepted a call as pastor of a church in Roches-
MACKEY 623  MACKINTOSH

educated at St. Leonard’s College. He deserves our no-

tice, first, for his Religio Stoici, or a short Discourse

upon several Diæmes and Moral Subjects (1663); his

Moral Essay upon Solitude (1663); and his Moral Gal-

lac, which was his last work. A second point of con-

nection with the government of Charles II as criminal

prosecutor in the memorable days of the Covenant.

By his severity in this position he earned for himself the

ugly name of the “blustering Mackenzie,” nor, we fear, can

it be disproved—in spite of his liberal antecedents—that

he became the bitter instrument of the most unutterable

malice. He has, however, written a defense of himself, entitled A Vindi-

cation of the Government of Charles II. After the Rev-

olution Sir George retired to Oxford. He died in Lon-

don May 2, 1691. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Aut.

k. ii., 1175, where many references are to be found.

Mackey, James Love, a Presbyterian minister,

was born in Lancaster County, Pa., Jan. 26, 1830. His

early educational privileges were few, but, being fond

of study, he struggled hard to qualify himself for teach-

ing. When fourteen years old he opened a school in his

father’s house; subsequently he taught public school in

the neighborhood, attended Hopewell Academ-

y and New London Academy, Pa. He graduated in the

latter. He entered the seminary at Princeton, N. J.,

resolved to do work in foreign missions. In 1849 he

called for Corisco Island. In April of 1851 he founded

the Evangelical Mission, after surmounting many ob-

stacles. In June of 1853 he returned to his home and

soon after became principal of the academy at New

London, Pa. He died April 30, 1867. Mr. Mackey was

a man thoroughly qualified for missionary labors; his

mental training, varied and accurate information, and

scientific attainments, prepared him for the great work.


Mackie, Josias, one of the earliest Presbyterian

ministers who came to America, was born in Donegal

County, Ireland. The year of his arrival in this coun-

ty is uncertain, but the first notice hitherto found of

him bears date June 22, 1622. His first settlement ap-

pears to have been on the Elizabeth River, Va., where

in all probability he became the successor of Francis

Mackenzie, the first regular Presbyterian minister in

America. After a formal oath in 1629, made publicly,

and in confirmation of his belief in the Articles of Re-

ligion, as allowed in the case of Dissenters, he was

licensed by the General Assembly of Virginia. In dis-

 traction with his family and their property, many miles

apart, on Elizabeth River. These

were in the Eastern Branch, in Tanneur’s Creek precipit-

ous, and in the Western Branch, to which was added, in

1636, the Southern Branch. Here, with the care of a

farm and a store, he found time to preach, but the rec-

ord of his labors has not yet been discovered.

Sprague, Annals, iii., 5.

Mackintosh, Sir James, one of the most cele-

brated literary characters of the 19th century, distin-

guished alike as a philosopher, jurist, statesman, and

historian was born at Auldburne, in the county of Inver-

ness, Scotland, October 24, 1755. His early instruc-

tion and training fell in the wake of his grandfather’s

a man of great excellence. In 1783 he entered King’s

College, Aberdeen, where he formed an intimate ac-

quaintance with the celebrated Robert Hall—a happy

association which told upon the whole career of Mack-

intosh. He was then in the growth of his manhood and

had great hopes which were never realized. As a student,

Hall’s society and conversation had on his mind. They

lived in the same house, were constantly together, and

led each other into controversies on the most abstruse

points of theology and metaphysics. By their fellow-

students they were regarded as the intellectual leaders

of their class. He was a man of universal mind, being

formed in King’s College, which was commonly design-

ated "The Hall and Mackintosh Club." In 1784 he

quitted King’s College as M.A., and removed to Edin-

burgh. His own inclinations were to the bar; family

circumstances, however, obliged him to enter upon the

study of medicine. But he by no means confined himself

to his professional studies. "He mingled freely with

the intellectual society of the place; divided his studious

hours between medicine, metaphysics, and politics, in-

cluding particularly the stirring controversy into its lighter litera-

ture and passing or pest controversies, and became a

prominent speaker in the medical, physical, and specu-

lative societies." Three years had been thus pleasantly

spent when the time for his examination came, and,

with diploma in hand, he turned southwards, and settled

at London. It was a season of great political excite-

ment when Mackintosh arrived in the great English

metropolis, and, as the political arena was much more to

his taste and inclination than walking the wards of a

hospital, he improved the opportunity, and determined

upon a study of the literary life. He supported himself

for a while by writing for the newspapers, at the same
time engaged in philosophical studies. In 1791 he fi-

nally published his Vindicia Gallicae, in reply to Burke’s

Reflections on the French Revolution—a work which,

though containing juvenile errors, at once gave him

great renown; three editions were sold within the same

year of its appearance before the public. “In sober

philosophic thought, sound feeling, and common sense,

it greatly surpassed the splendid philippic against which

it was directed, and was enthusiastically lauded.” The

leading statesmen of England, among them Fox, Sher-

idan, and Burke, made him an author’s friend, and when

the “Association of the Friends of the People” was

formed, he was appointed secretary. Encouraged by

this success, he turned to the legal profession in

1798, was called to the bar in 1796, and attained high

eheminence as a forensic lawyer. In 1790 he delivered a

course of lectures on the Law of Nature and of Nations

before the benches of Lincoln’s Inn, which were at-

tended by audiences of the most brilliant description.

Later he was made recorder of Bombay, and in 1806

was appointed judge of the Admiralty Court. His In-

dian career was already credited to the fame and honor-

able to his character. After his return to England he

entered Parliament as Whig member for Nairn (1818).

In 1818 he accepted the professorship of law in the

college of Hallebury, continuing, however, to take an

active part in the political affairs of his country, as

the representative of Knaresborough in the nation’s

council. In 1822, and again in 1828, he filled the honor-

able position of lord-rector of the University of Glasgow.

In 1828, his great attainments as a philosopher were

acknowledged by the selection of him to contribute to

Hart’s unfinished dissertation on the “Progress of Meta-

physical, Ethical, and Political Philosophy since the

Revival of Letters in Europe” for the Encyclopaedia Bri-

tannica. Sir James Mackintosh (he was knighted in 1803)

at once set to work, and in 1830 completed his part of

the task, entitled Dissertations on the Progress of Mathe-

matics during the 18th and 19th Centuries. Un-

fortunately, however, his professional and other duties,

as well as sickness, had prevented him from treating the

subject as carefully and completely as he might have

desired, and so far curtailed the original plan that a

survey of political philosophy and the history of the

ethical philosophy of the Continent were left unnoticed.

But, “notwithstanding these deficiencies,” says our dis-

tinguished late countryman, Alexander H. Everett

(N. Am. Review, xxxv, 451), “it will be read with deep in-

terest by students of moral science, and by all who take

an interest in the higher departments of intellectual re-

search, or enjoy the beauties of elegant language ap-

plied to the illustration of ‘divine philosophy.’ It gives

us, on an important branch of the most important of

the sciences, the reflection of one of the noblest minds that are drawn by original research and patient

study to probe it to the bottom.” See the article Etru-

cian in vol. iii, p. 822 sq. He died May 22, 1822.

We have thus far sketched the life of Sir James Mack-

intosh somewhat more in detail than the limited space of

our Cyclopedia really warrants, in order to enable
our readers fully to appreciate the valuable services of this master-mind in the department of philosophy, not only so far as they were exerted directly, but also indirectly. It is not without reason that his distinguished friend Robert Hall said "that if Sir James Mackintosh had enjoyed leisure, and had exerted himself, he would have completely outdone Jeffrey and Stewart, and all the metaphysical writers of our time." (John S. Mill's "History of the English People," 1849, pp. 340, 341.) Neither can we afford to pass hastily by the man whom so eminent an authority as Morell (Hist. and Crit. View of the Speculative Philosophy of Europe in the 19th Century [N.Y., 1849, 8vo], p. 405) points out as one of the most eminent moralists of our day. "The ardent spirit, the depth, and the learning," says Morell, "with which he combated the selfish system, pleased for the authority and sanctity of the moral faculty in man, contributed perhaps more than any single cause, not of a religious nature, to oppose the bold advances of utilitarianism, and infuse a healthier tone into the moral principles of the country. Without signifying our adherence to his peculiar theory respecting conscience [viz. "that conscience, or the moral faculty, is not an original part of our constitution, but a secondary formation," created at a later period of life by the effect of the association of the result of a variety of elements existing in the mind] (compilation of M'Cosh, Intuitions of the Mind, p. 239)," we still regard his thoughts and speculations as taking eminently the right direction, and had he obtained leisure to mature his views, and give them to the world in his own forcible style, it is the opinion of the best able to judge upon the subject (e.g., Robert Hall and J. D. Chalmers) that he would have placed the whole theory of morals upon a higher and more commanding position than it had ever occupied before in this country [England]."

Besides this work on Ethical Philosophy (re-published Philad. 1834, 8vo), Mackintosh wrote the chief portion of his history or antiquities of the Jews. The theology of them is what is called moderately orthodox. For these his valuable services to sacred literature Dr. Macknight received the rewards in the power of the Presbyterian Church to give. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by the University of Edinburgh. In 1798 he was removed from Maybole to the more desirable parish of Jedburgh, and in 1772 he became one of the ministers at Edinburgh. Here he continued for the remainder of his life, useful in the ministry and an ornament of the Church. He died Jan. 18, 1800. Of Dr. Macknight's translation of the epistles, universally regarded as his best production, Home says that it is "a work of theological labor not often paralleled. If we cannot always coincide with the author in opinion, we can always praise his learning, and his piety; qualities which confer no trifling rank on any scriptural interpreter or commentator." Dr. W. L. Alexander, however, is not quite so commendatory of Dr. Macknight's scholarship: "This work, which was the result of thirty years' labor, soon obtained and kept a high reputation. Of late years it has perhaps sunk into unremitted neglect, for there is much in it well deserving the attention of the Biblical student. Its greatest defects are traceable to two causes—the author's imperfect knowledge of the original languages of the Bible, and the want of fixed and systematical principles. In tracing out, however, the common ground, and suitable passages, especially of an argumentative kind, he often shows great ability." See Life, by his son, prefixed to the Epistles (in the editions since 1806); Kittto, Cyclop. a. v.; English Cyclop. a. v.
and a very imperfect translation of Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*.

**MACLAY, ARCHIBALD, D.D., or, as he was familiarly known by Christians of all denominations, "Father Maclay," a noted Baptist minister, was born in Killearn, Scotland, May 14, 1778, and in 1802 entered the ministry at Kirkaldy, in Fifeshire. In 1804 he was appointed a missionary to the East Indies, but the government objected to his being a Baptist and he was obliged to stay. By advice of his friends he quitte his native land, and in 1805 emigrated to this country. Immediately after his arrival he commenced to preach, and built up a Church in Rose Street, New York. Hitherto his connection was with the Established Church of Scotland, but in 1806 he united with the Baptists, and, most of his congregation following his example, a new Church was organized, known as the "Mulberry Street Church" (now the Tabernacle, Second Avenue Church), where he remained until 1857. He then resigned to become agent of the "American and Foreign Bible Society" just organized, and served this body to great advantage until 1850, when he was called within the domain of his own denomination to succeed the late Dr. Cone as the second president of the "American Bible Union." In this capacity he made an official tour of England, presenting the circulation of the Bible Union and collecting funds for the revision of the Bible, in which work that society is now engaged. In this mission he was very successful, owing, no doubt, to his fame as an eminent Baptist divine. One of the addresses made while abroad was translated into several languages and circulated in more than 100,000 copies. On his return to this country he made a similar tour South, and with his usual success. In 1856 he resigned his presidency of the Bible Union on account of dissatisfaction with the manner in which the internal affairs of the Bible Union were conducted. He continued to preach and labored for his Master till within a few months of his death, May 2, 1860. Dr. Maclay enjoyed the respect of his brethren in the ministry, and the affection of all Christian people who knew him. He was surpassed by no man in zeal, friendliness, and goodness. He was a safe counsellor, a cherubic, hearty, healthy soul, as incapable of cant as of frivolity. It was evident to all who approached him that he was a man as well as a clergyman. He retained to the last that strong, holy, Scottish common-sense which renders the sons of old Scotia indomitable and victorious all the world over. A man of moderation and immoveable honesty never breathed. (J. H. W.)

**Maclean, Archibald, an English Baptist minister, was born May 1, 1738 (O. S,), at East Kilbride, in Lanarkshire. He was for many years pastor of the Baptist Church in Edinburgh, and was founder of the Baptist congregations in Scotland. He died in Edinburgh Dec. 12, 1812. Mr. Maclean published *Paraphrase and Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinb. 1811-17, 2 vols. 12mo; Lond. 1819, 2 vols. 12mo; Aberdeen, 1847, 2 vols. 12mo). A collective edition of Maclean's works, including the above work, sermons, etc., with a memoir of his life and writings by W. Jones, was published (Lond. 1829, 6 vols.; vol. viii, 1852, 18mo; Edinb. 6 vols. 12mo). — Kitto, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Lit. vol. ii., s. v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, s. v.*

**Maclellan, James, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, a native of Scotland, came to the United States in early manhood, furnished with a good classical education. He had been brought up in the bosom of the Established Church of Scotland, and fully believed all its doctrines, but, owing to his Calvinistic views, had given himself no personal concern about his salvation. He was, however, awakened and convicted of sin, and in 1817 joined the Methodists, and, feeling it to be his duty to preach the Gospel, entered the Mississippi Conference Dec. 8, 1840. He took position at once in the Conference on account of his educational advantages. His first appointment was Jackson Station, then he preached in Lake Washington country, on the Mississippi River, and in 1849 was elected secretary of the Conference. For several years following he located; from 1863 to 1867 he was presiding elder of the Granville District, and in 1865 he was elected a delegate to the General Conference held in New Orleans in 1866. At the close of his life, in 1870, he was supernumerary on the Lake Lee and Leota Circuit. "Brother Maclellan was a man of strong character, a simple-hearted Christian, dearly loved the Church of his choice, and literally laid his life ‘living sacrifice upon her altar.'" — *Minutes of the M. E. Church South, 1870.*

**Macmillianites. See Scotland, Reformed Presbyterian Church in.*

**Macnab, Hugh, D.D., an Irish divine of note, was born in 1758, at Ballinrobe, in the county of Antrim, Ireland; was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he received both the degree of A.M. and D.D. and also the appointment of canon of Chester. In 1822 he married the daughter of Dr. Magee, late archbishop of Dublin, in whose family he had been tutor. After preaching for some years in London, where he attracted large congregations, chiefly at Charlotte-Street Chapel, Fitzroy Square, he became pastor of the London Church of St. Jude's, Liverpool, and of St. Paul's, Prince's Park, near Liverpool. In 1808 he was made dean of Ripon. He died in 1872. He published *The Church and the Churches, or the Church of God in Christ militant here on Earth* (1817, 12mo). — *Lectures on the Church of England* (12mo). — *Lectures on the Prophecies of the Jews* (1842, 12mo). — *Lectures on the Sympathies, etc., of our Saviour* (12mo). — *Letters on Seceding from the Church* (12mo). — *Sermons on the Second Advent* (12mo). — *Deventer Sermons* (12mo). He also published several separate sermons, addresses, and controversial pamphlets.

**Macnay, Councils of (Concilia Maiorum), Ecclesiastical councils held in this city of Bur- gundy in 584 and 585. At the former there were enactments to regulate the clerical dress, and forbidding Jews to appear in the streets from Maundy Thursday until Easter Monday; at the latter, which over Pius, archbishop of Lyons, presided, enactments were passed — memorial in the history of the Church — on the conduct of the laity towards the clergy. Among other things, it was required that whenever one of the laity met and saw the clergy in the public streets, the former should make a lowly and reverent bow; if both parties are on horseback, then the laityman should take off his hat; but if the laityman be on horseback and the clergyman on foot, the former is to dismount and make his obeisance. See Riddle, *Hist. ofPopes, I., 240; Landow, Mom. Councils, I., 966-9.*

**Macrobius, an ecclesiastical writer, flourished in the first half of the 4th century. He was a preacher in the Church in Africa after Gennadius became entangled in the Donatist heresy, and as a Donatist bishop secretly laborated at Rome one time. Before his separation from the orthodox he composed a discourse, *Ad confessorum et virginitates,* in which he insisted principally upon the beauty and the sanctity of chastity. After his union with the Donatists he addressed a letter to the laity of Carthage, *De Passione Maximianus et Jusici Donatitarum* (published by Matillon, *Analecta * [Paris, 1875], v. 119, and *Chrest. * [Paris, 1700], Amasya Thursday May, 1702). — *Hefner, Nouv. B. Générale,* xxiii, 307.

**Maçon (Masquer, i.e. long-beard; Vulg. Macer), the surname of Polumeneus or Poulomee, the son of Dory- menes (1 Macc. iii, 38), and governor of Cyprus under Ptolemy Philometor (2 Macc. x, 12).

**Macurdy, Eliza, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Carlisle, England, Oct. 15, 1873. Miss, she educated at the Academy of Cannonsburg, and was licensed by the Pres- bytery of Ohio about 1799. His first labors were as a missionary in the regions bordering on Lake Erie.
June, 1800, he was ordained and installed pastor of the united congregations of Cross Roads and Three Springs. During this connection he had an important agency in the revival in Western Pennsylvania, and was one of those who formed the "Western Miss. Society." In 1809 he went on a mission to Maine, and on his return he was obliged, from ill health, to resign his charge of the church of Three Springs, and confine himself to that of Cross Roads. He died July 22, 1845. See Sprague, *Amula*, iv, 241.

**MacWhorter, Alexander, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, born in Newcastle County, Delaware, July 15, 1788, went on a mission to Maumee, Ohio, in 1797, settled near Newark in 1798; was employed as a missionary to North Carolina in 1764-6; was chaplain to Knox's Brigade in 1778; settled in Charlotte, N. C., in 1779, but removed in 1780 to Newark, N. J., where he preached until his death, July 20, 1807. In 1786 he was prominent in settling the Confession of Faith and forming the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church. The degree of D.D. was conferred on him by Yale College in 1776. See Sprague, *Amula*, iii, 208 sq.

**Mad.** See MADNESS.

**Madagascar,** an island situated to the south-east of the African continent, in lat. 11° 57'—25° 38' S., and longitude about 43°—51° E.; length, 1600 miles; greatest breadth, 770 miles; area estimated at 540,000 square miles; before covering a territory inhabited by the ancient Malagasy people. The French, in 1862-63, contains a population of nearly five millions.

**History up to the Introduction of Christianity.**—The early history of this interesting island is involved in the deepest mystery. It is supposed to have been known to the Greeks, but it was generally considered as an appendage to the main land, and was probably discovered by the Phoenicians. As an island, we find it first mentioned by Marco Polo, in the 13th century, as *Magascar* or *Madagascar*; but its discoverer is now admitted to have been the Portuguese Antao Goncalves, who named it *Isla de Sao Lourenco*. The unhealthy climate made the stay of Europeans for a long time impossible. In 1774, Europeans attempted to establish a colony at Antongil Bay, on the eastern side of the island; it was mainly composed of Frenchmen; but, failing to receive encouragement and assistance from the French government, the settlement proved a failure. With the Christian missionaries (1816), skilful mechanics and tradesmen entered Madagascar, and to-day the island contains, in spite of its unhealthy climate, quite a number of Europeans.

The natives consist of many tribes, of which the Hovas inhabit the central and northern portion of the island, and are at present so powerful as to hold in subjection most of the others. The features of the inhabitants of this section present a striking resemblance to those of the South Sea Islanders; they are evidently of different extraction from the other and darker tribes, whose features are wholly African. The men are generally well made, having finely-proportioned limbs, and usually present a high type of physiological development. The women are well formed and active, but by no means so prepossessing in feature as the other sex. The complexion of the Hovas is a ruddy brown or tawny color, while that of the other tribes is much darker. Another and very peculiar distinction is the long, straight hair of the former as compared to the woolly growth of their neighbours. The principal article of dress in use among the Hovas is a gable, a garment worn by Romans, and made of cotton or linen materials.

The religion of these natives, not converts to Christianity, is strictly heathen. Mohammedanism never made its way to them, and has not converts among them. Aside from African heathens, there are no native religionists in Madagascar. The Supreme Being they style * Fragrant Prince.* Their ideas of a future state, and, indeed, their whole religious system, is indefinite, discordant, and puerile; it is a compound of heterogeneous elements, borrowed in part from the superstitious fears and practices of Africa, the opinions of the ancient Egyptians, and the prevalent idolatrous systems of India, blended with the usages of the Malayan Archipelago. There are no public temples in honor of any divinity, nor any order of men exclusively devoted to the priestly or the prophetical. The keeper of idols receives the offerings of the people, prescribes their requests, and pretends to give the responses of the god. They worship also at the grave or the tomb of their ancestors (Newcomb, p. 321). They practice circuminscence, have the division of weeks into seven days, abstain from swine's flesh, and follow other Jewish practices. Marriage is general, but polygamy prevails, and conjugal fidelity scarcely exists among the non-Christianized.

**Introduction of Christianity.**—In 1816, Radama, the king of the Hovas, virtually even then the prince of all Madagascar, entered into diplomatic and commercial relations with the English. Only two years later—In 1818—Protestant missionaries set out for it, and ultimately this African isle became one of the countries where the rapid and easy triumph of Christianity equals the most brilliant episodes in the history of Christian propaganda, and a lasting rebuke to those Roman Catholics who have dared to pronounce Protestant missions a failure. The first Protestant missionaries were sent out by the London Missionary Society, and their mission, from the beginning, was very successful. The whole Bible was circulated in the native language; and it is said that about ten thousand persons received Christian instruction. Suddenly, however, Radama died (July 7, 1828), and was succeeded by Ranavala Manjakana, a woman of great cruelty, and inimical to Europeans. With her accession to the throne of Madagascar opened a fierce ordeal of persecution, lasting for nearly thirty years. Europeans were banished from the isle; the public profession of Christianity was forbidden; churches and schools were closed, and many of the members of the churches were persecuted to death. The conduct of the converts was most exemplary; by their constancy, and many by their death, they refuted the slanders of Romanists that the converts of the Protestant mission churches consist, for a large part, of men who seek to obtain a lucrative position. In 1842 queen Ranavala Manjakana died, and her son was proclaimed king under the title of Radama II. With his accession to the throne of Madagascar the period of religious toleration commenced, and, although for a moment the assassination of the king (in 1863; he was strangled, and his own wife selected as his successor, the government having been modified in its governmental form) appeared to have modified the Christians, the missionaries of the London Society resumed their labors, and they were agreeably surprised in seeing that, in spite of all persecution, the Christian congregations had maintained themselves. In 1867, the erection of four memorial churches on places where the first martyrs of Christianity fell a prey to heathen superstitions of Madagascar was projected; three of these have already been completed, and the fourth is in progress. (See Christian Advocate, Nashville, Tenn., Dec. 2, 1871.) But the greatest triumph the Gospel achieved in Madagascar was the conversion of Queen Ranavala II. She was succeeded by her cousin, Queen Ranavalo II (she succeeded to the throne April 1, 1868), and, with her, a majority of the natives, threw away their idols, and embraced Christianity much in the same way as the ancient Britons did centuries ago. See the Missionary Advocate (N. Y., Feb. 15, 1868).

Among those particularly worthy of mention are those who conceived the idea of sending rendered in the missionary efforts in Madagascar, is the Rev. William Ellis (died in July, 1872). By years of missionary labors performed in the South Sea Islands he had become thoroughly acquainted with the missionary work; and when the death of Ranavalo Manjakana, Madagascar seemed again open to the Europeans, he was selected by the London Missionary Society to visit the country, in company with Mr. Cameron, in order to ascertain the actual condition of things, with a
view to resuming missionary labour. The manner in which Mr. Ellis conducted the most delicate negotiations with the government of Madagascar, so as to secure an entrance for the Christian teachers to the country, and the influence he exerted in high places, are well known to all persons acquainted with modern missionary enterprise. He left the land of Madagascar, always on important missions, and always with signal success. He went before, and prepared the way for those who have gone in and occupied the field. On each occasion of his return to England he had marvellous things to tell of Madagascar and the prospects that were opening up to the church of Christ. His Majesty's Church of Madagascar, Madagascar Revised (London, 1867, 8vo), and Three Visits to Madagascar, give a history of that mission-field which leaves nothing to be desired (compare, however, Westminster Rev. April, 1867, p. 249). It was he, too, who completed and revised the translation of the Scriptures into the Madagascan language.

The number of Christians in Madagascar is now estimated at more than 325,000. In 1888, the English missionaries (Episcopalians, Methodists, and Friends) who have been here more than 30 years, resident, or during a part of their time, in the island of Mauritius (an English possession), had in operation 924 schools, attended by 98,388 pupils. The Roman Catholics have, since 1861, missionaries (Jesuits) in the island, and they are mainly at the capital, Tamatave, and vicinity, and in the French possessions, the adjoining islands, and the coast. In the island of Bourbon, already mentioned, M'Loud, Madagascar and its People (London, 1865); Oliver, Madagascar and the Malagasi (London, 1865); J. Sibree, Madagascar and its People (London, 1867); Chamber's Cyclop. s. v.; Edilah Rev., 1867, p. 212; Grundemann, Missions-Atlas, No. 17; N. Y. Methodist, 1867; N. Y. Christian Intelligencer, July 11, 1872.

Mada'ei (Heb. Medo'y, "sage, Sept. Medoi", Gen. x, 2, a Midean "q. v.", as elsewhere rendered), the third son of Japhet (Gen. x, 2), from whom the Medes, etc., are supposed to have descended. R.C. pont. 2514. See Erran-troct.

Madan, Martin, an Anglican divine, was born near Hertford, England, in 1726. He first studied law, but finally entered the ministry, and was for a number of years chaplain to the Lock Hospital, London. He died in 1790. Mr. Madan gained great notoriety by a work which he published in 1780, entitled The History of Female inns, etc.; a treatise on female inns, in which he sturdily advocated the practice of polygamy. The pamphleteer which his work elicited he replied to in a number of tracts. Madan's object in advocating polygamy was the removal of seduction. He was quite a pupilator; several of his sermons have been published.—Allibone, Diet. of Brit. and American Authors, vol. ii, s. v.; Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliog., ii, 1920.

Madan, Spencer (1), D.D., an Anglican prelate, was born about the middle of the 18th century; became bishop of Bristol in 1792, and of Peterborough in 1794. He was born in 1719. Bishop Madan published several occasional Sermons (London, 1792, 8vo, and often, and a translation of Grotius's De Veritate Christiane Religionis (1781-83, 1815). See Gentlemen's Magazine, 1837, i, 296.

Madan, Spencer (2), D.D., an English divine, son of the preceding, was born in 1759; was educated at Westminster School and Trinity College, Cambridge; was rector first of Islington, Leicestershire, and later of Thorp, in Staffordshire. He was also chaplain for the king about thirty years, and prebend of Peterborough. He died in 1836. He published several sermons.

Madeira (a Portuguese word signifying wood, and given because of the unusual abundance of timber) is an island in the North Atlantic Ocean off the W. coast of Africa, in lat. 32° 43' N., long. 17° W., with an area of 345 sq. miles, and a population in 1865 of 125,841, and belongs to Portugal. It constitutes a part of a group of islands sometimes called "the Northern Canaries," which were discovered in 1419. The coasts of Madeira are steep and precipitous, rising from 200 to 2000 feet above sea-level, comprising few bays or landing-places, and deeply cut at intervals by narrow gorges, which give to the circumference the appearance of having been worn away by use, and many of them are so low as to make ships in danger of being drowned. Hence the name Tinta, from the Portuguese word tinta, which signifies "ink," given because of the height of 5000 feet; its highest point, the Pico Ruivo, is 6050 feet high. It is of volcanic origin, and slight earthquakes occasionally occur. The lower portions of the island abound in tropical plants, as the date-palm, plantain, sweet potato, Indian corn, coffee, sugar-cane, pomegranate, and cheyela. The flowers are very beautiful, and the trees are somewhat cultivated, but the country has until lately been mainly devoted to the cultivation of the vine and sugar-cane. Funchal, with a population of 25,000, is both the capital and port of the island. The climate is remarkable for its constantness. There is only a difference between the temperatures of summer and winter, the thermometer in Funchal showing an average of 74° in summer and of 64° in winter. At the coldest season the temperature is rarely less than 60°, while in summer it seldom rises above 78°; but sometimes a waft of the Mediterranean current makes the thermometer rise to 82°. The inhabitants of Madeira are of a mixed race, principally of Portuguese, Moorish, and negro blood. "They are meagre, sallow, and short-lived, which is attributed to their want of wholesome food [the poorer classes chiefly subsist on the eddic-root, sweet potatoes, and chestnut], a life of drudgery, and an unhealthy climate, and the dissipation of the air." The Roman Catholic Church is the established religion of Madeira, and until recently none other was tolerated. In 1839, Dr. Kelley, a physician, began to disseminate Protestant doctrines, and ultimately the Scotch Church took up the work most successfully begun by Dr. Kelley. The spirit of persecution, so general in Roman countries, was not wanting here, and there was great opposition to Protestantism. The first missionary to the island was the Rev. W. Hewitson, who arrived there in 1845, but for a long time the opposition of the government was so severe that he was obliged to confine his labours mainly to Dr. Kelley's converts. So uncomfortable were natives who chose the Protestant communion, that in 1846 some 800 of them left for Trinidad and for the United States. At present the Protestants have quite a hold on the country. Besides the Scotch Church, there are other places of worship, including a Presbyterian Church in connection with the Free Church of Scotland. The educational institutions comprise the Portuguese College, and Lancasterian and government schools. See White, Madeira, its Climate and Scenery ; Schultze, Die Insel Madeira (Stuttg., 1864); Chambers's Encyclop. s. v.; Newcomb, Cyclopaedia of Missions, s. v.

Mâdhava is one of the names of the deity Vishnu (q. v.) in Hindu mythology and in Sanskrit poetry.

Mâdhavachârya (i. e. Mâdhava, the Achârya or spiritual teacher), one of the greatest Hindu scholars and divines of the medieval literature of India, is said to have been born at Pampa, a village situated on the bank of the river Tungabhadra, probably near the beginning of the 14th century. He was prime minister of Sangama, the son of Kampa, whose reign at Vijayanagara commenced about 1336, and also under king Bukka I, who succeeded Harihara I about 1361. He died at the age of ninety, probably towards the close of the 14th century. Mâdhavachârya is famed for his dedication to teaching and important works on Vedâ, philosophical, legal, and grammatical writings of the ancient Hindus. The most important of these are his great commentaries on the Rig-ya, Tâjâr, and Sâma-veda [see Veda]; an exposition of the Mimamsâ philosophy; a summary account of fifteen religious and philosophical systems; a diffusely written treatise, with some treatises on the Vedânta philosophy; another on salvation; a history of Sankara's (q. v.) polemics against multifarious misbelievers and heretics; a
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commentary on Panisera's code of law; a work on dete-
ments, time especially, in reference to the observa-
tion of religious acts; and a grammatical commentary on Sanscrit radicals and their derivatives. The chief
performance of Madhava is doubtless the series of his
great commentaries on the Vedas, for without them no
conscientious scholar could attempt to penetrate the
secret and esoteric meaning of the ancient Hindu
works. In these commentaries Madhava labors to account for the grammatical
properties of Vedic words and forms, records their
traditional sense, and explains the drift of the Vedic
hymns, legends, and rites. So great was Madhavachar
yearning of the learned and wise Dandin, that popular superstition as
signed them a supernatural origin. He was supposed to
have received them from the goddess Bhuvaneshwart, the
consort of Siva, who, gratified by his incessant devotions,
became manifest to him in a human shape, conferred on
him the gift of extraordinary knowledge, and changed
his name to Vedagriga (the "Forest of Learning"), a
title by which he is sometimes designated in Hindu
writings.

Mad'abun ('Irsrv) Ha'mabaux v. r. Madh-
abau; Vulg. omits, a name interpolated in 1 Esdr. v,
38 as that of a Levite whose "sons" assisted at the re-
surrection of the temple under Zerubabel; but the Heb.
list ( Ezra iii. 9) has nothing resembling or correspond-
ing to it.

Ma'dian (Judith ii. 26; Acts vii. 29). See MIDIAN.

Madison, JAMES, D.D., an early Episcopal prelate
in America, was born near Port Republic, Rockingham
County, Va., Aug. 27, 1749; passed A.B. in the College
of William and Mary in 1772; was soon after admitted
to the bar, which he abandoned for the ministry; in
1778 became professor of mathematics in his alma
mater; in 1775 proceeded to England for ordination, was
licensed for Virginia, but on his return resumed his du-
ties as professor in his alma mater, of which he became
president in 1777. He afterwards revisited England to
see Cavollo and other scientific men. In 1784 he was
changed to the chair of natural and moral philosophy.
In 1786 he was chosen bishop of the Protestant Episco-
pal Church in Virginia, and in 1790 was consecrated
in England. Under his care the College of William and
Mary advanced steadily in reputation. He discharged his
duties with zeal and fidelity until his death, March 6t
1812. In his theological bishop Madison was much of
a rationalist, and is charged by bishop Cocks (A.M. Ch.
Rec. Jan. 1872, p. 36 and 46) with having given "something
which was essentially a negative element" to the vigorous
spirit in the Church. He published some Sermons, Let-
ters, and Addresses; also A Eulogy on Washington (1800).
See Sprague, Annals, v. 318; Drake, Dict. of Am. Biog.
A.

Madman. See MADNESS.

Madmam'nah (Hebrew Mad'mamnah, mad'ma-
nah: Sept. Melchymi and Malchymi v. r. Marcymi
and Bi; Vulg. Medemen and Madmena), a town in the
extreme south of Judah (Josh. xv, 31, where it is
mentioned between Ziklag and Sansannah), where it is
included in the territory afterwards assigned to Simeon.
From 1 Chron. ii. 45, it appears to have been founded
or, rather, occupied by Shaphi (or perhaps by a son
of his whose name it bore), the son of Caleb's concubine
Maachah. Eusebius and Jerome identify it with a
town of their time called Menois (Menwu), near the
city of Gaza (Onomast. p. 89). See MADMENAH.

MADMENNAH. In-
stead of Madmannah and Sansannah of Josh. xv, 31, the
parallel passage (Josh. xix. 5; comp. 1 Chron. iv, 81),
enumerating the Simeonith cities, has BETH-MARCA-
NAITH and Hazar-susim, probably the same respectively
(Kell's Joshua, ad loc.). Schwarz thinks (Palestine, p. 101) that it was the Levitical city Madithah, in which,
according to the words of Josh. xxiv. 15, the body of Jasher," was buried, but this locality is wholly apocryphal.
The first stage southward from Gaza is now el-Menid (Robinson, Re-
sources, i. 568), which, in default of a better, is suggest-
ed by Kiepert (in his Map, 1856) as the modern repre-
sentative of Menois, and therefore of Madmannah. A
more plausible identification, however, is that of Van de
Vedele (Travelle, i. 180) of the modern ruined village
Mirikl, west of the south end of the Dead Sea, as a re-
presentative of the ancient Beth-marcaboth.

Mad'men (Heb. Mad'men, mad'men, mad'mil; Sept.
Thi'ves v. r. Makobh, Malcbhm, and Malcbah; Vulg.
silea; a Moabitish town, threatened with de-
struction by the sword of Am non the Babylonian invade-
in connection with the neighboring Hebron (I. xvi.
2). Some (as Hitzig, after the Sept., Vulg., etc.) regard
it as an appellative; and in some editions of the Auth.
Vts. it is actually printed "O madmen!" The slight
notice only affords an approximate location opposite
the northern extremity of the Dead Sea. See MADMEN.

Mad'menah (Heb. Mad'meneh, mad'mil, mad'mil;
Sept. Mad'miyn, Vulg. Medemen), a town named in
Isa. x, 31, where it is placed on the list of the Moa-
bian invaders, in the northern vicinity of Jerusalem,
between Nob and Gibeon. It has been confounded by
Eusebius and Jerome with MADMENNAH, which is much
too far southward to suit the context. Gesenius (He-
braicae Linguae, ii. 267) calls it "one of the chief
active-—Madmen flies, as, not, in the A. Vera, 'is re-
moved' (so also Michaelis, Biblii fr Ungeliihrn). Mad-
menah is not necessarily alluded to by Isaiah (xxv, 10)
in his denunciation of Moab, where the word rendered
in the Auth. Vts. 'dunghill' is identical with that
name. The original text (or Kerib), by a variety of
position ('77 for '77'), reads the ' waters of Madmenah.'
If this is so, the reference may be either to the Mad-
menah of Benjamin—one of the towns in the district ab-
ounding with corn and threshing-floors—or, more ap-
propriately still, to MADMEN, the Moabitish town. Gesenius
(Josants, p. 780) appears to have overlooked this, which
might have been brought to his notice by the Suggestion that seems to have been first made by
Joseph Kimchi.

Madness. The words rendered by "mad," "mad-
man," "madness," etc. in the A. Vera, vary considerably
in the Hebrew of the O. T. In Deut. xxviii, 29; 34; 1
Sam. xxi, 15, 14, 15, etc. (marim, etc., in the Sept.),
they are derivatives of the root r36, mar, "to be stung or
stung," and are used metaphorically. In Judges xxv, 16; i. 38; ii. 25; 1 Sam. xiv, 41; etc. (Sept. me'mod),
from the root r365, kelal, "to flash out," applied (like the Greek philéther) either to light or sound; in Isa. xii, 25, from r365, sakel, "to make void or foolish" (Sept. memad), from six, 4, from r365, tamah, "to wander" (Sept. iemad).
In the N. T. they are generally used to render maroses or maria (as in John x, 20; Acts xxvi, 24; 1 Cor. xiv, 23;
in but 2 Pet. ii, 16 the word is paraporia, and in
Luke vii, 11, dvoun. The term is used in Scripture in
its proper and full sense of a raving maus or demented
person (Deut. xxvii, 84; 1 Sam. xxii, 13; John v, 39;
1 Cor. xiv, 23), and may be medically defined to be
delirium without fever. Our Lord cured by his word
several who were deprived of the exercise of their rational
powers, as in Matt. x, 14 (the verb has the advantage
from distemper of the bodily frame to augment
evils endured by the patient is more than may be af-
irmed, though the idea seems to be not absolutely
reglumant to reason (see Thomson, Unto and Book, i, 218).
"See also the word 'dement' as used in Scripture, as in common life, to any subordinate but
violent disturbance of the mental faculties, whether
springing from a disordered intellect (as by over-study,
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Acts xxvi, 24, 25; from startling intelligence, Acts xii, 15; from preternatural excitement, Hos. ix, 7; Isa. xxiv, 1-8; from resistance of oppression, Eccles. vii, 1; from impiety, Jer. xxxv, 16; ii, 7; or simple fatuity, 2 Kings ix, 11; Jer. xxxii, 26, or from irregular and furious passion (e.g., as a persecutor, Acts xxvi, 11; Isa. cii, 8; from idolatrous hallucination, Jer. i, 88; or wicked and extravagant jollity, Eccles. ii, 2). In like manner, "suffumigatum" (Del pandermia, the Delphic pun) was translated into the xxviii, 28, and so "madman," 1 Sam. xxii, 20; Prov. xxvi, 18). But also a reckless state of mind (Eccles. x, 13), bordering on delirium (Zech. xii, 4), whether induced by overstrained intellectual efforts (Eccles. x, 17; in John vii, 10) or by the sheer collapse of overdrawn tempers (Eccles. vii, 25; i, 3; 2 Pet. ii, 6). David's madness (1 Sam. xxi, 13) is by many supposed not to have been feigned, but a real epilepsy or falling sickness; and the Sept. uses words which strongly indicate this sense (τραγωδίαν τραγούδημαν). It is urged in support of this opinion that the troubles which David underwent might very well weaken his constitutional strength, and that the force he suffered in being obliged to seek shelter in a foreign court would disturb his imagination in the highest degree. A due consideration, however, of the context and all the circumstances absolutely only serves to render the opinion the more tenable, that it was feigned for obvious reasons (see Kitto's Daily Bible Illustr., ad loc.). "It is well known that among Oriental, as among most semi-civilized nations, madmen were looked upon with a kind of reverence, as possessed of a quasi-sacred character (see Lane, Mod. Egs. i, 940). This arises partly, no doubt, from the feeling that one on whom God's hand is laid heavily should be safe from all other harm, but partly also from the belief that the loss of reason and self-control opened the mind to supernatural influence, and gave it therefore a supernatural sacredness. This belief was heightened by the enthusiastic expression of idolatrous worship (see 1 Kings xviii, 26, 28), and (occasionally) of real inspiration (see 1 Sam. xix, 21-24; comp. the application of 'mad fellow' in 2 Kings ix, 11, and see Jer. xxvi, 26; Acts ii, 18)."

Ma'adon (Heb. Ma'adon, בְּמַדְוָן, strf, as in Prov. xv. 18, etc.; Sept. Ma'dow v. r. Ma'admin, a Cannaanish city in the north of Palestine, ruled over by a king named Jobab in the time of Joshua, who captured it (Josh. xi. 1; xx, 19). Calmet (Dict. s.v.), arbitrarily conjecturing that Ma'mon is the true reading, refers to Maronos, a small village of Syria thirty miles east of Antioch (Jerome, It. Mal. 2), probably the place alluded to by Pсел (cf. Gen. 15, 22), and by Pseudo-Clasiticus. Schwartzer infers (Palest. p. 90, 173) from Rabbinic notices (chiefly a statement of the early Jewish traveller hap-parch in Asher's Benj. of Tudea, p. 480) that the site is that of the present Kefr Manda, a considerable village at the foot of the hills north of Diosmonea, containing a very deep well and some traces of antiquity, which Dr. Robinson (new ed. of Researches, iii, 103-111) is inclined to regard as marking the place of the Aschias of Josephus (Livy, 41, 45, 8; War, i, 4, 2; Ant. xiii, 12, 4), although admitting that the latter may be to be identified with Tell ed-Bedawiyeh, in the vicinage. "In the Sept. version of 2 Sam. xxi, 20, the Hebrew words מַדְוָן מַדְוָן: 'a man of stature,' are rendered divip Madow, 'a man of Madon.' This may refer to the town Madon, or may be merely an instance of the habit which these translators had of rendering literally in Greek letters Hebrew words which they did not understand. Other instances will be found in 2 Kings vi, 8; ix, 18; xii, 9; xv, 10, etc.

Ma'donna (Italian, My Lady), a term applied in the language of art to representations of the Virgin Mary. Such representations first made their appearance after the 5th century, when the Virgin was declared to be the mother of Christ; hence they assumed the form of "Madonna" in the West, the mother is generally full, oval, and of a mild expression; a veil adorns the hair. At first the lineaments of the Virgin's countenance were copied from the older pictures of Christ, according to the tradition which declared that the Virgin was of the same mother. A chronological arrangement of the pictures of the Virgin would exhibit in a remarkable manner the development of the Roman Catholic doctrine on this subject. The Madonna has been a principal subject of the pencils of the great masters. The greatest success has been achieved by Raphael (q.v.), in whose pictures of the Madonna there prevails now the loving mother, now the ideal of feminine beauty, until in that of St. Sixtus there is reached the most glorious representation of the "Queen of Heaven." Murillo's "Conception" also in the Prado, should be noticed here. See also Michelangelo. One of these has lately been presented to the American public in chromo by the American art publisher Prang, of Boston.

Among symbolic representations may be mentioned Mary with the white mantle, i.e., the mantle of love under which she receives the faithful; and the Virgin with the half-moon or with the globe under her feet, according to the meaning put upon the twelfth chapter of Revelation. The Virgin was never represented without the Child until comparatively recent times. See Mrs. Jamieson's delightful work, Legends of the Madonna (1856) (3d ed. London, 1891; ed. L. B. Macrae, 1868) (July), p. 130; Old and New, 1872 (April).

Madox, Isaac, D.D., an English divine, was born in London in 1687; was educated at one of the universities of Scotland, and at Queen's College, Cambridge; was successively curate of St. Bride's, domestic chaplain to Dr. Waddington, bishop of Chichester; rector of St. Vedast, in Foster Lane, London. In 1729 he was appointed clerk of the closet to the Queen Caroline; in 1733 became dean of Wells; in 1736, bishop of St. Asaph; was translated to the see of Worcester in 1748, and died in 1759. Dr. Madox published a number of Sermons (London, 1734-58), and a review of the first volume of Neal's Hist. of the Particulars, entitled A Vindication of the Government, Doctrine, and Worship of the Church of England established in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth (1738, 8vo).—Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Diog. vii, 208.

Madras, one of the three presidencies of the Indian Empire, occupies the greater part of the south of the peninsula of Hindostan, including the coast lands, Malabar, the Laccadive Islands, and the Coromandel coast, in all coverage area of 189,856 square miles, with 31,672,613 inhabitants in 1865 (according to Behm, Geogr. Jahrbuch, 1870, eleven twelfths are Hindus, and some 80,000 adherents of Mohammedanism). The tributary states Mysoor, Cochin, Travancore, Puducotta, and Dijepur are a part of Madras; a part of the state is now included in our statistics of Madras. The capital of this presidency is a city of like name, and is situated on the Coromandel coast, the western shore of the Bay of Bengal, in lat. 19° 5' N. It stretches along the coast, with its nine suburbs, for nine miles, with an average breadth of three and one half miles. Its inhabitants number 403,948 (1887), among them about 50,000 native Christians. Madras was the first hold of the English secured by the occupation of Fort George (situated on the coast midway between the north and south extremities of the city) in 1693. It is now truly an Indo-European city. Like Calcutta and Bombay, it is a gathering-place for the missionaries of the different denominations and associations, and the basis for all missionary enterprise in southern India. Madras is the seat of the Anglican see of Madras, established in 1865. The missionary societies at work there are the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the "London Missionary Society," the "Church Missionary Society" (which started in 1805), the "Wesleyan Missionary Society," the "Church of Scotland," the "American Board," and the "Church of England." Its principal buildings and institutions are the Government House, a handsome edifice, though much
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inferior to the similar establishments in Calcutta, and even in Bombay; one of the finest light-houses in the
world. The last-bolted watchtower of St. George, founded in
1818, a stately and beautiful edifice; a university, with
tree European professors, and numerous teachers both
European and native, and containing a valuble museum
and a library; St. George's Cathedral, from which a
magnificent view of the city and its vicinity may be
obtained, and containing several monuments by Chan-
trey (including one of bishop Heber), and some figures
by Flaxman. There are also male, military, and female
orphan asylums, a medical school, a branch of the Royal
Asiatic Society, the Madras Polytechnic Institution, the
Government Museum, a mint, eight published Episco-
pal churches, among them a cathedral, besides numer-
ous places of worship of other Christian denominations,
and the Madras Club, to which members of the Bengal
and Bombay clubs are admitted as honorary members.

See Grondeirnann, Missions-Atlas, No. 14 and 15; New-
comb's Cyclopaedia of Missions, v. 2, also under Hindostan;
Wheeler, Madras in the Olden Times (Madras, 1861-62,
8 vols. 8vo); Aitken, Cyclopaedia of Missions, p. 148, 272.

See INDIA.

Madrzzius, Christopheur, a Roman Catholic ec-
clesiastic of note, was born at Bologna in 1512, and was
elected bishop of the high-churches of St. Paul and Padua. He was ambassador of Ferdinand at Bologna, and in
1539 became prince-bishop of Trent. In 1534 the bish-
opric of Brixen was added to his livings. Later he be-
came cardinal. He died in 1578. — Regensburg Real-
encyclopaedie, vol. ii. 5.

Madura (1), an island in the Indian Ocean, the pos-
session of the Netherlands, separated from Java by the
north-east by the strait of Madura, contains about nine-
enty-seven square miles, and is inhabited by 768,724
people, who adhere either to the religion of Brahama, or are
of the Mohammedan faith—about evenly divided. The
remains of Hindu temples, however, would lead us to
the belief that Hinduism was once the prevailing reli-
gion. As Java was, probably Brahmanism was crowded out by
the inroads of the Mohammedans in the 14th century,
when the Arabs invaded the country. Madura is governed by natives, tributary to the Nether-
lands, and is divided into three kingdoms. The products of the island, which are included in the trade-returns of Java (q. v.), are sugar, tobacco, indigo, cocoa-nut oil, edible birds' nests, etc.; but, owing to the extortions of the princes, agriculture is not
flourishing.

Madura (2), a maritime district in the south of

British India, in the presidency of Madras (q. v.), has
an area of about 10,700 square miles, and a population
of 1,730,000. Eastward from the shore runs a narrow
ridge of sand and rocks, mostly dry, and which almost
connects Ceylon with the continent. Cotton is the chief
commercial crop; and sugar-cane, betel-nut, and tobacco
are also grown. In this district the "American Board"
begins its labours in 1845, and now sustains a very succ-
cessful mission in fourteen stations. The Roman Cath-
olics gained a strong hold here by the accommodation
theory of Roberto del Nobilii the opening of the 18th
century. A native, formerly a priest of Pondicherry,
was established for Madura in 1840, and is in the care
of the Jesuits, who recommended labors there in 1846.
The principal town is Madura, on the river Vyyat, with
several noteworthy public buildings, and the seat of a
Roman Catholic and a Protestant mission. Madura, in
former days, was the capital of a kingdom, the centre
of South Indian culture and learning. See Grondeirnann,
Missions-Atlas, No. 14 and 15. See also INDIA.

Maf'iu (Μάφιος v. r. Μαφίος, Vulg. Michelus),
given (1 Esdr. ix. 26) as the name of an Israelite whose
position was raised from Babylon, in place of the Maha-
ixi (q. v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezra x. 25).

Maffei, Bernard, a cardinal, and secretary of pope
Paul III., was born at Bergamo in 1514, and died in 1588.

He wrote a commentary on Cicero's Letters, and some
other works, which were highly esteemed in his time—
Hertzog, Real-Encyklopaedie, viii. 660.

Maffei, Francesco Boscoponti de, a noted Ital-
ian scholar, known chiefly as a dramatic writer, was born
at Verona June 1, 1675; studied at the Jesuit college
of Parma, there led a literary life, went to Rome in 1688,
and afterwards entered the army, and distinguished himself
in the war of the Spanish Succession; resumed his liter-
ary pursuits, died Feb. 11, 1755. Resolved on the high
merely literary productions, he wrote some theatrical
works, such as Astoria theologica delldottrine, e delle opin-
ioni corse ne, cinque priimi secoli della chiesa, et proposto
della divina gratia, del libero arbitrio e della predettis-
zione, Tridenti, 1712; translated into Latin by the Jes-
uit Frederick Reisersen (Frankfurt, M., 1726); and Gien-
aniemino nuovo dimonistrato nelle conseguenze il medesimo
(Venet. 1732). Among his works on morals, the most
important is Della scienza chiamata curarellesca (Rom.
1728, and often), in which he condemns duelling. His
De victoria principum (Verona, 1758) is a defence of
the theatre as a moral institution. His collected
works were published at Venice (1790, 18 vols. 8vo) —
Hertzog, Real-Encyklopaedie, viii. 661; Life and Times of
Palleario (Rome, 1860, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. i and ii.

Maffei, Giovanni Pietro, a noted Italian Je-
suit, was born at Bergamo about 1586; was for a time
professor in the Collegio Grande in 1646 successor of the
government at that place, and in 1655 joined the Jesuits,
among whom he gained a great reputation. Brought to
the notice of cardinal Henry, of Portugal, he was called
to Lisbon. He died in Tivoli in 1603. Maffei wrote on
the style J. P. de Lutecia Opera omnia Latina scripta
prima in usum corum collecta (Venet., 1641, 2 vols. 4to).—
Hertzog, Real-Encyklopaedie, viii. 660.

Maffei, Vespasian, an Italian priest, canon of St.
John of Lateran, was born at Lodi, in Lombardy, in
1407, and died at Rome in 1458. He enjoyed great reputa-
tion as a theologian and writer. His most im-
portant works were De sancto Ioanne Laterano, De
clariis curnia studiis ac moribus (Paris, 1511). It
was often reprinted, and was considered in its day one of
the best on the subject of education. He also wrote Philo-
lithes seu de omni veritate literaria et eruditionis dialogus
De decretis religiosis; De quattuor hominum rebus
secundis; also biographies of St. Bernard of Sienna, St.
Peter Celestine, Augustine and Monica, and a contin-
uation of Virgil's Æneid in 18 vols., etc.—Hertzog, Real-
Encyklopaedie, viii. 660.

Maffey, John Newland, a minister of the Method-
ist Episcopal Church South, was born of Episcopal pa-
rentage at Dublin, Ireland, Dec. 28, 1784; was destined
for the mercantile profession by his parents, but, joining
the Wesleyans in 1818, he determined upon the mini-
istry. Opposed by his friends and family at home, he
emigrated to this country in 1819, and not long after his
arrival became a member of the New England Confer-
ence. For two years he remained in the New England
Conference, and then removed to New York, acting there-
after only as a local preacher, moving at his own discretion, and preaching and lectur-
ing at such points as offered. In 1833, conjunction with
Rev. Mr. Leffler, he was admitted to the New York Asso-
ciation, as the first member of The Methodist Societies (now The Chris-
ian Advocate), the central organ of the Methodist Epis-
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copai Church South). In 1836–1837 he was agent for La Grange College, in Alabama, and subsequently was elected to the chair of elocution and belles-lettres in that institution, but he gave little attention to its duties, and the chair was soon discontinued. In 1841 he was chaplain of the lower house of Congress. His advent West and South-west was marked by a quickened religious interest in the popular mind. Vast assemblies gathered to hear him, and thousands, directly through his instrumentality, were added to the Church. Returning to New York, he became somewhat lax in his Church relations, and consequently lost his membership. In 1847 he removed to Arkansas, and there joined the Methodist Episcopal Church South, and was licensed to preach in 1848. At that time the frontier was a wide one, and there was a success small in comparison with his previous history, he left Arkansas for the Gulf cities. His last days were spent in carrying on a religious meeting in a small chapel of a suburban villa of Mobile, Ala. Public interest could no more be evoked by him who had been its master in the wilderness and in the city, as well as the street-preacher, the lecturer, or the camp-meeting leader. The spell was broken, or—the spirit of the man. He died suddenly, of heart rupture, near Mobile, May 28, 1850.

"Though amiable, he had the appearance of vanity, with some instruction; he was edified and drawn into gentleness, his zeal in the prosecution of his Master's cause and his boldness in the rebuke of so often waked up enemies. His social relaxations were thought by many to run into indiscretions and follies that marred his character and changed him in private life. See Sprague, A Manual of the American Pulpit, vol. vii.

Mag. See RAB-MAG.

Magalhaes, Gabriel de, a Portuguese missionary, was born at Pedrogao, near Coimbre, in 1609; was admitted to the "Society of Jesus" when only sixteen, and, desiring to enter the missionary work, departed for Goa, India, in 1634. On his way he stopped at Macao, and was led to make an extended tour through China, and so great became his interest in that country that he abandoned his intention of proceeding to India, and preached Christianity in the Chinese empire with zeal and apparent success. At first he was in favor at court, but fell into disfavor during the Christian persecutions, and barely saved his life. He died a peaceful death, May 6, 1677. He wrote several works on China. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxxi, 662.

Magalhaes, Pedro de, a Portuguese theologian, was born at Torres-Verdes about 1592; was for some time instructor in that university in the theology of the Dominican order to which he himself belonged; and died in 1677. He published De Scientia Dei (Lisbon, 1660, 4to).—De Predestinationem Exequiatione (ibid. 1667, 4to).—Lyons, 1664. De Voluntate et Tristitiae (ibid. 1669, 4to). He also left several valuable works in MS.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, vol. xxxii, s. v.

Magarita, Magarites, names given by some writers of the Middle Ages to the apostates from Christianity, especially to such as became Mohammedans. The origin of the name is unknown. See Du Cange, s. v.; Hennog, Rer. Expugnator. viii, 691; 871.

Magian. Described as (Hebrew Magian, 12:27, gathering Sept. Mayyâh, Vulg. Magie), a man whose descendants (so Clericus, ad loc., who compares the Persian name Mekechush, Herod. ii, 70, 160) to the number of 156 returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 30). It is omitted in the parallel list (Neh. vii, 33, 34). Most interpreters regard it as the name of a place, probably in Persia, and if it is an appellation of a city, or of some of the closely associated names are those of localities in that tribe. But it was perhaps rather another form for that of the Mag-panah (q. v.) of Neh. x, 39, where some of the same names are mentioned in a similar connection.

Magdala (Maryyâh [v. r. Maryâh], prob. the Chahl. emphatic form of the Hebrew מגדלה, Magedla, a tower; see Paulus, Comm. ii, 837 sq.), a town in Galilee opposite the Sea of Tiberias (Otho, Loc. Rabb. p. 401). It is mentioned only in Matt. xv, 39, as a place to which Jesus repaired after having crossed the lake, "though the best MSS. (Sin. Var. 11) read Mar robotics; which Alford observes, 'appears to have been the original reading, but the better-known name Magdala was substituted for it.' It is not unusual, however, for Syrian villages to have two names, and for the same name to have different forms. The parallel passage in Mark viii, 10 has, on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee, and Dalmanutha probably a village near it, for the whole shore of the lake was then lined with towns and villages. Eusebius and Jerome locate this place, which they call Magana, on the east of the Sea of Galilee, and they say there was in their day a district of Magedalensium, which is the old Latin version has Magana. In the 1st century this name is found on the map of Ptolemy (Geogr. ii, 10) for the east side of the lake (Life, p. 24), but the best MSS. read Gamala (Robinson, B. R. ii, 397; Josephus, by Hudson, ad loc.). Lightfoot places Magdala beyond Jordan, but his reasons are not satisfactory (Opera, ii, 418) (Kitto). Although it appears on the map of Ptolemy, though it has usually been located on the eastern (see Robinson's Researches, iii, 278; Strong's Harmony of the Gospels, § 70), is confirmed by the Jerusalem Talmud (compiled at Tiberias), which several times speaks of Magdala as being adjacent to Tiberias and Hamath, or the hot springs (Lightfoot, Chorog. Capit. 11, cap. xlii). It was a seat of Jewish learning after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the rabbis of Magdala are often mentioned in the Talmud (Lightfoot, l. c.). M. de Sauley, however, takes an opposite view on all these points (Narrative, ii, 455-457), as Pococke had done before (Magazines, ii, 71). In the Gospels it is alternatively referred to as the birthplace of Mary Magdalen, i. e. the Magdalene (q. v.), or of Magdala. A small modern village, bearing the name of Mejdel, is now found on the shore of the lake about three miles north by west of Tiberias, and the name and place area very strongly in favor of the conclusion that it represents the Magdalene of Scripture. It evidently (like the ancient town) derived its name from a tower or castle, and here Buckingham found the ruins of an old structure of this kind (Trav. i, 494). He speaks of it as being a small village close to the lake and built on a high hill, with remains of an old square tower, and some larger buildings of rude construction, apparently of great antiquity. "A large solitary thorn-tree stands beside it. The situation, otherwise unremarked, is dignified by the high limestone rock which overhangs it on the south-west, perforated with caves, recalling, by a curious though doubtless unintentional coincidence, the scene of Correggio's celebrated picture. These caves are said by Schwarz (p. 169)—though on no clear authority—to bear the name of Teline, i. e. Talmanah. 'A clear stream rushes past the rock into the sea, issuing in a tangled thicket of thorn and willow from a deep ravine at the back of the plain' (Stanley, S. and P. p. 392, 383). Jerome, although he plays upon the name Magdalene in somewhat broader allusions (in the text of the Vulgate, cf. 1 Chron. ii, 18), calls it Tebhum tam, or ebus singularum fœlici ac ardoris constantiam—does not appear to connect it with the place in question. By the Jews the word יְבָעַת is used to denote a person who platted or twisted hair, a practice then much in use among women of loose character. A certain 'Miriam Magdalen' is mentioned by the Talmudists, who is probably intended for Mary Magdalen. (See Otho, Loc. Zea.)
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Magdalen, a surname regularly applied to one of the Marys in the Gospels, derived from her place of nativity or former residence, in order to distinguish her from the other Marys (Matt. xxxvi, 56, 61; xxxvii, 1: Mark xv, 40, 47; xvi, 1, 9; Luke viii, 2; xiv, 10; John xix, 25; xx, 1, 18). See MAGDALENE.

Magdalen, RELIGIOUS ORDER of, a denomination given to various communities of nuns, consisting generally of reformed prostitutes; sometimes also called Magdalenitates. They were established at Naples in 1824, at Paris in 1842, at Mentz in 1844, and at Rouen and Bordeaux in 1847. In each of these institutions there were three kinds of persons and congregations: (1) nuns proper and under vow, bearing the name of St. Magdalen; (2) the congregation of St. Martha, composed of those not yet fully avowed; (3) the congregation of St. Lazarus, composed of such as were detained by force. The Order of St. Magdalen at Rome was established by Pope Leo X. Clement VIII settled a revenue on them, and further appointed that the effects of all public prostitutes dying intestate should fall to them, and that the testaments of the rest should be invalid unless they bequeathed to them a portion of their effects, at least a fifth part. The term originated in the mistaken notion that Mary Magdalen, of whom we read in the Gospel, was a woman of bad character; a notion which is still very prevalent, notwithstanding the increased attention that has been given to the interpretation of holy Scripture. See MARY MAGDALENE.

Magdalena de Pazzi, a saint of the Romish Church, was born at Florence April 2, 1566. She belonged to one of the highest families in Tuscany: she was educated in the convent of the Hospitallers of Nuns of St. John of God, and was refused to marry, May 27, 1584, took the veil in the Carmelite convent of St. Mary of the Angels. Her name, hitherto Catherine de Gere de Pazzi, was now changed to Maria Magdalena. She became wild in her religious enthusiasm, claimed to have visions, and to hold converse with the angels, with the Virgin, and even with Christ himself. She filled divers offices in her convent, and died May 25, 1607. Pope Urban VIII in the same year beathed her, and in 1669 she was canonized by Alexander VII. Her biography was written by her confessor, and her works were collected by the Carmelites of Bologna (Ven. 1739). See Bolland, adv. 25 Maii: Baillot, Vie des Saints; Richard et Giraud, Bibliotheque Sacrée; Herzog, Real-Encyclop., viii, 662; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen., xxxii, 616.

Magdeburg, a city of Saxony. See MAGDEBURG.

Magdeburg Centuries. See CEN

MAGGI

Maggi is the Latin form of the Greek term μαγγις, maggos, rendered "wise men" in Matt. ii, 1, 7, 16, and occurring in the singular, μαγγιον, with reference to Elymas (Acts xii, 6, 7). Compare the epithet Simon Magus. The term is still extant on the cuneiform inscriptions (see Olshausen, ad loc. Matt.). It corresponds to the Heb. מָגִי, Mag. The term magi was used as the name for priests and wise men among the Medes, Persians, and Babylonians. So the word Magi in our version of Jer. xxxxi, 8. In the plural, the proper name, properly signifies the prince magus or chief of the magi. While the priests and literati were known by the general name of magi, they were also known by the name of wise men, and likewise Chaldees (Is. xlix, 52; Jer. i, 56; Dan. ii, 12, 17; iv, 6, 18; v, 7, 6, 12, 15). To their number belonged the men of the zoroastrians and star-gazers (Is. lxvii, 18). So, also, the Chaldeans scribes and dream-interpreters either denote various orders of magi, or they are merely different names of the
same general class (Dan. i, 20; ii, 2; x, 27; iv, 7; v, 7, 11). See Magician. In the following account of this important and interesting class, we supplement what we have elsewhere said upon the subject.

II. Etymology of the Name.—In the Pehlevi dialect of the Zend, mokh means priest (Hymn, Relig. Velt. Pers. c. 31); and this is connected by philologists with the Sanscrit mukhat (great, nityas, and mukh; Anquetil du Perron’s Zend-Verst., ii, 555). The coincidence of a Sanskrit root in the sense of illusion, magic,” is remarkable; but it is probable that this, as well as the analogous Greek word, is derived rather than the original meaning (comp. Eichhoff, Vergleichung der Sprachere, ed. Kaltischmidt, p. 231). Hyde (L. C.) notices another etymology given by Arabian authors, which makes the word = senet es (sea; ports), but rejects it. Prideaux, on the other hand (Connection, under B.C. 522), accepts it, and seriously connects it with the story of the pseudo-Smerdis who had lost his ears in Herod. iii, 69. Spanheim (Duba. Erzv. xviii) speaks favorably, though not decisively, of a Hebrew etymology.

II. Their Original Seat.—This name has come to us through the Greeks as the proper designation of the priestly class among the Persians (Herod. i, 182, 140; Xenoph. Cyr. viii, i, 23; Plato, Alcth. i, 122; Dioz. Lexr. Proc. i, 2; Cicero, De Divin. i, 41; Apol. Apul. p. 82 ed. Cusabo, p. 290 ed. Eumenhorst; Porphyry, De Abst. i, 2, ed. Deubner, s. v. Mokh, n. 1, as before). Properly, however, that Magism was originally a Persian institution, and it may be doubted if it in its original form it ever existed among the Persians at all.

The earliest notice extant of the magi is in the prophecies of Jeremiah (xxix, x, 15), where mention is made of Rab-mag, a term, which though regarded in the A.V. as a proper name, and as signs chief magus, under the analogy of such terms as ἱεροναῦς (chief shaman), ἱεραρχός (chief butler). (See below, § iv.) The Rab-mag of Jeremiah is the same as the Rab Sinna ‘al kol Chakahin (רבע סינא על כל חכאים) of Daniel (i, 48); the τῶν ἱερών ἑικαστικυμένων σὺν Βαβυλωνίων κολὼν Χαλαδίων of Diodorus Sic. (ii, 24); and the ἄρχως of the later Greek writers (Sosizomen, Hist. Ecl. i, 18). This indicates the existence among the Chaldeans of a magian institution, in a negro form, and as a recognized element in the state, at least as a period not later than 600 B.C. (J. Jer. i, 35, it is evident the same class that is referred to under the designation of the wise men of Babylon). In the time of Daniel we find the institution in full force in Babylon (Dan. i, ii, 12, 18, 24; iv, 5, 15; v, 7, 8). From him this class is divided into the men of the Ca-manum, exponents of sacred writings and interpreters of signs (i, 20; iii, 2, 4, 3); the Askhiphan, conjurors (iv, 10; v, 7, 11; comp. xlvii, 9, 12); the Mezakhiphan, sorcerers, soothsayers, and diviners (ii, 2; comp. Isa. xlvii, 9, 10; Jer. xvii, 9); the Gourian, casters of natal signs, and astrologists (ii, 27; v, 11, 13); and the Chaldeans in the narrow sense (i, 5, 10; iv, 4, 7, 7; compare Hengstenberg, Beiträge, i, 345 sqq.; Havernick, Comment ad. Daniel, p. 52; Gesenius, Thes. ad voc.).

So much was Magism a Chaldean institution that the term Chaldean became to be applied as a synonym for the class (Diod. Sic. ii, 29 sqq.; Strabo, xvi, 752; Dioz. Lexr. Proc. i, 2; Cicero, De Divin. i, 1; Curtius, Hist. iii, 3, 6; Josephus, War, ii, 7, 8; Aul. Gallius, xvi, 20, 2; Apuleius, Asin. ii, 229, etc.).

Whether Magism was indigenous in Chaldea, and was therefore advanced to the adjacent countries, or was carried by the Chaldeans from Assyria, is impossible now to determine with any certainty. In favor of its Assyrian origin it has been urged that the word zib is found as the name of the Assyrian fire-priest (Movers, i, 64, 240), and that the priests of the Assyrian Artemis at Ephesus were called Meg-Abyzi (Strabo, xiv, 641). But on this nothing can be built, as we find the syllable Meg or Mag occurring in names and titles belonging to other peoples, as Mag-Atar (fire-priest), the father of Artemis among the Phoenicians; Teker-Mag, Teker the Magus (on the mast), etc. While we cannot say that the Chaldean was the older nation, and that the Assyrians derived many of their religious beliefs and institutions from the Chaldeans (Rawlinson, Fire Great Monarchies, i, 308; ii, 228), the probability is that they derived the institution of the magi also from the Hebrew chazeret. This institution was originally Semitic is further confirmed by the Phoenician tradition preserved by Sanchoniathon (ap. Euseb. Prap. Exem. i, 10), that Magos was a descendant of the Titans, and, with his brother Aymunos, made men acquainted with villages and flocks. It must be confessed, however, that the word zib has no more obvious religious affinities in the Indo-European than in the Semitic tongues (see above, §); but this can hardly be allowed to weigh much against the historical evidence of the existence of the magi in Shemitic nations anterior to their existence among those of the Aryan stock.

That Magism was not, as commonly stated, a Persian institution, is shown from several considerations: 1. The word does not appear to have existed in the Zend language; at any rate, it does not occur in the Zend-Avesta. 2. The religious system of the ancient Persians was a system of Dualism, as the most ancient documents confirm; the Zend-Avesta, for example, in the statement of Zoroaster’s Hraotrods (i, 429), but with this Magism had no affinity. 3. In the Zend-Avesta, the Yaros, the practice of magical arts, is vehemently denounced, and men are enjoined to pray and present offerings against his arts, as an invention of the Devas. 4. Xenophon informs us (Cyr. viii, 1, 23) that the magi were first established in Persia by Cyrus (comp. also Ammian. Marc. xxiii, 6; Porphyry, De abstin. iv, 16, etc.), a statement which can be understood only, as Heeren suggests (i, 451 sq.), as intimating that the magian institute, which existed long before the time of Cyrus, was introduced into the Persians by Cyrus the Great. 5. The Zend-Avesta, and the Porphyrios of Ammians (24), which speaks of the Persians also. 6. Herodotus (i, 101) states that the magi formed one of the tribes of the Medes; and he also attributes the placing of the pseudo-Smerdis on the Persian throne to the magi, who were moved thereto by a desire to substitute the Median for the Persian rule (iii, 61 sq.; comp. Herod. Persica, c. 10-15; Justin, Hist. i, 9; and the Behistun inscription as translated by Sir H. Rawlinson; see Rawlinson’s Herodotus, i, 427). 6. Herodotus mentions that, after this attempt of the magi had been frustrated, it became a usage among the Persians to observe a festival in celebration of the overthrow of the magi, in which they gave thanksgiving to Magophoria (μαγοφορία), and during which it was not safe for any magus to leave the house (iii, 79; Agathias, i, 25), a usage which could have had its origin only at a time when Magism was foreign to Persian beliefs and institutions. 7. We find no allusion to the magi in connection with any of the Medo-Persian kings mentioned in Scripture, a circumstance which, though not of itself of much importance, falls in with the supposition that Magism was not at that time a predominant Persian institution. The probability is, that this system had its source in Chaldea, was thence transferred to Assyria, Media, and the adjoining countries, and was brought from Media into Persia, where it came at first into collision both with the national prejudices and with the ancient religious faith of the people. With this accord the traditions which impute to Zoroaster the institution of the magi. It does not seem to have been regarded as the apostle of Magism, sometimes a Partheni and sometimes a Bactrian origin. See Zoroaster. Eventually, however, Magism seems to have been adopted into or reconciled with Zoroastrianism, perhaps by losing its original theosophic character, and taking on a more practical or philosophical province.

III. Prophetic Accounts of the Order.—The magi were originally one of the six tribes (Herod. i, 101; Pliny, Hist. Nat. v, 29) into which the nation of the Medes was divided, who, like the Levites under the Mosaic institutions, were intrusted with the care of religion, an
office which naturally, in those early times, made this caste likewise the chief depositaries of science and cultivation of art. Little in detail is known of the magi during the independent existence of the Median government; but under the Medo-Persian sway the magi formed a sacred caste or college, which was very famous in the ancient world (Xenophon. Cyrop. viii. 1, 23; Ammian. Marcell. xxiii. 6; Heeren. Fides, i, 451; Schloesser. Unvcrsal. Cipicara, i, 258. Porphyry (Adv. i. 16) says: "The learned men who are engaged among the Persians in the service of the Deity are called magi; and Suidas, "Among the Persians the lovers of wisdom (μαγιστροί) and the servants of God are called magi." According to Strabo (ii. 1084, ed. Falconer), the magi practiced the science of divination, and the arts of casting the horoscope, foretelling death; 2, by cups or dishes (Joseph's dividing-cup, Gen. xlii., 5); 3, by means of water. By the employment of these means the magi affected to disclose the future, to influence the present, and to call to the past to their aid. Even the visions of the night they were accustomed to interpret, not empirically, but according to such established and systematic rules as a learned priesthood might be expected to employ (Strabo, xvi. 762; Cicero, De Divin. i. 41; Elian. V. ii. ii. 17). The success, however, of their efforts over the invisible world, as well as their success or failure, depended on the divination which they executed, demanded, and in themselves peculiar cleanliness of body, a due regard to which and to the general principles of their caste would naturally be followed by professional prosperity, and this, in its turn, conspired with prevailing superstition in the magi great social ascension, and made them of high importance before kings and princes (Diog. Laert. ix. 7, 2)—an influence which they appear to have sometimes abused, when, descending from the peculiar duties of their high office, they took part in the strife and competitions of politics, and found themselves sufficiently powerful even to overturn thrones (Herod. iii. 61 sq.). These abuses were reformed by Zoroaster, who appeared, according to many authorities, in the second half of the 7th century before Christ. He was not the founder of a new system, but the renovator of an old and corrupt one, being, as he himself intimates (Zend-Avesta, i. 48), the restorer of the word which Ormuzd had formerly revealed, but which the influence of Persia had degraded into a false and deceptive magic. After much and long-continued opposition on the part of the adherents and defenders of existing corruptions, he accomplished his virtuous purpose and caused his system eventually to prevail. He appears to have re-modelled the institute of the magian caste, dividing it into three great classes: 1. herbods, or learners; 2. Mobeds, or masters; 3. Destur Mobeds, or perfect scholars (Zend-Av. ii. 171, 261). The magi alone he allowed to perform the religious rites of prayer and worship; they knew the ceremonies which availed to conciliate Ormuzd, and were obligatory in the public offerings (Herod. i. 132). They accordingly became the sole medium of communication between the Deity and his creatures, and through them alone Ormuzd made his will known; none but them could see into the future, and they disclosed their knowledge to those only who were so fortunate as to conciliate their good will. Hence the power which the magian priesthood possessed. The general belief in the trustworthy nature of their predictions, especially when founded on astrological calculations, the all but universal custom of consulting the will of the divinity before entering on any important undertaking, and the blind faith which was imposed in all that the magi did, reported, or commanded in the name of the Deity, for that exact castal caste of power, both in public and in private concerns, which has probably never been exceeded. Indeed the soothsayer was a public officer, a member, if not the president, of the privy council in the Medo-Persian court, demanded alike for show, in order to influence the people, and for use in occasions of public importance. It was he, the soothsayer, who, in different ranks and with different offices, conspired to sustain the throne, uphold the established religion, and conciliate or enforce the obedience of the subject. The fitness of the magi for, and the usefulness to, an Oriental court were not a little enhanced by the pomp of their dress, the splendor of their ceremonial, and the number and gradation of the sacred associates. Well may Cyrus, in uniting the Medes to his Persian subjects, have imitated in all his actions and observances what a priesthood which would go far to transfer to him the affections of his conquered subjects, and promote, more than any other thing, his own aggrandizement and that of his empire. Neither the functions nor the influence of this sacred caste were reserved for peculiar, rare, and extraordinary occasions. In all the arts of divination—the divination of the break of day they had to chant the divine hymns. This office being performed, then came the daily sacrifice to be offered, not indiscriminately, but to the divinities whose day in each case it was—an office, therefore, which none but the initiated could fulfill. As an illustration of the high estimation in which the magi were held, it may be mentioned that it was considered a necessary part of a princely education to have been instructed in the peculiar learning of their sacred order, which was an honor conceded to no other but royal personages, except when offered to the officers and attendants of the court. The knowledge of their writings, and of the importance which they placed not merely to the worship of the gods, but to the whole private life of every worshipper of Ormuzd—the duties which, as such, he had to observe, and the punishments which followed the neglect of these obligations, whence may be learned how necessary the act of the priest on all occasions was. Under the veil of religion the priest had bound himself up with the entire public and domestic life. The judicial office, too, appears to have been in the time of Cambyses, in the hands of the magi, for from them was chosen the college or bench of royal judges, which makes its appearance under the history of that monarch (Herod. iv. 81; vii. 194; comp. Esther i. 18). Men who held these offices, possessed this learning, and exerted this influence with the people, may have proved a check to Oriental despotism in no painful manner. This power, thus influenced and rendered unable to guarantee their own lives against the wrath of the monarch (Herod. vii. 194; compare Dan. ii. 19), and they appear to have been well versed in those country arts by which the hand that bears the sword is wont to protect instead of destroying. Thus Cambyses might have found the feeble king (like Haman VIII) if the laws permitted such a union: "We have," they adroitly answered, "no law to that effect; but a law there is which declares that the king of the Persians may do what he pleases" (Heeren. Ideen, i. i, 451 sq.; Hyde, Rel. Vet. Persarmata, ch. xxxii. p. 672 sq.; Brisse. Princip. Pers. p. 179 sq.).

Among the Greeks and Romans they were known under the name of Chaldeans (Strabo, xvi. 762; Diog. Laert. Proem., 1), and also of magi (Diog. Laert. viii. i, 3). They lived scattered over the land in different places (Strabo, xvi. 789; compare Dan. ii. 14), and had possessions of their own. The temple of Belus was employed by them for astronomical observations, and their astronomy was connected with the worship of the heavenly bodies practiced by the Babylonians (Diod. Sic. ii. 63; Strabo, xvi. 631; Plutarch. THEMISTOCLES). This temple was the sanctuary of the magi, and was, in the 19th century, a great place of pilgrimage for the Persians and others (Transactions of the Berlin Academy for 1874-25), and was specially directed to vain attempts to forecast the future, predict the fate of individuals or of communities, and sway the present, in alliance with augury, incantations, and magic (Ant. Gell. iii. 10; xiv. 1; Am. Marcell. ed. Berrett; Diod. Sic. ii. 29; comp. Ias. xlvii. 9, 13; Dan. ii).
IV. Position occupied by the Magi in the period covered by the Historia Sacra, ch. X. 72. In the Hebrew account, the Magi occur but twice, and then only incidentally. In Jer. xxxix, 3 and 18 we meet, among the Chaldean officers sent by Nebuchadnezzar to Jerusalem, one with the name or title of Rab-Mag (22.22). This word is interpreted, after the analogy of Rab-shakeh and Rab-saris, as equivalent to chief of the magi (Ewald, Propheten, and Herzog, Geschichte des Alten Orients, taking it as the title of an officer), and we thus find both the name and the order occupying a conspicuous place under the government of the Chaldeans.

It is clear that there were various kinds of wise men, and it is probable that these were classes belonging to one great order, which comprised, under the general title of Magi, all who were highly educated and possessed of a science of religion; so that we find here an ample priesthood, a sacred college, graduated in rank and honor (see Bertholdt, Excurs. zum Dan.; Gesenius, Comment. on Isa. ii, 534 sq.). The word Rab-Mag (if the received etymology of magi be correct) presents a hybrid formation. The first syllable is unquestionably Shemitic, the last is all but unquestionably Aryan. The problem thus presented admits of two solutions: (1) If we believe the Chaldeans to have been a Hamitic people, closely connected with the Babylonians (see Chaldæan), we must suppose that the civilization and the greatness which showed themselves in Nebuchadnezzar's conquests led him to gather round him the wise men and religious teachers of the nations which he subdued, and that thus the sacred tribes of the Medes rose under his rule to favor and power. (2) If the Massagetae, who have this character among the Jews (Dan. i, 4) makes this hypothesis a natural one; and the alliance which existed between the Medes and the Chaldeans at the time of the overthrow of the old Assyrian empire would account for the intermixture of religious systems belonging to different races. If, on the other hand, with Réan (Histoire des Langues Shimitiques, p. 66, 67), following Lassen and Bletter, we look on the Chaldeans as themselves belonging to the Aryan family, and possessing strong affinities with the Medes, there is even less difficulty in explaining the presence among the one people of the religious teachers of the other. It is likely enough, in either case, that the simpler Median religion which the magi brought with them, corresponding more or less closely to the faith of the Zend-Avesta, lost some measure of its original purity through this contact with the more superstitious system. From this time onward it is noticeable that the names both of the magi and Chaldeans are identified with the astrology, divination, and interpretation of dreams, which had impressed themselves on the prophets of Israel as the most characteristic features of the old religion (Isa. vii, 16, 20; Dan. i, 18), the magi took their places among the "astrologers, and stargazers, and monthly prognosticators."

It is with such men that we have to think of Daniel and his fellow-exiles as associated. They are described as "ten times wise than the sages (Sept., penis) and astrologers" (Dan. i, 29). Daniel himself so far sympathizes with the order into which he is, as it were, enrolled, as to intercede for them when Nebuchadnezzar gives the order for their death (Dan. ii, 24), and accepts an office which, as making him "master of the magicians, astrologers, Chaldeans, soothsayers" (Dan. v, 11), was probably identical with that of the Rab-Mag who first came before us. May we conjecture that he found in the belief which the magi had brought with them some elements of the truth that had been revealed to his fathers, as in the Zend-Avesta, but in the strengthened sympathy which showed itself in a hundred ways when the purest Aryan and the purest Shemitic faiths were brought face to face with each other (Dan. vi, 3, 16, 26; Ezra, i, 1; Isa. xliv, 28), agreeing as they did in their hatred of idolatry and in their acknowledgment of the right of God, yet meeting in the fulfillment of his appointment serve as illustrations of the high reverence in which the magi were held: "Then the king, Nebuchadnezzar, fell upon his face and worshipped Daniel, and commanded that they should offer an oblation and sweet odors unto him" (verse 46; see also verse 48). From the 49th verse it would seem not unlikely that the administration of justice in the last resort belonged to this priestly order, as we know it to the hierarchy of northern and western modern consciousness. (Compare 2 Macc. vii, 14; 1 Macc. xi, 14, 15; Trog. Achamn. p. 144; Bleeck, in Schleiermacher's Theol. Zeitschr. iii, 277; Hengstenberg's Daniel, p. 541.)

The name of the magi does not meet us in the Biblical account of the Medo-Persian kings. If, however, we identify the Artaxerxes who stopped the building of the Temple (Ezra vi, 17-22) with the Persian magi, the Magi of Herodotus (see Antiquitates) and the Gomates of the Behistun inscription, we may see here also another point of contact. (Compare Sir Henry Rawlinson's translation of the Behistun inscription: "The rites which Gomates the magian had introduced I prohibited.. . . the state the chanting, and the worship, and to those families which Gomates the magian had deprived of them" [Journ. of Asiatic Soc. vol. x, and Blaskeley's Herodotus, Excurs. on iii, 74]). The magian attempt to assert Medean supremacy, and with it probably a corrupted form of Magianism, in place of the Aryan faith in Ormuzd of which Cyrus had been the propagator, would naturally be accompanied by antagonism to the people whom the Persians had protected and supported. The immediate renewal of the suspended work on the triumph of Darius (Ezra iv, 24; v, i, 2; vi, 7, 9) falls in, indeed, with the account, with the Maccabæan story. The story of the actual massacre of the magi throughout the dominions of Darius, and of the commemorative magophagia (Herod. iii, 79), with whatever exaggerations it may be mixed up, indicates in like manner the triumph of the Magian system. The story of Zoroaster, and the traditional date of Zoroaster as a contemporary of Darius, we may see in the changes which he effected a revival of the older system. It is, at any rate, striking that the word magi does not appear in the Zend-Avesta, the priests being there described as athræus (guardians of the fire), and that there are multiplied prohibitions in it of all forms of the magic which, in the West, and possibly in the East also, took its name from them, and with which, it would appear, they had already become tainted. All such arts, auguries, necromancy, and the like, and everything esoteric and anti-Greek, are now in the court of king Ferdinand with the most persistent hostility (Du Perron, Zend-Avesta, vol. i, part ii, p. 269, 424).

The name, however, kept its ground, and with it probably the order to which it was attached. Under Xerxes the magi occupy a position which indicates that they had recovered from their temporary depression. They are consulted by him as soothsayers (Herod. vii, 19), and are as influential as they had been in the court of Astyages. They prescribe the strange and terrible sacrifices at the Strymon and the Nine Ways (Herod. vii, 114). They were to have urged the destruction of the temples of Greece (Cicero, De Legg. ii, 10). Traces of their influence may perhaps be seen in the regard paid by Mardonius to the oracles of the Greek god that offered the nearest analogue to their own Mithras (Herod. viii, 184), and in the like reverence which had been paid to them by the Macedonians (previously before Mithra) on the island of Delos (Herod. vi, 97). They come before the Greeks as the representatives of the religion of the Persians. No sacrifices may be offered unless one of their order is present chanting the prescribed prayers, as in the ritual of Mithraism. It is the mighty and indomitable strength of their faith, and the vigour with which they pursued their aims, that secured their success. No great change is traceable in their position during the decline of the Persian monarchy. The position of Judaism as a Persian province must have kept up some measure of contact between the two religious systems. The histories of Esther and Nehemiah point to the influence which they received from their temporal depression as a subject-race. It might well be that the religious minds
of the two nations would learn to respect each other, and that some measure of the prophetic hopes of Israel might mingle with the belief of the magi. As an order they perpetuated themselves under the Parthian kings. The name rose to fresh honor under the Sassanides. The classification of the Magi as Jews was rediscovered as the basis of a hierarchical system, after other and lower elements had mingled with the earlier dualism, and might be traced even in the religion and worship of the Parsees.

VI. Transition-stages in the History of the Word and of the Order between the close of the O. T. and the time of the N. T.—In the mean while the title magi was acquiring a new and wider signification. It presented itself to the Greeks as connected with a foreign system of divination, and the religion of a foe whom they had conquered, and it soon became a passport (μάγος) for the worst form of imposture. The rapid growth of this feeling is traceable perhaps in the meanings attached to the word by the two great tragedians. In *Eschylus* (*Persh.e*., 291) it retains its old significance as denoting simply a tribe. In *Sophocles* (*Ed. Tyr. 387*) it appears among the epithets of Procris which the king heaps upon Tiresias. The fact, however, that the religion with which the word was associated still maintained its ground as the faith of a great nation, kept it from falling into utter disrepute, and it is interesting to notice how, at one time the good and at another the bad side of the word is apparent. Thus the μαγια of *Zoroas*.

trix
ter is spoken of with respect by Plato as *Σωτιαστική*, forming the groundwork of an education which he prizes as far better than that of the Athenians (Aecl. i, 122 o). Xenophon, in like manner, idealizes the character and functions of the order (*Cyrop.* iv, 5, 16; 6, 6). Both meanings appear in the later lexicographers. The word magos is equivalent to *άνατατοι* and *φαρακμαντείης*, but it is also used for *Σωτιαστική* and *Σωτιαστική* (*Hesych.*). The magi, as an order, are *οἱ μαγοὶ Περσίκοι* and *μαγοὶ Περσίκοι* (*Suidas*). The word thus passed into the hands of the Sephardim and from them into those of the writers of the N. T., oscillating between the two meanings, capable of being used in either. The relations which had existed between the Jews and Persians would perhaps tend to give a prominence to the more favorable associations in their use of it. In Daniel (i, 29; ii, 10, 27; v, 11) it is used, as has been noticed, for the priestly diviners with whom the prophet was associated. Philo, in like manner (*Quod omnis probus libri*, p. 792), mentions the magi with warm praise, as men who gave themselves to the study of nature and the contemplation of the mysteries of the deities, worthy of being the counsellors of kings. It was perhaps natural that this aspect of the word should commend itself to the theosophic Jew of Alexandria. There were, however, other influences at work tending to drag it down. The swarms of impostors that were to be met with in every part of the Roman empire, known as "Chaldæi," "Mathematæi," and the like, bore this name also. Their arts were "aræ magicae." Though philosophers and men of letters might perceive the better meaning of which the word was capable (*Cicero*, *De Divin.* 1, 67), the language and duplicitous behavior of public and of private historians they were treated as a class at once hateful and contemptible (*Tacitus, Ann. i, 32; ii, 27; xii, 22, 59), and, as such, were the victims of repeated edicts of banishment. See *Lenormant*, *Childers Magic* (Lond. 1877). Of the same class (class B of *Bel. Pug.* 111) were the "Persae Hestenni" of the Parthians, as being at that time the conspicuous Eastern monarch in which the magi were recognised and honored. It is, perhaps, a legitimate inference from the narrative of Matt. ii that in these magi we may recognize, as the Church has done from a very early period, the first Gentile worshippers of the Christ. The name, by itself, indeed, applied as it is in Acts xiii, 8 to a Jewish false prophet, would hardly prove this; but the distinctive epithet "from the East" was probably intended to mark them out as different in character and race from the Western Jews, who had been so long over the Roman empire. So, when they come to Jerusalem, it is to ask, not after "our king" or "the king of Israel," but, as the men of another race might do, after "the king of the Jews." The language of the O.-T. prophets and of Matthew, written (according to the general belief of early Christian writers) for the Hebrew Christians of Palestine, we find it, not as embodying the contempt which the frauds of impostors had brought upon it through the whole Roman empire, but in the sense of a disparagement, in which the false magi were translated out of darkness into light (Justin Martyr, *Chrysostom*. Theophylact, in *Spanheim*, *Dub. Evan. xix.*; *Lightfoot*, *Hor. Heb.* in Matt. ii), we are justified, not less by the consciousness of later interpreters (including even Michaelis) than by the general sense of the text, in seeing in them such as those that were in the minds of the Sept. translators of Daniel, and those described by Philo—"at once astronomers and astrologers, but not mingling any conscious fraud with their efforts after a higher knowledge. The vagueness of the description leaves their country undefined, and implies that probably the evangelist himself had no certain information. The same phrase is used as in passages where the express object is to include a wide range of country (compare οἱ ἀνατατοί, Matt. viii, 27; xxii, 27; Luke xii, 29). Probably the region chiefly pressed to the mind of the *Palestiniae* and consequently would be the tract of country stretching eastward from the Jordan to the Euphrates, the "children of the East" in the early period of the history of the O. T. (Gen. xxix, 1; Judg vi, 3; vii, 12; viii, 10). It should be remembered, however, that the language of the O. T., and therefore probably that of Matthew, included under this name countries that lay considerably to the north as well as to the east of Palestine. Balaam came from "the mountains of the East," i.e. from Pethor, on the Euphrates (*Numb. xxiii, 1; xxiii, 5*). Abraham (or *Cyrus*) is in the right-hand side of *Theodorus* (*Isa. xxvi, 2*). The Persian conqueror is called "from the East, from a far country" (*Isa. lxvi, 11*).

We cannot wonder that there should have been very varying interpretations given of words that allowed so wide a field for conjecture. Some of these are, for various reasons, worth noticing. (1) The feeling of some early writers that the coming of the wise men was the fulfillment of the prophecy which spoke of the gifts of the men of Sheba and Seba (*Ps. lxxii, 15, 10*; compare *Isa. lx, 6*) led them to fix on Arabia as the country of the magi. (2) The word sometimes is applied to the Parthians, as in *Spanheim*, *Dub. Evang. l.*, and they have been followed by Banastri, Maldonatus, Grotius, and Lightfoot. (2) Others have conjectured Mesopotamia as the great seat of Chaldæan astrology (Origen, *Hom. in Matt. vii, vii*), or Egypt as the country in which magus was most prevalent (Meyer, ad loc.). (3) The historical associations of the word led others again, with greater probability, to fix on Persia, and to see in these magi members of the priestly order, to which the name of right belonged (*Chrysostom*. Theophylact, Calv. *Bel. Pug.*). Of the commentators of the O. T. who are to be traced in the same elements are (5) the facts that the Parthians, as being at that time the conspicuous Eastern monarch in which the magi were recognised and honored. It is, perhaps, a legitimate inference from the narrative of Matt. ii that in these magi we may recognize, as the Church has done from a very early period, the first Gentile worshippers of the Christ. The name, by itself, indeed, applied as it is in Acts xiii, 8 to a Jewish false prophet, would hardly prove this; but the distinctive epithet "from the East" was probably intended to mark them out as different in character and race from the Western Jews, who had been so long over the Roman empire. So, when they come to Jerusalem, it is to ask, not after "our king" or "the king of Israel," but, as the men of another race might do, after "the king of the Jews." The language of the O.-T. prophets and
the traditional interpretation of it are apparently new things to them. The narrative of Matt. ii. supplies us with an outline which we may legitimately endeavor to fill up, as far as our knowledge enables us, with inference and illustration. Some time after the birth of Jesus there appeared among the strangers who visited Jerusalem these men from the far East. They were not idolaters. Their form of worship was looked upon by the Jews with greater toleration than sympathy with any other Gentiles (compare Wisd. xiii. 6, 7). Whatever may have been their country, their statement indicates that they were watchers of the stars, seeking to read in them the destinies of nations. They said that they had seen a star in which they recognised such a prophet as the Jews were in the habit of looking for the Messaiah. They came to pay their homage. It may have been simply that the quarter of the heavens in which the star appeared indicated the direction of Judaea. It may have been that some form of the prophecy of Balaam, that a "star should rise out of Jacob" (Num. xxiv. 17), had reached them, either through the Jews of the Dispersion, or through traditions running parallel with the O.T., and that this led them to recognise its fulfilment (Orig., c. Cir. i; Hom. in Num. xiii.; but the hypothesis is neither necessary nor satisfactory; compare H. R. H. Levison, in z. v. Jeruslachi), had roused their minds to an attitude of expectancy, and that their contact with a people cherishing like hopes on stronger grounds may have prepared them to see in a king of the Jews the Oschanterina ("Homo Mundus," Hyde, i. c.) or the Zostoth whom they expected. In any case they shared the "veus et conquinque opinio" which had spread itself over the whole East—that the Jews, as a people, crushed and broken as they were, were yet destined once again to give a ruler to the nations. It is not unlikely that they appeared, occupying the position of the most ancient inspiration of the Zoroastrians, they were the representatives of many others who shared the same feeling. They came, at any rate, to pay their homage to the king whose birth was thus indicated, and with the gold, and frankincense, and myrrh which were the customary gifts of subject nations (comp. Gen. xlix. 10; Psa. cviii. 10; 1 Chr. xxvii. 20) and if iii. 6; iv. 14). The arrival of such a company, bound on so strange an errand, in the last years of the tyrannous and distrustful Herod, could hardly fail to attract notice and excite a people among whom Messianic expectations had already begun to show themselves (Luke i. 25, 38). "Herod was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him." The Sanhedrim was convened, and the question where the Messiah was to be born was formally placed before them. It was in accordance with the subtle, fox-like character of the king that he should pretend to share the expectations of the people in order that he might find in what direction they pointed, and then take whatever steps were necessary to crush them. See Herod. The answer given, based upon the traditional interpretation of Mic. v. 2, that Bethlehem was to be the birthplace of the King to determine the king's plans. He had found out the locality. It required to determine the time; with what was probably a real belief in astrology, he inquired of them diligently when they had first seen the star. If he assumed that that was contemporaneous with the birth, he could not be far wrong. The answer was, they "saw it in the east." If they were the forerunners of the king's own homage. As they journeyed they again saw the star, which for a time, it would seem, they had lost sight of, and it guided them on their way. (See Star in the East for this and all other questions connected with its appearance.) The pressure of the crowds, which a fortnight, or four months, or well-nigh two years before, had driven Mary and Joseph to the rude stable of the caravanserai of Bethlehem, had apparently abated, and the magi, entering "the house" (Matt. ii. 11), fell down and paid their homage and offered their gifts. Once more they received guidance through the channel which their work and their studies had made familiar to them. From first to last, in Media, in Babylon, in Persia, the magi had been famous as the interpreters of dreams. That which they now desired now appeared in the form of a disclosure of the plans of Herod to them. It was enough that it directed them to "return to their own country another way." With this their history, so far as the N.T. carries us, comes to an end. It need hardly be said that this part of the Gospel narrative has had to bear the brunt of the attacks of a hostile criticism. The omission of all mention of the magi in a Gospel which enters so fully into all the circumstances of the infancy of Christ as that of Luke, and the difficulty of harmonizing this incident with those of Judas Iscariot, which he mentions in the N.T. has been, lastly, that the traditional predictions ascribed to their own prophet Zoroaster, leading them to expect a succession of three deliverers, two working as prophets to reform the world and raise up a kingdom (Tavernier, Travaux iv. of the Jewish) to gather the 'three, coming to be the head of the kings, to conquer Ahriman and to raise the dead (Du Perron, Zend-Avesta, i. 2, p. 46; Hyde, c. 31; Ellicott, Hulsean Lect. i. c.), and in strange fantastic ways connecting these redeemers with the seed of Abraham (Tavernier, l.c.; and D'Herbelier, Biblique, Orient, s. v. Zendast), had roused their minds to an attitude of expectancy, and that their contact with a people cherishing like hopes on stronger grounds may have prepared them to see in a king of the Jews the Oschanterina ("Homo Mundus," Hyde, i. c.) or the Zostoth whom they expected. In any case they shared the "veus et conquinque opinio" which had spread itself over the whole East—that the Jews, as a people, crushed and broken as they were, were yet destined once again to give a ruler to the nations. It is not unlikely that they appeared, occupying the position of the most ancient inspiration of the Zoroastrians, they were the representatives of many others who shared the same feeling. They came, at any rate, to pay their homage to the king whose birth was thus indicated, and with the gold, and frankincense, and myrrh which were the customary gifts of subject nations (comp. Gen. xlix. 10; Psa. cviii. 10; 1 Chr. xxvii. 20) and if iii. 6; iv. 14). The arrival of such a company, bound on so strange an errand, in the last years of the tyrannous and distrustful Herod, could hardly fail to attract notice and excite a people among whom Messianic expectations had already begun to show themselves (Luke i. 25, 38). "Herod was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him." The Sanhedrim was convened, and the question where the Messiah was to be born was formally placed before them. It was in accordance with the subtle, fox-like character of the king that he should pretend to share the expectations of the people in order that he might find in what direction they pointed, and then take whatever steps were necessary to crush them. See Herod. The answer given, based upon the traditional interpretation of Mic. v. 2, that Bethlehem was to be the birthplace of the King to determine the king's plans. He had found out the locality. It required to determine the time; with what was probably a real belief in astrology, he inquired of them diligently when they had first seen the star. If he assumed that that was contemporaneous with the birth, he could not be far wrong. The answer was, they "saw it in the east." If they were the forerunners of the king's own
thing, too, may have been due to the leading thoughts of the two Gospels. Matthew, dwelling chiefly on the kingly office of Christ as the Son of David, seized naturally on the first recognition of that character by the magi of the East (comp. on the fitness of this, Mill, Pandectariae Principes, p. 373). Luke, portraying the Son of Man with common humanity, in his common passion on the poor and humble, dwells as naturally on the manifestation to the shepherds on the hills of Bethlehem. It may be added further that everything tends to show that the latter evangelist derived the materials for this part of his history much more directly from the seer of the Lord, or her kindred, than did the former; and, if so, it is not difficult to understand how she might come to dwell on that which connected itself at once with the eternal blessedness of peace, good will, salvation, rather than on the homage and offerings of strangers, which seemed to be the badge of an earthly kingdom, and had proved to be the prelude to a life of poverty, and to the death upon the cross.

VII. Later Traditions which have gathered round the Magi of Matt. ii.—In this instance, as in others, what is told by the Gospel writers in plain, simple words has been expanded for a whole cycle of legends. Christian mythology has overshadowed that which itself had nothing in common with it. The love of the strange and marvellous, the eager desire to fill up in detail a narrative which had been left in outline, and to make fit for all the representative of this idea—these, which tend everywhere to the growth of the material, are an element within the region of history, fixed themselves, naturally enough, precisely on those portions of the life of Christ where the written records were the least complete. The stages of this development present themselves in regular succession.

1. The Magi are no longer thought of as simply "wise men," members of a sacred order. The prophecies of Psa. lxxii.; Isa. xlix, 7, 28; Is. 16, 16, must be fulfilled in them, and they become princes ("reguli," Ter- taill. c. Jud. 9; c. Marc. 5). This tends more and more to be the dominant thought. When the arrival of the magi, rather than the birth or the baptism of Christ, as the first of his mighty works, comes to be looked on as the great epiphany of his divine power, the older title of the feast receives as a synonym, almost as a substitute, that of the Feast of the Three Kings. (2) The number of the wise men, which Matthew leaves altogether undefined, was arbitrarily fixed. They were three (Leo Magm. Serm. ad Epiphs.), because thus they became a symbol of the mysterious trinity (Hilary of Arles), or because the number corresponded to the threefold government of the world; or to the three great divisions of the human race descended from the sons of Noah (Bede, De Collect.). (3) Symbolic meanings were found for each of the three gifts. The gold they offered as to a king. With the myrrh they prefixed the bitterness of the passion, the embalming for the burial. With the frankincense they adored the divinity of the Son of God (Suicer, Thea. s. v. Muyon; Breu. Rom. in Epiphs. passim). (4) Later on, in a tradition which, though appearing in a Western writer, is traceable probably to reports brought back by pilgrims from Italy or the East, the names are added, and Gaspar, Melchior, and Balthasar take their place among the objects of Christian reverence, and are honored as the patron saints of travellers. The passage from Bede (De Collect.) is in many ways interesting, and as it is not commonly quoted by commentators, though often referred to, it may be worth while to give it: "Primum dictitur fuisse Melchior, qui senex et canus, barba prolixia et capillis, aurum obtulit regi Domino. Secundus nomine Gaspar, juvenis imberbis, rubicundus, thure, quasi Deo oblatione dignus, Deum honoravit. Tertius fuscus, integre barbatis, Balthasar nomine, per myr- raham filium hominis moriturum professus." The treat- is De Collectarum is, in fact, a miscellaneous collection of memoranda in the form of questions and answers. The desire to find names for those who have none given them is very noticeable in other instances as well as in that of the magi; e.g. it gives those of the penitent and impotent thief. The passage quoted above is followed by a description of their dress, taken obviously either from some early painting, or from the decorations of a tunic (comp. the account of a performance in Trenck's "Story of the Wise Men, 70) Than the amount of the offerings, it will be noticed, does not agree with the traditional hexameter of the Latin Church: "Gaspar fert myrrham, thus Melchior, Balthasar aurum." We recognize at once in the above description the received types of the material art of Western Europe. It is open to believe that both the descriptions and the art-types may be traced to early quasi-dramatic representations of the facts of the nativity. In any such representations, names of some kind would become a matter of necessity, and were probably invented at random. Familiar as the names given by Bede now are to us, there was a time when they had no more authority than Bithiasara, Melchior, and Gathaspar (Moron, Did- tomor. s. v. Magi); Magalath, Pangalath, Saracen; Ap- pelianus, Amerius, and Damascus, and a score of others.

In the Eastern Church, where, it would seem, there was less desire to find symbolic meanings than to magnify the circumstances of the history, the traditions assume a different character. The magi arrive at Jerusalem with a retinue of 1000 men, having left behind them a king who sat on a throne of silver; the sea of the East turned into milk; the Babylonian tower of Babel fell down (7000) (Jacob. Eedes. and Bar-herbesa in, Hyde, l.c.). They have been led to undertake the journey, not by the star only, or by expectations which they shared with the sibyls, but by a prophecy of the founder of their own faith. Zoroaster had predicted that in the latter days there should be a mighty One and a Redeemer, that his descendants should see the star which should be the herald of his coming. According to another legend (Opus imperf. in Matt. ii. opus Caryorzet. t. vi. ed. Montafonius) they came from the remotest East, near the borders of the ocean. They had been taught to expect the star by a writing that bore the name of Seth. That expectation was handed down from father to son. Twelve of the holiest of them were appointed to be ever on the watch. Their post of ob- servation was a rock known as the Mount of Tentyro. Night by night they washed in pure water, and prayed, and looked out on the heavens. At last the star appeared, and in it the form of a young child bearing a cross. A voice came from it and bade them proceed to Judea. They started on their two years' journey, and in the course of the time the three, or the three hundred, or the thirty, or the three thousand, they started never failed them. The gifts they bring are those which Abraham gave to their progenitors the sons of Keturah (this, of course, on the hypothesis that they were Arabians), which the queen of Sheba had in her turn presented to Solomon, and which had found their way back again to the children of the East. (Epiphan. in Comp. Doctr. in Moroni, Diescit. l.c.) They return from Bethlehem to their own country, and give themselves up to a life of contemplation and prayer. When the twelve apostles leave Jerusalem to carry on their work as preachers, St. Thomas finds them in Par- thia. They offer themselves for baptism, and become evangelists of the new faith (Opus imperf. in Matt. ii. l.c.). The pilgrim-feeling of the 4th century includes them also within its range. Among other relics supplied to meet the demands of the home market which the devotion of Helenus had created, the bodies of the three magi are dis- covered somewhere in the East, are brought to Constanti- nople, and placed in the great church which, as the Mosque of St. Sophia, still bears in its name the witness of its original dedication to the divine Wisdom. The favor with which this church was regarded is that the emperor's prefect Eutocius called for some special mark of favor, and on his consecration as bishop of that city he obtained for it the privilege of being the rest-
ling-place of the precious relics. There the fame of the three kings increased. The prominence given to all the feasts connected with the season of the Nativity—the transfer to that season of the mirth and joy of the old Saturnalia—the setting apart of a distinct day for the commemoration of the Epiphany in the 4th century—all this added to the world-wide interest and weight which they were regarded. When Milán fell into the hands of Frederick Barbarossa (A.D. 1162), the influence of the archbishop of Cologne prevailed on the emperor to transfer them to that city. The Milanese, at a later period, consded themselves by forming a special confraternity for perpetuating their veneration for the magi by the annual performance of a "Mystery" (Moroni, L.), but the glory of possessing the relics of the first Gentile worshippers of Christ remained with Cologne. (For the later mediæval developments of the traditions, comp. Joas. von Hildesheim, in Quart. Res. Ixxvi, 485.) In that proud cathedral which is the glory of Teutonic art the shrine of the Three Kings has for six centuries been shown as the greatest of its many treasures. The tabernacle in which the bones of some whose real name and history have no reliogion beyond its own beauty, in its gold and gems, to the faith with which the story of the wanderings of the Three Kings has been received. The reverence has sometimes taken stranger and more grotesque forms. As the patron saints of travellers they have given a name to the inn of the Three Kings, which is frequented and painted on the walls of churches. In the Somme and Balthasar were used as a charm against attacks of epilepsy (Spanheim, Duk. Exeget. xxvi.).

Compare, in addition to authorities already cited, Trench, Star of the Wise Men (Lond. 1865); Upham, Wise Men of the East (N.Y. 1869); J. A. Barth, Magia; Tribel and Migues, in Crit. Sacri (Thes. Nova. ii, 111, 118); and Rhoden, in Crit. Sacri (Thes. Theol. Phil. ii, 69). For the Talmudic views of the magi, see Leckerney, Observ. ii, 182 sq.

Other monographs on the general subject have been written by Nothnagel (Viteb, 1863), Müller (Tigern. 1860), Stolberg (Viteb, 1863), Olearius (Lips., 1671), and Moller (Alt. 1668).

Magic (only occurs in the A. V. at Wisd. xviii, 7, paryes a. v. paryes, "art magic;" but the term "magician" (q.v.) is frequent), a word used to designate the power of working miracles beyond the scope of science or natural skill. It is derived from the Greek, and refers ultimately to the magi (q.v.), who were anciently regarded as its depositaries or experts. The magical arts spoken of in the Bible are those practiced by the Persian kings and the kings of the ancient Medes and Persians, and the Hebrews, the Chaldeans, and probably the Greeks. In all ages and parts of the world they have played an important part in popular superstition (q.v.).

1. Position of Magic in relation to Religion and Philology in Ancient Times. The degree of the civilisation of a nation is not the measure of the importance of magic in its convictions. The natural features of a country are not the primary causes of what is termed superstition in its inhabitants. With nations as with men—and the analogy of Plato in the "Republic" is not altogether without an answer in the biblical narrative—are essential to the mental constitution. Contrary as are these assertions to the common opinions of our time, inductive reasoning forbids our doubting them.

1. With the lowest race magic is the chief part of religion. The Nigritions, or blacks of this race, show this in their extreme use of amulets and their worship of objects which have no other value in their eyes but as having a supposed magical character through the influence of supernatural agents. With the Turanians, or corresponding whites of the same great family—we use the word white for a tribe of nations, neighbours, fellow, in contradistinction to black—incantations and witchcraft occupy the same place, Shaminian characterising their tribes in both hemispheres. In the days of Herodotus the distinction in this matter between the Nigritions and the Caucasian population of North Africa was what it now is. In his remarkable account of the journey of the Nasamorian young men—the Nasamo-nes, be it remembered, were "a Libyan race," and dwellers on the northern coast, as the historian here says—we are told that the adventurers passed through the in- habitant of the inhabited maritime region, and the tract occupied by wild beasts, and the desert, and at last came upon a plain with trees, where they were seized by men of small stature, who carried them across marshes to a town of such men black in complexion. A great river, running from west to east, formed constant brooks and rivulets, flowed by that town, and all that nation were sorcerers (δια τοιούτων ἀκτέουσαν ἀκτέουσαν, γάχα τινα πάντας, ii, 32, 38). It little matters whether the conjecture that the great river was the Niger be true, which the idea adopted by Herodotus that it was the upper Nile seems to favor: it is quite evident that the Nasamones came upon a nation of Nigritions beyond the Great Desert, and were struck with their fetishism. So, in our own days, the traveller is astonished at the height to which this superstition is carried among the Nigritions, who have no more respect for their sorcerers than the English for their witches, in its gold and gems, to the faith with which the story of the wanderings of the Three Kings has been received. The reverence has sometimes taken stranger and more grotesque forms. As the patron saints of travellers they have given a name to the inn of the Three Kings, which is frequented and painted on the walls of churches. In the Somme and Balthasar were used as a charm against attacks of epilepsy (Spanheim, Duk. Exeget. xxvi.).

Compare, in addition to authorities already cited, Trench, Star of the Wise Men (Lond. 1865); Upham, Wise Men of the East (N.Y. 1869); J. A. Barth, Magia; Tribel and Migues, in Crit. Sacri (Thes. Nova. ii, 111, 118); and Rhoden, in Crit. Sacri (Thes. Theol. Phil. ii, 69). For the Talmudic views of the magi, see Leckerney, Observ. ii, 182 sq.

Other monographs on the general subject have been written by Nothnagel (Viteb, 1863), Müller (Tigern. 1860), Stolberg (Viteb, 1863), Olearius (Lips., 1671), and Moller (Alt. 1668).

Magic (only occurs in the A. V. at Wisd. xviii, 7, paryes a. v. paryes, "art magic;" but the term "magician" (q.v.) is frequent), a word used to designate the power of working miracles beyond the scope of science or natural skill. It is derived from the Greek, and refers ultimately to the magi (q.v.), who were anciently regarded as its depositaries or experts. The magical arts spoken of in the Bible are those practiced by the Persian kings and the kings of the ancient Medes and Persians, and the Hebrews, the Chaldeans, and probably the Greeks. In all ages and parts of the world they have played an important part in popular superstition (q.v.).

1. Position of Magic in relation to Religion and Philology in Ancient Times. The degree of the civilisation of a nation is not the measure of the importance of magic in its convictions. The natural features of a country are not the primary causes of what is termed superstition in its inhabitants. With nations as with men—and the analogy of Plato in the "Republic" is not altogether without an answer in the biblical narrative—are essential to the mental constitution. Contrary as are these assertions to the common opinions of our time, inductive reasoning forbids our doubting them.

1. With the lowest race magic is the chief part of religion. The Nigritions, or blacks of this race, show this in their extreme use of amulets and their worship of objects which have no other value in their eyes but as having a supposed magical character through the influence of supernatural agents. With the Turanians, or corresponding whites of the same great family—we use the word white for a tribe of nations, neighbors, fellow, in contradistinction to black—incantations and witchcraft occupy the same place, Shaminian characterising their tribes in both hemispheres. In the days of Herodotus the distinction in this matter between the
The Iranians assign to magic a still less important position. It can scarcely be traced in the relics of old nature-worship, which they with greater skill than the Egyptians interwove with their more intellectual beliefs, as the Greeks gave the objects of reverence in Arcadia a place in poetical form, and the Scandinavians animated the hard remains of primitive superstition. The character of the ancient belief is utterly gone with the assigning of new reasons for the reverence of its sacred objects. Magic always maintained some hold on men's minds, but the stronger intellects despised it, like the Roman commander who threw the sacred chickens overboard, and the Greek who defied an adverse omen at the beginning of a great battle. When any, oppressed by the sight of the calamities of mankind, sought to resolve the mysterious problem, they fixed, like Echylus, not upon the childish notion of a chance-government by many conflicting deities, but upon the nobler idea of a dominating fate. Men of highly sensitive temperaments have always inclined to a belief in magic, and there has therefore been a section of Iranian philosophers in all ages who have paid attention to its practice; but, expelled from religion, it has held but a low and precarious place in philosophy.

The Hebrews had no magic of their own. It was so strictly forbidden by the law that it could never afterwards have any recognized existence save in times of general heresy or apostasy, and the same was doubtless the case in the patriarchal ages. The magical practices which obtained among the Hebrews were therefore borrowed from the nations around. The hold they gained was such as we should have expected with a Semitic race, making allowance for the discredit thrown upon them by the prohibitions of the law. From the first entrance into the Land of Promise until the destruction of Jerusalem we have constant glimpses of magic practiced in secret, or resorted to, not alone by the common, but also by the great. The Talmud abounds in notices of contemporary magic among the Jews, showing that it survived idolatry notwithstanding their original connection, and was supposed to produce real effects. The Koran in like manner treats charms and incantations as capable of producing evil consequences when used against a man. It is a distinctive characteristic of the Bible that from first to last it warrants no such trust or dread. In the Psalms, the most personal of all the books of Scripture, there is no prayer to be protected against magical influences. The believer prays to be delivered from every kind of evil that could hurt the body or the soul, but he says nothing of the magical influence. Herein everywhere magic is passed by, or, if mentioned, mentioned only to be condemned (comp. Ps. cvi, 28). Those who affirm that they see in the Psalms merely human piety, and in Job and Ecclesiastes merely human philosophy, explain the absence of all these throughout the Scriptures, of the expression of superstitious feelings that are inherent in the Semitic mind. Let them explain the luxuriant growth, in the after-literature of the Hebrews and Arabs, and notably in the Talmud and the Koran, of these feelings with no root in those older writings from which the after-literature of the Bible, the Talmud, and the Koran be several expressions of the Semitic mind, differing only through the effect of time, how can this contrast be accounted for?—the very opposite of what obtains elsewhere: for superstitions are generally strongest in the earlier literature of a race and gradually fade. The once profound objects of the pre-Abrahamic idolatry, put away by order of Jacob (Gen. xxxv, 2-4), yet retained even in Jacob's time (Josh. xxi, 14); and, if so, notwithstanding his exhortation, abandoned only for a space (Judg. xvii, xviii); and these were also known to the Babylonians, being used by them for divination (Zek. xxii, 11). But there is great reason for supposing a close connection between the oldest language and religion of Chaldaea and the ancient Egyptian language and religion. The
The Egyptian word ter signifies "a shape, type, transformation," and has for its derivative a mummy: it is used in the Ritual, where the various transformations of the deceased in Hades are described (Todtenbuch, ed. Lepsius, ch. lxxxvi sqq.). The small mummy-shaped figures of the kingdom which are shaped with a blue vitreous varnish, representing the Egyptian as deceased, is of a nature connecting it with magic, since it was made with the idea that it secured benefits in Hades; and it is connected with the word ter, for it represents a mummy, the determinative of that word, and was considered to be one of the states in which the deceased passed through transformations, term. The difficulty which forbids our doing more than conjecture a relation between ter and teraphim is the want in the former of the third radical of the latter: and in our present state of ignorance respecting the ancient Egyptian and the primitive language of Chaldæans in their verbal relations to the Semitic family, it is impossible to say whether it is likely to be explained. The possible connection with the Egyptian religious magic is, however, not to be slighted, especially as it is not improbable that the household idolatry of the Hebrews was ancestral worship, and the shebêti was the image of a deceased man or woman, as a mummy, and therefore as an Osiriad, bearing the insignia of that divinity, and so in a manner as a defined dead person, where we do not doubt that it was used in the ancestral worship of the Egyptians. It is important to note that no singular is found of the word teraphim, and that the plural form is once used where only one statue seems to be meant (1 Sam. xix, 13, 16): in this case it may be a "plural of excellence." If the latter inference be true, this word must have become thoroughly Semitized. There is no description of these images; but, from the account of Michah's strataegem to deceive Saul's messengers, it is evident, if only one image be there meant, as is very probable, that they were at least sometimes of the size of a man, and perhaps in the head and shoulders, if not lower, of human shape, or of a similar form (ver. 13-16).

The worship or use of teraphim after the occupation of the Promised Land cannot be doubted as having been one of the corrupt practices of those Hebrews who leaned to idolatry, but did not abandon their belief in the God of Israel. Although the Scriptures draw no marked distinction between those who forsook their religion and those who added to it such corruptions, it is evident that the latter always professed to be orthodox. Teraphim had no name; they were not, as in the case of the Hebrews necessarily connected with strange gods, whatever may have been the case with other nations. The account of Michah's images in the book of Judges, compared with a passage in Hosea, shows our conclusion to be correct. In the earliest days of the occupation of the Promised Land, in the time of anarchy that followed Joshua's rule, Michah, "a man of Mount Ephraim," made certain images and other objects of heretical worship, which were stolen from him by those Danites who took Laish and called it Dan, there setting up idolatry, where it remained among the whole tribe. But at that ark was at Shiloh, the priests retaining their post "until the day of the captivity of the land" (Judg. xvii, xviii, esp. 30, 31).

Probably this worship was somewhat changed, although not in its essential character, when Jeroboam set up the golden calf at Dan. Michah's idolatrous objects were a graven image, a molten image, an ephod, and teraphim (xvii, 3, 4, 5; xviii, 17, 18, 20). In Hosea there is a retrospective of this period where the prophet takes a harlot, and commands her to be faithful to him "many days." It is added: "For the children of Israel shall abide many years without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image [or 'pillar,' הַנְּצָרָה], and without an ephod, and teraphim: afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek Jehovah their God, and David their king; and shall fear Jehovah and his goodness in the latter days" (iii, esp. 4, 5). The apostate people are long to be without their spurious king and false worship, and in the end are to return to their loyalty to the house of David and their faith in the true God. That Dan should be connected with Jeroboam "who made Israel to sin," and with the clefam, is most natural; and it is therefore worthy of note that the image, ephod, and teraphim made by Michah, and stolen and set up by the Danites at Dan, should so nearly correspond with the objects spoken of by the prophet. It has been imagined that the use of teraphim and the similar abominations of the heretical Israelites are not described in the Scriptures as the worship of strange gods. This mistake arises from the mention of pious kings who did not suppress the high places, which proves only their timidity, and not any lesser sinfulness in the spurious religion than in false systems borrowed from the peoples of Canaan and neighboring countries. This theocracy of the heathen are indeed especially reprobated, but the heresy of the Israelites is too emphatically denounced, by Samuel in a passage soon to be examined, and in the repeated condemnation of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, "who made Israel to sin," to render it possible that we should take a view of it consistent only with modern sophistry.

We pass to the magical use of teraphim. By the Israelites they were consulted for oracular answers. This was apparently done by the Danites, who asked Michah's Levite to inquire as to the success of their spying expedition (Judg. xvi, 6). In later times it is distinctly stated of the Israelites where Zechariah says, "For the teraphim have spoken vanity, and the diviners have seen a lie, and have told false dreams" (x, 2). It cannot be supposed that, as this first positive mention of the use of teraphim for divination by the context is after the return from Babylon, and as that use obtained with the Babylonians in the time of Nebuchadnezzar, therefore the Israelites borrowed it from their conquerors; for these objects are mentioned in earlier places in such a manner that their connection with divination must be intended, if we bear in mind that this connection is undoubted in a subsequent period. Samuel's reproof of Saul for his disobedience in the matter of Amalek associates "divination" with "vanity," or "idols" (יִדְּוֹל, and "teraphim," however we render the difficult passage where these words occur (1 Sam. xvi, 22, 28). (The word rendered "vanity," יִדְּוֹל, is especially used with reference to idols, and even in some places stands alone for an idol or idols). We are told of the death of the workers in black arts, finding himself rejected of God in his extremity, sought the witch of Endor, and asked to see Samuel, the prophet's apparition denounced his doom as the punishment of this very divination as to Amalek. The reproof would seem, therefore, to have been a prophecy that the self-confident king would at the last alienate himself from God, and take refuge in the very abominations he despised. This apparent reference tends to confirm the inference we have indicated. As to a later time, when Josiah's reform is represented as putting away the "wizards, and the teraphim, and the idols" (2 Kings xxiii, 24); where the mention of the teraphim immediately after the wizards, and as distinct from the idols, seems to favor the inference that they are spoken of as objects used in divination.

The only account of the act of divining by teraphim is in a remarkable passage of Ezekiel relating to Nebuchadnezzar's advance against Jerusalem. "Also, thou son of man, appoint thee two ways, that the sword of the king of Babylon may come: both twain [two swords] shall come forth out of one land: and choose thou a place, choose [it] at the head of the way of the city. Appoint a way, that the sword may come to Rabba of the Ammonites, and to Judah in Jerusalem the fenced. For the king of Babylon stood at the parting of the way, at the head of the two ways, to use divina-
tion: he shuffled arrows, he consulted with teraphim, he looked in the liver. At his right hand was the divination for Jerusalem" (xxi, 19-22). The mention together of consulting teraphim and looking into the liver may not indicate that the victim was offered to teraphim and its liver then looked into, but may mean an independent art of divining. The former explanation seems, however, to have been adopted by the Sept. in its rendering of the account of Michal's stratagem, as if Michal had been divining, and on the coming of the messengers seized the image and liver and hastily put them together. The Mishnah gives two reasons why the Rabbinists go to Talmudic times as those of divining by teraphim are worthless. See T. Τεραπινια.

2. Joseph, when his brethren left after their second visit to buy corn, ordered his steward to hide his silver cup in Benjamin's sack, and afterwards sent him after them, ordering him to claim it, thus: "If he be not with me, let not my silverASI be with me; let me know in what manner he has wronged me."

The meaning of the latter clause has been contested, Gesenius translating "he could surely foresee it" (ap. Barrett, Synopsis, ad loc.), but the other rendering seems far more probable, especially as we read that Joseph afterwards said to his brethren: "Wot ye not that such a man as I can certainly divine?" (xlv, 10)—the same word being used. If, so the reference would probably be to the use of the cup in divining, and we should have to infer that here Joseph was acting on his own judgment (see Josephus), divining not as a mere doubtful act, but one of which he, when called before Pharaoh, had distinctly disclaimed the practice. Two uses of cups or the like for magical purposes have been obtained in the East from ancient times. In one use either the cup itself bears engraved inscriptions, supposed to have a magical influence (see D'Herbelot, Bibliothèque Orientale, 6 v. Giam), or it is plain, and such inscriptions are written on its inner surface in ink. In both cases water poured into the cup is drunk by those wishing to derive benefit, as, for instance, the cure of diseases, from the inscriptions, which, if written, are dissolved (Lane, Mod. Eg. ch. x). This use, in both its forms, obtains among the Arabs in the present day, and cups bearing Chaldaic inscriptions in ink have been discovered by Mr. Layard, and probably show that this practice existed among the Jews in Babylonia in about the 7th century of the Christian era (Ninive and Babylon, p. 566, etc.). There is an excellent paper on these bowls by Dr. Levy, of Breslau, in the Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, ix, 465, etc.). In the other use the cup or bowl was of very secondary importance. It was merely the receptacle for water, in which a boy locked to see what the magician desired. This is precisely the same as the practice of the modern Egyptian magicians, where the difference that ink is employed and is poured into the palm of the boy's hand is merely accidental. A Gnostic papyrus in Greek, written in Egypt in the earlier centuries of the Christian era, now preserved in the British Museum, describes the practice of the boy with a bowl, and alleges results strikingly similar to the alleged results of the well-known modern Egyptian magician, whose divination would seem, therefore, to be the relic of the famous magic of ancient Egypt. (See Lane, Mod. Egypt. ch. xii, for an account of the performances of this magician, and Mr. Lane's opinion as to the causes of their occasional apparent success.) As this latter use only is of the nature of divination, it is probable that to Joseph referred. The practice may have been prevalent in his time, and hieroglyphic inscriptions upon the bowl may have given color to the idea that it had magical properties, and perhaps even that it had thus led to the discovery of its place of concealment, a discovery which must have struck Joseph's brethren with the greater wonder. See Curr.

8. The magicians of Egypt are spoken of as a class in the histories of Joseph and Moses. When Pharaoh's officers were troubled by their dreams, being in prison they were at a loss for an interpreter. Before Joseph explained the dreams he disclaimed the power of interpreting save by the divine aid, saying, "[Do not inter-
pretations belong] to God? tell me [them], I pray you" (Gen. xii, 8). In like manner, when Pharaoh had two of his officers imprisoned for committing a theft he professed to interpret dreams. We read: "He sent and called for all the scribes of Egypt, and all the wise men thereof: and Pharaoh told them his dream: but [there was] none that could interpret them unto Pharaoh" (xii, 8; comp. ver. 24). Joseph, being sent for on the report of his brethren's words (viii, 21), interpreted the dreams which he had heard that he could interpret a dream. Joseph said, "It is not in me: God shall give Pharaoh an answer of peace" (ver. 16). Thus, from the expectations of the Egyptians and Joseph's disavowals, we see that the interpretation of dreams was a branch of the knowledge to which the ancient Egyptian magicians pretended. The failure of the Egyptians in the case of Pharaoh's dreams must probably be regarded as the result of their inability to give a satisfactory explanation, for it is unlikely that they refused to attempt to interpret.

The two words usually designate the wise men or scribes for by Pharaoh are בְּרֵאשׁי, "scribes" (?) and בְּרֵאשׁי, "wise men," "wise men." We again hear of the magicians of Egypt in the narrative of the events before the exodus. They were summoned by Pharaoh to oppose Moses. The account of what they effected requires to be carefully examined, from the point of view of the question whether they are regarded as impostors or pharaohs. Pharaoh, and it shall become a serpent."

It is then re-
lated that Aaron did thus, and afterwards: "Then Pha-

raoh also called the wise men and the enchanters: now they, the scribes of Egypt, did so by their secret arts: for they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents, but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods" (Exod. vii, 8-12). The rods were probably long staffs like those represented on the Egyptian monuments, not much less than the height of a man. If the word used mean here a serpent, the Egyptian magicians may have feigned a change: if it signify a crocodile, they could readily effect it. But in the third case these three occasions on which the magicians are designated are to be noted. That which we render "scribes" seems here to have a general significance, including wise men and enchanters. The last term is more definite in its meaning, denoting users of incubations. On the occasion of the first plague, the turning of the waters of Egypt into blood, the opposition of the magicians again occurs. "And the scribes of Egypt did so by their secret arts" (vii, 22). When the second plague, that of frogs, was sent, the magicians again made the same opposition (viii, 7). Once more they appear in the history. The plague of lice came, and we read that when Aaron had worked the wonder the magicians opposed him: "And the scribes did so by their secret arts to bring forth the lice, but they could not: so there were lice upon man and upon beast. And the scribes said unto Pharaoh, This is the God of the Hebrews that hath caused Pharaoh to hearken, and he hearkened not unto them, as the Lord had said" (viii, 18, 19 [Hch. 14, 15]). After this we hear no more of the magicians. All we can gather from the narrative is that the appearances produced by them were sufficient to deceive the Egyptians. It is nowhere declared that they actually produced wonders, since the expression "the scribes did so by their secret arts" is used on the occasion of their complete failure. Nor is their statement that in the wonder brought by Aaron they saw thefinger of God pointing that they were not the one of the gods whom they set in their cities. It is nowhere declared that they actually produced wonders, since the expression "the scribes did so by their secret arts" is used on the occasion of their complete failure. Nor is their statement that in the wonder brought by Aaron they saw the finger of God pointing that they were not the one of the gods whom they set in their cities.
no avail against the work of a divinity." There is one later mention of these transactions, which adds to our information, but does not decide the main question. St. Paul mentions Jannes and Jambres as having "withstood Moses," and says that their folly in doing so became manifest (2 Tim. iii, 8, 9). The Egyptian character of these names, the first of which is, in our opinion, found in hieroglyphics, is not inconsistent with the opinion that the apostle cited a prevalent tradition of the Jews. See Jannes and Jambres.

We turn to the Egyptian illustrations of this part of the subject. Magic, as we have before remarked, was inherent in the ancient Egyptian religion. The Ritual is a system of incantations and directions for making amulets, with the object of securing the happiness of the disembodied soul. However obscure the belief of the Egyptians as to the actual character of the state of the soul after death may be to us, it cannot be doubted that the knowledge and use of the magical amulets and incantations treated of in the Ritual was held to be necessary for future happiness, although it was not believed that they alone could assure it, since to have done good works, or, more strictly, not to have committed certain sins, was an essential condition of the acquittal of the soul in the great trial in Hades. The thoroughness of the murder of the most strikingly evident in the minute directions given for making amulets (Todtendub, ch. c, cxxix, cxxxiv), and the secrecy enjoined in one case on those thus occupied (ch. cxxxiii). The later chapters of the Ritual (cixciilav), held to have been added in more recent times after the composition of the rest, which theory, as M. Chabas has well remarked, does not prove their much more modern date (Le Papyrus Magique Harris, p. 162), contain mystical names not bearing an Egyptian etymology. These names have been thought to be Ethiopian; they either have no signification, and are mere magical gibberish, or else they are, mainly at least, of foreign origin. Besides the Ritual the ancient Egyptians had books of a purely magical character, such as that which M. Chabas has edited in his work referred to above. The main source of their belief in the efficacy of magic appears to have been the idea that the souls of the dead, whether justified or condemned, had the power of reviving the earth and taking various forms. This belief is abundantly used in the moral tale of "The Two Brothers," of which the text has recently been published by the trustees of the library of Leiden. A similar fate is handed down in the account of the deeds of Joseph (Deut. x, 19, 20), and we learn from this ancient papyrus the age and source of much of the machinery of medieval fictions, both Eastern and Western. A likeness that strikes us at once in the case of a fiction is not less true of the Ritual. The typical perils encountered by Hades are the first rude indications of the adventures of the heroes of Arab and German romance. The regions of terror traversed, the mystic portals that open alone to magical words, and the monsters whom magic alone can deprive of their power to injure, are here already in the book that in part was found in the reign of King Mencheres, four thousand years ago. Bearing in mind the Nigritian nature of Egyptian magic, we may look for the source of these ideas in primitive Africa. There we find the realities of which the ideal form is not greatly distorted, though greatly intensified. The forests that clothe the higher slopes of the Nile; the palm, the date, and the pomegranate; the serpents and scorpions, the crocodile, the pachydermata, the lion, perchance the gorilla, are the genii that hold this land of fear. In what dread must the first scatty population have held dangers and enemies still feared by their swarming posterity. No wonder, then, that imagination in the Nigritian mind would be filled with a superstitious fear which certain conditions of external nature always produce with races of a low type, where a higher feeling would only be touched by the analogies of life and death, of time and eternity. No wonder that, so struck, the primitive race imagined the evils of the unseen world to be the recurrence of those against which they struggled while on earth. That there is some ground for our theory, besides the generalization which led us to it, is shown by a usual Egyptian name of Hades, "the west," and the west region of Egypt might directly give birth to such fancies as form the common ground of the machinery, not the general belief, of the Ritual, as well as of the machinery of medieval fiction, is shown by the fables that the rude Arabs of our own day tell of the wonders they have seen.

Like all other peoples of the Nile basin, generally, the Egyptians separated it into a lawful kind and an unlawful. M. Chabas has proved this from a papyrus which he finds to contain an account of the prosecution, in the reign of Rameses III (B:C: circ. 1220), of an official for unlawfully acquiring and using magical books, the king's property. The culprit was convicled and punished with death (p. 169 sqq.).

A belief in unlucky and lucky days, in actions to be avoided or done on certain days, and in the fortune attending birth on certain days, was extremely strong, as we learn from the remarks of the most strikingly evident in the minute directions given for making amulets (Todtendub, ch. c, cxxix, cxxxiv), and the secrecy enjoined in one case on those thus occupied (ch. cxxxiii). The later chapters of the Ritual (cixcilav), held to have been added in more recent times after the composition of the rest, which theory, as M. Chabas has well remarked, does not prove their much more modern date (Le Papyrus Magique Harris, p. 162), contain mystical names not bearing an Egyptian etymology. These names have been thought to be Ethiopian; they either have no signification, and are mere magical gibberish, or else they are, mainly at least, of foreign origin. Besides the Ritual the ancient Egyptians had books of a purely magical character, such as that which M. Chabas has edited in his work referred to above. The main source of their belief in the efficacy of magic appears to have been the idea that the souls of the dead, whether justified or condemned, had the power of reviving the earth and taking various forms. This belief is abundantly used in the moral tale of "The Two Brothers," of which the text has recently been published by the trustees of the library of Leiden. A similar fate is handed down in the account of the deeds of Joseph (Deut. x, 19, 20), and we learn from this ancient papyrus the age and source of much of the machinery of medieval fictions, both Eastern and Western. A likeness that strikes us at once in the case of a fiction is not less true of the Ritual. The typical perils encountered by Hades are the first rude indications of the adventures of the heroes of Arab and German romance. The regions of terror traversed, the mystic portals that open alone to magical words, and the monsters whom magic alone can deprive of their power to injure, are here already in the book that in part was found in the reign of King Mencheres, four thousand years ago. Bearing in mind the Nigritian nature of Egyptian magic, we may look for the source of these ideas in primitive Africa. There we find the realities of which the ideal form is not greatly distorted, though greatly intensified. The forests that clothe the higher slopes of the Nile; the palm, the date, and the pomegranate; the serpents and scorpions, the crocodile, the pachydermata, the lion, perchance the gorilla, are the genii that hold this land of fear. In what dread must the first scatty population have held dangers and enemies still feared by their swarming posterity. No wonder, then, that imagination in the Nigritian mind would be filled with a superstitious fear which certain conditions of external nature always produce with races of a low type, where a higher feeling would only be touched by the analogies of life and death, of time and eternity. No wonder that, so struck, the primitive race imagined the evils of the unseen world to be the recurrence of those against which they struggled while on earth. That there is some ground for our theory, besides the generalization which led us to it, is shown by a usual Egyptian name of Hades, "the west," and the west region of Egypt might directly give birth to such fancies as form the common ground of the machinery, not the general belief, of the Ritual, as well as of the machinery of medieval fiction, is shown by the fables that the rude Arabs of our own day tell of the wonders they have seen.

Like all other peoples of the Nile basin, generally, the Egyptians separated it into a lawful kind and an unlawful. M. Chabas has proved this from a papyrus which he finds to contain an account of the prosecution, in the reign of Rameses III (B:C: circ. 1220), of an official for unlawfully acquiring and using magical books, the king's property. The culprit was convicled and punished with death (p. 169 sqq.).

A belief in unlucky and lucky days, in actions to be avoided or done on certain days, and in the fortune attending birth on certain days, was extremely strong, as we learn from the remarks of the most strikingly evident in the minute directions given for making amulets (Todtendub, ch. c, cxxix, cxxxiv), and the secrecy enjoined in one case on those thus occupied (ch. cxxxiii). The later chapters of the Ritual (cixcilav), held to have been added in more recent times after the composition of the rest, which theory, as M. Chabas has well remarked, does not prove their much more modern date (Le Papyrus Magique Harris, p. 162), contain mystical names not bearing an Egyptian etymology. These names have been thought to be Ethiopian; they either have no signification, and are mere magical gibberish, or else they are, mainly at least, of foreign origin. Besides the Ritual the ancient Egyptians had books of a purely magical character, such as that which M. Chabas has edited in his work referred to above. The main source of their belief in the efficacy of magic appears to have been the idea that the souls of the dead, whether justified or condemned, had the power of reviving the earth and taking various forms. This belief is abundantly used in the moral tale of "The Two Brothers," of which the text has recently been published by the trustees of the library of Leiden. A similar fate is handed down in the account of the deeds of Joseph (Deut. x, 19, 20), and we learn from this ancient papyrus the age and source of much of the machinery of medieval fictions, both Eastern and Western. A likeness that strikes us at once in the case of a fiction is not less true of the Ritual. The typical perils encountered by Hades are the first rude indications of the adventures of the heroes of Arab and German romance. The regions of terror traversed, the mystic portals that open alone to magical words, and the monsters whom magic alone can deprive of their power to injure, are here already in the book that in part was found in the reign of King Mencheres, four thousand years ago. Bearing in mind the Nigritian nature of Egyptian magic, we may look for the source of these ideas in primitive Africa. There we find the realities of which the ideal form is not greatly distorted, though greatly intensified. The forests that clothe the higher slopes of the Nile; the palm, the date, and the pomegranate; the serpents and scorpions, the crocodile, the pachydermata, the lion, perchance the gorilla, are the genii that hold this land of fear. In what dread must the first scatty population have held dangers and enemies still feared by their swarming posterity. No wonder, then, that imagination in the Nigritian mind would be filled with a superstitious fear which certain conditions of external nature always produce with races of a low type, where a higher feeling would only be touched by the analogies of life and death, of time and eternity. No wonder that, so struck, the primitive race imagined the evils of the unseen world to be the recurrence of those against which they struggled while on earth. That there is some ground for our theory, besides the generalization which led us to it, is shown by a usual Egyptian name of Hades, "the west," and the west region of Egypt might directly give birth to such fancies as form the common ground of the machinery, not the general belief, of the Ritual, as well as of the machinery of medieval fiction, is shown by the fables that the rude Arabs of our own day tell of the wonders they have seen.
nations of Canaan were to be driven out (Deut. xvii. 9-14, esp. 10, 11). It is remarkable that the offering of children should be mentioned in connection with magical arts. The passage in Micah, which has been supposed to preserve a question of Balak and an answer of Balaam, when the soothsayer was sent for to curse Israel, has long been noticed, for here no questioner asks after speaking of sacrifices of usual kinds, "Shall I give my first-born [for] my transgression, the fruit of my body [for] the sin of my soul?" (vi. 5-8). Perhaps, however, child-sacrifice is specified on account of its atrocity, which would connect it with ancient arts, such as we know were frequently, in later times, the causes of cruelty. The terms which follow appear to refer properly to eight different kinds of magic, but some of them are elsewhere used in a general sense. 1. דְּבָר יְהוָה is literally "a diviner of divinations." The verb בַּשָּׁה is used of false prophets, but also in a general sense for divining, as in the narrative of Saul's consultation of the witch of Endor, where the king says "divine unto me (נָבָה אֵלֶּה)," I pray thee, by the familiar spirit" (I Sam. xxviii., 8). 2. בַּשָּׁה כָּרָ֥ב' conveys the idea of "one who acts covertly," and so "a worker of hidden arts." The meaning of the root כָּרָ֥ב is "covering," and the supposed connection with fascination by the eyes, like the notion of "the evil eye," as though the original root were "the eye" (אֶל), seems untenable. The ancient Egyptians seem to have held the superstition of the evil eye, for an eye is the determinative of a word which appears to signify some kind of magic (Chalas, Papyrus Magique Harris, p. 170 and note 4). 3. בַּשָּׁה, which we render "an augurer," is from בַּשָּׁה, which is literally "he or it hearkened or whistled," and in Hebraism is applied to the practices of enchantments, but used to divining generally, as in the case of Joseph's cup, and where, evidently referring to it, he tells his brethren that he could divine, although in both places it has been read more vaguely with the sense to foresee or make trial (Gen. xliii., 5, 13). We therefore render it by a term which seems appropriate, but not too definite. The supposed connection of בַּשָּׁה with בַּשָּׁה, "a serpent," as though meaning serpent-divination, must be rejected, the latter word rather coming from the former, with the signification a hisser." The name Nahash (נַֽחַש), of a prince of Judah in the second year after the exodus (Num. i. 7; Exod. vii. 29; Ruth iv. 20, etc.), means "enchanter:" it was probably used as a proper name in a vague sense. 4. בַּשָּׁה signifies "an enchanter:" the original name meant probably "that which was prayed, and the strict sense of this word "one who uses incantations." 5. בַּשָּׁה seems to mean "a fabricator of material charms or amulets," if בַּשָּׁה, when used of practicing sorcery, means to bind magical knots, and not to bind a person by spells. 6. בַּשָּׁה לִגְּנֵ֥שׁ is an "inquirer by a familiar spirit." The second term signifies a bottle, a familiar spirit consulted by a soothsayer, and a soothsayer having a familiar spirit. The Sept. usually render the plural בַּשָּׁ֥הּ by ἀραβομάρια, which has been rashly translated ventriloquists, for it may not signify what we understand by the latter, but refer to the mode in which soothsayers of this kind gave out their responses: to this subject we shall recur later. The consulting of familiar spirits may mean no more than invoking them: but in the Acts we read of a damask spirit possessed with a spirit of divination for the very distinct terms. This kind of sorcery—divination by a familiar spirit—was practiced by the witch of Endor. 7. בַּשָּׁ֥ה, which we render "a wizard," is properly "a wise man," but is always applied to wizards and false prophets. Gesenius (Thesaur. s. v.) supposes that in Lev. xx. 27 it is used of a familiar spirit, but surely the reading "a wizard" is there more probable. 8. The last term, דַּכְּרָ֣ה לִגְּנֵ֥שׁ, is very explicit, meaning "a consultant of the dead:" necromancer is an exact translation if the original signification of the latter is retained, instead of the more general one it now usually bears. In the law it was commanded that a man or woman who had a familiar spirit, or a wizard, should be stoned (Lev. xx., 27). An "enchancer" (בַּשָּׁ֥ה לִגְּנֵ֥שׁ) was not to live (Exod. xx. 28, [Heb. 17]). Using augury and hidden arts was also forbidden (Lev. xix. 26). See Dives. 5. The history of Balaam shows the belief of some ancient nations in the powers of soothsayers. When the Israelites had begun to conquer the land of Promise, Balak, the king of Moab, and the elders of Midian, resolved to embassied to Balaam, for they were afraid of the men of Israel, and hence sent messengers with the "rewards of divination (נַשָּׁ֥ה לִגְּנֵ֥שׁ)" in their hands (Num. xxii., 7) for Balaam the diviner (גֵּבֹה, Josh. iii., 22), whose fame was known to them, though he dwelt in Arah. Balak's message shows what he believed Balaam's powers to be: "Behold, there is a people come out from Egypt: behold, they cover the face of the earth, and they abide over against me: come now, I pray thee, curse me, even so may the Lord make himself great against me, for they [are] too mighty for me: peradventure I shall prevail, [that] we may smite them, and [that] I may drive them out of the land: for I wot that whom thou blessed [is] blessed; and whom thou cursest is cursed" (xxii., 6). We are told, however, that Balaam, warned of God, first said that he could not speak of himself, and then by inspiration blessed those whom he had sent for to curse. He appears to have received inspiration in a vision or a trance. In one place it is said, "And Balaam saw that it was good in the eyes of the Lord to bless Israel, and he went not, now as before, to the meeting of enchantments (נַשָּׁ֥ה לִגְּנֵ֥שׁ), but he set his face to the wilderness" (xxiv., 1). From this it would seem that it was his wont to use enchantments, and that when on other occasions he went away after the sacrifices had been offered, he hoped that he could prevail to obtain the wish of those who had sent for him, but was constantly defeated. The building of new altars of the mystic number of seven, and the offering of seven oxen and seven rams, seems to show that Balaam had some such idea; and the marked manner in which he declared "there is no enchantment with me against Jacob" (xxii., 20) proves that he had come in the hope that he could have prevailed, the divination being made to declare his own powerlessness while he blessed those whom he was sent for to curse. The case is a very difficult one, since it shows a man who was used as an instrument for declaring God's will trusting in practices that could only have incurred his displeasure. The simplest explanation seems to be that Balaam was never a true prophet but on this occasion, when the enemies of Israel were to be signal!y confounded. This history affords a notable instance of the failure of magicians in attempting to resist the divine will. See Balaam. 6. The account of Saul's consulting the witch of Endor is the foremost place in Scripture of those which refer to magic. The supernatural terror of which it is full cannot, however, be proved to be due to this art, for it has always been held by sober critics that the appearing of Samuel was permitted for the purpose of declaring the doom of Saul, and not that it was caused by the incantations of a sorceress. As, however, the narrative is allowed to be very difficult, we may look for a moment at the evidence of its authenticity. The details are strictly in accordance with the age: there is a simplicity in the manner described that is up to the time. The circumstances are agreeable with the rest of the history, and especially with all we know of Saul's character. Here, as ever, he is seen resolved to gain his ends without caring what wrong he does: he wishes to consult a prophet, and asks a witch to call up his shade.
Most of all, the vigor of the narrative, showing us the scene in a few words, proves its antiquity and genuineness. We can see no reason whatever for supposing that "all the nations" which inhabited the earth knew of it.

"Now Samuel was dead, and all Israel had lamented him, and buried him in Ramah, even in his own city. And Saul had put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land. And the Philistines gathered themselves together, and came and pitched in Shunem; and Saul gathered all Israel together, and they pitched in Gilboa." That the Philistines should have advanced so far, spreading in the plain of Esdraelon, the garden of the Holy Land, shows the strains to which Saul had come. Here, in times of faith, Sisera was defeated. Here the Philistines were defeated. Here, in time of distress and fear, Samuel was sent by God to appoint a king to Israel. Samuel knew Gideon, some of the army of the former perishing at En-dor itself (1 Sam. xxxiii, 9, 10). "And when Saul saw the host of the Philistines, he was afraid, and his heart greatly trembled. And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets. Then said Saul unto his servants, Seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit, that I may go to her, and inquire of her. And his servants said to him, Behold, there is a woman that hath a familiar spirit at En-dor." And Saul disguised himself, and put on other clothing, and went, and two men went with him, and they came to the woman by night. "And the woman saw Saul, but Saul lurked by her chamber in another chamber." For Saul was on the side of the Philistines, and lay in the territory of Issachar, about seven or eight miles to the northward of Mount Gilboa. Its name, the "fountain of Dor," may connect it with the Phoenician city Dor, which was on the coast to the westward. If so, it may have retained its original population, and be modernly known under the modern name of the "fountain of Dor." It was a common place of journeying by night, seem to have been taken that he might not alarm the woman, rather than because he might have passed through a part of the Philistine force. The Philistines held the plain, having their camp at Shunem, whither they had pushed on from Aphek: the "inhabitants of" the Israelites were first encamped by a fountain at Jezreel, but when their enemies had advanced to Jezreel they appear to have retired to the slopes of Gilboa, whence there was a way of retreat either into the mountains of Bashan or across Jordan. The latter seems to have been the line of flight, but the minds of men are not always solemn and true to the uses of the land. On Mount Gilboa, his body was fastened to the wall of Bethshan. Thus Saul could scarcely have reached En-dor without passing at least very near the army of the Philistines. And he said, divine unto me, I pray thee, by the familiar spirit that is in thee, shall I go up to the Philistines? For the Lord hath said unto me, Go up; for I will deliver thee into the hand of the Philistines. ..." It is noticeable that here witchcraft, the inquiring by a familiar spirit, and necromancy, are all connected as though but a single art, which favors the idea that the prohibition in Deuteronomy specifies every name by which magical arts were known, rather than so many different kinds of arts, in order than no one should attempt to evade the condemnation of such practices by any subterfuge. It is evident that Saul thought he might be able to call upon Samuel by the aid of the witch, but this does not prove what was his own general conviction, or the prevalent conviction of the Israelites on the subject. He was in a great extremity; his kingdom in danger; himself forsaken of God: he was weary with a night-journey, perhaps of risk, perhaps of great length to avoid the enemy, and fear of death added, if he was conscious of wrong as, probably for the first time, he commanded unholy rites and heard in the gloom unholy incantations. In such a strait no man's judgment is steady, and Saul may have asked to see Samuel in a moment of sudden desperation, when he had only meant to demand an oracle by which he might be guided. He had no thought of rewarding the counsel of Samuel, and longing to learn, if the net that he felt closing about him were one from which he should never escape, Saul had that keener sense that some say comes in the last hours of life, and so, conscious that his life was not in his own hands, he dared to come, at once sought to see and speak with it, though this had not before been permitted. Strange things we know occur at the moment when man feels he is about to die, and if there be any time when the unseen world is felt while yet unentered, it is when the soul first comes within the chill of its long-projected shadow. "And the woman said unto him, Behold, thou knowest what Saul hath done, how he hath cut off those that have familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land: wherefore, then, layest thou a snare for my life, to cause me to die? And Saul said unto her, Bring, [As] the Lord liveth, there shall no punishment happen to thee for this thing." Nothing shows Saul's desperate resolution more than his thus swearing when engaged in a most unholy act, a terrible profanity that makes the horror of the scene complete. Everything being prepared, the final act takes place. Then said Saul to the woman, Whom shall I bring up unto thee? And he said, Bring me up Samuel. And when the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice: and the woman spake to Saul, saying, Why hast thou deceived me? for thou art [are] not in the [in] truth. And the woman said, Let not my lord be afraid: for what sawest thou? And the woman said unto Saul, I saw gods ascending out of the earth. And he said unto her, What [is] his form? And she said, An old man cometh up; and he is [is] covered with a mantle. And Saul perceived that it was Samuel, and he stood with his face to the ground, and bowed himself. And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted [or disturbed] me, to bring me up? And Saul answered, I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answered me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams; therefore I have called thee: thou art not the least of the thee. And Saul answered, I am [am] thy servant, even of the Lord. And the Lord said to me, Go up to the city, and meet the man of God, and enquire of him what thing is best for me to do. And the woman said, It is well. And the Lord said, Behold, stand thou on the top of the house; and I will break forth the flesh of Amelek, and will give it to thee for a price. The Lord imparted the thought that mayest make known unto me what I shall do. Then said Samuel, Wherefore, then, dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy? And the Lord hath done to him as he spake by me; for the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbor, [even] to David: because thou obeyedst not the voice of the Lord, nor executedst his fierce wrath upon Amelek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day. Moreover, the Lord will also deliver Israel into the hand of the Philistines: and thou shalt have no war this night." (1 Sam. xxviii, 1-20). The woman clearly was terrified by an unexpected apparition when she saw Samuel. She must, therefore, either have been a mere juggler, or one who had no power of working magical wonders at will. The sight of Samuel at all would have been sufficient to make her who had come to consult her. The prophet's shade seems to have been preceded by some majestic shapes which the witch called gods. Saul, as it seems interrupting her, asked his form, and she described the prophet as he was in his last days on earth, an old man, covered either with a mantle, such as the prophets used to wear, or wrapped in his winding-sheet. Then Saul knew it was Samuel, and bowed to the ground from respect or fear. It seems that the woman saw the appearances, and that Saul only knew of them through her, perhaps as being too late, else she would have asked what form Samuel had? The prophet's complaint we cannot understand, in our ignorance as to the separate state: thus much we know, that state is always described as one of perfect rest or sleep. That the woman should have been able to call him up cannot be here inferred: he did not possess the power of calling the dead, and it would be explanation enough to suppose that he was
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sent to give Saul the last warning, or that the earnestness of the king's wish had been permitted to disquiet him in his resting-place. Although the word "disqui-

eted" need not be pushed to an extreme sense, and seems to mean the interruption of a state of rest, our translators wisely, we think, preferring this rendering to "dis-
turbed," it cannot be denied that, if we hold that Sam-
uel was present, this is a great difficulty; however, we suppose that the prophet's coming was ordered, it is not unsu

mountable. The declaration of Saul's doom agrees with what Samuel had said before, and was fulfilled the next day, when the king and his sons fell on Mount Gil-

boa. It may, however, be asked, Was the apparition of Samuel himself, or a supernatural messenger in his stead? Some may even object to our holding it to have been aught but a phantom of a sick brain; but, if so, what can we make of the woman's conviction that it was Samuel, and the king's horror at the words he heard, or, as these would say, that he thought he heard? It was not only the hearing his doom, but the hearing it in a voice from the other world that stretched the faithless man on the ground. He must have felt the presence of the dead, and heard the sound of a sep-

ulchral voice. How could the dead have come true, and not the king alone, but his sons, have gone to the place of disembodied souls on the morrow? For to be with the dead concerned the soul, not the body: it is no difficulty that the king's corpse was unburied till the generous men of Jabesh-gilead, mindful of his old kind-

ness to them, brought it from the wall of Bethshan. If then, the apparition was real, should we suppose it Samuel's? A reasonable criticism would say it seems to have been so; for the supposition that a messenger came in his stead must be rejected, as it would make the speech a mixture of truth and untruth; and if asked what suffi-
cient cause there was for such a sending forth of the prophet from his rest, we may reply that we know not the reason for such warnings as abound in the Bible, and that, perhaps, even at the eleventh hour, the door of repentance was not closed against the king, and his impiety might have been pardoned had he repented. Instead, he went forth in despair, and, when his sons had fallen and his army was put to the rout, sore wound-
ed, he fell on his own sword.

From the beginning to the end of this strange history we have no warrant for attributing supernatural power to Saul. Viewed reasonably, it refers to the ques-
tion of apparitions of the dead as to which other passages in the Bible leave no doubt. The connection with mag-

ic seems purely accidental. The witch is no more than a bystander after the first: she sees Samuel, and that is enough. The prediction may have been a terrible fulfil-

ment of Saul's desire, but this does not prove that the measures he used were of any power. We have exam-

ined the narrative very carefully, from its detail and its remarkable character: the result leaves the main ques-
tion unanswered. See IMMANUEL.

7. In the later days of the two kingdoms magical practices of many kinds prevailed among the Hebrews, as we especially learn from the condemnation of them by the prophets. Each form of idolatry which the people had adopted in succession doubtless brought with it its magic, which seems always to have remained with a strange tenacity that probably made it outlive the false worship with which it was connected. Thus the use of teraphim, dating from the patriarchal age, was not abandoned when the worship of the Canaanitish, Phoenician, and Syrian idols had been successively ac-

cepted, and the historical books of Scripture there is little notion of magic, except that wherever the false prophets are mentioned we have, no doubt, an indication of the prevalence of magical practices. We are es-

pecially told of Josiah that he put away the workers with familiar spirits, the wizards, and the teraphim, as well as the idols and the other abominations of Judah and Jerusalem, in performance of the commands of the book of the law which had been found (2 Kings xxii, 24).

But in the prophets we find several notices of the magic of the Hebrews in their times, and some of the magic of foreign nations. Isaiah says that the people had be-

come workers of hidden arts (דִּבָּרֵי לִבְּשֵׁנִים) like the Philis-
tines, and apparently alludes in the same place to the practice of magic by the Bene-Kedem (li, 6). The na-

tion had not only abandoned true religion, but had be-

come generally addicted to magic in the manner of the Philistines, whose name is E Canaanite or Aramaic, and is consistent with such a condition. The origin of the Bene-Kedem is doubtful, but it seems certain that as late as the time of the Egyptian wars in Syria, under the sixth dynasty, B.C. cir. 1800, a race, partly at least Mongolian, inhabited the valley of the Orontes, among whom, therefore, we should again expect popular prac-
tice of magic, and its prevalence with their neighbors. Balaam, too, dwelt with the Bene-Kedem, though he may not have been of their race. In another place the prophet reproves the people for seeking "unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto the wizards that chirp, and that mutter" (viii, 19). The practices of one class of magicians are still more distinctly described where it thus saith of Jerusalem: "And I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee with a mount, and I will raise forts against thee. And I will bring down, and [will] lay thee low; and the voice of thy song shall be low out of the dust, and thy voice shall be, as of one that hath a fa-
miliar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust" (xxix, 4, 5). Isaiah alludes to the magic of the Egyptians when he says that in their calamity "they shall seek to the idols, and to the char-

mers (דָּעַן), and to them that have familiar spirits, and to the wizards (xix, 5). And in the same manner he thus taunts Babylon: "Stand now with thy charma, and with the multitude of thine enchantments, wherein thou hast labored from thy youth; if so thou shalt be as Enosh and Azirah if so thou mayest be snared with them. Thou art wearied in the multitude of thy counsels. Let now the viewers of the heavens [or astrologers], the star-
gazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up and save thee from [these things] that shall come upon thee" (xlvii, 18). The magic of Babylon is characteristic by the prominence given to astrology, no magi-
cians being mentioned excepting practitioners of this art; unlike the case of the Egyptians, with whom astrology seems always to have held a lower place than with the Chaldean nation. In both instances the folly of those who practice magic is shown.

Micah, declaring the judgments coming for the crimes of his time, speaks of the prevalence of divination among prophets who most probably were such pretended prophets as the opponents of Jeremiah, not avowed prophets of idols, as Ahab's seem to have been. Concerning these prophets it is said, "Night [shall be] unto you, that ye shall not have a vision; and it shall be dark unto you, that ye shall not divine; and the sun shall go down over the prophets, and the day shall be dark over them. Then shall the seers be ashamed, and the diviners confounded; yea, they shall all cover their lip; for [there is] no answer of God" (viii, 6, 7). Let it be said, as to Jerusalem, "The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divide for money; yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, [Is] not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us" (ver. 11). These prophets seem to have practiced unlawful arts, and yet to have expected reve-

lations. Jeremiah was constantly opposed by false prophets, who pretended to speak in the name of the Lord, saying that they had dreamed, when they told false visions, and who practiced various magical arts (xv, 14; xxiii, 24, 38; xxvii, 10, 11, 12). It is interesting to apply to those who counselled the people not to serve the king of Babylon may be used in contempt of the false prophets—xxix, 8, 9).
Ezekiel, as we should have expected, affords some remarkable details of the magic of his time, in the clear and forcible descriptions of his visions. From him we learn that fetialism was among the idolatries which the Hebrews, in the latest days of the kingdom of Judah, had adopted from their neighbors, like the Romans in the age of general corruption that caused the decline of the empire. In Ezekiel, in which he speaks of the abominations of Jerusalem, he enters the chambers of imagery in the Temple itself: "I went in and saw; and behold, every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel, portrayed upon the wall round about." Here seventy elders of the people were with him (chap. xiv, 12). This idolatry was probably borrowed from Egypt, for the description perfectly answers to that of the dark sanctuaries of Egyptian temples, with the sacred animals portrayed upon their walls, and that does not accord with the character of the Assyrian sculptures, where creeping things are not represented as objects of worship. With this low form of idolatry an equally low kind of magic obtained, practiced by prophetesses who for small rewards made amulets by which the people were deceived (xiii, 17, ad fin.). The passage must be allowed to be the more extended, it seems almost certain that Ezekiel compiled that amulets are referred to which were made and sold by these women, and perhaps also worn by them. We may probably read: "Woe to the [women] that sew pillows upon all joints of the hands (elbows or armholes) of the thick skirt (the skirt of every woman is fringed, see Prov. xiv, 2), and foretells a time when the very names of idols should be forgotten, and false prophets have virtually ceased (xiii, 1-4), yet in neither case does it seem certain that he is alluding to the usages of his own day.

10. In the Apocalypse we find indications that in the latter centuries preceding the Christian era magic was no longer practiced by the educated Jews. In the Wisdom of Solomon, the writer, speaking of the Egyptian magicians, treats their art as an imposture (xiv, 7). The book of Tobit is an exceptional case. If we hold that it was written in Persia or a neighboring country, and, with Ewald, date its composition not long after the fall of the Persian empire, it is obvious that it relates to a different state of society from that of the Jews of Egypt and Palestine. If, however, it was written in Palestine about the time of the Massacees, as others suppose, we must still remark that it refers rather to the superstitions of the common people than to those of the learned. In either case its pretensions make it unsafe to follow as indicating the opinions of the time at which it was written. It professes to relate to a period of which its writer would have known little, and borrows its idea of supernatural agency from Scripture, adding as much as was judged safe of current superstition.

11. In the N. Test. we read very little of magic. The coming of magi to worship Christ is indeed related (Matt. ii, 1-12), but we have no warrant for supposing that they were magicians from their name, which the A.V. not unreasonably renders "wise men." See Magic. Our Lord is not said to have been opposed by magicians, and the apostles and other early teachers of the Gospel seem to have rarely encountered them. Philip the deacon, when he preached at Samaria, found there Simon, a famous magician, commonly known as Simon Magus, who had had great power over the people; but he is not said to have been able to work wonders, nor, had it been so, is it likely that he would have soon been admitted into the Church (Acts viii, 5-28). When Barnabas and Paul were at Paphos, as they preached to the proconsul Sergius Paulus, Elymas, a Jewish sorcerer and false prophet (τόνα ἀνθράκα μάγων φασίςτοφρονίτη) withstood them, and was struck blind for a time at the word of Paul (xii, 6-12). At Ephesus, certain Jewish exorcists gained the crédito in the Temple among the populace, as they called it, and professed the practice of magical arts. "And many that believed came, and confessed, and showed their deeds. Many of them also which used..."
curious arts brought their books together, and burned them before all: and they counted the price of them, and found [it] fifty thousand [pieces] of silver' (xix, 18, 19). Here both Jews and Greeks seem to have been greatly addicted to magic, even after they had nominally joined the Church. See ENTHUSIASM. In all these cases it appears that though the practitioners were generally or always Jews, the field of their success was with Gentiles, showing that among the Jews in general, or the educated class, the art had fallen into disrepute. Here, as before, there is no evidence of any real effect produced by the magicians. We have already noticed the remarkable cases of the 'destruction of a spirit of divination' (εγκομήνειν πνεύμα πτωτον) 'which brought her masters much gain by forestalling' (μακρυνοιον), from whom Paul cast out the spirit of divination (xvi, 16-18). This is a matter belonging to another subject than that of magic. See PROPHECTY.

Our examination of the various notices of magic in the Bible gives us this general result: They do not, as far as we can understand, once state positively that any but illusive results were produced by magical rites. They therefore afford no evidence that man can gain sufficient powers over the arts of Egypt to use at his will. This consequence goes some way towards showing that we may conclude that there is no such thing as real magic; for although it is dangerous to reason on negative evidence, yet in a case of this kind it is especially strong. Had any such arts ever been worked by magicians, surely the Scriptures would not have passed over a fact of so much importance, and one which would have rendered the prohibition of these arts far more necessary. The general belief of mankind in magic, or things akin to it, is of no worth, since the holding of such current superstition in some of its branches, if we push it to its legitimate consequences, would lead to the rejection of faith in God's government of the world, and the adoption of a creed far below that of Plato.

From the conclusion to which we have arrived, that there is no evidence in the Bible of real results having been worked by supernatural agency used by magicians, we may draw this important inference that the absence of any proof of the same in profane literature, ancient or modern, in no way militates against the credibility of the miracles recorded in Scripture. III. During the Middle Ages, and down almost to the 18th century, magic was greatly studied in Europe, and could boast of distinguished names, who attempted to treat it as a grand and mysterious science, by means of which the secrets of nature could be discovered, and a certain godlike power acquired over the "spirits" (or as we should now say, the "forces") of the elements. The principal students and professors of magic during the period referred to were pope Sylvester II, Albertus Magnus, Roger Bacon, Raymond Lully, Pico della Mirandola, Paracelsus, Cornelius Agrippa, Trithemius, Van Helmont, and Jerome Cardan. See Huet's L'Or de l'Al-

then et de neige, Ueber, Idee, Umfang und Ge-
schichte (Ments, 1890), and Emmerseer's Geschichte der Magie (2d edit. Leipzig, 1884; transl. into English by W. Howell, 2 vols. London, 1884). For an interesting account of the manœuvres of the "art," consult of the Dogme et Rite de la Haute Magie (2 vols. Paris, 1850), by Elijphas Levi, one of its latest adherents. For monographs on the general subject, see Volbeding, Index Programmata, p. 160. Many curious notices have been collected by Thomson in his Philosophy of Magic (translated from the French of Salvayre, London, 1846; 2 vols.). See also Maury, La Magie et L'astrologie (Par-

is, 1860). The Arabian Nights' Entertainments is well known as a classical text-book on Oriental views of magic. For other literature, compare Necromancer. Some of the legendary wonder-working, which seems to have been the basis of the traditionary fame of free-masonry, see Solomon. Alchemy and astrology (q. v.) have likewise furnished their quota of interest to the subject. For the medieval thaumaturgic prac-
tices, see Ronicheliana; for the later superstitions, see Witchcraft; for the modern, see Spiritualism.

Magician (Chald. בָּלִּים, charton); Heb. plural בַּלִּים, chartomin, thought by Gesenius, Theeau, p. 520, to be of Hebrew origin, signifying "sacred scroll," a title applied to the 'wise men' of Egypt (Gen. xxi, 8, 22; Exod. vii, 11; viii, 7, 18, 19; ix, 11) and of Bab-
yon (Dan. i, 20; ii, 2). The word 'magicians' is not in either case properly applied, as the magi properly are usually assigned to Persia rather than to Babylon or Egypt, and should be altogether avoided in such application, seeing that it has acquired a sense different from that which it once bore. The term rather denotes 'wise men,' as they called themselves and were called by others, but as we should call them, "men of infinite learning and science," their exclusive possession of which in their several countries enabled them occasion-
ally to produce effects which were accounted supernatural by the people. Pythagoras, who was acquainted with Egypt and the East, and who was not unaware of the unattainable depths of ignorance which lie under the highest attainable conditions of human knowledge, thought the modest title of philosopher (φιλοσοφος), 'lover of wisdom,' more becoming, and accordingly he brought it into use; but that of 'wise men,' still retained its high signification. It is thought that the Egyptian chartomin were those of the Egyptian priests who had charge of the sacred records. There can be little doubt that they belonged to some branch of the priest-
hood, seeing that the more recondite departments of learning were cultivated as a matter of course in that powerful caste." See MAG. See Jablonski, Prolog. in Pseudep. Ephraim, p. 91 sq.; Creuzer, Mythologie und Symbolik, i, 245; Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, ii, 516 sq.; Kenrick, Egypt under the Pharaohs, i, 383. See MAGIC.

Magician. The early Christians were derided by this name. Celsus and others pretended that our Saviour, because he wrought miracles, practiced magic, which he had learned in Egypt. Augustine speaks of a popular belief among the enemies of the Christian faith that our Saviour had written books on magic, soon after entered Princeton College, and, subsequent to his graduation from the theological seminary, was for two years tutor in the college. In 1821 he was installed pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of Elizabeth, "to which he was bound as by a golden chain, giving them the services of his soul, with willing and grateful hearts, they yielded him, at the call of God, to enter his eternal joy," May 10, 1865. Dr. Magie de-

clined many calls to other stations of responsibility and eminance, believing the pastoral relation too sacred to be dissolved but at the unquestionable bidding of the great Master. "He was indeed a "man of science."... Combining temperance, charity, humility, prudence, sound judgment, simplicity, and earnestness, he was a faithful, persevering, successful laborer in the vineyard committed to his charge. He preached and prayed with a convincing and pleasing and moving power into the hearts of his hearers. None went from any sermon without having had the way of salvation by Christ af-

fectionately and clearly presented to them." He was a trustee of the College of New Jersey; a pillar in the
Theological Seminary: a member of the American Board of Foreign Missions, also of the Publishing Committee of the American Tract Society, etc. Besides several able published discourses, Dr. Magill was the author of *The Spring-time of Life* (an excellent volume of 580 pages, published by the American Tract Society, N. York, 1832, 16mo; 1855, 16mo), "in which his own character, and that of the people engaged by Callahan and the young, are happily perpetuated." See Wilson, *Pref. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 128.

Magill, Charles Beatty, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Wellsville, Ohio, Oct. 3, 1840; graduated at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, in 1865; studied divinity at the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny City, Pa., and was licensed to preach at Rotan, Texas, in April, 1881. In the winter of 1862-63 he was sent to Princeton, N. J.; subsequently he preached in Virginia and Illinois; and was finally ordained and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Birmingham, Iowa. He afterwards spent a short time in the service of the Christian Commission in Georgia, where he contracted the illness of which he died, Aug. 28, 1864. Mr. Magill was thoroughly educated and devoutly pious. See Wilson, *Pref. Hist. Almanac*, 1865, p. 96.

Maginiss, John Sharp, D.D., a Baptist minister, was born in Butler Co., Pa., June 18, 1855; was licensed to preach by the Water-ville College, W. Va., in 1887; studied at Water-ville College, Me., Brown University, and the theological seminary in Newton, Mass.; was ordained pastor of the First Baptist Church of Portland, Me., in Oct., 1882, and there remained until ill health compelled him to remove. In the winter of 1887-88 he was pastor of the Pine Street Church of Providence, R. I.; later he became professor of Biblical theology in the literary and theological institution at Hamilton, N. Y. (now Madison University); in 1850, professor of Biblical and pastoral theology in the new theological school connected with the Board of Education, and also professor of the intellectual and moral philosophy in the university. He was made M.A. by Waterville College while at Hamilton, and D.D. by Brown University in 1844. Failing health finally compelled him to resign his professorship in the theological school until his death, Oct. 15, 1852. Dr. Maginiss published only a few detached articles, among them one on the philosophy of Cousin (published in the *Christian Review*), which attracted much attention. See Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 766; *Christian Rev.* vol. xviii (Jan.).

Magister Disciplinae (master of discipline) was the title of certain ecclesiastical officers in the ancient Church. It was a custom in Spain, in the time of the Gothic kings, about the end of the 6th century, for parents to dedicate their young children to the service of the Church. They were taken for this purpose into a bishop's family, and educated, under his supervision, by a discreet and grave person, who was generally a presbyter, and was called magister disciplinae. The second and fourth councils of Toledo prescribed the duties of this master, the chief of which was, that he should vigilantly watch over the moral character and behavior of the young, and instruct them in the rules and discipline of the Church.

Magister Sacri Palatii (master of the sacred palace). This office was created in 1218 by pope Honanrius III, and was first held by St. Dominic. The latter, during his residence at Rome, had noticed that the persons employed by the cardinals and authorities made a bad use of their unemployed time. He therefore had commenced, with the consent of the pope, to give them religious instruction during their leisure time, and was rewarded by Honorius with the above office. The task assigned was to watch that which Dominic had previously chosen for himself, but the pope increased it by directing that the employes of the papal household, besides attending to other duties, should also attend these instructions. The office was made perpetual to the Dominicans. Many privileges were gradually attached to it. Thus a bull of pope Eugenius IV, of 1486, ordained that in case of need the *Magist* *er* *s* *p* *a* *l* *a* *t* *i* *i* *s* should be placed next to the *A* *u* *d* *i* *t* *u* *l* *a* *t* *o* *r* *e* of the Rota; no one was to preach in the chapel without his permission; and on his being temporarily absent from Rome, he was to invest his substitute with the same privileges. These prerogatives were confirmed by a bull of Sixtus V, which, notwithstanding the resignation of the *Magistr* *e* *s* *s* *p* *a* *l* *a* *t* *i* *i* *s* of reproving the preacher in the papal chapel, even in the presence of the pope. Leo X, in 1616, decided that nothing should be printed in the diocese of Rome without the consent of that official and of the cardinal-vicar. In 1625 Urban VIII went further, and forbad the monasteries to publish in the States of the Church without this authorization. Pius V, in 1570, connected with the office a canonization of St. Peter, which was, however, taken from it in 1688 by Sixtus V. Finally, Alexander VII gave the *Magistr* *e* *s* *s* *p* *a* *l* *a* *t* *i* *i* *s* the precedence before all the other clergy composing the Roman cabinet. These privileges, however, were gradually taken back, and the censorship of books now alone remains to the *Magistr* *e* *s* *s* *p* *a* *l* *a* *t* *i* *i* *s*. See *Mun* *son*, *Proc. Geschicht. d. Monachvorden*, viii, 38; *Helyot*, *Gesch. d. geselt. Kl.terent. u. Relikv.orden* (Leipzig, 1748), iii, 262; Schruck, *G. xii, 33*, 86; *Herzog*, *Real-Encyclop. viii, 868.

Magistrate (the representative in the Auth. Vers. of several Heb. and Gr. words, as below), a public civil officer invested with authority. Among the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, the corresponding terms had a much wider significance than the term magistrate has with us. The Hebrew שָׁשיִים, shophetin, or, judges, were a kind of magistrates, with a limited jurisdiction. See *Judges*.* The phrase in Judges xviii,7,"And there was no magistrate in the land, that might put them to shame in anything," ought to be rendered, "And there were none to harm (עָשַׁב) at all in the land; and they were possessed (בְּנֵבִיא, govern) of wealth." So, also, the terms עִם עִם and, shophetin re-dajamin, rendered "magistrates and judges" (Ezra vii, 25), would be better rendered "judges and rulers." The עִם עִם, segamin, rendered "rulers," properly nobles, were Babylonian magistrates, prefects of provinces (Jer. ii, 23, 28, 57; Ezek. xxiii, 6). The same name was borne by the Jewish magistrates at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (Ezra ix, 2; Neh. ii, 16; iv, 14; xiii, 11). The word דֶּבֶר, dāber, rendered magistrate (Luke xi, 58; Tit. iii, 1), properly signifies one just in power, authority; hence "a prince" (Matt. xx, 25; 1 Cor. i, 6, 8); "a ruler" (Acts iv, 26; Rom. xiv, 17); the term is also used for the "kings of the earth" (Rev. i, 6); and of Moses as the judge and leader of the Hebrews (Acts vii, 27, 35). It is spoken of magistrates of any kind, e.g. the high-priest (Acts xxiii, 5); of civil judges (Luke xii, 58; Acts xvi, 19); also of a ruler of the synagoge (Luke viii, 41; Matt. ix, 18, 20; Mark v, 22); and of persons of weight and influence among the Pharisees and other sects at Jerusalem, who also were members of the sanhedrim (Luke xiv, 1; xvii, 18; xxiii, 13, 35; xxiv, 20; John iii, 1; viii, 38, 48; xii, 42; Acts iii, 17; iv, 5, 6, 8; xiii, 27; xiv, 6). The term is also used of Satan, the prince or chief of the fallen angels (Matt. ix, 34; xii, 24; Mark iii, 22; Luke xi, 15; John xii, 31; xiv, 30, 31; xvi, 11; Eph. ii, 2). So likewise the kindred דַּפֶּר (Luke xi, 11; Tit. iii, 1). The word ρημάργος, rendered "magistrate," properly signifies leader of an army, commander; general. So of the ten Athenian commanders, with whom the polemarch was joined. Afterwards only one or two were sent abroad with the army, as circumstances required, and the others had charge of military affairs at home, l. q. war-minister. In other Greek cities the ρημάργος was the chief magistrate: prefect. The term was also used of Roman officials, the consul and the dictator. In Roman colonies and municipal towns, the chief magistrates were usually two in number, called duumviri: oe
casionally four or six, quattuorvirii, scrieri, who also were sometimes styled pretors, the same as the Greek ἐπιστήμονας. Hence, in the New Testament, this term is used for the Roman duumviri, pretors, magistrates of Philippi, which was a Roman colony (Acts xxvi, 20, 22, 55, 30, 36). The word ἐπιστήμονας is also used collectively for these persons, as in Text, as if it might signify the "powers" for rulers, magistrates (Luke xii, 11; Rom. xiii, 2, 3; Tit. iii, i). The "higher powers" (Rom. xiii, i) are the "ruling authorities"—the magistrates in office—all invested with civil power, from the emperor or king, as supreme, to the lowest, who are civil officers who are employed in making and executing the laws. The Roman emperor and some of the subordinate magistrates wore a small sword or dagger, the symbol of punishment, as a part of their official costume. SeeGov. 

In the earliest periods of Jewish history the magistrates were the hereditary chieflains, but afterwards the judicial office became elective. In the time of Moses, the larger collections of families were fifty-nine in number, and the heads of these families, together with the twelve princes of the tribes, composed a council of seventy-one members; but the subdivisions afterwards were more numerous, and the number of heads of families greater, for we find no less than two hundred and fifty chiefs of this rank included in the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. The דֶּרֶךְ וּנְאָפֶל, skotierim, or genealogists, are mentioned in connection with the elders—that is, the princes of tribes and heads of families. See or. 2 Sam. xxiii, 1. See the genealogical tables. Under Joshua, they communicated the orders of the general to the soldiers; and in the time of the Kings, the chief skotier had a certain control over the army, although he was not a military commander. The skotier, who were superintended by this chief, were distributed into every city, and performed the duties of their office for it and the surrounding district. As they kept the genealogical tables, they had an accurate list of the people, and were acquainted with the age, ability, and domestic circumstances of each individual; but they are not to be confounded with another officer who kept the muster-rolls, and whose name had a similar etymology. Moses added a new class of magistrates for the administration of justice, which, he informs us, was not of divine appointment, but was suggested by his father-in-law Je- thro. He divided the people into tens, fifties, hundreds, and thousands, and nominated wise and pious judges having each of these divisions. They were selected, for the most part, from the heads of families, genealogists, or other people of rank (Exod. xviii, 13, 26). Difficult questions were brought before Moses himself, and, after his death, before the chief magistrate of the nation. These judges were included among the rulers, and when Joshua summoned them to the general assemblies; and they are mentioned, in one instance, before the genealogists (Deut. xxxi, 29; Josh. viii, 30). When the magistrates of all the cities collecting any one tribe to be collected, they formed the supreme court, or legislative assembly of the tribe; and when the magistrates of all the tribes were convened together, they formed the general council of the nation, and could legislate conjointly for all the tribes they represented. After the settlement in Canaan, although the chief magistrate of the Jewish state was the king, the supreme ruler for the whole community could be legally chosen when the necessities of the state required it, who was designated a judge, or governor. See Judge. In the book of Deuteronomy (xxvii, 14, 15) we find Je- thro, the lawgiver among the Midianites, who, having arrived in the Promised Land, they wished to have a king like the other nations round about them, they were to receive one whom he would appoint, and not a stranger. Josephus and others have correctly understood this passage not to mean that God commanded the Israelites to de- 

not a Gentile. See King. Judges, genealogists, the heads of families or clans, and those who, from the relation they sustained to the common class of people, may be called the princes of the tribes, retained their authority after as well as before the introduction of a monarchic form of government, and acted the part of a legis- lature, who alone were the depository of the law. But with the civil officers who were employed in making and executing the laws. The Roman emperor and some of the subordinate magistrates wore a small sword or dagger, the symbol of punishment, as a part of their official costume. See Gov. 

In the earliest periods of Jewish history the magistrates were the hereditary chieflains, but afterwards the judicial office became elective. In the time of Moses, the larger collections of families were fifty-nine in number, and the heads of these families, together with the twelve princes of the tribes, composed a council of seventy-one members; but the subdivisions afterwards were more numerous, and the number of heads of families greater, for we find no less than two hundred and fifty chiefs of this rank included in the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. The דֶּרֶךְ וּנְאָפֶל, skotierim, or genealogists, are mentioned in connection with the elders—that is, the princes of tribes and heads of families. See or. 2 Sam. xxiii, 1. See the genealogical tables. Under Joshua, they communicated the orders of the general to the soldiers; and in the time of the Kings, the chief skotier had a certain control over the army, although he was not a military commander. The skotier, who were superintended by this chief, were distributed into every city, and performed the duties of their office for it and the surrounding district. As they kept the genealogical tables, they had an accurate list of the people, and were acquainted with the age, ability, and domestic circumstances of each individual; but they are not to be confounded with another officer who kept the muster-rolls, and whose name had a similar etymology. Moses added a new class of magistrates for the administration of justice, which, he informs us, was not of divine appointment, but was suggested by his father-in-law Je- thro. He divided the people into tens, fifties, hundreds, and thousands, and nominated wise and pious judges having each of these divisions. They were selected, for the most part, from the heads of families, genealogists, or other people of rank (Exod. xviii, 13, 26). Difficult questions were brought before Moses himself, and, after his death, before the chief magistrate of the nation. These judges were included among the rulers, and when Joshua summoned them to the general assemblies; and they are mentioned, in one instance, before the genealogists (Deut. xxxi, 29; Josh. viii, 30). When the magistrates of all the cities collecting any one tribe to be collected, they formed the supreme court, or legislative assembly of the tribe; and when the magistrates of all the tribes were convened together, they formed the general council of the nation, and could legislate conjointly for all the tribes they represented. After the settlement in Canaan, although the chief magistrate of the Jewish state was the king, the supreme ruler for the whole community could be legally chosen when the necessities of the state required it, who was designated a judge, or governor. See Judge. In the book of Deuteronomy (xxvii, 14, 15) we find Je- thro, the lawgiver among the Midianites, who, having arrived in the Promised Land, they wished to have a king like the other nations round about them, they were to receive one whom he would appoint, and not a stranger. Josephus and others have correctly understood this passage not to mean that God commanded the Israelites to de-
Magistrates, an authority for her interference in temporal affairs. See JOHN POWER OF THE ROMAN POWER OF THE POPE. In Protestant Churches that are united with the state, these Romish views are manifest, though in a somewhat different form. The state controlling the Church, the magistrate is clothed with authority even in matters really pertaining to the domain of the ecclesiastical state. Thus the Westminster Confession gives to the magistrate extraordinary power in or about sacred things. The earlier Scotch Reformers went still further, as in the first Confession. The Books of Discipline are no less explicit. The First Book of Discipline, We do respect unto the Church, so that what penalties shall be required of such; but this we fear not to affine, that the one and the other deserve death; for if he who doth falsifie the sale, subscription, or coin of a king, is judged worthy of death, what shall we think of him who plainly doth falsifie the seals of Christ Jesus, Prince of the kings of the earth? If Darius pronounced that a bark should be taken from the house of that man, and he himselfe hanged upon it, that durst attempt to hinder the re-edifying of the material temple, what shall we say of those that contemnously blaspheme the name of God, and make sport with the seals of God, which is the soules and bodies of the elect, to be purged by the true preaching of Christ Jesus from the superstition and damnable idolatry in which they have been long plunget and holden captive? If ye, as God forbid, declare your selves careless over the true religion, and do not fear your master, God, or the powers that did not usually possess; so also Felix, Festus, and the other procurators of Judea. Some of the procurators were dependent on the nearest consul or president; for instance, those of Judea were dependent on the consul-general, or president of Syria. They enjoyed, however, great authority, and possessed the power of life and death. The only privilege, in respect to the officers of government, that was granted by the procurators of Judea to the nation was the appointment from among them of persons to manage and collect the taxes. In all other things they administered the government themselves, except that they frequently had recourse to the counsel of other persons (Acts xxiii, 24-55; xxv, 23). See PROVINCE.

The military force that was granted to the procurators of Judea consisted of six cohorts, of which five were stationed in the vicinity of the city where the procurator usually resided, and one at Jerusalem, in the tower of Antonia, which was so situated as to command the Temple (Acts x, 1; xxi, 52). It was the duty of the military cohorts to execute the procurator's commands and to repress seditions and demonstrations of the people (Acts xvi, 1; John xix, 23). On the return of the great festivities, when there were vast crowds of people at Jerusalem, the procurators themselves went from Cesarea to that city in order to be at hand to suppress any commotions which might arise (Matt. xxvii, 2-5; John xviii, 29; xix, 38). See GOVERNMENT.

Magistrates. In the early Church, magistrates whatever the grade of their office, were under the spiritual jurisdiction of the clergy; and if they were impious or profane, they were subject to censure and excommunication. The Council of Arles, called by Constantine, ratified this ecclesiastical power. Sulpicius Severus, a pupil of Prolemais, excommunicated Andronicus, the governor for his blasphemies and cruelties, and with him all his accomplices. Athanasius pronounced a similar sentence on the governor of Libya. Ambrose denied the communion to the emperor Theodosius. But such a spiritual sentence did not deprive the magistrate of his lawful civil authority. The Church rendered allegiance to the rightful governor, whether heathen or heretic; but she had a perfect right to exclude from her fellowship any magistrate of erroneous creed or depraved life. She did not attempt to interfere with a magistrate's temporal authority while she refused him ecclesiastical fellowship. The Roman Catholic Church has sought, in this practice of

Magnanimity, greatness of soul, a disposition of
mind exerted in contending dangers and difficulties, in scouring temptations, and despising earthly pomp and splendor.—Ciceró, De Offic. lect. i. ch. xx.; Grove, Moral Philosophy, ii. 268; Steele, Christian Hero; Watts, Self-murder; Buck, Theological Dictionary, a. v. See Courage; Fortitude.

Magnificat. Paulus Magnus, a Roman general, for a short time emperor of the West, was born in Gaul about A.D. 800. Partly by courage and partly by flattery, he gained the confidence of the emperor Constans, and was intrusted with the command of the imperial guards, the famous Jovian and Heracleian battalions. He fell out with Mercurialis, chancellor of the imperial exchequer, conspired against Constans and caused himself to be elected emperor by the soldiers in 850. He was recognised as such by Italy, Spain, Britanny, and Africa, but the Illyrian legions elected Vetranio, who was soon joined by Constans, brother of the late emperor. The war between Magnentius and Constans ended in the defeat of the former at Murina, Sept. 28, 392. As Magnentius saw that his soldiers would deliver him up to his enemies, he committed suicide at Lyons about the middle of August, 395. Zosimus, ii. 7, relates the whole affair as overbearing his people, and weak and irresolute in adversity. He is shown to have been a Christian by the cross being stamped on his coins. The only part he took in ecclesiastical affairs was to prevent, for two years, Constans from favoring Arianism. As for himself, he looked upon religion from a political point of view; in order to conciliate the West, he gave more freedom to the heathen worship. He had relied on Athanasius to win over Egypt to his side, but in this he was mistaken, as Athanasius upheld the rights of the legitimate successor of Constans.—Herzog, Real-Encyclop., viii. 686; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. ii. 900.

Magni,John, a Swedish prelate, was born at Wex-}

ioe in 1598; travelled extensively on the Continent, especially in Germany, and on his return home became professor of history at his alma mater, the University of Upsala. Queen Christina, who succeeded her noble husband, Gustavus Adolphus, the great defender of the Protestant faith, in the government of Sweden (1632), frequently availed herself of the counsels of John Magni, and created him bishop of Skara. He died in 1651, three years previous to Christina's abdication of the throne. See Swensson. Magni took a great interest in the edification of Sweden, and did much to afford his countrymen far superior advantages than they had enjoyed previous to this. His writings are of a secular nature. See Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxii. 718; Biographie Universelle, a. v.

Magni,Valerian, a celebrated Italian ecclesiastic, was born in Milan, Italy, in 1486; was appointed by pope Urban VIII apostolical missionary to the Northern kingdoms; influenced the pope to imprison the Jesuitesses in 1631; was himself imprisoned in Vienna some time afterwards, through the influence of the Jesuits, for having said that the pope's primacy and infallibility were founded on tradition and not on Scripture, but regained his liberty under the favor of the emperor Ferdinand III, after having written warmly against the Jesuits. He died at Salzburg in 1661. Magni was celebrated as a controversial writer against the Protestant, as well as his philosophical works in favor of Descartes and against Aristotle. One of his apologetical letters may be found in the collection called Tuba Magni, vol. ii.—Hook, Eccles. Biog. vii. 209.

Magnificat, a song in praise of the Virgin used in the evening service of the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, and Anglican churches. Its name Magnificat it obtains from the Latin words in the Vulgate text, Magnificat virgo Maria. Magnify the Lord, etc. It was introduced into the public worship of the Church about the year 506. In the 6th century it was chanted in the French churches. In the English Church it is to be said or sung after the first lesson, at every prayer, unless the 98th Psalm, called 


Magnus. The Roman Catholic Church commemorates several saints of this name.

1. St. Magnus, Magnus, Magnus, of whom we possess two biographical notices, one by Peres, and another by recess, who was a native of Ireland, built the convent of Flamen after the destruction of St. Gall, converted the inhabitants of Augsburg, and was buried there, and died in 656. He is commemorated Sept. 6. See Koch-Stemf. 2. St. Magnus, the apostle of the Orkneys. The inhabitants of these islands possessed a large goblet which he is said to have drained: it was offered at once to every person present, and it was considered a happy omen if one emptied it. 3. St. Magnus, of Alltun, in Venicia, became bishop of Osboda about 638; transmitted his episcopal charge to Heracleas, and died about 650. He is commemorated July 21. 4. St. Magnus, died in the early half of the 6th century, as bishop of Milan (522-529). He is commemorated Nov. 5.—Herzog, Real-Encyclop., viii. 687; Pierer, Universal Lex. x, 718. (J. N. P.)

Magnus, John or Jonas, a noted Swedish prelate, was born at Linköping March 19, 1498, of noble parentage. When only eighteen years old he obtained a canonate at his native place; later he continued his theological studies at Louvain, afterwards in several universities of Germany and Italy, and resided several years at Rome, where he gained the favor of the papal court. In 1520 Persus honored him with the doctorate of theology. A short time after, probably in 1523 (the year of Vasa's ascension to the throne), he was dispatched to his native country by pope Adrian VI to stem the inroads of the reformed doctrines in that northern country. Gustavus Vasa received Magnus kindly, and elevated him to the archbishopric of Upsala. Later, the Vasa, or Gustavus Vasa himself interested towards Protestantism, Magnus made himself unpopular, and was finally obliged to quit the country, after Lutheranism and religious liberty had been established in Sweden (1527). Several later attempts to stem the progress of the reformed doctrines proved unsuccessful, and he returned disheartened to Rome in 1541. He died at Rome March 22, 1544. One of his works deserves our notice, Historia Metropolitana seu episcoporum et archiepiscoporum Upsalensium (Rome, 1557, 1560, fol,). See Niceron, Mémoires, xxxv, a. v.; Chauffe, Diction. Hist. a. v.; Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxii, 739.

Magnus, Olau, a Swedish prelate, brother of the preceding, was born at Linköping, near the close of the 15th century; was provost of the church at Storgren when Gustavus I sent him to Rome to secure the papal confirmation to the appointment of his brother John to the archbishopric of Upsala. It is not exactly known when Olau returned to Sweden, but it is certain that after 1537 he was constantly with his brother as his secretary. After John's decease Olau was appointed by the pope to succeed the archbishopric of Upsala, but the Reformation had in the meanwhile changed the religious position of his soul so entirely that he never filled the archbishopric chair. He attended the Council of Trent by order of pope Paul III. Hence the mistake on the part of some writers of making John Magnus a member of the Trinitarian gathering, which took place two years later.
after his decease (1544). Olaus returned to Rome from Trent, and died there in 1568. His works, which are of much interest, are given in Hoefner, Novae. Brev. Generale, xxxii, 734.

Ma'agog (Heb. Mapog, מַּעֲגוֹג, region of Gog [see below]; Sog. Māgo'y, Vulg. Mago'), the second son of Japhet (Gen. x., 2; Chron. v., 6). B.C. post 2514. Various etymologies of the name have been suggested. Knobel (Völkerl. p. 63) proposes the Sanscrit mukh or maha, 'great,' and a Persian word signifying 'mountain,' in which case the reference would be to the Caucasian range. Others take the word as maya, and suppose it to be applied to some of the heights of that range. This etymology is supported by Von Bohlen ([Intro. to Gen. ii.], 211). On the other hand, Hitzig (Comm. in Ex.) connects the first syllable with the Coptic ma', 'place,' or thae Sanscrit maha, 'land,' and the second with a Persian root, kosh, 'the moon,' or as though the term had reference to moon-worshipers.

In Ezekiel (xxxviii, 2; xxxix, 6) it occurs as the name of a nation, and, from the associated names in all the passages where it occurs, it is supposed to represent certain Scythian or Tartar tribes descended from the son of Japhet. See Histoire. Thus, in Genesis, it is coupled with Gomer (the Cimmerian) and Madai (the Medes), among the Japhethites, while Ezekiel joins it with Meshech and Tubal (הַמְשֶׁךָ וּתַבּ, "chief prince," should be prince of Rosh), as the name of a great and powerful people, dwelling in the extreme west of the earth, whom they would invade the Holy Land at a future time. Their kingdom is the Gog of the Apocalypse.

The people of Magog further appear as having a force of cavalry (xxxviii, 15), and as armed with the bow (xxxix, 8). The oldest version gives the word unchanged; but Josephus (Ant. i., 6, 5) interprets it by Scythians (Σιθυδαίοι), and so Jerome; but Scaliger renders it Persians. "Michaels (Sulp. ad Lex. Heb. 1471), Rosenmuller (Scholar. in Gen. x., 2), and Gesenius (Theaurus, s. v.) adopt the view that the Scythians generally are intended. Bochart (Phyleg. iii., 19) suggests that the name Gog appears in I'wappo'w, the name of a district near to that through which the Araxes flows (Strabo, p. 629) and this falls in with the supposition that the Magogites were Scythian, for the traditions of the latter represent their nation as coming originally from the vicinity of the Araxes (Dod. Soc. ii. 23). Since Bochart's time the general consensus of scholars in favor of regarding the eastern Scythians as the Magog of Genesis is that Kiepert 'associates the name with Marcia, or Maha, and applies it to Scythian nomad tribes which forced themselves in between the Arian or Arianian Medes, Kurds, and Arme
dans (Keil and Delitzsch, Bibl. Comment. on the O.T. [Cl. ii. 197]) passim, places the name in Persia; though in the map accompanying his Biblekert it is placed to the north of the Euxine. Knobel also places Magog there, and connects the Scythian tribes thus named with those which spread into Europe, and were allied to the Scythians, who gave their name ultimately to the whole north-east of Europe, and are the ancestors of the Slavic nations now existing (Kitto).

It is certain that the term Scythian was a collective title of the remote savage tribes of the north in a similar manner to the use of Magog (Cassir. Notiti. ii. 738 sq.). See Scythia. There are certain and the earliest times that a legend of the enemies of religion and civilization lived in that quarter (Haukauem's Tribes of the Caucasus, p. 55). From the accounts found among the Aborigines, Persians, and Syrians, some of which are embellished with various fables, we learn that they comprehended under the designation Tadjj and Magjji all the less known barbarous people of the north-east and north-west of Asia. (See the Koran, xviii. 94-99; xxi. 98; Ammian. Bibl. Orient. iii. 11, 16, 17, 20; Hylander, Spec. opus. cosmog. pt. 30-32 [Lon. 1600]); Klaproth, Histor. Curius. 2d ed. (On. ii. 1); Herbelot, Ath. Orient. 2d ed. (On. ii. 181 sq. ; Flügel, in the Hal. Encyl. iv. 74. 78 sq.). Yet, though the Gog and Magog of the Hebrews may have had an equally vague acceptance, it nevertheless seems to have pointed more precisely to the northern tribes of the Caucasus, between the Euxine and the Caspian Sea, and to the people of that region, it seems, were a terror to middle Asia; and they have often been named the Scythians of the East. Jerome says of Magog that it means 'Scythian nations, fierce and innumerable, who live beyond the Caucasus and the lake Mecost, and near the Caspian Sea, and spread out even onward to India.' The people dwelling among the Caucasian Mountains have preserved their original character down to the present hour, as is evident from their recent long-continued contests with the Russians. The famous Caucasian wall, probably the foundation of some of the successors of Alexander the Great, as a defence against the incursions of the northern barbarians, which extended from Derbend, on the western shore of the Caspian, to near the Euxine or Black Sea, is still called "the wall of Gog and Magog." (See Reitnig, Breschi. d. Caucasus, ii. 78.) The traveller Ginzel visited this wall in 1770, in the course of the scientific mission upon which he was sent by the Russian government. From Derbend, on the Caspian Sea, the head-quarters of the Russian military guard in that country, Ginzel directed his course westward, towards the Euxine Sea. He met with some ancient wall, which he describes as in some places thirty feet high, and for large distances nearly entire, and in other places partially or wholly fallen down. There are watch-towers along the wall at signal distances; two of these he ascended, and from their top he could discern the snowy ridges of Caucasus. This wall seems to have been built in almost a straight line from the Caspian to the Euxine, and the watch-towers and fortresses were probably erected as a means of keeping up communication between Derbend, the garrison at the eastern extremity, but some time or other it was apparently abandoned, and the fastnesses in the mountains. (See Bayer, De Muro Caucasico, in Acta Acad. Scientiar. Petropoli, i. 425; Ker Porter, Travels, ii. 520; Ritter, Erdk. ii. 884 sq.)

In Rev. xx. 7, 9, the terms Gog and Magog are evidently used tropically, as names of the enemies of Christianity, who will endeavor to extirpate it from the earth, but will thereby bring upon themselves signal destruction. But that Ezekiel, in his prophecy, meant to be understood as predicting the invasion of Palestine by Gog and Magog in the literal sense, is hardly credible. He uses these names to designate distant and savage nations; and in the same way John has been able to employ the word barbarians. That both writers should employ these two names in a tropical way is no more strange than that we should employ the words Scythian, Tartar, Indian, etc., in the same manner. Nothing could be more natural than for Essel
tiel, who has been able to create new names, to adopt Magog and Magog, since they were the formidable enemies of all that region; and that John, writing on the same subject, should retain the same names, was equally natural. (See Stuart's Comment. on the Apoc. ad loc.) See Goo.

Mag'or-mis'sabbib (Heb. Magor 'mis-sabbib', מַגְּוֹר מִזְיָאָב, terror from round about; Sept. Μισίσσας κυκλοστρόφημος, Vulg. Pavor unique), an epithet applied to the divine instance of Jeremiah to the persecuting Pashur (q. v.), emblematical of his signal fate, as explained in the context (Jer. xx., 3). "It is remarkable that the same phrase occurs in several other passages of Jeremiah (vi. 25; xxx; 10; iv. 1; xlii. 29; Lam. ii. 22), and is only found besides in Psa. xxx.i. 13" (Smith).

Mag'pinash (Heb. Magpinash, מַגְּפִּנָשׁ, perhaps for מַגְּפִּנָשׁ, moth-slayer; Sept. Μαγγηπανος v. r. Μαγγηπανος, Vulg. Maggiphanus). A chief Levite, son of Jehiel, who was appointed in the sacred covenant instituted on the return from Babylon (Neh. x., 20). B.C. cir. 410. Some suppose the name, however, to be the same as Maghish (q. v.) of Ezra ii., 30.

Magyars: See Hungary.

Maha-bharata (from the Sans. mahat—changed
to māhā—great, and Bhārata, a famous Hindu prince) is the name of a great epic poem of ancient India. As its main story relates to the contest between two rival families, both descendants of a king, Bhārata, the title probably implies “the great history of the descendants of a king.” The immense size of its scope and content of upwards of 100,000 verses, each containing 32 syllables, and is divided into 18 parvans or books. That this huge composition was not the work of one single individual, but a production of successive ages, clearly appears from the multifariousness of its contents, from the difference of such episodes which characterizes its various parts, and even from the contradictions which disturb its harmony. Hindu tradition ascribes it to Vyāsa; but as Vyāsa means “the distributor or arranger,” and as the same individual is also the reputed compiler of the Vedas, Purāṇas, and several other works, it is obvious that no historical value can be assigned to this generic name.

The contents of the poem may be distinguished into the leading story and the episodical matter connected with it. The former is probably founded on real events in the oldest history of India, though in the epic narrative it will be difficult to disentangle the reality from the fiction.

The story (c. 1/4 of the whole poem) comprises the contest of the celebrated families called the Kauravas and Pandavas, ending in the victory of the latter, and in the establishment of their rule over the northern part of India. Of course no part is assigned in the poem to the deities, and, consequently, Hindu mythology is pretty extensively interwoven with these events of semi-historical Hindu antiquity. This episodical matter, as it were, incidentally linked with the main story, may be distributed under three principal heads. One category of such episodes comprises narratives relating to the ancient or mythical history of India, as, for instance, the epistles of Nala and Sakuntalā; a second is more strictly mythological, comprising cosmogony and theogony; a third is didactic or dogmatic—it refers to law, religion, morals, and views on other subjects. In the celebrated Bhagavadgītā, and the principal portions of the 12th and 18th books. By means of this episodical matter, which at various periods, and often without regard to consistency, was superadded to the original structure of the work, the Mahābhārata gradually became a collection of all that was needed to be known by an educated Hindu; in fact, it became the encyclopedia of India, notwithstanding that the Brahmanic authors themselves intended it mainly for the Kṣatriyas, or military caste, whose history, interests, religion, and deities it specially dwells on. The text of the Mahābhārata has been published at Calcutta (5 vols. 4to, 1834–1839. Vol. v is a table of contents). Two other editions are in course of publication at Bombay. The best researches on it are those by Lassen, in his Zeitschrift für die Kunde der Morgenlande (1857–59), and in his Indische Altertumskunde. A sort of analysis of the leading story of the Mahābhārata (not of the episodes) has lately been given by F. G. Eichhoff (Poesie Héroïque des Indiens, Paris, 1860), and by Professor Monier Williams (Indian Epic Poetry, London, 1863). See also Schack, Strömern von Ganges (Berl. 1856); Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.

**Maha-deva** (i. e. “the great god”) is one of the names by which the Hindu god Siva is called. In Buddhist history, Mahādeva, who lived 200 years after the death of the Buddha Sākyamuni, or 483, is a renowned teacher who caused a schism in the Buddhist Church. His adversities accuse him of every possible crime; but, as he is ranked among the Arhats, his eminence cannot be matter of doubt. The school founded by him is called Pārāca, aita. See W. Wasawiel, Der Bhuddhismus, etc. (St. Petersburg, 1860).

**Mahādevi or Mahdhī** (Arab. director, sovereign, or pontiff) is the surname, by way of excellence, of the twelfth and last imam (q. v.) of the race of Ali. This Mahādi, who bore the same name with the false prophet, being called Abulcassim Mohammed, was born in the year of the Hegira 255, and, according to Persian tradition, when nine years old, was shut up in a cage or cistern by his mother, and is there kept till he shall appear at the end of the world as one of the Antichrist, and make of the two laws, the Mussulman and Christian, but one. Some among them believe that this imam was twice hidden; the first time from his birth to the age of 74 years, during which interval he secretly conversed with his disciples without being seen by others, because he who preceded him hade been poisoned by the caliphs, who knew their pretensions, and feared a revolt in their favor. The second retreat of this imam is from the time his death was made known to the time which Providence has appointed for his manifestation. The disciples of this Mahādi give him the title of Mōrebatken, the secret or concealed. There is in Chaldæa, in a little province called by the Arabians Akras, a castle named Hem Mahalādi, where all the waters of that country join and form a marsh, which runs into the sea. It is here, according to the billets, that Mahādi will make his appearance. See D'Herbelot, Bibl. Orient. s. v.; Broughton, Bibl. Hist. Soc. vol. ii. s. v.; Malcolm, Hist. of Persia, ii, 345, note.

**Mahā-Kala** is another name of the Hindu divinity Śiva (q. v.).

**Mahā-Kail.** See KAIL.

**Mahā-kṣayapa** is the name of one of the main repositories of the Buddhist Sākyawmi (q. v.). He arranged metaphysically the portion of the sacred writings of the Buddhists called Abhidharma; and tradition ascribes to him also the origin of the Sātavat division of the Viśdakṣa school of Buddhist philosophy. Many legends are connected with his name. See E. Burnouf, Introduction à l'Histoire du Bouddhisme indo- dien (Paris, 1844), and his posthumous work, Le Lotus de la Bonne Loi (Paris, 1862).

**Maḥalāh** (1 Chron. vii, 18). See MAHLAR.

**Malahalel** (Heb. Mahālālēl, מַהֲלוֹלֶל, protee of God; Sept. and N. T. Mahalēk), the name of two men.

1. The son of the antediluvian patriarch Cain, of the line of Seth, born when his father was 40 years old; he became the father of Jared at sixty-five years of age, and lived to the age of eight hundred and ninety-five years (Gen. v. 12–17; 1 Chron. i. 2; Luke iii. 37, in which last passage the name is Anglicized "Mai lel"); B.C. 3777–2981.

2. "Ewald recognises in Mahalalel the sun-god, or Apollo of the antediluvian mythology, and in his son Jared the god of water, the Indian Varuna (Gesh. i. 357), but his assertions are perfectly arbitrary."

**2. Malāla.** A relative of the family of Phares, father of Shephatiah, and ancestor of one Azahal, who resided at Jerusalem after the exile (Neh. xi. 4). B.C. much ante 586.

**Mahāla** (Heb. Mahākāla, מַהֲכָכָל, a late, otherwise the title of a song), the name of two women. See below.

1. Sept. Malā, Vulg. Malalecth. The daughter of Jehoam, and third wife of Esaü (Gen. xxviii. 9); elsewhere called Bāthkāth (Gen. xxxvi. 8); but the Samar. Pent. has Mahalath in both passages. See Esaul.

2. Sept. Malā, Vulg. Malolēl, Vulq. Malolath. The daughter of Jerimoth, granddaughter of David, and tribute to the mariners (2 Chron. xi. 18). B.C. 973. She was thus her husband's cousin, being the daughter of king David's son, who was probably the child of a concubine, and not one of his regular family. Josephus, without naming Malathah, speaks of her as a 'kinwoman (muyeya ṭena, Ant. viii. 10, 1). No children are attributed to the marriage, nor is she again mentioned. The ancient Hebrew text (Kethib) in this passage has 'son' instead of 'daughter.' The latter, however, is the correction of the Keri, and is adopted by the Sept., Vulg., and Targum, as well as by the A. V."
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MAHALATH MAS'CHIL occurs in the title of Ps. liii, and MAHALATH LEAN'NOTH MAS'CHIL in the title of Ps. lxxviii. For these latter names, see each in its alphabetical order. The term MAHALATH (Heb. Macalath, מַכָּלָת, Sept. Macáthi, Vulg. Maceth, Maketh) is thought by Gesenius (Thesaur. Heb. p. 476) to be for מַכָּלָה, from מָכַל, to be sweet, spoken of musical sounds; hence signifying a stringed instrument, e. g. a lute or guiar, accompanied by the voice. First, however, denies (Heb. Lex. s. a. r.) that it denotes an instrument; and maintains that it was the title of an old air to which the psalms in question were to be sung. Ludolph (p. 272) compares the equivalent Egyptian, signifying a song or hymn. The use of Leannoth in the same connection would perhaps favor the reference to some kind of instrument; but the versions render no assistance as to the meaning of either word, and most interpreters resort either to vague conjecture or mystical allusions. The use of the particle יָּם, upon, before Mahalah, in each case, seems to indicate some kind of instrument. See Psalms.

MAHALATH, (Exod. vii. 19). See MAHAL.

MAHALATH-leannoth is the name of the mother of Buda
dihat. See GutaMA.

Mahalanaim is (Hebrew Machalanaim, מַחֲלַנֵאֵי, name comprising, as often, and explained in Gen. xxxii. 2, as meaning the heavenly army of God; we may, therefore, see the Sept. has "Galanaim, idem Castra; elsewhere "Galanael, or Galanaya, once "gala
darolai"); Vulg. Manuaim, but usually castra), a place beyond the Jordan, north of the river Jabbock, which derived its name from Jacob's having being there met by the angel (Josephus, Bell. Iudaic. xv. 26, 1) on his return from Padan-aram (Gen. xxxii. 2). See JACO.

The name was extended to the town which then existed, or which afterwards arose in the neighborhood. This town was on the confines of the tribes of Gad and Manasseh, as well as on the southern boundary of Bashan (Josh. xiii. 26, 30), and was a city of the Levites (Josh. xxxi. 38; 1 Chron. vi. 80). It was in this city that Ishbosheth, the son of Saul, reigned (2 Sam. ii. 8, 12) during David's reign at Hebron, and here he was assassinated (ch. iv). The choice of this place was probably because he found the influence of David's name less strong on the east than on the west of the Jordan; at least, it seems to show that Mahanaim was then an important and strong place (comp. 2 Sam. ii. 29; xix. 82). Hence, many years after, David himself repaired to Mahanaim, where he was entertained by Zariel, the chief of that region, the son of the fugitive beyond the Jordan from his son Absalom (2 Sam. xvii. 24, 27; 1 Kings ii. 8). In this vicinity also appears to have been fought the decisive battle in the wood of Ephraim, between the royal troops and the rebels (2 Sam. xviiii. 26). See DAVID. We only read of Mahanaim again as the station of one of the twelve officers who had charge, in monthly rotation, of raising the provisions for the royal establishment under Solomon (1 Kings iv. 14). Some find an allusion to the place in Canti.

vi, 13 ("companies of two armies.", lit. dance of Mahanaim). This is doubtful. "On the monument of Sheeshonk (Shishak) at Karnak, in the 22d cartouch —one of those which are believed to contain the names of Hebrew cities conquered by that king—a name appears which is read as M-ḥa-n-a-n-a-l, that is, Mahanaim. The adjoining cartouches contain names which are read as Beshal, Shumen, Megiddo, Beth-horon, Gilron, and other Israelitish names (Brunschi, Geogr. der nachbarländer Ägyptens, p. 61). If this interpretation may be relied on, it shows that the invasion of Shishak was more extensive than we should gather from the records (2 Chron. xii.), which recorded only the main invasion with occurrences at the metropolis. Possibly the army entered by the plains of Philistia and Sharon, ravaged Edraelon and some towns like Mahanaim just beyond Jordan, and then returned, either by the same route or by the Jordan valley, to Jerusalem, attacking it last. This would account for Rehoboam's non-resistance, and also for the fact, which special mention is made, that many of the chief men of the country had taken refuge in the city. It should, however, be remarked that the names occur in most promiscuous order, and that none has been found resembling Jerusalem." In Dr. Eli Smith's Arabic list of names of places in Jebel Ajlun (Robinson's Bib. Researches, iii. Append. p. 166), we find a ruined site under the name of Mahan, which is probably that of Mahanaim (Pestle, p. 261; Keil's Comment. on Josh. xiii. 26). The same identification was pointed out by the Jewish traveller Haparchi, according to whom it lies about half a day's journey due east of Bethanah (Zunz, in Asher's edit. of Benj. de Tudeki, p. 40), the same direction as in Kisper's Map, but only half as far. Its distance from the Jabbok is considerable but not fatal objection. Tria-

traversed the place which he defends at length as the site of Mahanaim, and describes it as well situated for a large town, with considerable remains and a fine pond (Land of Israel, p. 495).

Mahaneh丹 (Heb. Macanah'-Dan, מַחֲנֶה דָּן, camp of Dan; Sept. Ἰονίαν, Ἰονίαν, Vulg. Castra Dan), a name probably derived from the west of Kirjath-jearim, in consequence of its having been the encampment of the party of Danites on their way to capture Leish (Judg. xviii. 12). Mr. Williams suggests a site called Beit Ma
hanem, on the north side of wady Ismail, and N.N.E. of Deir el Hora (1835, 129). While the name appears on no map, and occurs in no other traveller.

Maha-Pralya (i. e. the "great end" or "great destruc
tion"), a term applied by the Hindus to the final consummation of all things, which they suppose will take place after a hundred years of Brahma have elapsed (each Brahmanic day, with its nine nights, is reckoned as 8640 millions of years). At the time referred to, all the gods, including Brahma, as well as all creatures, will be annihilated; Brahm, the eternal, self-existent Spirit, will alone remain. See Moor, Hindoo Pantheon; Thomas, Dict. of. Bibl. and Mythol. s. v.

Mahara (Hebrew Maharayy, מָחַרַיָּה, hoary; Sept. Mergapal and Mopar; r. Mopari and Mopari), a Ne
tophathite, and one of David's chief warriors (2 Sam. xxiii. 28; 1 Chron. xi. 30); being a descendant of Ze
rab, and the tenth captain of a contingent of 24,000 men (1 Chron. xxvii. 13). B.C. 1014.

Maharudra is another name of Siva (q. v.). See Rudra.

Maha-sanghiika is the name of one of the two great divisions of the Buddhist Church which arose about two hundred years after the death of the Buddha Skkyamuni, or about 343. See STHAYIRA. Out of this school arose, in the course of the next centuries, numerous sects. For the tenets common to all, and for those peculiar to each of these sects, the special student of the Buddhist religion will at present most advantageously consult the work of Prof. W. Wasmuth, Der Buddhistismus, seine Dogmen, Geschichte und Literatur (St. Petersburg, 1860).

Maha-thath (Heb. Mah'ath, מַחָת, prob. for מַחָט, grooping; Sept. Mada), the name of two Levites.

1. A Kohathite, son of Amasi and father of Zikanah (1 Chron. vi. 35); apparently the same elsewhere (1 Chron. vi. 26) called AMIMOTH (q. v.). B.C. cir. 1375. See SAMUEL.

2. Another Kohathite, one of those who cleansed the Temple in the reformation instituted by Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxix. 12), and was appointed by that king one of the subordinate overseers of the secreted revenues (2 Chron. xiii. 13). B.C. 726.

Maha-vansa is the title of two celebrated works written in Pali, and relating to the early history of Ceylon (q. v.). The older work was probably composed
by the monks of the convent Uttararājā at Anurādhāpurā, the capital of Ceylon. Its date is uncertain, but it apparently preceded the reign of Divāntasena (459-477), as that monarch ordered it to be read in public, a circumstance which seems to prove the celebrity it already enjoyed in his time. The later work of the same name is an improved edition and continuation of the former. Its author, Mahābhārata, was the son of the chief priest of the king Divāntasena, and he brings down the history of Ceylon, like his predecessor, to the death of Mahāvira, who was the last volume of the latter work, "in Roman characters, with a translation subjoined, and an introductory essay on Pāli Buddhist literature," was published by the Hon. George Turnour (Ceylon, 1857). See also Lassen, Indische Alterthums- kunde, ii, 16 sq. (Bonn, 1859).

Mahāvira (literally, the "great hero"), also called Viśva and Varadhānā, is the twenty-fourth or last Jina, or deified saint, of the Jainas (q. v.), described as of a golden complexion, and having a lion for his symbol. His legendary history is given in the Kalpa-Sūtra (q. v.) and the Mahābhārata-Charitra. According to the Mahābhārata's birth, he died at a period infinitely remote; it was as Nagadara, the head man of a village, that he first appeared in the country of Vijaya, subject to Satrumadana. He was next born as Marichi, the grandson of the first Jina Rishabha; he then came to the world of Brahmā, was reborn as a worldly-minded man and after several births and deaths was separated from the other by an interval passed in one of the Jainas heavens, and each period of life extending to many hundreds of thousands of years—he quitted the state of a deity to obtain immortality as a saint, and was incarnate towards the close of the fourth age (now past), when seventy-five years and eight and a half months of it remained. After he was thirty years of age he renounced worldly pursuits, and departed, amid the applause of gods and men, to practice austerities. Finally, he became an Arhat or Jina; and at the age of seventy-two years, the period of his liberation having arrived, "he resigned his breath," and his body was burned by Indra and other deities, who erected a splendid monument on the spot, and then returned to their respective heavens. At what period these events occurred is not stated, but, judging from some of the circumstances narrated, the last Jina expired about five hundred years before the Christian era. Other authorities make the date of this event about a century and a half earlier.

The works above referred to state, with considerable detail, the conversations worked by Mahāvira. Among the pupils were Indrabhūti (also called Gautama, and for this reason, but erroneously, considered as the same with the founder of the Buddhist religion), Agnibhūti, Vāyu-bhūti—all three sons of Vasubhūti, a Brahmana of the Gotama tribe, and others. These converts to Jain principles are mostly made in the same manner: each comes to the saint prepared to overwhelm him with shame, when he salutes them mildly, and, as the Jainas hold, solves their metaphysical or religious doubts. Thus Indrabhūti doubts whether there be a living principle in the body of the body; Vasubhūti doubts if the body has not made up his mind on the subjects of bondage and liberation; Achalabhṛttī is sceptical as to the distinction between vice and virtue, and so on. Mahāvira removes all their difficulties, and, by teaching them the Jina truth, converts them to the doctrine of his sect. For a summary account of the life of this saint, see H. T. Colebrooke's Miscellaneous Essays, ii, 213 sq.; H. H. Wilson's Works, i, 291 sq.

Mahāvītā (Hebrew only in the plur. Mahāvin, in the singular collectively, Mahāvikī, patronymic of the same form from Mahāvi); the name of the elder son of Mahāvira; but in Num. xxvi, 58, Sept. omits, Vulg. Maholos; A. Ver. constantly "Mahelitae," the descendants of Mahāvira, the son of Menri (Num. iii, 58; xxxvi, 58). See also Hebrew Mahelon, Mahelic, sickly; Sept. Maholos, Vulg. Maholos, the elder of the two sons of Eлимētē the Bethilehemite by Naomi; they removed with him to Moab, where this one married Ruth, and died childless (Ruth 1, 5, 8; iv, 9, 10). B.C. cir. 1586. See RUTH. "It is uncertain which was the elder of the two. In the narrative (1, 2, 5) Mahalon is mentioned.
first, but in his formal address to the elders in the gate (iv. 9), Boaz says "Chilion and Mahlon." Like his brother, Mahlon died in the land of Moab without offspring, which in the Targum on Ruth (i. 5) is explained to have been a judgment for their transgression of the law in marrying a Moabitess. In the Targum on 1 Chron. iv. 14, Mahlon is identified as being ashamed on account of the double meaning of the Hebrew word which follows, and which signifies both 'had dominion' and 'married.'

Mahmúd, Abú-Kámír Yémín Ed-Dowlah, one of the most celebrated of the Mohammedi & s Evl the sovereign, the founder of the Gavdence dynasty, and the first who ever held the permanent Mahommedan power in India, was born at Gazz (or Ghzian) in A.D. 967. His father was originally a Turkish slave, but having become governor, under the sovereignty of Persia, of the province of Kandahar, he finally secured for his own possession the whole of the Punjab (q.v.), besides the Afghan dominions. Mahmud came to the throne A.D. 977. Already, during the reign of his father, Mahmud had distinguished himself by superior warlike qualities. Ill treated by Munsir, the Samanide sovereign of Persia, he made war against him, resulting in the overthrow of the Samanide dynasty and the establishment of Mahmoud himself as the most powerful monarch in Asia. A devout Mussulíman, he aspired to the character of an apostle of his religion. "His chief ambition was to extend his religion throughout the rich provinces of India, a task to which he was stimulated by a belief cherished from his infancy that he was intrusted with a divine mission to extirpate idolatry from the land of the Hindus." In twelve successive expeditions into India, during a reign of thirty-five years, he carried fire and sword among the idolaters, de-throned and slew several princes, plundered and burned their cities, stormed the forts, massacred the garrisons, ravaged the fields, and carried away so many natives into captivity, that the price of a slave was reduced at Gazz to a couple of rupees; and all this notwithstanding that all India regarded the contest with Mahmoud in the light of a holy war, and that no sacrifice of money or men was spared to defend the religion of their forefathers (compare Moore's poem "Paradise and the Peri"). Mahmud extended his conquests not only over the whole of the Punjab, but penetrated as far as Bundelkund on the east, and Guzerat on the south. He frequently been charged that these incursions to India were made by Mahmoud rather for the sake of spoil than to extend the Mussulman faith (comp. Trevor, India, p. 72), but there is every evidence, both in the fact that his arms were constantly directed against the religion rather than the people, and in the fact that he was the most expensive of all Gazz at the treasures brought from India, and in the encouragement he gave to learning, that Mahmoud believed in his divine mission. He founded a university in Gazz, with a vast collection of curious books, in various languages, and a museum of natural curiosities. He appropriated a large sum for the maintenance of this establishment. He also set aside £10,000 a year for pensions to learned men. He died in 1030. The great Mussulman poet Firdusi flourished at this time. See Ferishta, "History of the Rise of the Mohammedi Power in India" (translated by the general Briggs); Wilken, "Historia Chamsirvand"; History of British India, vol. i (Harper's Family Library); Von Hammer, "Gemäldeєul großer Moslemischer Herrscher"; Trevor, India, p. 69 sq.; India, Pictorial, Descriptive, and Bot, (London, Bohn, 1844, 12mo), p. 54 sq.; D'Herbelot, Académie Frangaise, p. 544 sq.; and the excellent articles in Thomas, "Dict. of Byz. and Mythol," a. v. (J. H. W.)

Mahrensçhmidt, John Peter, a pioneer of the German Reformed Church in Ohio, was born probably in Somerset or in Westmoreland Co., Pa., in 1783; first taught school for a number of years, and was finally, in 1812, licensed to preach, and soon after removed to Ohio, where he performed missionary labors in the counties of Columbiana and Trumbull. He laid the foundations of numerous congregations, which he lived to see grow and prosper. He died in Cynthian, Mahoning Co., Ohio, July 11, 1857. Mahrensçhmidt was a modest, childlike, and earnest man. See Harbaugh, Fathers of the German Ref. Ch. (Lancaster, Pa., 1872, 12mo), iii, 207 sq.

Ma'hol (Heb. Machol, מַכוֹל, a sacred dance, as in Ps. xx. 12, etc.; Sept. Μακολ); Josephus'Hmōun, Ant. viii, 2, 5, a person apparently named as the father of the famous wise men Ethen, Heeman, Chalcol, and Dur- da (or at least of the last two), prior to the time of Solomon (1 Kings iv. 81); but if these be the same with those enumerated as sons of Zerah (1 Chron. ii. 6), the word must be taken as elsewhere to denote simply their being chosen or appointed, as was the case with the sons of Kēllis (see Kel's Comment, ad loc. Kings), an art with which dancing has ever been intimately connected. See Ethan.

Mahomet. See Mohammed.

Mahrattas, a people of Central India, south of the River Ganges, inhabiting the mountains from Gwalior to Gau, and by many supposed to be the descendants of a Persian or North Indian people who had been driven southwards by the Mongols. They are a vigorous and active race, and though, like many Eastern nations, fundamentally and distinctively, are devoted to the practice of agriculture and to the pursuits of peace, they are, in fact, a people of martial instincts (see Bell's Comment, ad loc. Kings), an art with which dancing has ever been intimately connected. See Ethan.

Mahrattas. See Mohammed.
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Mahrattas. See Mohammed.

Mahommed. See Mohammed.
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Church in India date with the settlement of the Portuguese in Goa, where the Roman Catholics established the first bishopric in 1534. The second important hold the Romish Church secured at the two Salsettes, the peninsula and island near Bombay. From these the work was gradually pressed through the Mahrratta-land. At Goa they are claimed to be 32,140, and at Bombay 20,000. See India. The first Protestant mission was commenced in the Mahrratta-land by the American Board in 1811. For about twenty years it was confined to the territory this side of the Ghauta. Mahim, Tannah, and Chowal (Choule) were occupied for a while, but abandoned in 1826. In 1835, however, the work began to show signs of vigor and promise. At this time a mission was established on the high lands of Ahmednuggur, a city of 80,000 inhabitants, and by 1842 it became an independent mission centre. For the success of this work and its present status, see the articles INDIA, VOL. IV., p. 555, vol. 2. The Anglican Church first began missionary labors in Bombay in 1820, and gradually gained a hold at Tannah, Bandora, and Bassein. In 1832, Nasik, the most celebrated centre of Brahminism in all Deccan, was secured; in 1846 the work was extended to Aton Junir, Siolim, and Kudighur. The attempt made a few years ago, at Yeolat, to Christianize exclusively by the aid of native helpers failed completely. Neither did the effort among the Marang, in the neighborhood of Aurangabad (stations Buldana, etc.), prove successful. In Bombay and vicinity, a Missionary Society has established mission schools, and Christian influences are moulding the character of the rising generation. A special missionary for the Mohammedans is sustained here. See BOMBAY. The Scotch Mission commenced at Konkan in 1823; the first stations were Banjor and Suvarrudug, but these were abandoned when the laborers were needed at Bombay. Here both the "Established Church" and the "Free Church" sustain schools. The Scotch Mission at Poona, which originated in 1838, belongs to the Free Church. Of late years the Free Church has established missions among the Wahrals (aborigines) near Damun. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has labored in this field since 1840, but confined mainly to Bombay. Very lately the Medical Missionary Society has established an institute which will prove of valuable service to the mission work. See Spruell, Geschichte der Maharatta (Halle, 1786); Duth. History of the Maharattas (London, 1826, 3 vols. 8vo); Grundemann, Missionarischen, No. 12; Chamber, Cyclopaedia, s. v.

Mai, Angelo, a noted Roman Catholic prelate, and one of the most distinguished scholars of the 19th century. He was born at St. Schiloerpil (province Fr. Los Angeles, California, March 7, 1782. As a youth he arrested the attention of his instructor, the ex-jesuit father Lewis Mozi de Caspini, by the unusual taste and capacity which he displayed for classical learning. The father, determined to lead Angelo's instruction towards the service of the Church, finally induced him to enter, in 1790, the novitate of the Society of Jesus, which, although elsewhere suppressed, the Duke of Parma, with the sanction of Pius VI, was just re-establishing at Colombo, a small city of his duchy. In this community Mai resided till the provisional restoration of the society in Naples (1804), whither he was sent as Professor of Greek and Latin literature. About the end of 1805 he was transferred to Rome for the completion of his theological studies, and soon afterwards to Orvieto, and was there admitted to priest's orders. It was at this place that he acquired great familiarity with the Hebrew language, his accurate knowledge of paleography, and his skill in deciphering ancient manuscripts. He returned to Rome in 1806, just about the time when the contest of Pius VII with Napoleon was reaching the crisis; an order issued by the Emperor compelling all subjects from the kingdom of Italy to return to their respective provinces, had compelled him to change his residence once again. Happily for the interests of literature, he settled at Mi-
they were still on his hands, he commenced an edition of the well-known Codex Vaticanus of the Old and New Testament, with various readings of the manuscripts, which, however, he never entirely completed; or if he did, as some suppose, he destroyed a greater part of his manuscript on the Old Testament, lest it should ever see the light of day in an incomplete and imperfect state. The text of the New Testament was published in 1668, and in a thoroughly revised form in 1699, under the title Novum Testamentum ex versione saeculare Codicis Vaticanae, edition studio Angeli Maii; but even in a revised form the work does not deserve the name of Mai on its title-page. Comp. Kito, Journ. Sac. Lit. 1659 (Oct.), p. 166 sq. Engaged in these vast literary labors, Cardinal Mai held the labors and responsible post of secretary of the Propaganda, to which he had been appointed in 1833; and it was observed with wonder that his other engagements were never suffered to interfere with the duties of the secretariatum. In 1858 he was rewarded for his great services to the Church with the cardinal's hat, at the same time with his friend and successor in the Vatican Library, Mozaffanti; and soon afterwards was appointed to several important and confidential offices in the Roman court, chiefly of a literary character. He was named successively prefect of the Congregation for the Supervision of the Oriental Provinces of the Congregation of the Index; and prefect of the Congregation of the Council of Trent. In 1858 he was appointed to the still more congenial post of librarian of the Roman Church. He died September 9, 1884.

"Cardinal Mai's abilities as an editor," says his biographer in the English Cyclopaedia, "were of the very highest order. While his collections comprise an infinite variety of authors of every age, of every country, of every variety of style, and in every department of literature, he appears in all equally the master. Whether the subject be theology, or history, or law, or languages, or general literature, his learning is never at fault, and his critical sagacity never fails. In the many delicate and difficult questions which so often arise—in assigning an anonymous manuscript to its true author, in collecting fragments of the same work and dovetailing them together into intelligible order, in selecting from a heap of unknown materials all that is unpublished, and deciding upon the question of its genuineness or its intrinsic value—in a word, in all the thousand investigations which fall to the lot of a critical editor treading upon uncharted ground, he possessed a skill which can hardly be described as other than instinctive, and which, taking into account the vast variety of subjects which engaged him, must be regarded as little short of marvellous. The private character of Cardinal Mai has been well described as the very ideal of a Christian scholar. Earnestly devoted to the duties of his sacred calling, he yet loved literature for its own sake also, and he was ever foremost in every project for its advancement. He was a member of all the leading literary societies of Italy, and not infrequently read papers in those of Rome and Milan. His charities were at all times liberal, and, indeed, munificent; and at his death he bequeathed the proceeds of the sale of his noble library to the poor of his native village of Schiaporo. A monograph has been erected to his memory in the church of St. Anastasia, from which he derived his title of cardinal. See Mutti, Elogio di Angelo Mai (1826); Rabbe, Biog. Univ. des Contemporanea, Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxiii, 857 sq.; English Cyclop. s. v.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lehren, vol. xii, s. v.

Maias neas (Maias, Vulg. omits), given (1 Exod. ix, 49) in place of the Maaias (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Neh. viii, 7).

Maid or Maiden (prop. מַיָּד, madla, a girl, as corresponding to מָנוֹס, moes, a young man; also מַיָּדָמ, madesam, a virgin; for which the usual term is מַיָּדָה, but מַיָּדָא and מַיָּדָה, like moth, are a maid-servants). See HANDMAID; MAIDEN.

Maius (Milan, Volg. omits), given (1 Esd. ix, 49) in place of the Maias (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Neh. viii, 7).

Mainan, Emanuel, a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, noted as a philosopher, was born at Toulouse, in France, in 1651; was educated at the College of the Jesuits in that place, where he exhibited extraordinary ability as a mathematician and philosopher. A strong inclination to a religious life led him to seek the monastery for his retreat. In 1656, however, he was called to fill a professor's chair of mathematics in Rome; returned from Rome to Toulouse in 1658, and was created by his countrymen provincial in the same year. He died in 1676. Maianus published De Perspectiva Horaria (Toulouse, 1648), and a Course of Philosophy (Toulouse, 1652, 4 vols. 8vo; 2d edit. 1678, folio), enlarged by two Treatises on the same subject in 1673. He opposed Des Cartes in his theory of the Creation, and to refute it the more completely, he invented a machine "which showed by its movements that Des Cartes's supposition concerning the manner in which the universe was formed, or might have been formed, and concerning the centrifugal force, was entirely without foundation." See Gen. Biog. Dict. ix, 1, s. v.; Thomas, Dict. Biog. and Mythol. s. v.

Mainot, Charles, a French Jesuit and missionary, was born at Paris in 1652; entered the order and prepared for missionary labors in foreign parts. In 1681 he was sent to Siam, and in 1683 he was placed in charge of the missions of China. In 1686 pope Clement XII created him, for his zeal in propagating Christianity among the inhabitants of the "Middle Kingdom," bishop in partibus of Conon. In 1699 he was visited with the displeasure of his order for his opposition to the peculiar manner in which the Jesuits sought to advance the interests of Christianity among the Chinese. He was even at one time in danger of his life. Supported by the Dominicans, he was appealed to pope Clement XI, who, June 20, 1702, gave his approval to the attitude of the bishop of Conon; and, to make known his wish, dispatched cardinal de Tournon to the emperor of China, who, as we have seen in the article on China, was greatly displeased with the conduct of the Christian missionaries, and issued an edict ordering them all from his dominions. Mainot at first refused to obey the imperial command, and only quitted the country when his life was imperilled. He went to Rome by way of Ireland, and died in the Eternal City Feb. 18, 1730. He only wrote one work, and that is still in MS. form; it is entitled De Sinico Religione (4 vols. fol.). See Le Go- bien, Hist. de l'Édit de l'empereur de Chine en faveur de la religion Chrétienne (Paris, 1698, 12mo); Berault-Ber- castel, Hist. de l'Édit de 1698 (Paris, 1698, 12mo); Mailla, Hist. Générale de la Chine, vol. ix; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxiii, 867.

Mail (מַיָּד, madla, "a scale," as of fish, Lev. xi, 9, etc.), spoken of as a cuirass composed of plates of
MAIDUFL

MAIMBOURNE

metal attached to a bodice like scales, so as to be impervious to the sword (1 Sam. xviii, 5). Another term, rendered "cost of mail," is מֶּרֶבֶן, sibyon, which signifies the corselet or garment thus ensquared (1 Sam. xvii, 86). At other times metallic rings were employed in stead of scales (see Kittto, Fict. Dict. note at 1 Sam. xvii).

See ARMOR.

Maillouf, an Irish monk, who flourished about the middle of the 7th century, established a monastery in Wiltshire, England, A.D. 650, long called Mailluborough, now known as Malmsbury. It was richly endowed by Athelstan and other kings of England, and became the alma mater of some of the first educated Saxons in England in either Church or State. Among them was Alksmd, bishop of Sherborne, who acknowledged "that Maillouf had thoroughly instructed him in Latin and Greek." Camden says that Aldhelm was the first Saxon who wrote in Latin, or who made Latin verses; his style, however, was pedantic, and full of alliterations. William of Malmsbury, the first Saxon historian, received his education in this school, the first one among the twelve which Montalembert says the Irish monks established in England (Monks of the West, 1864). The period from the 7th to the 10th century was a very dark one in England. Alfred the Great, speaking of his own times (A.D. 870), said, "There were few churchmen on the throne who could understand the daily prayer in English, or who could translate a letter in Latin" (Turner's History of the Anglo-Saxons, book v). And William of Malmesbury said "that, a few years before the Norman invasion, a clergyman who understood grammar was considered a prodigy" (ibid.). During this dark period, a large number of Irish scholars, impelled by a devotion to literature, or, as some say, driven out by the Danes, went over to England and established a great many schools, and, among others, that also of Glastonbury. It was often called "Glastonbury Abbey," but the name of that monastery had long since passed away and it was known and loved in his own monastery. See Illustrious Men of Ireland, i, 137; Moore's History of Ireland; Fict. Hist. of England, i, 277 sq.

Maillouf, OLIVIER, a celebrated French pupil orator, was born in Bretagne in the 15th century. His early history is somewhat obscure. He became a doctor of the Sorbonne, professor in theology in the order of the "Minor Brothers," and court preacher to Louis XI and to the duke of Burgundy. In 1501 he was instructed by the papal legate with the reform of the Paris convents of the order of "Gray Friars," and he discharged this task so energetically and independently that he incurred the displeasure of the "Gray Friars." His reputation, however, rests mainly on the wonderful power of oratory and independence of thought displayed in his pulpit utterances. In many respects he may be likened to Bossuet, but in one he even excelled him—in dealing out truth, in criticising the faults and sins of his hearers. It is reticent that his royal master, Louis XI, having one day been subjected by him to unusual severity, sent word that if Olivier Maillouf would suffer himself to speak thus severely a second time, he should do it at the loss of his life. But Olivier was ready to return a prompt reply even to the royal messenger. "Tell the king that I will thus only arrive sooner in Paradise, and make the way for the king so much the harder." Louis XI never again molested Maillouf, though he continued in his former course unabated. In course of time, however, one moderate part of the populace of Maillouf has died of his contemporaries be true, the French of the 15th century have never had their equal in moral corruption. He died near Toulouse, according to some, June 13, 1602; but his death must have occurred much later, if it be true that he preached at Paris in 1508. His principal works are Sermons de l'Académie déclarati Parisins in ecclesia & Johannis in Gratia anno 1490 (Paris, 1494, 4to; 1511, 8vo)—Quadragesimal Opera (Paris, 1494, 4to; 1512, 8vo)—Sermones dominicales et aliis (1515, 8vo)—Sermones de Nativitate et Circumcisione Nostri Domini, expounded by the Saints and other mysteries of the Mass (also under the title Le Mystère de la Messe, etc.)—L'Exemplaire de Confession avec la Confession générale (Rouen and Cayen, 4to; Lyon, 1524, 8vo)—Tractatus enregy de plusieurs religion pour les intructure et exercicre a le bien gouverner (8vo)—Contemplatio ad salvationem angelicum (1607). See Nie- ron, Memoires, vol. xxxii. a.; Le Bae, Dict.-Encyclop. de la France, s. v.; Gersosy, Essais d'Hist. litter.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxi, 871 sq.

Maillat, JOSEPH ANNE MARIE DE MOYHIA DE, a French Jesuit missionary, was born in 1640 at the ancestral castle near Nantua. He entered the order quite young. In 1701 he was appointed to take a part in the mission to China, and embarked in 1703 for Macao, and thence for China. He quickly mastered the Chinese language, and as readily familiarized himself with the customs of that country, so that he became of great service to the Celestial empire. In 1708 a map of China and Tartary was prepared for the Chinese government under his superintendence, and he secured not only approval for his services, but was actually invited to take office at court. He died June 26, 1748, at Pekin. His studies were mainly in the history and archeology of China, and his works are of the same department. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxii, 867.

Maillé de Brese, SIMON DE, a French prelate, was born in 1515; became a religious of the order of Cister, was made abbot of Loraux, then bishop of Viviers, and in 1554 archbishop of Tours. He was a member of the Council of Trent, and took decided ground against the Reformers, who had given him no little trouble in his archiepiscopal dominions. He was at one time obliged to quit his see, in all probability because the Calvinists had made a strong case of immorality against him (ibid., Jan. 11, 1557). He died a Jesuit, and left a Latin translation of several homilies of St. Basil (Paris, 1558, 4to), and Discours au peuple de Touraine (ibid. 1674, 16mo).—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxii, 878.

Maim. See ABEIL-MAIN; MISPETHPOOTH-MAIM.

Maimbourg, LOUIS, a celebrated French ecclesiastic and defender of Gallican liberty, was born at Nancy in 1620; entered the "Society of Jesus" in 1630; was by them sent to Rome to study theology; was, on his return to France, for six years professor of rhetoric in the College of Rouen; then began preaching, and soon attained great eminence. Having, however, in his Traité Historique de l'Eglise de Rome (Paris, 1645; new ed., Nevers, 1831) come out boldly in favor of the liberty of the Gallican Church, he was expelled from the Order of the Jesuits. The king took sides with Maimbourg and indemnified him by a pension. He retired to the Abbey of St. Victor, in Paris, where he wrote the history of schism of England, and died Aug. 15, 1686. He had entirely disconnected himself from the Jesuits, and did not were them much in his writings; yet in his Histoire du Calculisme (Paris, 1682, 4to), dedicated to the king, one can readily distinguish the influence of his former associations when he called Calvinism "the most rabid and dangerous of all errors," and included all the protestant sects in Bossuet's interpretation of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church [see BOUSSUET] Maimbourg pronounced against. (Compare Schröck, Kirchenrecht, s. a. Ref.
MAIMBourg, Theodore, a relative of the distinguished Louis Maimbourg (q.v.), flourished about the middle of the 17th century. He embraced the Reformed faith and was ordained in 1659. He was afterwards translated to Louis justifying his course. In 1664 he returned to the Romish Church, and subsequently left it again. He then retired to England, and died at London in 1669.


Maimon, Solomon, a Jewish rabbi and philosopher, one of the ablest exponents of the Kantian school, was born in Lithuania in 1716. He was a student of the rabbinical parentage, and in his youth was confined in his educational advantages to the study of Hebrew. Yet his talent for speculation manifested itself at a very early age, when still confined to the expounding of Talmudic lore. In his very youth, Moses Maimonides' Moreh Nebuchim fell into his hands; but while to Moses Mendelssohn it became the guide to truth, it became to Maimon a guide to a labyrinth of speculation from which no open exit: gave him an outlet until, in advanced life, he fell in with the writings of Kant, to become one of his most ardent students and able expounders. In the dispair which the Moreh Nebuchim prepared for him, he turned to the Cabala for relief, determined to become a Jewish Faust. Plagued by the disadvantages of Russo-Jewish society, he finally quit his native land and went to Germany to study medicine and thus gain a livelihood. He was 22 years of age when he set foot in Prussia. His condition in this, the old capital of Prussia, the seat of a university at that time in the very zenith of her glory, was much like that of a man who, after having suffered starvation for days, is suddenly placed at a table d'hote without stint.

In 1779 he went to Berlin, and became an intimate associate of the German Jewish savant, Moses Mendelssohn. It was not, however, until years had been passed in a roving life that he finally, in 1786, on his return to Ber-

lín, gave himself to the study of Kantian philosophy, was recommended to Kant, and soon made a great name for himself. Both Schiller and Goethe, it is said, sought his society; the latter, we are told, desired Maimon to take up his residence near his side (Maimontane, p. 187). Valckenaer, in his Vues de l'Empire, i, 324 sq.; Vattel, Droit des Gens, i, 243 sq.; David Velt, i, 243 sq., 247 et al.; ii, 23.

In his last years count Kalkreuth gave Maimon a home on one of his estates in Silesia. He died in 1800. From an admirer of Kant, Maimon finally changed to a decided opponent, and, to make good his claim he presented the world with a new system of philosophy, which was written in the interests of scepticism. According to Maimon, there is no knowledge strictly objective except pure mathematicals, and all empirical knowledge is only an illusion. He traces all the forms of thought, categories, and judgments to a general and unique principle, that of determinability, of reality, of substance; but he contends that we have no right to suppose that our thought has for its object a thing without ourselves, existing independently of the thought, which determines it. He says, without reference to Kant (De la Causalite et de la Prude-

Maimonides (i.e., son of Maimon), Moses, also called by the Jews Rambam, from the initial letters רם-מאַם), and by the Arabs Abu Amram Musa b. Maimon Obeid Allah, one of the greatest of the Jews since the exile —the great luminary, the glory of Israel, the second Moses, etc., etc., the second legislator between 1780 and 1800, at Cordova, March 80, 1185. As a youth, he received his instruction in the Heb. Scriptures, the Talmud, and Jewish literature from his father, R. Maimon, who held the dignity of judge of the Jews, as also his forefathers had held it for some centuries previous, and was himself renowned as a scholar and author of a commentary on Esther, a work on the laws of the Jewish prayers and festivals, a commentary on the Talmud, etc., etc. But for instruction in the Arabic, then the predominant language of Spain, as the country was in the hands of the Mohammedans, and mathematics, and astronomy, Moses was handed over to the care of the renowned Arabian philosophers Averroes and Ibn-Thoefili (compare Joseph, Gesch. d. Israeliten, vi, 168), Spain, in which the Jews had found an early home (some say as early as the days of Solomon; compare Rule, Kaussles, p. 146 sq.; Linds, Hist. d. Jews of Spain and Portugal, p. 1 sq.; Da Cass, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 211), is by Milman (History of the Jews, iii, 155) spoken of as the country in which "the golden age of the Jews shone with the brightest and most enduring splendor." In the early days of Christianity we find the Jews, according to the early Christian writers, a source of danger and scandal [see ELYTRA], and legislation enacted in his behalf; but, to the shame of Christianity be it said, the Jews enjoyed his greatest privileges in the Iberian peninsula.
MAIMONIDES

under Mussulman rule, and "from the conquest by the Moors till towards the end of the 10th century, when, while Christian Europe lay in darkness, Mohammedan Cordova might be considered the centre of civilization, of arts, and of letters, . . . the Jews, under the enjoyment of equal rights and privileges, were in their master- ters, or, rather, the treasurers to the califs, but more frequently as physicians, philosophers, poets, theologians—in a word, as saracens and men of letters." Especially worthy to be called the golden age of Spanish Judaism was the age that gave birth to Moses Maimonides. While the Jews, who at that time lived under less extensive circumstances in France and Germany, were disinclined to all scientific endeavors, and all their spiritual activity became absorbed in the study of the Talmud, the Spanish Jews vied in all sciences—in philosophy, mathematics, astronomy, medicine, and in poetry, with the power of the Arabian genius. Formerly the Jews of the Iberian peninsula had derived their learning of the Biblical writings and their commentators from the famous schools of Babylon and Persia, whither the young were sent for theological instruction; but when, by sheer accident, a noted Eastern rabbi of the 10th century found a home in these Western coasts (see Rabbi Moses, "clad in sackcloth:" compare Milman, iii, 156, and other histories of the Jews), and "the light of learning, which, by the rapid progress of the iron age of Judaism in Babylonia, by the extinction of the authority of the prince of the captivity, the dispersion of the dispersed, and the final prosperity of the great schools, seemed to have set forever, it suddenly rose again in the West in renewed and undismayed splendor." From this time (A.D. 990) the schools of the Spanish Rabbanim (at Cordova, Toledo, Barcelona, and Granada) not only became the centre of Jewish civilization and learning, but the auxiliaries of the Arabo-Muslim philosophers in their endeavor to keep alive the flame of learning during the deep darkness of the Middle Ages, and the Jews became the communicators of Arabo-Muslim philosophy to the Christian world, or, as Tzemachman (Manual of Philosophy, trans. by Morell, p. 521) has it, "the interpreters between the Saracens and the Western nations." It was at such a time—when the heaven of Spanish Judaism was resplendent with stars of its greatest magnitude—Solomon Ibn-Gabirol (1021-1070), Judah Halevi (1066-1141; died 1143), David ben Yehuda (1160-1240), a galaxy of great and learned men of which any nation might well be proud—that Moses Maimonides lived, wrote, and flourished as the brightest ornament of them all.

As we noticed above, Moses was born in 1135. The Almorавides—i.e., men devoted to the service of God—who were then the masters of Mohammedan Spain [see MOHAMMADANS], like the Ommandes, were tolerant and kind to the Jews. But just at this time the power of the Almoravides was fast declining, and by the middle of the 12th century the Almohades, a political Mohammedan sect [see IN-TUMART], landed in Southern Spain, soon gained the upper hand, and succeeded the Almoravides altogether. With the accession of these Almohades to power in Southern Spain begins a new chapter in the history of the Jews. On the Seine, on the Rhine, on the Danube, and in the steppes of Africa and Southern Spain, "as if by previous arrangement, a bloody chase was now inaugurated, in the name of religion, against the Hebrew tribe both by Mohammedans and Christians, quite unmindful of the fact that whatever of the good and Godlike has in their confession had been derived from the teachings of this very tribe. Hitherto persecutions of the Jew had been only occasional; with the year 1146 they begin to be more frequent, usual, consequent, and severe, as if to make up for the period in which the spirit of intelligence began to dawn among men surpass in inhumanity the days of dark barbarism" (Grätz, vi, 175). In that part of Spain controlled by the Almohades no other religion than that of the Crescent was to be tolerated, and Jew and Christian alike were obliged either to abjure the faith of their fathers or to quit the country within a month. To remain and yet to adhere faithfully to the teachings of the Old or New Testament was to incur the penalty of death. Maimonides's family, like many others to whom emigration was well-nigh impossible, embraced the Mohammedan faith, or, rather, for the time being, renounced the public profession of Judaism, all the while, however, remaining faithful to it in secret, and keeping up a close communication with their co-religionists abroad (compare Carmoly, A moslem, 1859, p. 355 sq.; Munk, Archiv Erfurts, 1851, p. 319 sq.). For more than 25 years Moses lived together with his family, under the assumed character of Mohammedan; but when the death of the reigning sovereign brought no change in the system of religious intolerance, they, with the greater part of the Jewish community, resolved to emigrate and travel abroad, as he himself tells us, "by land and by sea," without finding a resting-place for the sole of his foot. Their first landing-place was Acco, in Palestine; from thence they went via Jerusalem to Cairo; then to Hebron, and next to Egypt, stopping first a short time at Alexandria, but finally settling at Fustat (compare Jerusalem, A moslem, 1849, p. 45 sq.). On their journey Maimonides had lost his father (at Cairo), and, to earn a livelihood for his father's household, he engaged with his younger brother in the jewelry trade; the care of the business mainly falling to David, while Moses devoted most of his time to literary pursuits and to the study of medicine, which he afterwards practised, and in which profession he attained to great eminence.

Life and Labors.—During his boyhood, Moses Maimonides is said to have manifest anything but a promise of those great abilities which were unfolded in his manhood. He was a child of ten years old when his father sent him, at a very early age, from his paternal roof. During his absence from home, however, an earnest desire for knowledge was manifested by him, and, by study and intercourse with learned co-religionists and Arabs, he acquired a great treasure of knowledge in the different provinces of science, which his clear, penetrating, and methodical mind mastered with a marvellous power. An elegant oration, delivered by him at fourteen, reconciled father and son. Acquainted with all the writings of ancient philosophers, he became the most eminent philosopher of his age. He was an able political economist and metaphysician. When only 23 years old (1156), he proved the possession of extraordinary powers of comprehension and elucidation in a treatise on the Jewish calendar, based on astronomical principles (Hebrew: לאמשרה), which he composed for a friend. In the same year also, whilst wandering about from place to place, and deprived of the aid of a library, he yet began his stupendous Commentary on the Mishra (Hebrew: הלוחות). At this time also (about 1160) he composed the Letter on Religious Persecution (Hebrew: ארológico), or A Treatise on Glorifying God (Hebrew: תוחם), i.e., by suffering martyrdom—a most ingenuous plea for those who have not
of the Jewish religion, and was regarded as a new Bible or Talmud. A detailed account of its reception is given by Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebr. i, 840 sq. Most of the young Israelites of his days were spending their best time in acquiring a mediocre knowledge of the sixty books of the Talmud, to the neglect and exclusion of all secular science and philosophy. To obviate this, Maimonides wrote those philosophical works, which have become the main contents of the whole Talmud. "If the Talmud," says Grätz (vii, 389), "may be likened to a Dedalic structure, in which one can scarcely find his way even with an Ariadne thread, Maimonides has transformed it into a well-organized edifice with side-wings, halls, apartments, chambers, and closets, in which the seeker, led by the fitting superscriptions and numbers, may make his way without a guide, and gain a view of all the contents of the Talmud... One might almost say that Maimonides created a new Talmud. It is true these are the old elements; we know their origin, their original connection; but in his hands it looks like another work; the mist is removed; the disguising ad- dena done away with; it appears remoulded, smoother, fresher, and newer. The Mishna, the foundation-structure of the Talmud, opened by propounding the question on the law: 'At what time on the third day of the week is the Shema to be read?' and closes with the discussion, when this or that thing becomes lethumically unclear. Maimonides, on the other hand, thus opens his Talmudical codex: 'The foundation of foundations, and the pillar of wisdom, is to know that there exists a first.' He has remoulded all other beings into existence, and that all things existing in heaven or on earth, and whatever is between them, exist only through the medium of this first Being, and closes with the words, 'The earth will one day be covered with knowledge as the ocean's ground is by water.' The whole work is permeated by a peculiar savour; it breathes the spirit of complete wisdom, cool reflection, and deep morality. Maimonides, so to speak, has Talmudized philosophy and metaphysicized the Talmud. He has admitted philosophy within the precincts of the religious code, and there conveyed its citizenship of equality besides the Halacha. Though philosophy had, previous to his day, been cultivated by Jewish thinkers (here comp. Sachs, Religion Oe Poet in Juden in Spanien, p. 185 sq.), and applied to Judaism from Philo down to Abraham Ibn-David [see Chatuyq], she had always been regarded as something outside of the rabbinical law—as a something which had nothing in common with practical Judaism as exercised daily and hourly. Maimonides, however, introduced her into the very bosom of Judaism, and, so to speak, gave Aristotle a place by the side of the rest of the Talmud. 'He was the mind of Maimonides only,' says Dr. Wise (Judaism, Dec. 1, 1871), 'could accomplish such a gigantic task, and codify that immense mass of laws and customs as systematically and linguistically exact as he did. Nobody before or even after him has been able to do it so well and completely as he has done it. He alone has brought the rabbinical law within a compass, to be mastered in a few years, and under a system to find particular laws or customs without roaming over a mass of rabbinical sources, thereby affording students an opportunity to master the rabbinical laws, and to save time for other studies.' His fame now became world-wide. Not only, however, as a law-giver in Judah did he advance to the first place among the great and learned; as a physician also he excelled his colleagues, and for his attainments in this field of labor his name was carried to many foreign lands. Richard Courz de Lion, learning of his medical skill, anxiously sought to secure the services of this noted Jew as his court physician. Maimonides, however, preferred to remain in the land of his adoption, and declined the proffered honor (compare Well, Chalifren, iii, 425 sq.). It was at this time that the vizier of Saladin, the Kadi al-Fâhbel, who had taken the Maimonides under his protection, appointed Moses chief (Re'a, v22) of all the congregations in Egypt (about 1887).
The numerous and onerous duties now put upon him as the spiritual head of Judaism, and the constant demand for his great medical skill, were, however, alike unable to overcome the powers of his intellect, which he had consecrated to the elucidation of the Bible and its traditions, and to the harmonizing of revelation with philosophy, and in the midst of all his engagements Maimonides entered upon the preparation of a third regligio-philosophical work, which became, of all his productions, the most valued and important. Its object was to reclaim one of his disciples, Ibn-Akinin (q.v.), from the prevailing scepticism about a future world, the destiny of souls, and other such matter; and in his designs the advice of the work is explained by Maimonides himself in the following terms: "I have composed this work, not for the common people, neither for beginners, nor for those who occupy themselves only with the law as it is handed down without contemplating its principle. The design of my work is rather to promote the true understanding of the real spirit of the law, to guide those religious persons who, adhering to the truth of the Torah, have studied philosophy, and are embarrassed by the contradictions between the teachings of philosophy and the teachings of the Torah. The work is divided into three parts in 204 sections, and entitled in Arabic تردد مورخ نهشيم (the Guide of the Perplexed), in allusion to Exodus, xiv, 8, and, according to Gritz (vi, 363), "constituting the summit of the Maimonidean mind and the justification of his immovable convictions," created a new epoch in the philosophy of the Middle Ages. "Ce livre," says Frank (Etudes Orientales, p. 360), "inspire également le respect par les puissantes facultés de l'auteur, la prolixité soupçonnée de son esprit, la variété de ses connaissance, l'élevation de son spiritualisme enfin par la lumière qu'il repand sur quelques-uns des points les plus obscures de l'esprit humain. Not only did Mohammedans write commentaries upon it, but the Christian schoolmen learned from it how to harmonize the conflicts between religion and philosophy (compare Joe, Einfluss d.Jud. Philos. auf die christl. Scholastik, in Frankel's Mittelalter [Bresl. 1860, p. 210 sq.]; Munk, Melanges, p. 486). The contents of this great and noble work, which has become for Jewish thinkers, as it were, a "touchstone of philosophy," are, in the three parts into which it is divided, as follows: The first part is especially devoted to the explanation of all sensory expressions which are made use of in the Bible in regard to God; the second part treat, more detailed the nature and the relation of the Mosaic and of the Maimonides had already laid down in the first book of his aforementioned code, namely, that such expressions must be taken only in a spiritual and figurative sense; this part contains also the rational arguments by which they are justified, and the further spiritual nature of God. The second part treats, first, of natural religion and its deficiencies; secondly, of the creation of the world and the different gradations of the world's system; and, thirdly, of revelation, prophecy, and of the excellence and perfection of the divine law. The third part, after giving an explanation of the first vision of the prophet Ezekiel, treats of the opposition of good and evil in the world, of God's providence and omniscience, and their relation to the free will of man; a number of chapters of this last part are taken up in explaining the great distinction of the Mosaic law, and the reason for each separate law. But while, on the one hand, the Morkh Neechim contributed more than any other work to the progress of rational development in Judaism, on the other hand, also provoked a long and bitter strife between orthodoxy and heresy; in rousing out the latter, did not only cause the broad principle that "the Bible must be explained metaphorically by established fundamental truths in accordance with rational conclusions." So bitter, indeed, was the contest which broke out between the subsequent spiritualistic Maimonidians and the "literal Talmudistic" schools, that the fierce invectives were speedily followed by anathemas and counter-anathemas issued by both camps, and, finally, about the middle of the 18th century, the decision was transferred into the hands of the Christian authorities, who commenced by burning Maimonides' books, continued by bringing to the stake all Hebrew books on which they could lay their hands, and followed this decision up by a wholesale slaughter of thousands upon thousands of men, women, and children—irrespective of their philosophical views. Under these circumstances, the antinomistic parties, chiefly through the influence of David Kimchi and others, came to their senses, and gladly enough submitted to the verdict of the Christian world as far as to send a deputation (in 1252) to Maimonides' grave at Saphet "to ask pardon of his ashes" (Linda, p. 60); and, as time wore on, the name of Moses Maimonides became the pride and glory of the nation. Moses, himself, however, never witnessed the end of the conflict into which he had the mortification to see his nation plunged, caused by his own labors, which had been intended solely for their good. In the midst of the conflict (the opposition begun by Samuel ben-Alli, the son of Bagdadi, was particularly strong in Southern France and Italy, and was connected with a festival of the 8th of Adar under the name "the Great Luminary of the Jewish nation was extinguished Dec. 18, 1204. Both Jews and Mohammedans of Fostat had public mourning for three days. At Jerusalem the Jews proclaimed a day of extraordinary humiliation, reading publicly the threatenings of the law (Lev. xxvi, 32) and the history of the destruction of the ark by the Philistines (1 Sam. iv, etc.), for they regarded Maimonides as the ark containing the law. His remains, in accordance with a personal request before his decease, were conveyed to Tiberias; and the reverence with which the Jewish nation still cherishes his memory is expressed by the well-known saying, מַעֲרֹת יְסוֹד תֵּבִּירֵס (From Moses, the lawgiver, to Moses Maimonides), no one hath arisen like Moses," in allusion to Deut. xxxiv, 10. "No man since Ezra had excelled so deep, universal, and lasting an influence on Jews and Judaism as Moses Maimonides. His theological-philosophical works formed an authority among the progressive thinkers equal to his Mishna-Ṭora among rabbinical students. All Jewish thinkers up to date—Baruch Spinoza, Moses Mendelssohn, and the writers of the 19th century included—are more or less the disciples of Maimonides; so that no Jewish theologico-philosophical book, from and after A.D. 1200, can pick up the saving aid of what Maimonides form not a prominent part." (Dr. Wise). Maimonides as a Jewish Theologian and Philosopher. His importance for the religion and science of Judaism, and his influence upon their development, is so great that he truly deserves to be placed second only to Moses, the great lawgiver, himself. Maimonides first of all brought order into those almost boundless repetitions of tradition, and the discussions and decisions to which they had given rise, which, without the remost attempt at system or method, lay scattered upon and down the works of R. Judah and Abraham—Midras, Mishna, Talmud. Imbued with the spirit of lucid Greek speculation, and the precision of logical thought of the Arabic Peripatetics, aided by an enormous knowledge, he became the founder of rational scriptural exegesis, and, while he held to all the Maimonidean precepts, he endeavored to explain by the light of reason, with which, as the highest divine gift in man, nothing really divine could, according to his theory, stand in real contradiction. The fundamental idea in his works is that the law was given to the Jews merely to train them to obedience, but also as a revelation of the highest truths, and that, therefore, fidelity to the law in action is by no means sufficient, but that the knowledge of the truth is also a religious duty. By this teaching he offered a powerful incitement to speculation in religious philosophy, yet he always guarded by his enunciation of definite articles of faith a narrow
row determination of Jewish dogmas, although his own investigations bear throughout a rationalistic character. When the Talmud left his influence, he fastens on lies. His creed is an invention, of which the ancients had no idea. With more of a Mohammedan than a Jewish and Talmudic despotism, he constructed a code, in order that all articles of faith and practices of the least consequence should be regulated and decided upon (ibid. p. 5, 6, 400). No less decided is Isaac Reggio (q. v.), who approves of Luzzat's critique, and demands the removal of the yoke which Maimonides put upon the Israelites, and which robs of all freedom in thinking (ibid. p. 22).

As unjust as this criticism may be, nothing not only the form but also the matter of the world, the philosophical proofs to the contrary not appearing to him conclusive. If these proofs possessed mathematical certainty, it would be necessary to interpret those passages in the Bible which appear to oppose them allegorically, which is now not admissible. Accordingly Maimonides condemns the hypothesiss of the eternity in the Aristotelian sense, or the doctrine that matter is eternal ab initio, and has always been the substratum of an order or form arising from the tendency of matter to be eternal and in absolute Spirit; "the Bible," he says, "teaches the temporal origin of the world." Less discordant with the teachings of the Bible, according to Maimonides, is the Platonic theory, which he interprets with the exactness strictest according to the literal sense of the dialogue Timaeus. He renounces the assumption uphanded at Monastir that eternal, but that the divinely-caused order, by the addition of which to matter the world was formed, had a beginning in time. Yet he does not himself accept this theory, but adheres to the beliefs that matter was created by God. In Ethics, Maimonides, holding reason in man—"if properly developed and tutored by divine revelation—to be the great touchstone for the right or wrong of individual deeds, fully allows the freedom of will, and, while he urges the necessity, nay, the merit of listing; to a certain degree, to the promptings of nature, rigorously condemns a life of idle asceticism, and dreamy, albeit pious contemplation. No less is it, according to him, right and praiseworthy to pay the utmost attention to the healthy and vigorous development of the body, and the care of its preservation by the closest application to hygienic rules. Providence, he argues, is certain—"broad and sure humanit-

y, and holds the sway over the destinies of nations; but he utterly denies its working in the single event that may befall the individual, who, subject above all to the great physical laws, must learn to understand and obey them, and to shape his mode of life and action in accordance with conditions—"the different circumstances of the study of natural science and medicine being there-fore a thing almost of necessity to everybody. The soul, and the soul only, is immortal, and the reward of virtue consists in its—strictly unobliged—bliss in a world to come; while the punishment of vice is the "loss of the soul." "Do not," says Maimonides, "allow thyself to be persuaded by fables that God predetermines who shall be righteous and who wicked. He who sins has only himself to blame for it, and he can do nothing better than speedily to change his course. God's omnipotence has bestowed on each man his own lot. Man fore-knows man's choice without guiding it. We should not choose the good, like children and ignorant people, from motives of reward or punishment, but we should do good for its own sake, and from love to God; still retaining as wary the immortal soul in the future world."

The resurrection of the body is, it seems, ascribed by Maimonides as being simply an article of faith, which is not to be opposed, but which cannot be explained.

Exception continues to be taken to Maimonides's theologico-philosophical views even in our day, by many who recognize his ability and the importance of his labors. The great Italian Jewish theologian, the late Da-

vid Luzzatto (q. v.), is quite decided in his opposition, Maimonides, he holds, brought trouble with all his philosoph.

(4) The Moreh Nethuchm, or The Guide of the Perplexed, was, till lately, read in the Hebrew translation of Ibn-Tibbon, first published about the year 1312, in Venice, 1551; Sabionetta, 1588; Berlin, 1791-96; Salzsbach, 1589, etc.
It was translated into Latin by Justinian, bishop of Neo-
bia, R. Mosci, Αγγέλη Περιοδικόν (Paris, 1520); then again by Buxtorf jun., Doctor Per-
plexorum (Iasle, 1629). The first part was translated into
German by Fürstenbach (Krotochil, 1839); the
second by M. E. Stein (Vienna, 1864); and the third by
Scheyer (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1848). The first part, ii: 36-90,
has been translated into English by Dr. Trowell, The
Reasons of the Laws of Moses (Lond. 1827). The original
Arabic, with a French translation and elaborate
tocages, was noted by Munk (Paris, 1856-66, 8 vols.
8vo). Commentaries on Morek Nebuchad, or parts of it,
have been written by A. de Person (Frankfort-on-
the-Main, 1848); Moses b. Jusea of Nornbeuren (1855-62;
edited by Goldenthal, Vienna, 1852); and Is. Abrabanel
(16th century); edited by Landau, Leips. 1863). Of his
smaller works, we may enumerate, in conclusion, a trans-
lation of Aricenna's Canon; an extract from Galen;
several medical, mathematical, logical, and other treat-
tises, spoken of with the highest praise by Arabic writers;
legal decisions, theological disquisitions, etc., for
which see Fürst, Biblioth. Judaeos, s. v.

Besides the authorities already quoted, see O. Celsius, De
Maine-Maïonide (1727); Revue Orientale
(Brun, 1841); Beer, Leben und Wirken des Maïonides
(Frag. 1844); Lebrecht, in Magazin f. d. Liter. d. Aus-
lande, 1844, No. 45, p. 62 sq.; Scheyder, Psychol. Syst. des
Maïonides (Frankfort, 1846); Stein, M. Maine-Maïonides
(Long. 1837); Goldschlag, Leben und Wirken des
Maïonides (Lond. 1837); Edelmann, Cheruda Genera; Joel, Relig-
iosis philos. d. Maïonides, in the Programme of the
Jewish Theol. sem. at Breslau (1859); Jashe-Wensky,
in Zeitschr. f. Philos. u. philos. Kritik, nev ser. xevi (Halle,
81 sq.; Gruter, Gesch. d. Jud. vi, ch. x and xi; vii, ch. i and ii;
Jose, Gesch. d. Juden u. d. Sept., ii, 428 sq. ibid. in
(translated by Prof. Morris), i, 97; Dr. Miiller, in the
s. v.; Chambers' Cyclopaedia, s. v.

Main-sail is the rendering in the Auth. Version of the
nautical term απρήσιον (from απρείᾳ, to suspend or
hoist), which occurs only in this sense in Acts xxviii.
40. It is explained by some critics, the largest sail of
the poop, answering to our "mizzen-sail," and even yet
called by the Venetians arrtinoe. Some regard it as
the "top-sail," Lat. supparum. Others understand it by
the "middle-sail," Lat. fléjil; near the poop, and by the Ro-
mans the dolon. The term may thus be understood to
signify properly the fore-sail, which, in the opinion of
those qualified to judge, would be most useful in bring-
ing a ship to head to the wind under the circumstances
narrated by Luke (see Hackett's Comment, ad loc.).
The vessels of that time had one, two, or three masts; the
largest was in the stern (Smith's Dict. of Ant. s. v. Mai-
lus). Hence, if Paul's ship had but one sail, the sail in
question would have been that now called the jib, being fast-
ened to a "boom" or spar projecting from the bowsprit;
but if it had been probably from its size it had at least
two masts, this sail would be the one attached to the
front mast, that is, the "fore-sail." A "sailor will at
once see that the fore-sail was the best possible sail that
could be set under the circumstances" (Smith, Shipwreck
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The vessels of that time had one, two, or three masts; the
largest was in the stern (Smith's Dict. of Ant. s. v. Mai-
lus). Hence, if Paul's ship had but one sail, the sail in
question would have been that now called the jib, being fast-
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but if it had been probably from its size it had at least
two masts, this sail would be the one attached to the
front mast, that is, the "fore-sail." A "sailor will at
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Maine de Biran, MARIE FRANCOIS PIERRE GOUTHIER, one of the most eminent French philosophers of
the 18th century. He was born in Bordeaux in 1744, and

Finally, he proves that we gain our first notion of
causality from the consciousness of our own personal
effect, and that having once felt the operation of
power exerted and effect produced in this particular
case, we transfer the notion of cause thus originated into the
objective world, and conclude by analogy the ne-
MAITRE
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MAITRE de Sacy. See SACR.

MAISTRE, Joseph (cousin) de, an eminent French Roman Catholic writer, the greatest advocate of Ultramontanism in the 19th century, was born at Chambéry, April 1, 1791, of an ancient noble family of the province of Savoy, and he became himself a member of that body in 1877. When the French armies invaded Savoy in 1792 he retired to Piedmont, where he wrote his Considérations sur la France (1796, 8vo; three editions in one year). Charles X., as he was called Louis XVIII., made him prince of the Order of the Holy Spirit, where he remained until the downfall of that prince, Nov. 19, 1798; he then retired to Venice, and lived there one year in great poverty. In 1799 he was created grand chancellor of Sardinia, and in September, 1802, was sent by that country as ambassador to Russia. While there he published (in 1810) his Essai sur le principe régulateur des constitutions politiques, a full exposition of his political views, advocating the principle of divine right, and declaring the rights of the people derived from the sovereign—with a sort of theocratic form of government more suitable to the Middle Ages than to the 19th century. "M. de Maistre," in this work, "represents men as connected with God by a chain which binds them to his throne, and holds them without enslaving them. To the full extent of this chain we are at liberty to move; we are slaves indeed, but we are freely slaves (librement esclaves); we must necessarily answer for the purposes of the Supreme Being, and yet the actions by which we work out these purposes are always free. So far so good; but here come the peculiarities of our author's system. He does not consider men as individually responsible before God; he takes them as nations, and the nation, for M. de Maistre, is made up of the king and the aristocracy. Even considering each order separately, he asserts that all the members of the same order are indissolubly bound together, each bearing a share of the mutual and joint responsibility which weighs on the whole order. Now let us suppose the case of a revolution. In those terrible events which follow the disregard of all the laws of right and wrong, although the persons who fall victims to the fury of the multitude may sometimes be those whose very crimes have called down the divine vengeance, yet very often, nay, in most cases, the individually innocent suffer most. But, then, although individually innocent, they must come in for the share of the solidarity which belongs to the whole order. This results from the fact that the doctrine of atonement is the principle on which rests the constitution of society: the crimes of the guilty are visited on the innocent, and the blood of the innocent, in its turn, atones for the guilty. Here is to be found
the key-stone of count De Maistre's theory; the Savoyard publicist develops it with all the resources of logic and erudition." It has been well remarked that a system such as this is fatalism of the very worst description. Not only does it take away the free agency of men considered as individuals, but it effectually proclaims the validity of the maxim that might is right. "Wishing to transform all earthly governments into one homogeneous theocracy," he proposed, as a control over absolutism, an absolutism of a much more dangerous character. M. de Maistre's leading idea is a good one: he wishes to appeal from the passions and depraved will of man to the Deity itself as to the eternal source of right and good; but not being, of course, able to receive immediately from God the counsel and the laws he wishes to reduce into practice for the good of society, he traces them to the pope, as the viceregent of Heaven—an error common to all reactionary movements—from the fear of allowing anything like vagueness to exist in the minds of men respecting their connection with the Almighty. He is not satisfied with anything short of what is really tangible, visible, perceptible to the senses. The sovereign power, the Mediator. Failing to understand that both divinity and humanity have met together only in the man Christ Jesus, he would fain make us believe that the pope is "God made manifest in the flesh." With such views, he could not but condemn severely the charter of 1814, which restored the universal institutions to France, and by which Napoleon turned his face towards Russia with a view of making it his home. By a ukase of December, 1815, Russia expelled the Jesuits. To them De Maistre and his family were much attached, and being on this account himself suspected of proselytism, he quitted the country and returned to Savoy in 1817, and became minister of state. He died Feb. 26, 1821.

Among the principal works of De Maistre, our special consideration is claimed also by his Du Pavé (Lyons, 1815, 2 vols. 8vo; second and improved edition, 1821, 2 vols. 8vo), in which he treats of the papacy, 1, in its relation to the Roman Church; 2, to the temporal powers; 3, to civilization; and, 4, to the dissenting churches. It is a daring apologue of the spiritual and temporal power of the pope. He starts from the principle that modern nations need a guarantee against the abuse of sovereign power. Such guarantee, he claims, is not to be found either in written charters, which are always useless, nor in assemblies, which are powerless when they are not anarchic. He can find it only in a sovereignty superior to all others, at once independent and dependent. With the independence, the right to intervene in a dependent prelates, was restrained in the exercise of the exercise of legislative power by the clergy, the nobility, and the commons, each resting on its own foundation, and acting within its allotted sphere, above white was the papacy, which, by its subordinate authority, maintained, in cases of collision, the harmonious co-operation of the members of all the body politic. We are told to admire the noble, temperate monarchy which had grown up under the shelter of the Christian Church, and which, though never brought to perfection (this is, at least, a candid acknowledgment), had not been secured to the mediaval nations so long a career of happiness and freedom, prosperity and glory. It would be a task both useless and unprofitable to point out all the misstatements which occur in the description just given. The futility of his scheme was demonstrated by the conduct of De Maistre himself. In 1804 pope Pius VII crowned Napoleon emperor. This, according to the theory of the work De Pavé, was one of those judgments by which the papal infallibility settled political difficulties. Yet De Maistre speaks of this decision in the following deprecating terms: "The spirit of infallibility which is everywhere for the present the great subject of conversation. . . . All in the French Revolution is wonderfully bad, but this is the ne plus ultra. The crimes of an Alexander VI are less frightful than this hideous apostasy of his more wretched successors. . . . If we are to reconcile the heart that the unfortunate pontiff would go to St. Domingo to crown Dessalines. When once a man of his rank and character so far forgets both, that all is to be hoped for is that he may completely degrade himself until he becomes but an insignificant puppet." (Corresp. dip. p. 186, 189.) It was thus the great ultramontane writer respected papal infallibility when not in accordance with his own views or his passions. De L'Église Gallicane dans ses rapports avec le souverain pontife (Paris, 1821, 2 vols. 8vo; Lyons, 1822) is a sort of continuation of the preceding, and attacks the true degree of independence claimed by the Church of France. This book, in which Bossuet and Fleury are somewhat roughly handled, was not well received at first by the French clergy. Abbé Bontem published an answer to it under the title Réclamations pour l'Église de France, et pour le roi; réponse à Bossuet. In this book, which at the course of time, it was greatly instrumental in causing the triumph of the ultramontane doctrine. La série de St. Pétersbourg, ou Extravagants, etc. (Paris, 1821, 3 vols. 8vo), "the best known and certainly the most readable book of the author," treats of retoric and his works here and hereafter. We cannot give here the details of De Maistre's theory, but its most important features may be summed up thus: the thorough badness of human nature, the necessity of atonement, the reversion of the merits of the innocent paying for the guilty, and salvation through blood. These views, in which outward Christians have found a daring perversion of the most holy Christian principles, led De Maistre to justify the Inquisition. His apology, entitled Lettres à un gentilhomme Francais sur l'Inquisition Exposé (Paris, 1823, 2 vols. 8vo), is, however, but a very lame defence of that odious institution. His violent attacks against Bacon, Examen de la Philosophie de Bacon (Paris, 1826, 2 vols. 8vo) is not much better. His works are very original, but more in the form than in the ideas. Carrying often a true principle to its fullest extent, he arrives at paradoxes and absurdities. That is the cause of abuse, says the "plague writer," says Dr. M'Clincock (in the Methodist Rev. 1856, p. 218), "De Maistre may be compared, in some respects, to Paul Louis Courier; he had the same point, the same finesse, the same elegance of style, and an apparent simplicity, which only set off with greater effect the home-truths he addressed to his readers; but judged as these minor works decidedly were, true both as to sentiment and language, they were merely suggested by the events of the times, and, as such, were likely to lose most of their point as the course of things moved on. To a man with an independent spirit, he will, ever retain their interest, for they discuss principles; they belong to the philosophy of history. Whatever view we may take of the conclusions adopted by De Maistre, we cannot but admire both the extent of his learning and the depth of his thoughts; the work is plumply deserving of a place in the immense storehouse of man's life here below, of which we have before spoken. From this point of view he is admirably placed to discuss the most serious questions, and he does so with a power and an eloquence to which
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everything must yield (compare Fouquel, Christopher's Divisions, i, 200). Another remarkable point is the soundness of his judgment and the sagacity with which he assigns, both to events and to men, their proper influence over the whole course of contemporary history. Many views, many principles now generally adopted, he assigned to his contemporaries, and have been borrowed from that extraordinary book, often without any acknowledgment. See Raymond, Éloge du comte Jos. de Maistre (Chambéry, 1832, 8vo); Rodolphe de Maistre, Notice biog. sur le comte Jos. de Maistre (in the prefixed to J. de Maistre's Correspondance et Opuscules (Paris, 1851, 2 vols. 8vo; 1852, 2 vols. 12mo)); Sainte-Beuve, Conversations du Lundi, vol. iv, and his Portraits Contemporains, vol. ii; Villeneuve-Arifat, Éloge du comte Jos. de Maistre (1858); Damiron, Essai sur l'Histoire de la Philosophie en France au 19e siècle; Taine, Les Philosophes Francais du 19e siècle; Edinburgh Review, Oct. 1852; Albert Blanc, Introduction à la Correspondance diplomatique de Joseph de Maistre; Migne, Nouve. Encyclopédie Théologique, ii, 1836; Études, Revue, 1849; Lond. Quart. Rev., 1857, art. vii; and especially the article by Dr. McClintock in the Meth. Quart. Rev., 1858, iii, 1859.

Maitland, Samuel Roffey. D.D., an English divine of some note, was born in London in 1782; was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge; entered the law profession in 1816, but shortly after turned towards the ministry; was ordained deacon and priest in 1821; perpetual curate of Christ Church, Gloucester, in 1823-29; keeper of the Lambeth MSS., and librarian to the archbishop of Canterbury, in 1827. He died at Lambeth Palace, London, Jan. 19, 1866. His principal theological publications are as follows: An Inquiry into the Grounds on which the Prophetic Period of Daniel and St. John has been supposed to consist of 1260 Years (Lond. 1826, 8vo); — A Second Inquiry, etc. (1829, 8vo); — Attempt to elucidate the Prophecies concerning Antichrist (1830, 8vo); — Tracts and Documents illustrative of the History, Doctrines, and Rites of the Ancient Abbeys and Welldens (1832, 8vo); — The Dark Ages: a series of Essays intended to illustrate the state of Religion and Literature in the Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth Centuries (reprinted from the British Magazine, with corrections and some additions, 1841, 8vo; 2d ed. 1845, 8vo); — Essays on the Subjects connected with the Reformation in England (reprinted, with additions, from the British Magazine, 1847, 8vo); — London Athenaeum, etc. (1853); — Illustrations and Inquiries relating to Memorium, parts i—vi (1849, 8vo); — Erwin, or Miscellaneous Essays on Subjects connected with the Nature, History, and Destiny of Man (2d ed. 1850, 8vo).—An Essay on the Mystical School of Philosophy, etc. (London, 1851, 8vo); — Review of Fox's History of the Welldens.—Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.; Thomas, Dict. of Biography and Mythology, s. v.; English Cyclopedia, s. v.

Maitland, William, a noted Scotch politician of the Reformation period, better known as "Secretary Lethington," was born about 1525, and was educated both at St. Andrew's and the Continent. He rose to great influence as a political leader, and though he became a convert to the Reformed doctrines about 1555, he was in 1558 appointed secretary of state by Mary of Guise. In the following year, however, he openly joined the lords of the Congregation, and was one of the Scotch commissioners who met the duke of Norfolk at Berwick, to arrange the conditions on which queen Elizabeth would give them assistance. In 1561, after the arrival of queen Mary from France, he made an extraordinary lord of session. He strongly objected to the ratification of Knox's confessions, and as such founded the prosecution raised against Knox for treason. From this time he appears to have lost his influence with the reformers. In 1564 he held a long debate with Knox on the claims of the Reformed Church to be independent of the state. In 1568 he took part in the conspiracy against Rizzio, after whose assassination he was proscribed, and obliged to seek shelter for some months in obscurity. After queen Mary's imprisonment (1567) in England he played a most unenviable part, pretending to Elizabeth to be one of her admirers, but really seeking all the while to protect the cause of Mary, and it is evident that he never really deserted her, although he was present at the coronation of king James VI, and although he fought on the side of her opponents on the field of Langside. He took part in 1568 in the conference held at Edinburgh, in such unsatisfactory sympathy for Mary that the Scottish lords marked him as a dangerous enemy to the commonwealth, and in 1569 he was arrested at Stirling, but was liberated shortly after by an act of Kirkaldy of Grange. In 1570 he openly declared for Mary, and became the soul of the queen's party, in consequence of which he was declared a rebel, deprived of his offices and lands by the regent Morton, and besieged, along with Kirkaldy, in Edinburgh Castle. After a long resistance, the castle surrendered, and he was imprisoned in Leith, where he died (in 1578), "some," says Melville, "supposing he took a drink of the wine, as the said Romans they used to do." Buchanan has drawn his character with a severe pen in his Scottish tract entitled The Chameleon. Froude (x, 474) believes that Maitland died a natural death. Burton (Hist. of Maitland, iv, 55-57) says that Maitland that "his character is by no means suitable for a place in the history of literature or of art. Yet . . . if we look at his life and doings, we do not find him to be just one of those who have left the mark of their influence upon our age. . . . He had great abilities, but they were rather those of the wit and rhetorical than of the practical man." In the estimation of Knox, Maitland had greatly lowered himself by his unhappiness and vacillation, and the great reformer, in his dying hours even, was called upon to pronounce against the wary Scotch politician: "I have no warrant that ever he shall be well," alluding to Maitland's state in the hereafter. See Froude, Hist. of England, vol. x, ch. xix and xxii; Robertson, Hist. of Scotland (see Index).

Maitreya, a Buddhist divinity, according to the Buddhists was a disciple of the Buddha Sakyamuni, and a Bodhisattwa, or a man of pre-eminent virtue and sanctity. He is classed among the gods called Tushitas, or "the happy," and has generally the epithet Ajita, or unconquered, and is believed to become incarnate, and succeed Gotama (q. v.) as their future Buddha. In Tibet he is called Jampa. A faithful representation of this Buddha, surrounded by the (Tibetan) goddesses Dolma, the Mantas or Buddhavas of medicine, two ancient priests, and various saints, will be found in the works of Emil Schlagintweit's Buddhisms in Tibet (London and Leipzig, 1868), where an interesting sketch is given (p. 207 sq.) of the characteristic types of Buddha images, and of the measurements of Buddha statues made by his brothers in India and Tibet. See also Hardy, Manual of Buddhism (Index, s. v. Maitri).

Majoris. See Sosamkex.

Majoris. See Cluny.

Major, Georg, a German theologian, was born at Nuremberg, April 29, 1802. He studied theology under Luther and Melanchthon, and was successively rector at Magdeburg (1829), superintendent at Elbeien (1856), and professor of theology and court-preacher at Wittenberg (1859). In 1844 he was made doctor of divinity, and two years later he was called to the bishopric of Würzburg (with Bucer and Brenz) of the Protestants at the colloquy at Regensburg. On the breaking out of the Small-cald war, Major left Wittenberg, and received (1847) the appointment of superintendent and court-preacher at Merseburg; but on the close of the war, next year, he returned to Wittenberg. After rejecting the offer of prominent positions, made by the king of Denmark and the duke of Holstein, he became, in 1852, superintendent of the Mansfeld churches. In the mean time he
had been active in supporting the Leipzig Interim, which asserted that good works are necessary to salvation, and had thus excited the suspicion of the strict Lutherans, who denied that proposition. Towards the close of 1553 Amsdorf, Major on these grounds, and the clergy of the district soon joined him in opposing the new superintendent, as having corrupted the doctrine of justification by faith. Major replied to the charge of Amsdorf in 1554, denying its truth, and asserting its acceptance of the doctrine of the Church; but, as he still insisted on the necessity of good works, the controversy continued to rage, and, as the count of Mansfeld held with the orthodox party, Major finally removed to Wittenberg. He then sought to give an unobjectionable form to his views by teaching that while faith alone is essential to salvation, good works are necessary as a consequence of saving faith. But, despite every effort at reconciliation, his opponents persisted, and even went to the length of asserting that good works are detrimental to salvation. The doctrines advocated by Major were finally branded as heretical in the Corpus doctrina Prædicantium, and were condemned by the compiler of the Formula Concordiae. Towards the close of his life he became involved in the Crypto-calvinistic controversy (q. v.), and, together with the Wittenberg and Leipzig theologians, was compelled to subscribe to the Torgau articles (q. v.). He died at Wittenberg, Nov. 28, 1574, before his Majoristic controversy had concluded.


Major, Johann, a humanistic poet at Wittenberg during the latter half of the 16th century, deserves a place here as the greatest satirist among the Philippists, as the followers of Melancthon were called. He was born in 1530 at Joachimsthal, where Johann Matthaeus (q. v.) became a friend. At the age of sixteen he went to Wittenberg, and formed a most intimate connection with Melancthon. To the influence of this association may doubtless be attributed his future course. After attaining to the degree of M.A. he returned to Wurzburg, with a view to succeed the university. Towards the degree of D.D. was conferred on him, and in the following year he was honored with the title of crown poet. Returning to Wittenberg, he was, in 1560, admitted to the philosophical faculty of that university, and, besides lecturing on poetry and the interpretation of Latin poets, he wrote occasional poems. In 1574 the Philippists were overthrow in Electoral Saxony, and its heads imprisoned. It is certain that Major suffered in this reverse, and he is said to have been three times imprisoned—once (from 1579 to 1581) was under sentence of death, although his opponents charge this, not to his connection with the Philippists, but to his conviction for criminal offences.

The prominence with which Andrae at this time advocated the Formula Concordiae opened a new and wide field to the vexation and sarcastic power of Major. He had not subscribed to the Formula, and made it and its originators the subject of his spleen. When he ventured to do this in an official address, he was, at the beginning of 1587, expelled from the university; but when the Elector Christian I ascended the throne, the Philippist party was restored to favor, and Major was soon recalled. He did not refrain from venting his satirical humor on his opponents, but when, in 1591, the elector died, and a new policy was initiated, our poet, with many others, was again imprisoned. So bitter was the feeling against him that a Wittenberg mob pelted him with stones and dirt, and even children ran at him as a "Calvinistic rogue." He was released in 1568, and spent the remainder of his life in a private station, writing only an occasional poem. He died in the Calvinistic German, often degenerated into ridicule of the anti-Philippists that was even cruel. See Frank, Johann Major, der Wittenberger Poet (Halle, 1863); and the same in Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, xx, 75 sq. (G. M.)

Major, John, a Scottish historian and theologian, was born at Gledborn, East Lothian, Scotland, in 1669; was educated at Oxford, Cambridge, and Paris. After teaching a number of years in Paris, as professor of scholastic philosophy, he became professor of divinity, and subsequently provost at St. Andrews, in Scotland. He died in 1647. He published Commentaries on the Scriptures, besides works of a secular character—Allison, Hist. of the Brit. and Amer. Authors, v. v.; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. a. v.

Majoris, a name given to Jewish ministers in the Theodisian Code, and also by Augustine and others to a party called Coeleitico, made up of Jewish apostates. The laws were specially severe against them, three states being inflicted upon being aimed at them.

Majorina. See DONATISTA.

Majoristic Controversy, named after Georg Major—his followers holding that good works are essential to salvation; his opponent, Amsdorf, reproaching them as prejudicial to it. See MAJOR, GEORG.

Majoritas. See MAJOR, GEORG.

Majoritas (Precedence) is the form in ecclesiastical law to denote the preference of the clergy over the laity, as well as the rank of the Church officers. In the Roman Catholic Church the distinction between the clergy and the laity is greater than in the Protestant churches. In the former there is also greater distinction in the ranks of the clergy itself. Thus an older ordinance has precedence over a more recent ordination, and a higher over a lower order (c. i, 15, X, De mag. ced. i, 33), excepting only an ordination conferred by the pope himself, as his act takes precedence in any case (c. vii, X, cod.). In ordinations equal in rank the secular clergy precede the regulars; and again, among the regulars, the cloister precedes the collegiate; among the orders, the regular canons the monks, and all other orders the mendicants; and among the latter the Dominicans precede all others (compare Benedict XIV, De syn. dicet. lib. iii, c. x). This term expresses also the official authority, the legal power of the Church office. Persons who are invested with such offices are designated in the Protestant churches officialis (q. v.). In the Roman Catholic Church they are called Church superiors (superiores ecclesiasticus), and as a body they make up the hierarchical (hierarchy) rank (hierarchy). The Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, who enjoins obedience not only of its subjecta, i.e. non-officials, but also of its officials, who, on entering upon their office, vow submission and obedience to their superior by a formal oath. Hence arose the dispute whether the pope should be accepted as the highest authority, or whether even he was subject to a council. See INFALLIBILITY; PAPACY.

Makarj, a noted Russian prelate, was born in the Moscovite province near the end of the 15th century. He early entered the monastic state; became archimandrite (abbot) of the famous Ivan monastery at Moscow; in 1508, archbishop of Mygoryd Velik; and in 1542, finally, metropolitan of all Russia. He died at Moscow Dec. 31, 1564. By reason of his talents, scholarship, ecclesiastical authorship, eloquence, zeal for Chris-
tian missions among the heathen, extensive activity and influence, and patriotism, and by reason of the sincerity of his character, Makarj figures prominently in Russian history. When yet archbishop, he converted the Ibadan tribes in the north of the empire, and is justly styled the "apostle of the Ibadus." When a metropolitans, he became the patron of the school for the training of schollars from Russia as well as from abroad, with whose aid he compiled many books. His celebrated "Book of Legends" went through more than a dozen editions, and was translated into German,—Wagner, Staats und Gebr. Leck, vol. xii, s. v.

Makas (Heb. Ma'akas, מַקאָס, boundary: Septuag. Μακάς, v. r. Μακάς; Vulg. Macaeth), a place first named among those designating the district of Ben-Dekar, one of Solomon's purveyors (1 Kings iv, 9). The associated names, Shal-bim, Beth-shemesh, and Elon-beth-hanan, would seem to indicate a locality in the tribe of Dan, perhaps in the plain east of Ekron.

Maked (Makid v. r. Makiδ; Syr. Moker; Vulg. Maged), one of the "strong and great cities" of Gilead.—Josephus says Galilee, but this must be an error—into which the Jews were driven by the Ammonites under Timotheus, and from which they were delivered by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc. v, 36, 36); in the latter passage the name is given in the A. V. as Maged). By Josephus (Ant. xx, 8, 3) it is not mentioned among the other cities named in this narrative have been identified, but no name corresponding to Maked has yet been discovered, and the conjecture of Schwarz (p. 280), that it is a corruption of Minnith (מִינִית for מִית), though ingenious, can hardly be accepted without further proof.

Makemnie, Francis, a distinguished Presbyterian minister, was born near Rathmell, Donegal Co., Ireland, about the middle of the 17th century. After completing his academic and theological course, he was licensed by the presbytery of Lagann in 1681. He undertook a mission to Barbadoes soon after, and was ordained June 2, 1682, with a view to coming to America. From Barbadoes he went to Somerset Md., Ind., where he is supposed to have founded the Church in Snow Hill, and from thence he removed to Virginia. In 1699 he obtained a formal license to preach agreeably to the requisitions of the Toleration Act, and was very successful in his labors. He went to London in 1704, to make arrangements for the supply of his Church, and returned with two ministers from Ireland. In 1705 he obtained with difficulty the certificates required for the exercise of his ministry, and sailed, in 1706, in the formation of the Philadelphia presbytery, by which he was moderator. He died in 1708. Makemnie published A Catechism (1691):—An Answer to George Keith, etc. (1692):—Truths in a New Light, etc. (1699):—A plain and lively Persuasion to the Inhabitants of Indiam and Virginia, etc. (1704):—A Letter to Lord Cornbury (Bost. ton, 1707):—An Account of his Imprisonment and Trial (N. Y. 1755, and since). See Sprague, Amasa, III, 1.

Makeloth (Heb. Makeloth; מַכְּלָת, assem bles, as in Psa. xxviii, 27; Sept. Maye, אוֹסַמָּס), the twenty-sixth station of the Israelites in the desert, between Haradah and Tahath (Num. xxxiii, 25, 20); probably situated on the summit north-west of Jebel el-Mukrah. See Exon.

Makkedah (Heb. Makkedah; מַכְּדָה, keremah's place; Sept. Mancia, Josephus Macida, 1 Macc. v, 1, 17), a royal city of the ancient Canaanites (Jos. xii, 16), in the neighborhood of which was the cave where the five kings who confederated against Israel took refuge after their defeat (Jos. x, 20). It afterwards belonged to Jericho (Jos. x, 19); it is not mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome. Some eight Roman miles to the east of Eleutheropolis (Otomast. s. v. Maceda), which would bring it among the mountains, as Keil observes, who therefore locates it to the west (Comment, on Josh. x, 10), since it was situated in the plain of Judah (Josh. xv, 41), north of Libnah (Josh. x, 29, 31) and west of Azekah (Josh. x, 10). De Saulcy (Narrat. ii, 488) is disposed to fix its site at a place which he names el-Merke'd, on the way from Hebron to the Dead Sea, a little east of Jenneh; but this is at least twenty-five miles west of Eleutheropolis, and the place itself was not known to Dr. Robinson, who passed along the same route. Porter suggests a ruin bearing the slightly similar name el-Kedish, on the northern slope of wady el-Sumih, about eight miles north-east of Eleutheropolis, with large caves adjacent (Handbok, p. 224, 281); but Van de Velde's drawings (Herber, p. 589, 591) seem quite too far north for the narrative in Joshua, as well as for the associated names, his proposed identification of which would place some, at least, of them (e.g. Beth-dagon, at Beit-Dejan) clearly within the tribe of Dan.

Makoth. See Talmud.

Makowski. See Macovius.

Malcrina. The Roman Catholic Church recognises two saints by this name.

1. A Cappadocian lady, grandmother of Gregory of Nyssa, who suffered persecution under the reign of Maximian, and wandered for a long time through the woods, together with her husband. She is commemorated on the 14th of January.

2. The sister of St. Basil and of St. Gregory of Nyssa; after the death of her father she withdrew into solitude, and afterwards induced her mother to establish a convent in Pontois, into which she retired. She died in 379, after performing a great number of miracles, etc. Her life was written by her brother, St. Gregory. She is commemorated on the 19th of July—Herzog, Real-Encyclop. viii, 746; Pierer, Universal-Lexicon, x, 764; Migne, Nouv. Encyclopédie Théologique, ii, 1298.

Maktea (Heb. Makthea, מַכְּתֶה [but with the art.], a mortar; as in Prov. xxvii, 12, or the socket of a tooth, as in Josh. xv, 41; Sept. renders, "socket," Vulg. Pilo), a place in or near Jerusalem, mentioned as inhabited, apparently by silver-merchants (Zeph. i, 11). Gesenius regards it as the name of a valley, so called from its mortar-like shape (Theaurus, p. 725). The rabbins understand the Kidron and other less likely places to be meant. Ewald conjectures (Propheten, p. 804) that it was the "Phoenician quarter of the city, in which the traders of that nation—the Canaanites (A. Vera. "merchants") who in this passage are associated with Makethath, presided, after the custom in Oriental towns. Dr. Barclay writes (City of the Great King, p. 184, 178) ingeniously suggests that it may have been a quarter devoted to minting operations, and therefore situated near the goldsmith's bazaar, which was doubtless located somewhere in Acra or the lower city, but whether in the Tyropoion adjoining the Temple, where it places itself, is uncertain.

Malabar, a tract of country extending along the western coast of India, from Cape Comorin to the River Chandra:agr, in N. lat. 12° 30'. Frequently the name Malabar, however, is erroneously applied to the whole country from Bombay to the southern extremity. Brit ish Malabar is situated between the 10th and 15th degrees of N. lat., belongs to the presidency of Madras, and has a population of 2,261,250. By far the most extensive portion of Malabar lies in the vicinity of the Gulf of Khauté.
Mountains, and consists of low hills, separated by narrow but fertile valleys. The upland is barren, and the cultivation much neglected; and it is in the valleys, and extensive ravines, and upon the banks of the rivers that the inhabitants chiefly reside. Until a recent period slavery existed in Malabar, but in 1843 a legislative enactment was passed by the British government, by the provisions of which slavery has been abolished throughout the whole extent of the British possessions in the East. The country is distinguished by the neatness of its villages, which are superior to many in India, being built of mud, neatly smoothed, and either whitewashed or painted; their picturesque effect is heightened by the beauty and elegant dresses of the Brahmin girls. The villages, as well as the bazaars, are the work of foreigners, the aboriginal natives of Malabar living in detached houses surrounded with gardens. The higher ranks use little clothing, but are remarkably clean in their persons, and all ranks are free from cutaneous distempers excepting the very lowest castes.

History.—It is supposed that Malabar was, at a very early period, conquered by a king named Above Ghaznas. The Nairs may have been established at the same time by the conqueror, or called in by the Brahmins, as a military body to support the government. In process of time they obtained settlements in the land, and the chiefs, taking every opportunity to aggravate themselves in the eyes of the rajahs, and submitted to a remonstrance continued to govern Malabar like independent princes. In 1760 the Mohammedans first effected an entry here under Hyder Ali, who subdued the country in 1761, and expelled all the rajahs except such as conciliated him by presentments. Disturbances were occasioned by these proceedings, but he continued to establish his authority, and in 1782 appointed a deputy, who made still further progress in subdued and settling the country. In 1786 Tipoo Sahib, his son, attempted forcibly to supersede Hindooism by his own faith, Mudderianism. This produced a general rebellion, which, however, was soon quelled by his vigorous administration, but in the mean time the country was laid waste by his tyrannical proceedings. On the breaking out of the war between Tipoo and the British in 1798, the refractory rajahs and Nairs joined the British, and Tipoo was driven from the country; Malabar became a portion of the British possessions of India, and, with slight disturbances, has since remained in the hands of the English. Under the management of the British the country is said to be advancing in prosperity.

Religion.—The original manners and peculiar customs of the Nairs have been preserved to this day. The Nairs are of each greater purity than in other parts of India. Besides the Hindus, who form the greater proportion of the inhabitants, the population consists of Moplays or Mohammedans, Christians, and Jews. The Hindu are divided into the following castes, namely, Namuries, or Brahmins; the Nairs of various denominations; the Leers, or Liars, who are cultivators of the land, and freemen; and, lastly, the Patiars, who were slaves or bondmen. Of these castes the most remarkable are the Nairs, the pure Sudras of Malabar, who all lay claim to be born soldiers; they are of various ranks and professions. There are altogether eleven ranks of Nairs, who form the militia of Malabar, under the Brahmins and rajahs. They are proud and arrogant to their inferiors, and in former times a Nair was expected instantly to cut off a cultivator or fisherman who presumed to defiance him by touching his person, or a Patiar who did not turn out of his road as a Nair passed. It is a remarkable custom among this class that a Nair never cohabits with the person whom he calls his wife; he gives her all proper allowances of clothing and food, but she remains in her mother's, or brother's, or her own home, and cohabits with any person or persons she chooses of equal rank; so that no Nair knows his own father, and the children all belong to the mother, whose claim to them admits of no doubt. This state of manners also prevails in neighboring countries. The native Mussulmans (Moplays) form about one fourth of the population; they are descended from Hindu mothers by Arab fathers, who settled in Malabar about the 7th or 8th century.

Christianity appears at a very early period to have made considerable progress in the Malabar coast, and there is a greater proportion of persons professing that religion in this country than in any other part of India. The accommodation theory of the Jesuits was practiced here in the 17th century by Pater Nobili. See India, p. 383. Three hundred and fifty years before the Portuguese Church at Goa, and one by the Jesuits of Rome—rule over this establishment, besides the Babylonian bishops, who preside over the Nestorian community. The last named Christians consider themselves descendants of converts made by the apostle Thomas in the 1st century. All the lands of any value in India are in the hands of the Christians, and are estimated at 200,000; 90,000 of them are settled at Travancore. There are also some 30,000 Jews in Malabar. See Cyclop. Britannico, s. v. See MADRAS.

Malacca, an extensive region, situated in Southern India, consisting of a large peninsula connected by the isthmus of Krow, extends from the 1st to the 12th degree of latitude and the 98th to the 104th of longitude, of E. long., and is 775 miles in length by 125 in average breadth. The country is a long, narrow strip of land, traversed by a chain of lofty mountains, and covered with extensive forests and marshes, so that it is very difficult to penetrate into the interior. A range of extremely bleak mountains, running through it from one extremity to the other, gives rise to innumerable streams, the courses of which, from the proximity of the mountains to the sea, are short, and are so obstructed at the mouths by bars and sand-banks that they can not be ascended by boats of any size. At the western extremity of the continent are the islands of Bintang, Batang, and Singapore, with many others, so thickly clustered together that they are only separated from the continent by narrow straits, and seem to be a prolongation of the island. On the west coast also there are numerous islands.

History.—The political state of Malacca has been subject to many revolutions, having been occasionally dependent on Siam when that monarchy was in the height of its power, and when its supremacy was owned by the Portuguese. But, when the Portuguese left, the city became a prey to the increasing power of the Burmans, all the southern portion of the peninsula has shaken off the yoke, and the northern states pay only a moderate tribute. The whole of the west-coast from that latitude to Port Romana is still possessed by the Malays, who are mixed in some places with the burgesses from Celebes, and who have a small settlement at Salengore. The northern and inland parts of the peninsula are inhabited by the Patany people, who appear to be a mixture of the Siamese and Malays, and who occupy independent villages. The negro is found along the coast and among the aboriginal natives. The great majority of the inhabitants are, however, of the Malay race, who are well known and widely diffused among all the eastern islands. The origin of this remarkable race is not distinctly known; they are understood, however, to be the descendants of the negroes, who were introduced into this country, but to have come originally from the district of Palembang, in the interior of Sumatra, situate on the banks of the River Melaka. Having crossed over about the end of the 12th century to the opposite continent, they, in 1253, founded the city of Malacca. Sultan Mohamed Shah, who ascended the throne in the 18th century, was the first Mussulman prince who extended his rule over Malacca. During part of the 19th century Malacca was under Siamese sovereignty. In 1819 Sultan Mahmoud repelled the aggression of the
king of Siam, but in 1511 he was conquered by the Portuguese under Albuquerque. In 1642 it became the possession of the Dutch, and in 1824 it was finally transferred to the British among the cessions made by the king of Netherland in exchange for the British possessions on the island of Sumatra, E. long. 109° 9 N. lat. 5° 9° (comp. Cyclop. Brit. s. v.)

Religion.—Until the arrival of the Mohammedans in the 18th century, the inhabitants of Malacca were pagans or followed some corrupt form of Hindu idolatry. With the Mussulman religion the religion of the Crescent became the predominating belief. Christianization was introduced in the 18th century by the Portuguese. One of the earliest laborers in this work was the renowned Spanish Jesuit, Francis Xavier (q. v.). Unfortunately, however, for the success of the Gospel truth, the conduct of the Romish priesthood and of the Portugese authorities was very unkind toward the natives. Not much better was the influence of the Dutch. Though Protestantism, with their entrance, superseded Romanism in a measure, the government hesitated to encourage the Christian missions, and gave great liberty to Mohammedans, lest the latter should be tempted to insurrection, and Holland be deprived of these valuable possessions. To this period belong the infamous mass executions of Christians in Malacca. The Romanists maintain a suffragan bishop at the capital (of like name as the country). For further details on the success of Christianity in Malacca at present, see the articles INDIA; MALAYAS. See also Grundmann, Missionarische, No. 7, 21, and 34; Camerour, Our Trop. Posses. to Malayn Ind. (Lond. 1865).

Malachi (Heb. Malakî, מָלָאכִי, messenger; Sept. in the title Malakiy, but in ch. 1, it renders ἀγγέλος). The last of the minor prophets, and the latest writer in the canon of the O. T. (comp. iv. 4, 5, 6). What is known of him is so intimately connected with his prophecies that it will be most convenient to consider the whole subject together. In doing so we will, at the same time, treat any doubtful questions involved.

I. Personal Account.—The name Malachi is rendered by some my angel, but it is usually regarded as contracted from Malachijah, "messenger of Jehovah," like Abi (2 Kings xviii, 2) from Abijah (2 Chron. xxix, 1). The traditionalists regard the name as having been given to the prophet on account of the beauty of his person and his unblemished life. The name means an angel, angels being, in fact, the messengers of God; and, as the prophets are often styled angels or messengers of Jehovah, it is supposed by some that "Malachi" is merely a general descriptive term, and not a proper name. So Hengstenberg, Christol. iii, 372 sq. Of his personal history nothing is known (see Dr. Davidson in Horne's Introd. new ed. ii, 894 sq.). A tradition preserved in Pseudo-Epiphanius (De Vitis Proph.) relates that Malachi was of the tribe of Zebed, and born after the captivity at Sopha (Sopha, ?Saphir) in the territory of that tribe. According to the same apocryphal story he died young, and was buried with his fathers in his own country. Jerome, in the preface to his Commentary on Malachi, mentions a belief which was current among the Jews, that Malachi was identical with Ezra the priest, because the circumstances recorded in the narrative of the latter are also mentioned by the prophet. The Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel, on the words "by the hand of Malachi" (i. 1), gives the gloss whose name is called Ezra the scribe. With equal probability Malachi has been identified with Mordecai, Nehemiah, and Zerubbabel. The Sept., as above noted, renders "by Malachi" (Mal. i. 1), "by the hand of his angel," and this translation appears to have given rise to the idea that Malachi, as well as Haggai and John the Baptist, was from the court of Artaxerxes. On all this, however, it is highly probable that the efforts of the secular government were on this occasion seconded by the preaching of "Jehovah's messenger," and that Malachi occupied the same posi-
tion with regard to the reformation under Nehemiah as Isaiah held in the time of Hezekiah, and Jeremiah in that of Josiah. The last chapter of canonical Jewish history is the key to the last chapter of its prophecy. See Noel Alexander, De Malachia Prophetis, in his Com. De S. Hier., iii, 642 sq.; Vitzting, ibid., in his Observ. in Mal. (Lips. 1781 sq.).

III. Contents of the Book.—The prophecies of Malachi are comprised in four chapters in our version, as in the Sept., Vulgate, and Peshito-Syriac. In the Hebrew the book includes the oracles of the first, third, and fourth chapters, but the whole prophecy naturally divides itself into three sections, in the first of which Jehovah is represented as the loving father and ruler of his people (i, 1-12); in the second, as the supreme God and father of all (ii, 10-16); and in the third, as their righteous and final judge (ii, 17-23).

These may be again subdivided into smaller sections, each of which follows a certain order: first, a short sentence; then the sceptical questions which might be raised by the people; and, finally, their full and triumphant refutation. The formal and almost scholastic manner of the prophecy seemed to Ewald to indicate that it was more delivered in writing than spoken publicly. But though this may be true of the prophecy in its present shape, which probably presents the substance of oral discourses, there is no reason for supposing that it was not delivered originally in public, like the warnings and denunciations of the older prophets, however they may differ from them in vigor of conception and high poetic diction.

1. The first section of the prophet's message consists of two parts: the first (i, 1-6) addressed to the people generally, in which Jehovah, by his messenger, asserts his love for them, and proves it, in answer to their reply, "Wherein hast thou loved us?" by referring to the punishment of Edom as an example. The second part (i, 7-12) is addressed especially to the priests, who had changed the name of Jehovah, and had been the chief movers of the defection from his worship and covenant. They are rebuked for the worthlessness of their sacrifices and offerings, and their profanation of the Temple thereby (i, 7-14). The denunciation of their offence is followed by the threat of punishment for future neglect (i, 15-18), and the character of the true priest is drawn as the companion picture to their own (i, 9-12).

2. In the second section (ii, 10-16) the prophet reproves the people for their intermarriages with the idolatrous heathen, and the divorces by which they separated from their legitimate spouses, who were at the altar of Jehovah, in violation of the great law of marriage which God, the father of all, established at the beginning.

3. The judgment, which the people lightly regard, is announced with all solemnity, ushered in by the advent of the Messiah. The Lord, preceded by his messenger, shall come to his Temple suddenly, to purify the land from its iniquity, and to execute swift judgment upon those who violate their duty to God and their neighbor. The first part (ii, 17-3, iii, 4) of the section terminates with the threat of the coming judgment; in the second (ii, 4-12) the faithfulness of God to his promises is vindicated, and the people are exhorted to repentance, with its attendant blessings; in the third (iii, 13-iv, 6) they are reproved for their want of confidence in God, and for confusing good and evil. The final severence between the righteous and the wicked is then set forth, and the great day of judgment is depicted, to be announced by the coming of Elijah, or John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ (Matt. xi, 14; xvii, 10-13).

IV. Style.—The diction of Malachi offers few, if any, distinctive marks as distinct from the manner of his prophecy. Smooth and easy to a remarkable degree, it is the style of the reasoner rather than of the poet. The rhythm and imagery of his writings are substantially those of the old prophets, but they possess no remarkable vigor or beauty. We miss the fiery prophet-like eloquence of Isaiah, and have in its stead the calm and almost artificial discourse of the practiced orator, carefully modelled upon those of the ancient prophet. His phraseology is accounted for by his living during that decline of Hebrew poetry which we see in the latter part of his oracles. His whole mode of expression is intended for the instruction of the people, and is not calculated for a wide circulation among the learned. His is the spirit of a letter, and not of a book; of an address, and not of a treatise. His style is always clear, and polished, and the manner of introducing a new line of argument or a new range of thought is most striking. Here the peculiarities are noticed, that there is no longer the ancient dramatic manner displayed, but a kind of discursive method. Each thought is carried on between God and the people or the priests, whose half-mocking questions are enlarged upon and finally answered with scorn by the mouth of the messenger. He seems fully aware of being the last of the sacred scribes (iii, 1 and 22), and the epoch of transition from the glowing evaneglical fulness of the inspired seer, who speaks to the people as the highest power suddenly and forcibly moves him, to the carefully studied and methodically constructed written discourse, becomes strangely apparent in him. We find both the ancient prophetical improvisation original exhortation, with its repinations and apparent incongruities, and the artificially composed address, with its borrowed ideas well arranged and its euphonious words well selected. This circumstance has probably also given rise to the notion that we are only in his book a summary of his orations: a work of defective memory that it were, the subject matter addressed, written out by himself from his recollections—an opinion which we do not share. Of peculiarities of phraseology we may notice the occurrence of passages like 'since the day of the Lord hath come' (i, 2, 8), etc.

V. Controversy and Intermixture.—The claim of the book of Malachi to its place in the canon of Old Testament literature has never been disputed, and its authority is established by the references to it in the New Testament (Matt. xi, 10; xvii, 12; Mark i, 2; ix, 11, 12; Luke i, 17; Rom. ix, 18). Philo, Josephus, Melito, Jerome, and other ancient authorities, mention it, and quote from it as in accordance with our present copies. Nor is there anything, either in its language or the circumstances of its time, the manners and customs touched upon, or its topographical and geographical allusions, that could give rise to the slightest critical suspicion.

Its text is one of the purest and best preserved, and no part of it is so much to be found in the Codex, that it need be added to correct the corruptions of other books. The differences in the various ancient versions arise only from the differences of the vowels assumed or found by the translators in their copies. The few variants which occur in the different texts are so unimportant that they do not call for any detailed remark.

VI. Commentaries.—Special exegetical helps on the whole book are as follows, a few of the most important of which we designate by an asterisk prefixed: Ephraim Syrus, Explanation (in Syriac, in his Opp. v, 813); Rupertus Tuitienis, In Mal. (in his Opp. v, 589); D. Kimchi and S. Jarchi, Mal. (in his opponents' Hebrew commentary); De Musis (Paris, 1618, 4to); Aben-Ezra's and other Jewish commentaries, tr. into Latin by Hein ben Lippes (Lips. 1746, 4to); D. Kimchi's and Aben-Ezra's commentaries (in Latin by Bohle (Rost. 1637, 4to); Kimchi's alone, by Carpio (Lips. 1676, 8vo), by Münster (Basil. 1550, 8vo); Aben-Ezra's alone, by Münster, ibid. 1550, 8vo; Bergwall (Uppal. 1707, 8vo); Abrabanel's, by Meyer (Ham- mond, 1685, 4to); Luther, Commentarius (in Opp. Witt- tenb. edit. iv, 520); in German, by Agrippa, 1555; Mel- lancthon, Explanationes (Vittem 1568; also in Opp. ii, 441); Drascus, in his Commentarius (in Opp. ii, 454; Grymus, Expositio (Rost. 1658, 8vo; also in Opp. ii, 455); Moller, Expositio (Vittem 1659, 8vo); Bucardus, Inter- pretatio (including Cant., Hag., and Zech.) (B. 1539, 8vo); Grymus, Hypomnemata (Gen. 1538, 8vo; Basel 1539, 1612, 4to); Palamas, Analysias (Basel 1537, 1604, 8vo).
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8vo): Baldwin, Commentarius; [also Hag. and Zech.] (1614, 8vo); or from Guide, Commentarius [also Nab.] (Harp. 1622; Log. 1623, fol.); Tarnow, Commentarius (Kost. 1624, 4to); Stock and Torshall, Commentarius (Lond. 1641, fol.); Acosta, Commentarius [including Ruth, etc.] (Lud. 1641, fol.); Sclater, Commentarius (Lond., 1650, 4to); Ursinus, Commentarius (Francof. 1652, 8vo); or, for better and more correct revelations, see Vs. 8vo); Varenni, Trifolium, [including Hag. and Zech.] (Kost. 1662, 4to); Pocock, Commentary (Orf. 1677, fol.); also in Works, i, 19; Van Til, Commentarius (L. B. 1701, 4to); Köppen, Observationes (Gryph. 1708, 4to); Weiss, Exodus (L. B. 1729, 4to); Venetian Observationes (L. B. 1759, 4to); Fischler, Proslogia (Lips. 1759, etc.); Bharat, Commentarius (Lips. 1768, 8vo); *Faber, Commentary (Onold. 1779, 4to); Rosenmuller, Scholia (Lips. 1828, 8vo); *Reinike, Commentar (Giessen, 1856, 8vo); *Moore, Commentary (including Hag. and Zech.) (N. Y. 1856, 8vo); Kübler, Erklärung (Erlang. 1865, 8vo). See PROPHETES, MINOR.

Malachi (Vulg. Malachios), a familiar form (2 Esdr. i, 40) of the name of the prophet Malacli.

Malachi, Sr., archbishop of Armagh, one of the most noted characters in Irish Church History, was born of a noble family at Armagh about 1195. While yet a youth he retired from the world to subject himself to a most rigid asceticism under the abbot Imar of Armagh. His humility and fervor soon gained him a great reputation and appointment to a most exalted position in ecclesiastical rule, he was ordained priest only twenty-five years old, by Celsus, then archbishop of Armagh, who took a special interest in Malachi, and favored him in many ways. He also employed Malachi as assistant in the discharge of the archiepiscopal office, Celsus intending thus gradually to introduce Malachi to the archiepiscopal duties, with a view of securing him as successor. Of these opportunities Malachi availed himself for the furtherance of a plan he had long cherished, that of bringing the Irish Church, which since the conquest of the south-western provinces by the Normans had remained independent of Rome, into subjectivity to the papal chair. Malachi gradually introduced the Roman method of reciting the hours, and also established the rites of confession, confirmation, ecclesiastical marriage, etc., in the several convents. Then, in order to become betier acquainted with the customs and usages of the Church in the literal rule, he resided for some years with bishop Malchus of Lismore, also a native of Ireland, but who had been a monk of Winchester, England, and had there become thoroughly acquainted with the practices of Rome. Upon his return, he was immediately engaged by his friends for the restoration of the Banger monastery, which had remained in ruins since its destruction by the Danes, and which was now the possession of Malachi's uncle. Assisted by ten monastic associates, he erected an oratory and a small house for their accommodation, and, as their superior, remained there until about 1225, when he was called away to preside over the see of Connereth (Connor), where, by unwearied exertions, he built up the cause of Christianity. About 1129 he was further promoted by a call to the archiepiscopal of Armagh, the place for which Celsus had long intended him. Malachi readily accepted the position, however, only upon condition that he should be permitted to resign it "as soon as it was rescued from its present unbecoming situation." Hitherto, by custom, the archiepiscopacy had been hereditary, and in consequence, though Celsus had himself nominated Malachi, the latter had not undisputed possession of the primasial see until about 1155, when he at once applied himself most earnestly and zealously to perfecting the reforms he had inaugurated while yet with Celsus. Previous to Malachi's accession to the archiepiscopal throne there had been a hierarchy or a legalized support for religion in the Irish Church. The ministry had been sustained by voluntary offerings, and in some instances by the donation of Tremon, or free lands, the rents of which was to be appropriated annually to the bishop and the poor. These lands, however, were neither large nor numerous. During the comotions of the 10th and 11th centuries those which had been given to Armagh were again claimed by the lineal descendants of the original donors as their rightful inheritance. At this time they had been increased for eight centuries, and now amounted to over 8000 acres. Malachi's great endeavor was to do away with this abuse. See IMPROPRIATION. But he failed to accomplish this object, and in consequence resigned the primatial office and retired to the bishopric of Down, hitherto a part of the Diocese of Armagh.

Malachi unstiringly devoted himself to the one great object likely to be successfully accomplished—the Romanizing of the Irish Church. To accomplish this object—the greatest task which could have been undertaken by any person in his day, and which in consequence has made the name of Malachi one of the most prominent connected with the ecclesiastical annals of Ireland—he first travelled extensively in his own country, and then all the way to the Imperial City, where he was affectionately received by the pope (Innocent II), bishops, and cardinals, all vying with each other in their attentions to him. The pontifical envoys for Rome being ready, however, for which he had come, the pope refused to grant until a request for union with Rome should come from one of the Irish synods. Malachi received, however, a sure proof of the purity of his holiness with the proposed union: a certain degree of personal eminence he was confined by the sentence of excommunication by all Ireland, and returned to his native land expectant of the immediate realization of his life-long dream. On his way homeward he became intimately acquainted with Bernard of St. Clairvaux, whom he had already visited on his way towards the Eternal City, and so sharpened was he with the desire and rule of the Cistercian monastery that he determined to establish the order also in his country, and in 1142 opened the first Cistercian monastery in Ireland. In the mean time, however, Malachi busily employed himself, his legislative power also, in behalf of union, and in 1143 at last succeeded in moving a synod to make the request which Rome demanded previous to the bestowal of the pallium on the Irish clergy. It is, however, not a little remarkable that the synod from which this very important request emanated was not one convened in any province of Ireland, but principal church at Lismore (Patrick's Island), a small, inaccessible island near the Sherries, in the northern channel of Ireland (Haverty's History of Ireland [New York, 1866], p. 161). Could no more conspicuous place be found? From this and other internal evidences the historian is enabled to assert that the Irish clergy were not then in favor of union with Rome. The request, however, was issued, and St. Malachi set off immediately with it, expecting to meet the pope (now Eugene III) at Clairvaux; but, having been long delayed in England by the jealousy of king Stephen, Malachi, to his sore disappointment, did not reach there till the pope had left. Shortly afterwards he was taken ill, and died (1148) in the arms of his friend and future biographer, St. Bernard. Although Malachi did not personally obtain the cherished wish of his heart, he yet inaugurated and put in train the measures which brought the desired result after several years. St. Malachi was by far the most prominent and powerful native ecclesiastic of Ireland in her early days. "His personal influence," says Todd (Irish Ch. p. 116), "was so great that he was able to direct the minds of his countrymen as he saw fit: and for this he was admirably fitted by his descent, his learning, his eloquence, and his fascinating address. In A.D. 1152 St. Bernard wrote his Life in elegant mediæval Latin. Previous to an acquaintance with the Irish saint, Bernard had written to ten many hundreds against him the term "a stiff-necked, intractable, and ungovernable race;" but, in reference to Malachi, he declared that he could not find words to express his admiration of the saint.
A curious Prophecy concerning the Future Roman Pontiffs is extant under the name of Malachia. It designates, by a few brief phrases, the leading characteristics of each successive reign, and in some instances these descriptive characteristics have proved so curiously appropriate as to lead to some discussion. The characteristic of Pio Nono, and therefore of the Jesuits, was the subject of much speculation. That the prophecy really dates from the time of St. Malachy no scholar now supposes; it was unknown not only to his biographer, St. Bernard (Liber de vita S. Mal.), but neither does any other author allude to this work until the beginning of the 17th century. It has, however, been sufficiently discussed in the works of those who state that neither Baronius nor any of his contemporaries deemed it deserving of attention. It is now supposed to have been prepared in the concave of 1690 by the friends of Cardinal Simoncelli, who is clearly described in the work (comp. Dullinger, Fabels respecting the Popes of the Middle Ages, edited by Prof. H. B. Smith [Dodd and Mead, N. Y., 1873, 12mo], p. 150 sq.).

See Menestreri, Tractatus sur les prophéties attribuées à saint Malachie; John Germano, Vita gestis & predicationis de patriam sancta Malachiae (Naples, 1670, 2 vols. 4to); Bre- nner, Ezechiel und Jesaja (Berlin, 1794); Todd, Hist. ant., Ch. in Ireland, p. 106-117; Inettì, Origines Anglicanae (see Index); Jabbr. deutsch. Theol. 1871, p. 664. (J. H. W.)

*Malagrida, Gabriele*, an Italian theologian and preacher, who flourished in Portugal in the first half of the 18th century, was born in the Milanese in 1688. He entered the Society of Jesus, went to Portugal, and became popular as a pulpit orator and a theological writer. In 1758, when an attempt at assassination was made on Joseph I, then reigning monarch of Portugal, the Jesuits were charged with the crime (they were shortly after expelled from the kingdom); Malagrida was suspected of complicity, and was arrested on the same charge. Freed from this charge, he was accused of spreading heretic doctrines, and suffered death at the stake in 1761. A list of his writings is given in Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, vol. xxxii, s. v. See Platel, Relation de la condamnation et exécution du Gesuita G. Malagrida (1761).

*Malakanas, of Milk-eaters* (Russian Molokani, i. e. those who, contrary to the rule of the Eastern Church, take milk on fast-days), is the name of a religious sect in the Russo-Greek Church. The name Malakanas is a term applied to these religious sects, and originated, as the word Shaker, Methodist, etc., among those who did not approve of the movement. They themselves like to be called Gospel-Men. They were first brought into notice by the zeal of a Prussian priest of a war, about the middle of last century. He settled among the southern Russians, and was full of applying the Scriptures to the villagers, and in visiting from house to house. After his death he acknowledged him as the founder of their new religious belief. The Malakans acknowledge the Bible as the Word of God, and the Trinity of the Godhead. They admit the fall of Adam, and the resurrection of Christ. They teach that Adam's soul only, and not his body, was made after God's image. The Ten Commandments are received among them. Idolatry and the worship of images are forbidden. It is considered sinful to take an oath, and the observance of the Sabbath is strictly enjoined; so much so that, like many of the Oriental sects, they devote Saturday evening to preparation for the Sabbath. They are firm believers in the Millennium, and are improperly described as followers of the fanatic Teutonic Beloroff, who, if ever, in fact, a member of the sect, is more an imitator of the Church of Rome. They are a sect of the Russian Church, and all parts of Russia to witness this miracle. Beloroff appeared, majestically seated in a chariot, ordered the titude to prostrate themselves, and then, opening his arms like an eagle spreading his wings, he leaped into the air, but, dropping down on the heads of the gaping multitude, was instantly seized and dragged off to prison as an impostor. He died soon after, so doubts in a state of insanity, declaring himself to be the prophet of God, and to be in his di- vine mission. A considerable number of his followers afterwards emigrated to Georgia, and settled in sight of Mount Ararat, expecting the Millennium. They spent whole days and nights in prayer, and have all their goods in common. See MILLENNARIANS in Russia.

Three thousand men and women were seized by the police, arranged in gangs, and driven with rods and thongs across the dreary steppes and yet more dreary mountain crests into the Caucasus. Meanwhile, the milk-eaters fled across the Pruth into Turkey, where the Sultan gave them a village called Tulcha for their residence. The Methodist mission at that place, under the leadership of Mr. Flocken, labored among them for some time; at present, however (1872), the mission is discontinuing its labors. See World's Missions, History of Christian Churches and Sects, ii, 294; Les Rus- kov, Essai historique et critique sur les sectes religieuses de la Russie (Paris, 1804, 8vo). See RUSSIA. (J. H. W.)

*Malan, Abraham Henri Caspar, D.D., one of the most noted of Swiss Protestant divines of our day, was born at Geneva July 13th, 1783, but in infancy of three years Malan exhibited great powers of intellec-

tural superiority, and the hopes which he awakened while yet an inmate of the cradle by securing a prize for reading at the Geneva Academy were more than realized in his manhood and hoary age. The poverty of his parents induced him to turn aside from an intellec-
tual career to which he so much inclined, and to enter the mercantile profession at eighteen, but he soon returned again to his former mode of life, and decided upon the ministry. In 1810 he was consecrated for this sacred vocation by the venerable Dr. Vairins, vicar of Geneva, and he at once made a name for himself as a pulpit orator of unusual eloquence. He was appointed preacher at the Geneva cathedral, and from the pulpit whence formerly the immortal Calvin had thundered forth the unalterable decrees of the Holy One, Malan now taught the Word of God to a great multitude of hearers. Unfortunately, however, the spiritual life built up by Calvin and his successors in the hearts of their flocks had been suffered to die out, and in the hearts of the hearers of Malan, as well as in the heart of the preacher himself, there was a lukewarmness, a coldness, to all religion—rationalism sat enthroned in the pulpit and the pew of Geneva; the forms of the Church founded by Calvin remained, but the spiritual life had departed. The young preacher endeavored to infuse the vitality of his own fervid spirit into the lifeless forms and the lifeless spirit of the "Vénérable Compagnie," but in vain; both the preacher and the auditor lacked that most essential element of a Chris-
tian life, the possession of the truly orthodox belief and trust in a divine Saviour. In the midst of his de-
spair Malan was brought under the influence of the noble-hearted Scotchmen, the Haldane brothers, and by them and our late Dr. John M. Mason (q. v.), and Mathias Bruen, was led to see the error of a faith built on a human Saviour, and brought to acknowledge the di-
vinity of Jesus the Christ. From this time forward Malan was a man of God. The first opportunity to display his ability as a polemic he found against the Vénérable Compagnie itself. This
body had issued for circulation among the masses an edition of the N.T. in which all passages bearing on the divinity of Christ were expunged as to favor the Socinian belief; this translation Malan denounced with the most vehement eloquence, and from his pulpit expounded these self-same passages in the spirit of their intended declaration to the multitudes who crowded around him. (For a review of the Job translation, see supra, E. W. W., vol. II.)

By 1818 the rupture between him and the Church authorities of Geneva had become so great that reconciliation was an impossibility, and Malan was consequently disinherited from the Established Church. Besides his relation to the cathedral, Malan had become the owner of a sizeable estate in the country; he was now succeeded by a divine of Socinian tendency. Not in the least daunted, he now followed the example of the Haldane brothers, and preached the truth whenever an opportunity would offer to address the multitudes and press forward the interests of Christ his master.

No church accessible to him, he preached in his own house, for preach he would. The most eminent of Geneva's inhabitants gathered regularly, and by 1820 he was enabled to rear a church upon his own ground. He named it "The Testimonial Chapel" ("La Chapelle de la Testimonie") and, being actively engaged in building up Christ's kingdom among men, to his pen also he gave no rest; now busy in the defence of Christ's divinity or the sovereignty of divine grace, to-morrow exposing and attacking Roman error, and next rushing up the great truths of divine sovereignty, tract, clear, simple, and practical. With these manifold duties upon him, he was yet far from content. He organized a school of theology, and himself became one of the instructors; founded a tract society, and a Magazine of piety or penitentiary. He has also the honor to have been the first to introduce the Sabbath-school into Switzerland. Not even all this toil could prevent him in the least from fostering also a joy in the development of esthetic talants which he possessed. As a sacred poet he will live as long as the language in which he wrote shall be known. He has been pronounced by the French Dr. Watta. As a composer he likewise displayed unusual endowments, and as a painter and sculptor masters of art delighted to enjoy his friendship and counsel. Thorvaldsen was his intimate friend, and more than once intrusted him with the completion of his choicest group. Surely a man of the pulpit, as well as of the pen. With untiring industry maintaining his position in the pulpit almost to the last, he died at his native place, May 8, 1864. No better comment on such a life can be given than by E. De Pressensée: "César Malan a été, dans la mesure de sa vocation, un grand ecclésiastique; il a suivi les impulsions de sa conscience sans hésitation" (Revue Chrétienne, Aug. 5, 1869, p. 502).

His appearance at the age of fifty is thus described by an American divine who had the pleasure of being his guest: "His person was noble and imposing; a little above the medium height, stout built, and, having something of a military bearing, he was still natural and easy in his manners. His broad shoulders supported a superb head; his open and lofty brow gave one an idea of his mental power; his eyes were full of intellect and fire, and at the same time his loving look won your heart; his fine mouth indicated an iron will, combined with a generous thought; a profusion of white hair fell upon his shoulders" (The Observer [N.Y.], April 22, 1869).

The degree of D.D. was conferred on Malan by the University of Edinburgh. Of his works, many of which have appeared also in an English dress both in England and in the United States, the following deserve special mention, The Ch. of Rome (N.Y., 1844);--Les Mômiers sont invisibles (1838); his followers were called Mômiers:--Les Chalets de Sion (1826, 12mo, and only), a collection of his hymns:--Le Témoignage de Dieu (1838, 8vo). See, besides the excellent article in the New Amer. Cyclop., 1864, p. 495, and Bost, Mémoires du Rèvel rel. des églises protest. de la Suisse et de la France (see Index); the Life,
not show a superior facial angle." This people must, however, be classified, as there is a great distinction among them (as a civilized standpoint. There is a certain class of Malays who have a written language (the spoken language is essentially the same with all the Malays), and who have some progress in the arts of life; then there are the sea-people, orang-inat, literally "men of the sea," who live by fishing or robbery, also the orang boncu or orang utan, "wild men" or "savage," dwelling in the woods or forests, and supposed to be the aborigines of the peninsula and islands.

**Origin and Language.**—The name of Malays seems to have been first used about the middle of the 15th century. The most generally accepted etymology is that of having been Menangkabo, in the island of Sumatra, rather than the peninsula itself. Even the Malays of Borneo claim to have come from Menangkabo. Palembang, however, also in Sumatra, has been mentioned as the original home of Malay civilization; while others again, point to Java as the source from which both Menangkabo and Palembang received their first settlers. "The Javanese," says Crawford, "would seem to have been even the founders of Malacca. Monuments have been discovered which prove the presence of this people in the country of the Sultans of Malacca. Thus Sir Stamford Raffles, when he visited Menangkabo, found there inscriptions on stone in the ancient character of Java, such as are frequent in that island; and he was supported in his conclusion by the learned natives of Java who accompanied him in his visitation, who stated that the settlement of the Javanese in several parts of Sumatra is, indeed, sufficiently attested. In Palembang they have been permanently the ruling people; and, although the Malay language is the popular one, the Javanese, in its peculiar written character, is still that of the court." According to Wallace the Malays are found in Malacca, Sumatra, Borneo, Timor, Temata, Macian, and Obi. The northern peninsula of Giloio and the island Ceram are inhabited by Alfur; Timor and the neighboring isles as far to the west as Flores and Sandalwood, and as far to the east as Timor-lant, are inhabited by a people more akin to the Papoos than to the Malays, the Timorese being distinctly distinguished from both; the inhabitants of the island Buru are partly Malays, partly Alfur; while the Papoos inhabit New Guinea, the Kay and Aro isles, Meis, Salawaty, and Weigim, and all the country eastward as far as the Fiji Isles. (See F. Müller, *Die Ethnographie, in Behm, Geograph. Jahrbuch [Gotha, 1869, vol. ii.]) The Malay language is simple and easy in its construction, harmonious in its pronunciation, and easily acquired by Europeans. It is the lingua Franca of the Eastern Archipelago. Of its numerous dialects, the Java- nese is the most refined, a superb art, in which it owes to the influence of it of Sanscrit literature. From the Arabsians (who gave the Malays Mohammedanism) their characters are borrowed, and many Arabic words have also been incorporated with the Malay language, by means of which the Javanese are able to supply the deficiency of scientific terms in their own tongue.

**Religion.**—The civilized Malays are generally Mohomedans in religious belief; they embraced the faith of the Crescent in the 13th or 14th century. The tribes in the interior and the "men of the sea" have either no religion or only the most debased superstition. In the years 1805-38 a sect of wild fanatics, the Padris-Priests, also called Orang-Patih, white men (after their dress), sought to re-establish their superstitious creed by fire and sword. They did much mischief until the Hollanders found that their own safety as rulers was threatened, and, after a short war, subdued the Padris and broke their power most substantially. The moral character of the Indo-Malays generally is not high; they are passionate, treacherous, and revengeful. But it must be said that the cruel and persecution which they are accused of at the hands of the Netherlands, who became their conquerors in the 16th century, and afterwards under the sway of the Hollanders, greatly

moulded the present character of this people. Little is done, even in our day, to ameliorate the forlorn condition of this unfortunate people. Polygamy is practised only among the affluent and in the large towns. Marriage can be effected in three ways: either by purchase of the woman, who, upon the decease of her husband, becomes the property of his nearest blood relation; by entering into a formal contract upon which, and there are supposed father-in-law, a custom reminding us of the patriarchal days of the Bible; by an equal tax borne by both contracting parties. They practice the right of circumcision upon the male child between the ages of 6 and 10. The N. Testament was translated into the Malay language as early as the 17th century. Hence it is stated to have been used in the O. T. only three fourths of a century later (1756); the whole Bible was published at Batavia in 1758 in 5 vola., and often since, e. g. by Willmet (1824, 3 vola. 8vo.). Comp. Du Lapalus, *Mémoires, lettres et rapports relatifs du cours de langue Malais et Javanais* (Paris, 1848); Gray and Bleek, *Handbook of Africa*. *Polygamy in the Philippines* (Cape City, 1858 sq., 3 vola. 8vo.). See Waits, *Archéologie der Nationvölker* (Leipzig, 1869, 5 vola.); Wallace, *Studies of Man and Nature* (London, 1865, 2 vola. 8vo.); Chambers, *Cyclopæd. a. v.* See *Malay Archipelago.*

**Malacca** (Heb. *Malacca*, מלחמה, their king, as often and as it should be rendered in Zeph. i. 5, instead of the Auth. Ver. "Malcham," i.e. *Mo'lónch*); *Sepang*; *Malájak* v. *Malájak*, Vulg. *Malochon*), the fourth-from of the seven sons of Shapharim by his wife Hodech (1 Chron. viii. 9). B.C. prob. 1612. See *Malacca*.


**Head of the fifth division of the ascendant order in the distribution appointed by David (1 Chron. xxiv.)**

**Father of Parshur (1 Chron. ix. 17; Neh. xi. 12), which latter was one of those who proposed to execute the prophet Jeremiah on a charge of treason (Jer. xxxviii. 1), although he had but unfortunately assailed his inquiry respecting the fate of the city (Jer. xxxix. 4). Of this there is now no vestige in the name of the Hammelech (lit. 'the king of the oxen'), and owner or constructor of the private dungeon into which Jeremiah was cruelly thrown (Jer. xxxix. 6). See *Jéramm.* The title *ben-ham-Melek* is applied to Jerahmeel (Jer. xxxvi. 26), who was among those commissioned by the king to take prisoners from and bring back to the besieged, and, after his capture, to appear in the presence of the king (Deut. xxi. 20). It was unknown in the time of the first temple of Solomon (1 Chron. xxvii. 1). Jerahmeel was a man of great wisdom and courage, and to him, as the natural inheritor of his title, the writer of the Book of Jerahmeel. Jerahmeel was the first man to come to the assistance of the Jews, and to assist them in their troubles and misfortunes.

**Another Israelite of the same place (or parentage) who lived likewise (Exra x. 25).** B.C. 469. In the Sept. (and also in the A. V.) this name appears as *Jerummelech*.

**One of the former residents (or descendents) of Harim, who assisted in reconstructing the wall of Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (Neh. iii. 11).** B.C.
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446. He was one of the Israelsites who had previously divorced his Gibele wife (Ezra xii, 31). B.C. 460.

7. Son of Rechab, and ruler of part of Beth-hazarim, who repaired the dung-gate of Jerusalem after the cap-
tivity (Neh. iii, 14). B.C. 446.

3. The son of a “goldsmith,” and the repairer of part
of the wall of Jerusalem opposite Ophel (Neh. iii, 31).

B.C. 446.

9. One of the priests appointed as musicians, appar-
ently vocal, to celebrate the completion of the walls
of Jerusalem after the exile (Neh. xii, 42). B.C. 446.

10. One of those who supported Ezra on the left
hand while reading the law to the people assembled at
Jerusalem, which probably makes him one of the
priests who subscribed the sacred covenant entered
into on the same occasion (Neh. xii, 8). B.C. cir. 410.

Malchiel (Heb. Malkiel, מַלְכִּיֵל, king of God; Sept. Μαλκυλίη, the second of the two sons of Deirah,
son of Asher (Gen. xvi, 17); he became the “father” (? founder) of Birevith (1 Chron. vii, 31), and his de-
scent is bore his name (Numb. xxvi, 45). B.C. 1856.

"Josephus (Ant. iv, 7, 4) reckons him with Heber among
the six sons of Asher, thus making up the number of
Jacob’s children and grandchildren to seventy, without
reckoning great-grandchildren.”

Malchielite (Heb. Malchiel, מַלְכִּיֵל, patron-
ynymic from Malchiel, used collectively; Sept. Μαλκυ-
λιατε, Αισθ. V., "Malchielites"), a descendant of Mal-
ceel (Numb. xxvi, 45).

Malchiah (in several passages, for different men).

See Malchiel.

Malchiram (Heb. Malkiram, מַלְכִּרְăm, king of
height; Sept. Μαλκερασί, the second son of king Jeho-
achin, born to him (according to Jewish tradition,
and Susannah) during his captivity (1 Chron. iii, 18),
and apparently himself without issue (see Strong’s "Harmony

Malchiah’s (Heb. Malki-Sha’a, מַלְכִּי-
שָׁע, king of help, twice as one word, מַלְכִּי-
שָׁע, 1 Sam. xiv, 49; xxii, 2; where the Auth. Vees. Anglicizes "Mel-
chi-sha’al"). Septuag. and Vulg. everywhere Malchias, his name,
Malchias, the second or third named of the four sons
of king Saul (1 Chron. viii, 33; ix, 39), apparently by Abi-
noam (1 Sam. xiv, 49); he perished in the battle at Gil-
boa with his father (1 Sam. xxxi, 2; 1 Chron. x, 2). B.C. 1053.

In the fact that the name of Saul’s eldest son
was Jehoachin in form (Jonathan kath’icnoos), whereas no
such peculiarity is found in the names of his brothers,
some writers (e.g. Mr. F. Newman) have seen a trace
of Saul’s gradual apostasy. Josephus only mentions Mal-
chias when, after his brothers (Malchee, Ant. vi, 14,
7).

Malchus (Mαλκος, from the Heb. מַלְכִּס, king, or
Malchus a follower, a slave of the high-priest Caiaphas,
and the individual among the party sent to arrest Jesus
whose right ear was cut off by Peter in the garden of
Gethsemane (John xviii, 10), but which was cured by a
touch from Christ (Luke xxii, 51). He had a kinman,
another slave of the same master (John xviii, 26). A.D.
29. The name of Malchus was not unfrequent among
the Greeks (see Westcin, ad loc.; Genees, Monument. Phoe.
p. 409), but it was usually applied to persons of Oriental
countries, as to an Arab chieftain (Josephus, Ant. xiii, 5,
1; xiv, 14; xv, 6, 2). This Malchus "was the personal
servant (δομινος) of the high-priest, and not one of
the bailiffs or apparatus (σφαργυρος) of the Sanhedrin.
The high-priest intended is Caiaphas (a doubt; Hieron. Anas
is called δραγυρος in the same connection), for John, who
was personally known to the former (John xviii, 15), is
the only one of the evangelists who gives the name
of Malchus. This servant was probably stepping forward
at the moment to settle with others to lay hold on him
with his sword, when the zealous Peter struck at him with
his sword, The blow was undoubtedly meant to be more
effectiue,

but reached only the ear. It may be, as Ester remarks
(Asher, vi, 268), that the man, seeing the danger,
threw his hand back to the left, as to expose the
right ear more than the other. The allegation that
the writers are inconsistent with each other, because Ma-
thew, Mark, and John say either ουριον or ουρανον (as
that meant the lappet or tip of the ear), while Luke
says ουρανον, is groundless. The Greek of the New Testa-
ment age, due to the modern Romanism, often de-
tinction between the primitive and diminutive. In fact,
Luke himself exchanges the one term for the other in
this very narrative. The Saviour, as his pursuers were
about to seize him, asked to be left free for a moment
longer (διδασκ’ηνα), and then restored the wounded man
to soundness. The θαυματικον of τοις ουριοιν may
indicate (which is not forbidden by διδασκ’ηνα, ουρανον) that
the ear still adhered slightly to its place. It is noticeable
that Luke, the physician, is the only one of the writers who mentions the act
of healing" (Smith). "Some think Peter’s name was omit-
ted by the synoptists, lest the publication of it in its
lifetime should expose him to the revenge of the un-
believing Jew, but, as the gospels were not published, this
seems improbable.

Maldive Islands, a chain of low coral islands in the
Indian ocean about 400 miles west of Ceylon; some 500 miles in length by 45 in average
breadth, consist of 17 groups or atolls, each atoll sur-
rounded by a coral reef. The entire number, including
the islets, is estimated at about 50,000. Moll, the largest of the chains, in miles in circumference, with a popu-
lation of 2000, is the residence of the ancient, now dis-
rupted. Wild-fowl breed in prodigious numbers; Feb.
rice (imported from Hindustan), and cocoa-nuts, consti-
tute the food of the inhabitants. These people are
strict Mohammedans in their religion.

Maldonatus, Joannes (1), a celebrated Spanish
Jesuit, was born at Las Casas, in Cuba, in Estremadura,
in 1534; studied at the University of Salamanca, and
afterwards taught Greek, philosophy, and theology with
great success; the lecture-rooms of the college were
often too small to accommodate his numerous pupils.
He subsequently removed to Poitiers, France, from whence
he was made cardinal of the July priestly breed, of the
Papal Church.

Maldonatus, a name which occurs in the Gospels
of Pont-a-Mousson. Later he came to Paris, and there
and created an unprecedented enthusiasm. His exegetical
lectures were attended not only by Romanists, but even
by Protestants, and the renown of his teaching reminis-
cence of the history of Abelard. His brilliant course
was checkered by accusations against him of having induced
the president, Montbrun, to will away all his fortune to
the Order of the Jesuits, and of teaching false doctrines
touching the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.
He was acquitted, however, on both charges, but left Paris,
and retired to Bourges, where he devoted himself to ex-
egetical studies, and prepared several of the works (see
list below) which have made his name celebrated.
He was called to Rome by pope Gregory XIII, to take a
part in the publication of the Greek Septuagint.
He died in that city in 1593. His principal works are Com-
mentarius in primum et secundo Sacrae Scripturae Partem
Petrarci Testimenti (Paris, 1643, fol.; — Commentarius in quattuor
Evangelistarum, etc. (Ludip, 1615; Mayence, 1841–45, 5 vols.
8vo). "Though condemned by some, and procuring for
its author the title of 'vulgentimismus et maldecimtis-
amus,' this work is one of the best. Cahus, and two con-
stant writers a most justly praiseworthy (see Bayle, Richard
Simon, Schlichtgrius, M. Poole, and Jackson). In this
work Maldonatus collates the opinions of the fathers
with great ability, and does not hesitate to differ even
from Augustine, when sound erudition demands it. He
shows acquaintance with the Vatican MS. of the N. T.
MALDONATUS

with and the Sept. version of the O. T., and with the
original Hebrew." The critical Simon (Hist. crit. des
princip. commentateurs du N. T. p. 618 sq.) says he
succeeded better than any one else in explaining the literal
sense of the sacred writers. He also wrote Traité des
Sacraments (Lyon, 1614, 4to)—Traité de la grâce, etc.,
(Paris, 1617)—Traité de la communion (Paris, 1617)—
Tractatus de ceremoniis (Bibliotheca ritualis,
Rome, 1781, 4to). Summulae casuum conscientiae has
been, we believe, unjustly accredited to Maldonatus. It
is a work of doubtful morality, and very unlike the
unproductions of Maldonatus. See Herzig, Real-Encyk-
lop. v., s. v.; also W. H. Moore, Ath. Soc. (ser. 3),
Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. n. s. v.; Pratt, Maldonat et l'Uni-
689.

Maldonatus, Joannes (3), a Spanish Jesuit, who,
according to Aubertus Mirzenus, was a priest of Burgos,
and is stated by Zeller to have ordered the lessons of
the Roman Breviary, flourished about the middle of the
16th century. In 1549 he published a treatise, De Se-
nectate Christiana, and an elegant abridgment of the
lives of the saints.—Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. vol. iii, n. v.

Male (Heb. מַלֶּא, kabur), Gen. i, 27; vi, 19; xxxiv,
25), applied to the male of either man or beast. The
superior estimation in which male children were held among
the Hebrews is testified by numerous passages in
Scripture, and we find the same feeling, expressed al-
most in the same words, still existing in Eastern coun-
tries (see Job iii, 3: and comp. Roberts, Observ. ad loc.).
See CHILD.

Malebranche, Nicholaus, a French Jesuit, distin-
ctive for his peculiar philosophical views, and for the
brilliance and fascination of the style in which they
were expounded. He was one of the most illustrious
of the Cartesians, aiming by his speculations to correct
the dangerous tendencies of Des Cartes's philosophy
[see Spinoza], and occupied an eminent, though not a
controlling, position in the history of the higher philo-

some knowledge of his system is required for
the just estimation of the doctrines both of Locke and
of Leibnitz, and for the illustration of the views of
Berkeley.

Life.—Malebranche was born of respectable parents
in Paris, Aug. 6, 1638. Feebly and sickly from his birth,
and deformed by a curvature of the spine, he was reared
with the tenderest care, and was educated mainly at
home. His ill health and his deformity confirmed the
natural shyness of his disposition. He avoided the com-
pany of his fellows, and was more given to meditative
placation, and spent most of his time in solitary meditation.
He found his world within himself. Eager for seclusion
from the turmoil of life, he sought a refuge in the Soci-
ey of Jesuits, and joined the Congregation of the Or-
tory in the twenty-second year of his age. His studies
were at first ecclesiastical history and antiquities, but
these he soon abandoned in consequence of the weakness
of his memory. He was next induced by the learned
Richard Simon to prosecute sacred criticism and the
Oriental languages. They had few attractions for him.
In his wandering mood he picked up the then recently
published treatise of Des Cartes On Man. To this new-
ly-acquired treasure he devoted himself assiduously, and
sought the mastery of the Cartesian doctrines and of
philosophical problems. Thus he busied himself for the
next ten years of his life, and became one of the most
cardinal and eminent of the Cartesians. His perspicacity
discerned the weak point of the Cartesian system; and
he was too honest and too independent to be "addictus
jurare in verba magistri." He meditated intensly—
closing the windows of his room that he might not be
distracted by the noise of the world; and he revolved in
silence and solitude the arduous questions which presented themselves for solution. He read little, thinking the knowledge of man, of mind, and
of God the all-sufficient realm of speculation; and con-
sidering that such knowledge was to be attained only
by diligence, introspection, and abstract reasoning.
Exalted and enriched by such silent and solitary labors,
Malebranche proposed his modifications of Cartesianism
in a work entitled Rêcherche de la Vérité, the first vol-
ume of which appeared at Paris in 1673; the second
and last volume being published in the ensuing year.
An improved and enlarged edition was brought out,
towards the close of his life, in 1712. This is his
principal work; it is that which determines his position
in the history of philosophical opinion. Besides other
interesting topics discussed, it, in a manner less open
to objection, would have the effect of giving the idea of
all things in God. The treatise itself was an examina-
tion of the nature and characteristics of knowledge,
of the origin of ideas, of the mode of avoiding error and
arriving at truth, of the precautions required to guard
against delusions of various kinds, and especially the
fallacies which arise from the senses and from prejudice.
Malebranche has been accused of unacknowledged obli-
gations to Bacon. In this he only imitated the exam-
ple of his illustrious master Des Cartes. Nor did he
deviate from his exemplar in the attention bestowed
upon the faithful execution of the book. The style, too,
so exquisite that it exercised an irresistible fascination
over all its readers. Many who rejected his principles
and deductions were charmed by his exposition; and
many were beguiled into the acceptance of his theories
by the beauty of their presentation or by the
beauty of their expression. His ornate style disguised
his dogmas even to himself. His language wanted phi-
losophical precision, and offered many salient points for
attack. His system was assailed by Foucher, by An-
toine Arnauld, and by Locke. The Jesuit Du Tertre, at
the instigation of his order, reluctantly impugned it.
Hardouin, in his Athéism Unmaské, accused it of athe-
istic characteristics. Leibnitz, in defending it against
such charges, admitted that the looseness of the bril-
liant presentation rendered it liable to misapprehension
and misrepresentation, but maintained that the real
opinions of the author were very different from those
attributed to him by his opponents (Lettre à M. Remond,
Nov. 4, 1715). The whole system of Malebranche, so
far as it is a departure from Cartesianism, is centred in
the doctrine of his "Vision in God," and this doctrine
led by a logical development to those views of free will
and grace which resulted in the controversy with Ar-
nauld (1680). His inquiries were, however, actuated
throughout by an earnest religious desire for the puri-
ification and elevation of his fellow-men, and were not
conceived with a view to speculative or metaphysical
purposes, but were directed to practical topics. With this
design he composed his Considérations Chrétienes (1676), and his Traité de la
Moralé (1684). The latter is one of the landmarks of
ethical philosophy, and has merited the high commen-
sation of Sir James Mackintosh. Besides these noted
treatises, Malebranche was the author of several essays
on various scientific topics, published in the Journal of
the Academy of Sciences. Whatever opposition was ex-
cited by the peculiarities, or the extravagances, or the
apparent peril of his metaphysical speculations, he was
sai
in this work he had exhibited his rare and powerful
intelligence, his simple goodness, and his unaffected
purity.

The life of a valetudinarian so retired, and bound by
the restraints of a rigid religious order, offers few in-
cidents for curious investigation. The calm and equable
tenor of Malebranche's frail existence, the long time
that he lived so reticent, and the leisurely and easy
account of the last year of his life, even in another form of existence, he may be believed
to have entered upon that "vision of all things in God"
which, with pious enthusiasm, he had endeavored to at-
tend on earth. He died at Paris Oct. 13, 1714, a year
and a month before his seventy-eighth year. His last
work was a Treatise on "Ethical Philosophy."—The cardinal tenet of the philosophy of
Malebranche, which contradistinguishes it from that of
Des Cartes, of Spinoza, of Leibnitz, etc., is the reform-
ing and of the acquiescing ascetics of the Cartesian
school, is the doctrine of seeing all things in God, to which such a supreme power was already conceded. The motive, the meaning, the genesis of this doctrine, and its relation to antecedent, contemporary, and subsequent speculation, are unintelligible, unless it is contemplated in connection with the dogmas of Des Cartes and their development. Des Cartes (q.v.) recognized only two essential universal intelligences, which, together with God, of which with him were the equivalents of mind and matter.

The mystery, the enigma, which presents itself in such endless forms, and which inevitably returns with all the Proten changes of metaphysical speculation—which cannot be evaded in the study of that strange mixture of scholasticism and the rationalism of the times, as he had arbitrarily conceived it, and with the absolute divorce of the two existences postulated by him, introduced a Deus ex machina, and imagined a divine intervention to effect perfect action on every occasion with the power of the physical world, of the physical nature. This hypothesis has been given the name of the doctrine of Assistance. This scheme is assuredly ominous to the sharp censures of Aristotle on some of his precursors, and renders the active intelligence of the human race a mere collection of imaginative episodes, like a worn-out tragedy (Metap. x., xiii, iii). The explanation was soon discovered to be not merely a presumption, but utterly ineflectious, and of most perishable tendency. Obviously, it made the creating and sustaining God the direct agent in man's actions in all cases where inward tendencies forced him to proceed to outward act, and it made the universe a complicated piece of puppetry, whose motions were communicated by a hidden personage constantly jerking at the strings. The logical inconsistency of maintaining an entire separation between the grand constituents of human nature, and of reducing the activity of the human mind to all effective manifestation of human thought, offended the acute perspicacity of Spinoza. He sought to restore harmony and congruity to the philosophical interpretation of the intelligible world, by considering thought and action, and not matter, as only effences, phenomenal coruscations, from the eternal, self-sustaining, eternal, all-embracing Existence, which did not so much support and regulate, as constitute and contain alike the whole creation and the Creator. This, of course, pushed Cartesianism to the absurdity of its logical extreme, but annihilated all moral responsibility, all distinctions of nature, annulled all individual existence, establishing, in short, a pure Pantheism. But Pantheism, whether Stoic, Platonie, Spinozistic, or Schellingistic, is the negation of a personal God, of all separable existence, and of all the duties, thoughts, and feelings that spring from human obligations to a heavenly Father, and to a divine Creator and beneficent Governor of the universe.

About the same time that Spinoza, was secretly engaged in transmuting Cartesianism into Pantheism, and probably independently of any impulse from his investigations, Malebranche endeavored to uphold and enforce the obligations which were nullified by the Spinozistic system, to preserve all the dogmas of revealed religion, to fortify the sense of religious duty, to escape the absurdities and aberrations of the Cartesian theory, and yet to uphold the Cartesian doctrine of the attributes. He endeavored to correct its excesses, and by indicating the means of conciliation between the two widely separated constituents of his creation. The Cartesian philosophy was in some measure obliterated by his own celebrated hypothesis of Occasional Causation, supposing all material motion, in accordance with the movements of the apparently moving mind, to be due to a mechanical impulse of the Divinity, disconnected from human intelligence, he imagined that all such phenomena were wrought and inspired of God, of which with him were the equivalents of mind and matter, and that human knowledge and action proceeded exclusively from seeing all things in God.

A half-truth is the most dangerous, because it is the most seductive form of delusion. The moiety of truth which is present usually precedes the suspicion of deception. A half-truth is the best ladder from the divine mind, and that human knowledge and action proceeded exclusively from seeing all things in God.

A half-truth is the most dangerous, because it is the most seductive form of delusion. The moiety of truth which is present usually precedes the suspicion of deception. A half-truth is the best ladder from the divine mind, and that human knowledge and action proceeded exclusively from seeing all things in God.
a quo est omnis modus, omnis species, omnis ordo; sine quibus nihil rerum inveniri vel cogitari potest" (De Civ. Dei, xi, xv).

The thesis has been amply commented upon, elucidated and expanded, by S. Thomas Aquinas, Henry of Ghent, Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, and the better half of the schoolmen. It is confirmed by lord Bacon, John Milton, and many of the most distinguished moderns, out of Germany as well as in that land of golden mists. "In this, at once most comprehensive and most appropriate acceptance of the word, reason is pre-eminentiy spiritual, and a spirit, even our actual self is the measure of the excellency by which we are privileged to say, Our Father" (Coleridge, Aids to Reflection); and the same author cites with approval a still stronger utterance to the like effect from that easily distinguishable personage, John Smith, 1660.

Leibniz might well say that Malebranche's doctrine was no novelty. It was, indeed, both very old and very generally accredited, but in a form and with an application widely different from what was contemplated by him in his new presentation. The long citation of the evidences of its general acceptance—and not the tenth part of those which were of the same order by which we are privileged to say, Our Father—is a Coleridge, Aids to Reflection; and the same author cites with approval a still stronger utterance to the like effect from that easily distinguishable personage, John Smith, 1660.
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and the other historians of philosophy, the following may
can be consulted with advantage: Arnauld, Des Idees Fréres et
Fouassé; Bayle, Dict. Hist. et Critique; Noris, Essays
towards the Theory of the Ideal or Intellectual World
(Lond. 1701, vol. 8vo); Leibniz, Examen des Sentiments de
Malebranche, in Esopus, Gasp. Philosophae de M. Leibniz
(Amst. 1765); Leibniz, Théories et Epistolaire de
Religion de M. Malebranche, edited by A. Hercyni
Fontenelle, Hist. du Renouvellement de l'Académie
Royale des Sciences; Dug. Stewart, Philosophy of
the Human Mind, and Dissertation 1, Supplement to the
Encyclopedia Britannica; Mackintosh, Dissertation,
Supplem. Encycl. Britannica; Sir William Hamilton,
Lectures on Metaphysics (Boston, 1859); Blakeny, History of
the Philosophy of Mind (London, 1850, vol. ii; Saisnet,
Panthéisme, i, 66 sq; and the same in Revue des
Denz Mondes, April 1, 1863; Herzog, REAL-Encyclopädie,
vol. xx, s. v.; Erdmann, Malebranche, Spinoza, die Skeptiker
und Mystiker des Siebteckens Jahrhunderts (1866); Reli,
Dissertatio de Malebranche Philo(
(1846); Hallum, Intro. to the Lit. of Europe (Harper's
dition), ii, 91 sq; Blampignon, Etude sur Malebranche
(Paris, 1864, 8vo). (G. F. H.)

Malec (kay) So the Mohammedans call the
principal bird in care of hell. In the Koran it is said
(speaking of the infidels), "And they shall call aloud,
saying, O Malec, intercede for us, that the Lord
would end us by annihilation. And he shall answer, Verily,
ye shall remain here forever. We brought you the truth
herefore, at ye abhorred the truth."
Some of the Mohammedan doctors say this answer will
be given a thousand years after the final dissolution of this
world.
—Broughton, Bibl. Hist. Soc. vol. ii, s. v.; Sale,
Koran, p. 401.

Malekites, the second of the four orthodox
Mohammedan sects. The founder of the Malekites was
Malek the Anas, born at Medina about the end of the
Hejira 95. He was remarkable for strenuously insisting
on the literal acceptance of the prohibitory precepts.
Tradition will have that it was visited in his last illness by a friend, who found him in tears,
and asked him the cause of his affliction, he replied;
"Who has more reason to weep than I? Would God
that for every question decided by me according to
my own opinion I had received so many stripes, then
would my account be easier. Would to God I had never
given any decision of my own." The Malekites are
chiefly found in Arabia and other countries of Asia.
—Sale's Koran, Prel. Disc. § 8; Taylor, Hist. of Mohammedan
mysticism, p. 288; Broughton, Bibl. Hist. Soc. vol. ii,
s. v. See MOHAMMEDAN.

Mal'elethi (Luke iii, 37). See MAHALALEL.

Malevolence is that disposition of mind which
inclines us to wish ill to any person. It discovers itself
in frowns and a lowering countenance, in uncharitableness,
in evil sentiments, harsh speeches to or of its object,
in cursing and reviling, and doing mischief either with
open violence or secret spite, as far as there is power.
See MALEOL.

Maley, Horace W., an American Methodist
minister, was born in western Pennsylvania in 1819;
was educated at an academy in Butler, Pennsylvania;
was converted in 1819; was licensed to preach and
recommended to the Ohio Conference in 1821, and
was appointed to the Mad River Circuit; in 1822, to
London; in 1823, to Fiqua; in 1824, to White Oak; in 1825,
to Fiqua; in 1826-7, to Union; in 1826-8, to Hillsboro;
in 1832-3, to White Oak; in 1834, to Madison; in 1835,
to New Richmond; in 1836-7, to Milford; in 1838,
to Franklin; in 1839-40, to Germantown; in 1841,
agent for Springfield and Germantown
Academy; in 1842, to Frankfort; in 1843, to Lebanon;
in 1844-5, to Cincinnati City Mission. In 1846 he
attended the Kentucky Conference, M. E. Church South;
in 1846-7, was presiding elder of Covington District;
in 1848 was appointed to Soule Chapel, Cincinnati, Ohio;
the next ten years was supernumerary, and the remain-
der of his life superannuated. He died in Urbana,
Champaign Co., Ohio, Dec. 14, 1866. In his last illness,
though suffering, he was uncomplaining and happy,
and sent his love and greetings to his ministerial associates:
"Tell my brethren of the Kentucky Conference that I
die in the faith, and in full fellowship with the whole
Church, Eastern, Western, North, and South." —Minutes of
Conference, 1867.

Malice is a settled or deliberate determination
to revenge or do hurt to another. It more frequently
denotes the disposition of inferior minds to execute every
purpose of mischief within the more limited circle of
their affilations, and yet it may be a tasteful temper in the
sight of God, strictly forbidden in his holy Word (Col.
ii, 12), disgraceful to rational creatures, and every way
inimical to the spirit of Christianity (Matt. v, 44). See
MALEOL.

Malignity, a disposition obstinately bad or mali-
cious. Malignancy and malignity are words nearly syn-
onymous. In some connections, malignity seems rather
more pertinently applied to a radical depravity of
nature, and malignancy to indications of this depravity
in temper and conduct in particular instances. See
MALEOL.

Mallary, Charles Dutton, D.D., an American
Baptist minister, was born at Poultney, Vermont, Jan.
25, 1801. He graduated at Middlebury College in 1821,
and in 1822 removed to Columbia, South Carolina; was
ordained, and preached six years. He afterwards re-
-sided in Georgia, and was a principal founder of Mercer
University. In the division of the denomination in
1836, on the missionary question, he advocated that sys-
tem. He died July 31, 1864. Dr. Mallary published a
Life of Mercer, and Soul Prosperity.—Drake, Dict. of
Amer. Biog. p. 593.

Malleolus. See HEMMERUS.

Mallac, a town of Asia Minor, whose inhabitants
(Malalac, Vulg. Mallacote, A. V. "they of Mallacot") with
the people of Tarus, revolted from Antiochus Epiphanes
because he had bestowed them on one of his concubines
(2 Macc. iv, 30). The absence of the king from Antioch
did put down the insurrection gave the infamous Mene-
lus, the high-priest, an opportunity of purging some
of the sacred vessels from the Temple of Jerusalem (ver.
32, 39), an act which finally led to the murder of the
good Onias (ver. 54, 85). Mallos was an important city
of Cilicia, lying at the mouth of the Pyramus (Sehun),
on the shore of the Mediterranean, north-east of Cyprus,
and about twenty miles from Tarsus (Tarsos). (See
Smith, Dict. of Chr. G. Geography.)

Mallothi (Hebrew Mallothi, מַלְלָתִּי, perhaps for
Mallothi, Vulg. Mallothi, τοῦ μαλαθίου, one of the fourteen
sons of Hemam the Levite (1 Chron. xxx. 4), and head
of the nineteenth division of Temple musicians as
arranged by David (1 Chron. xxx. 25). R.C. 1014.

Mallows (Mallows, Malloch, salted; Sept. Μάλον,
Vulg. herba) occurs only in the passage where Job com-
plains that he is subjected to the contumely of the mean-
est people, "who cut up swallows by the bushers for their
meat" (Job xxx. 4). The proper meaning of the word malluch has been a subject of considerable
discussion among authors, in consequence, apparently,
of its resemblance to the Greek μαλαχή, signifying
"mallow," and also to mallow, which is said to be the
Syracuse name for the species of Oenothera, or Missouri
mallow. It is difficult, if not impossible, to say which is the more
correct interpretation, as both appear to have some
foundation in truth, and seem equally adapted to the sense of
the above-quoted passage. (See Gesenius, Thesaur.,
Hebr., p. 791.)

Authors apply the description of Dioscor-
MALLOWS

ides to ἱδίκη, a name which in India is applied both to species of Malva rotundifolia and of M. sylvestris, which extend from Europe to the north of India, and which are still used as food in the latter country, as they formerly were in Europe, and probably in Syria. That some kind of mallow has been so used in Syria we have evidence in the quotation made by Mr. Harmer from Biddulph, who says, “We saw many poor people collecting mallows and three-leaved grass, and asked them what they did with it; and they answered, that it was all their food, and that they boiled it, and did eat it.” Dr. Shaw, in his Travels, on the contrary, observes that “Mallow-bush, or mallow-bush, is used, as in the Arabic, is the same with the medelacha or corchorus, being a podded species of mallows, whose pods are rough, of a glutinous substance, and used in most of their dishes. Mallow-bush appears to be little different in name from מִלּוֹע (Job xxx, 4), which we render ‘mallows,’ though some other plant, of a more saltish taste, and less nourishing quality, may be rather intended.” The plant alluded to is Corchorus olitorius, which has been adopted and figured in her Scripture Herbal (p. 255) by lady Calcott, who observes that this plant, called Jews’ Mallow, appears to be certainly that mentioned by the patriarch. Avicenna calls it olos ḫadičem; and Hauswolf saw the Jews about Aleppo use the leaves as potagers; “and this same mallow continues to be eaten in Egypt and Arabia, as well as Palestine.” But there are so many plants of a mild mucilaginous nature which are used as articles of diet in the East, that it is hardly possible to select one in preference to another, unless we find a similarity in the name. Thus species of Amaranthus, of Chenopodium, of Portulaca, as well as the above Corchorus, and the mallow, are all used as food, and might be added as suitable to the above passages, since most of them are found growing wild in many parts of the countries of the East.

The learned Bochart, however, contends (Hieros, part i, t. iii, c. 16) that the word malluah denotes a saltish plant called ḫyếc by the Greeks, and which with good reason is supposed to be the Atriplex halimus of botanists, or tall shrubbery Orache. The Sept., indeed, first gave the name halimus to other interpretation elsewhere. Celsus adopts it (Hierobot. ii, 96 sq.), and many others consider it as the most correct. A good abstract of Bochart’s argument is given by Dr. Harris. In the first place the most ancient Greek translator interprets malluah by ἀλυσία. The Jews were in the habit of eating a plant called by the former name is evident from the quotation given by Bochart from the Talmudical tract Kiddushin (c. iii, 65). By Ibn-Buetar, malšk is given as the synonym of al-luuf al-bahuri, i.e. the sea-alde-

Kutuf or Orache, which is usually considered to be the Atriplex marina, now A. halimus. Bochart, indeed, remarks that Dioscorides describes the halimus as a shrub with branches, destitute of thorns, with a leaf like the olive, but broader, and growing on the seashore. This notice evidently refers to the ḫyếc (Dioscor. i, 121), which, as above stated, is supposed to be the Atriplex halimus of botanists, and the Kutuf bahuri of the Arabs, while the ap̄r̄aqâz̄ of the same author (ii. 145) is their kutuf and Atriplex hortensis, Linnaeus. Bochart quotes Galen as describing the tops of the former as being used for food when young. Dioscorides also says that its leaves are employed for the same purpose. (Comp. Theophrast. Plant. iv, 17; Athen. Deipn. iv, 161; Horace, Ep. i, 12, 7; Pliny, xxii, 55; Tournelot, Traité, i, 41.) What the Arab writers state as to the top of the plants being eaten corresponds to the description of Job, who states that those whom with whom he refers cropped upon the shrub—which by some is supposed to indicate that the malluah grew near hedges. These, however, do not exist in the desert. There is no doubt that species of Orache were used as articles of diet in ancient times, and probably still are so in the countries where they are indigenous; but there are many other plants, similar in nature, that is, soft and succulent, and usually very saline, such as the Solanum, Solanum, which, like the species of Atriplex, belong to the same natural family of Chenopodiaceae, and which, from their saline nature, have received their respective names. Many of these are well known for yielding soda by incineration. In conformity with this, Mr. Good thinks that “the real plant is a species of Solanum, or ‘salt-wort;’ and that the term ḫyếc, employed in the Greek versions, gives additional countenance to this conjecture.” Some of these are shrubry, but most of them are herbaceous, and extremely common in all the dry, desert, and saline soils which extend from the south of Europe to the north of India. Most of them are saline and bitter, but some are milder in taste and mucilaginous, and are therefore employed as articles of diet, as spinach is in Europe. Sal- olis Indicus, for instance, which is common on the coasts of the Peninsula of India, Dr. Roxburgh states, saved the lives of many thousands of the poor natives of India during the famine of 1791-2-3; and, while the plant lasted, most of the poorer classes who lived near the sea had little else to eat; and, indeed, its green leaves ordi-

Jews’ Mallow (Corchorus olitorius).

Sen-parslane (Atriplex halimus).
interpretations, see Rosenmuller (ad loc. Job). Mr. Tristram (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 466) decides in favor of the former hypothesis (Atrapez Altamaze), which he says grows abundantly on the shores of the Mediterranean, in salt marshes, and also on the shores of the Dead Sea still more luxuriantly. We found chicklets of it of considerable extent on the west side of the sea, and it exclusively supplied us with fuel for many days. In one place there was a dense growth of ten feet—more than double its size on the Mediterranean. It forms a dense mass of thin twigs without thorns, has a very minute purple flower close to the stem, and small, thick, sour-tasting leaves, which could be eaten, as is the Atrapez kormatis, or Garden Orache, but which would be very unpalatable food.

Mallonach. See Malloows.

Malkuch (Heb. Malkuk, γάλακτος, reigned over, or from the Syr. a counsellor), the name of several men.


2. (Sept. Maláq, Vulg. Maloch.) An Israelite of the descendants of Ithamar (or residents of Jerusalem) who pronounced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra xix, 29). B.C. 450.

3. (Sept. Maláq, Vulg. Maloch.) Another Israelite of the descendants (or residents) of Harim, who did the same (Ezra xix, 32). B.C. 459.

4. (Sept. Maláq, Vulg. Maloch.) One of the priests who carried away from Babylon with Zerubbabel ( Neh. xii, 4). B.C. 536. The associated names would appear to indicate that he was the same with one of those who signed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 4); although that would imply a very advanced age. B.C. cir. 410. He is probably the same with the son of Jonathan, elsewhere called Malach (Neh. xii, 14, 12, 17, 5). Sept. Maláq, Vulg. Maloch.


Malmesbury, William of, an English monastic and historian of the early period of his country’s history, was born near the close of the 11th century, probably in Somersetshire, was educated at Oxford, and afterwards entered the Benedictine monastery whence he derived his name, and of which he became librarian. He died some time after 1142, but the exact date is not known. He wrote (in Latin) De Gestis Regnum, a history of the kings of England from the Saxons to the Saxon Chronicle, extant from the twenty-sixth year of Henry I (translated into English by the Rev. John Sharpe [ Lond. 1815]; also in Bohn’s Library, edited by Dr. Giles [1847]):—Histoire Novelee, extending from the twenty-sixth year of Henry I to the escape of the empress Maud from Oxford; and De Gestis Pontificum, containing an account of the bishops and principal monasteries of England from the conversion of Ethelbert of Kent by St. Augustine to 1123:—Antiquitates Glastonbury, and Life of St. Wulstan (printed in Wharton’s Anglia Saevra). Malmesbury gives proof in its writings of great diligence, good sense, modesty, and a genuine love of truth. His style is much above that of his contemporaries. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. (v. William of Malmesbury); Lond. Quart. Rev. 1856 (Jan.), p. 290 sq.; Hoefer, Noue. Biog. Génér. (v.); Chambers, Cyclopædia, s. v.

Malo, Jean Baptiste, a Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Yper; studied theology at the University of Louvain, where in 1655 he became a professor; in 1684 was made bishop of Bruges, and died March 23, 1684. He wrote La lecture de la Ste. Bible en langue vulgaire (Louv. 1846, 2 vols. 8vo). His brother Jule is the author of Recherches sur le véritable auteur du livre de l’Inspiration de Jesus-Christ (Louv. 1848).

Malta. See Melita.

Malta, Knights of. See Knighthood; Temp. Plaas.

Malvenda, Thomas, a learned Spanish exegete, was born at Nativa in 1566, and entered the Dominican convent of Lombay in 1582. A good Latin, Greek, and Hebrew scholar, he now applied his philosophical talents to the study of the diviner texts of the Bible, at the same time devoting much attention also to dogmatics and to ecclesiastical history. In 1585 he wrote a treatise to prove that St. Anna was only once married, and that St. Joseph always held fast to the rule of abstinence. From 1586 to 1610 he taught for philosophy, and afterwards theology. In 1600 he addressed to cardinal Baronius a memoir on some parts of the Annales ecclesiastici, and of the Martyrologium Romanum, which he deemed incorrect. Baronius, struck by the knowledge exhibited in this memoir, called Malvenda to Rome, where the general of his order interceded with the correcting
of the breviary, the missal, and the martyrology of the Dominicans. This work was completed in 1608. The congregation of the Index then submitted to him for revision the Bibliotheca Patrum of La Vigne (Par. 1575, 1589, 9 vols. fol.). His critical annotations on this work appeared at Rome in 1607, and were afterwards published together with the Biblioth. Patr. (Paris, 1609, 1634). Although in the meantime he commenced the collected ordinas ordinis fratrum predicatrorum, which he never completed; the existing fragment, extending over a period of thirty years, was subsequently published by Gravina (Naples, 1627, 2 vols. fol.). In 1616 Malveda was recalled to Spain where the grand inquisitor appointed him a member of the congregation of indexes librorum prohibitorum. He died at Valencia in 1628. His principal work, to which the later years of his life were devoted, was a literal translation of the Bible, with commentaries; he was unable to finish it, and left it at the 18th chapter of Ezekiel (published in this incomplete state by the general of the Dominicans, under title Commentaria in sacram Scripturam una cum notis de verbo ad verbum ex Hebraeo translatione, variisque lectionibus [Lyons, 1650, 5 vols. fol.]). The translation is so literal as to be very inelegant and sometimes unintelligible. The notes are more or less unmetrical, and though perhaps valuable at the time, are now considered unimportant. Among his other works, which are very numerous, we notice Libri nomen de Antichristo (Rome, 1604, often reprinted) — Commentaria in Paradisi apokalypsis (Rome, 1605, 4 to) — De Mortis (Samarganda, 1618, 8vo). A complete list of his works is given in Quetif and Escorial, Scriptores ordinis predicatrorum, ii, 454 sq. See Antonio, Bibliotheca nova, vol. ii. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop., viii, 771; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxiii, 122; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, xx, 806. (J. N. P.)

Mamachi, Thomas Antia, a distinguished Dominican, was born on the island of Chilo de, 3, 1819; was brought to Italy when yet a youth, and joined the Dominicans. He became professor of theology at Florence, and in 1740 was called to Rome as a member of the college of the Propaganda. Benedict XIV made him a doctor of divinity, and appointed him member of the congregation of the Index, of which he became secretary in 1778. Under Pius VI he was appointed Magister palatii. He died in 1792, at Corneto, near Montefiascone. His principal works are Ad Joh. D. Manum de ratione temporum Athonitiorum deque aliquot Synodi earum celebratioribus Annales (Rome, 1740), against the schismatics, who, in his De episcopo conciliorum Sardicae et Sinasii, ceterumque in causa Arianorum, hoc occasione simul rerum pontificalium S. Athenarian Chronicologiam restituit (Leure, 1740), asserted, contrary to general opinion, that the Church of Constantinople was held in 511,1011, that the return of Athenasius to Alexandria took place in 846. His Origines et antiquitates Christianorum Lib. xx (Rom. 1749-55), of which only five books, however, was completed, is a very important work, holding the same position among the Roman Catholics as Bingham's Origins ecclesiastici among the Protestants; it is written in view of the later work, which it often attempts to refute. De Costumi de primitivi Christiani libri tres (Rome, 1758; Venice, 1757) is an interesting work on the early ages of Christianity, and contains some valuable and curious information. Epistolarum ad Justiniun Febronius, de ratione regendi Christiani rei publicae, deque legitima Romani Pontificia potestate, Liber primus (Rom. 1776), in answer to Justinius Febronius's (J. N. von Honthoven, q. v.) De statu Ecclesie et legitima potestate Romani Pontificis liber singularius, etc. (Bollonii, 1765), is but a weak production compared to that which it attacked. See Noue theol. Bibliothek, iv, 392 sq.; Acta historicos-eclesiasticae nostri temporis, xxxix, 888; Gottgerget. Anstredg. 1757, p. 1189 sq.; 1759, p. 595; Richard et Giraud, Bibliotheque sacrée. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxix, 29; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, viii, 772; Pierer, Universal-lexikon, x, 806.

Mamad'as (Zapaia, Vulg. Samae), given 1 (Edr. viii, 14) in place of the Shamalai (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Exx. viii, 10).

Mamass, a town of the Roman Church, a native of Paphlagonia, flourished in the 5th century. He was born in prison, his mother, Russia, having been arrested on account of her adherence to Christianity. He was brought up by a Christian widow named Amma, and while a boy was already consecrated for his faith, but conducted herself with great discretion. He subsequently became a hermit. He succeeded the Bishop of Cesarina, and died a martyr in 274. He is commemorated on the 17th of August. Mamass was highly honored in the ancient church. Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, and Walafrid Strabo make mention of him. See C. Baronii Mystagogiae Romanae (Moguntiae, 1603), p. 202, 213; R. Huyert, Acta primorum Martirum (Amst. 1713), p. 264 sqq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, viii, 774. (J. N. P.)

Mamertus, St., archbishop of Vienna, was a brother of Claudianus Ecodius Mamertus [see Claudianus], author of the celebrated work De statu animae. St. Mamertus is especially known for having, on the occasion of a great fire, and other accidents which befell the city of Vienna, instituted the Rogations, i.e. penitential prayers for the three days preceding the ascension. Baronius, in his Martyrologium Romanum (Moguntiae, 1603), p. 255 sq. and 256, denies that Mamertus was the founder of these rogations, claiming that they were an old institution which had fallen into disuse, and which he merely revised. Bingham in his Origins eccles. (iii, 80 sq. v. 29), subsequently took the same view. However, it is certain that the example of Mamertus induced the Council of Orleans, in 511, to introduce the rogations throughout France. They were subsequently adopted by the whole Western Church, by order of Gregory the Great, in 591. Mamertus is generally believed to have died in 475. He is commemorated on the 11th of May. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, viii, 774; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxiii, 159; Pierer, Universal-lexikon, x, 748.

Mamertus, Claudianus. See Claudianus.

Mamme, Julia. See Severus, Alexander.

Mammiarians, the name of a branch of the Asabantae which arose in Harlern, Holland. Its origin is as follows. A young man having taken undue liberties with a young woman whom he intended to marry, was accused of it before the Church; the church authorities, however, did not agree on the subject, some desiring to expel the offender from their society, and others opposing so severe a measure. This caused a separation, and those who were on the young man's side were visited by their opponents with the reproachful name of Mammiarians (from the French femelle, a woman's breast). See Bayle, Dict. Historique, s. v.; Micrelius, Syntag. Hist. Eccl. (ed. 1679) p. 1018; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, viii, 774.

Mam'mon (μαμών), or μαμώνας, from the Chald. μαμών or μαμώνας, that in which one trusts; see Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. col. 1217 sqq.), a term pre-eminent, by a technical and invidious usage (see Suidas in his lex. s. v.), "signifying wealth or riches, and bearing that sense in Luke xvi. 9, 11; but also used by our Saviour (Matt. vi. 24; Luke vii. 18) as a personification of the god of riches: 'Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.' Gill, on Matt. vi. 24, brings a very apt quotation from the Slavonic Hieros. (Rom. fol. 88) in confirmation of the character which Christ in these passages gives of the Jews in his day: 'We know that they believed in the law, and took care of the commandments, and of the tithes, and that their whole conversation was good-only that they loved the Mammon, and hated one another, and never cared for the word which Christ spake in the Chaldee Targums of Onkelos, and later writers, and in the Syriac Version, in the sense of riches.' This meaning of the word is given by Tetirall, Ad. Marc. iv. 38, and by Augustine and Jerome commenting on Matthew. Augustine adds that it was in use as a Dunic, and Jerome adds that it was a Syriac.
word. There is no reason to suppose that any hol
received divine honors in the East under this name. It is used in Matthew as a personification of riches. The derivation of the word is discussed by A. Pflüger, _Opera_, p. 474. The phrase "mammon of unrighteous
" as used in Luke xvi, 9, probably refers to gain which is too much unjustly acquired (see the public
sins), but which may be sanctified by charity and piety so as to become a passport, in some sense, to final bless
ness. See Grubenberg, _De mammona iniquitatis_ (Jen. 1700); Wukinis, _De m. d. d. i. i. c_. (Jen. 1701). In Rab
binical language the word is used to denote confidence.

_Mammoniāni_. E.g. (Mammoniāniouς v. _Mamono
_). Matthew, given (1 Exod. ix, 84) for corruption for the two names "Mathanani, Mannaiona" of the Heb. list (Ezra x, 87).

Mam(o)mon, A1, Abra-Andallah, a celebrated Musulman ruler, was born at Bagdad in A.D. 786; was the son of Hamanu-al-Maschid; and ascended the throne as the seventh Abbaside caliph in 818. By his deter
mination to enforce the heretical doctrine that the Ko
was created and not eternal, he became very unpopular among the Moslem doctors and gave strength to the house of All. See _MOHAMMEDANISM_; _MOHAMMED
_.

Mammon was a patron of science and liter
and is praised by Eastern critics for his talents and liberality. His capital, Bagdad, was in the day of the great centre of the world of learning and science. He died in 838. See Weil, _Gesch. d. Chalifen_, II, chap. vii; Hammer-Purgstall, _Literaturgesch. d. Araber_.

Mam' re (Heb. Mam're, מַמְרֶה, fath.; Sept. Μαμ
βρίχ; Josephus_ _Μαμπρίχ, Am. i, 10, 2; Vulg. Mambr.), the name of an Amoritish chief who, with his brothers Aner and Eschol, was in alliance with Abraham (Gen. xvii, 24). B.C. cir. 2000. In the Jewish traditions he appears as encouraging Abraham to undergo the covenant from which his brothers would have dissa
ed him, by a reference to the deliverance he had already experienced from far greater trials—the furnace of Nimrod and the sword of Chedorlaomer (Beek, _Leben Abrahami_, p. 36). Hence (בַּמְרֵה, Sept. Μαμβρίχ, _Mambr_., in the Auth. Vera., "the oaks of Mamre," "plain of Mamre" (Gen. xxiii, 18; xviii, 1), or simply "Mam're" (xxiii, 17; xxxv, 27), a grove in the neighbor
of Hebron. It was here that Abraham first dwelt after the call. (Gen. xiv, 13; Rev. iv, 11). The divine an
engaged him with the warning of Sodom's fate (Gen. xvii, 1); it was in the cave of the field opposite this place that he deposited the remains of Sarah (Gen. xxiii, 17, 19); where he himself was buried (Gen. xix, 4). He was the Jacob (Gen. xlix, 20; i, 13). In later times the spot is said to have been visited by several Jews from Hebron, still marked by a reputedly sacred tersebith (Joseph. War, iv, 9, 7; Eusebius, _Prap. Eran_., v, 9; Sozomen, _Hist. Eccl._, i, 18; Eusebius, _Onomast., s. v._ "Apyv_, Aroboe); and later travellers likewise (Samuel, _Trav. Fèid._, ii, 14, 3, in the _Gesta Dei per Francem_, i, 248; Troilo, _Trav., p. 418_ speaking of a very venerable tree of this kind near the ruins of a church at Hebron (see _Reeland, Palaest._, p. 712 sq.). Dr. Robinson found here, at a place called Ramet el-Khalil, one hour distant from Hebron, some ancient remains, which he regards (in accordance with the local tradition) as probably marking the site of Abraham's sepulchre (Rechesarches, i, 318). He saw the venerable oak near Hebron which still passes with the Mohammedans for the tree under which Abra
pitched his tent (Rechesarches, ii, 429), but which he accepted as a tempe (ib. 443). See _Oak_. Accordin
Schwartz, "North of Hebron, and sideward from Halhul, is a plain about two and one half miles in length, which the Arabs call Elon, no doubt the ancient dwell
place of Abraham" ( _Palestine_, p. 109). See He

Mam' re, "Mamre is stated to have been at Hebron, for we read that Isaac came unto Isaac's father, to Mam
re, to Kirjath-Aresh, which is Hebron, where Abraham and Isaac sojourned ( 27). The relative positions

of Machpeleh and Mamre are also described with great exactness. Five times Moses states that Machpeleh lay
before Mamre ( 27; Sept. _dariwiari; Vulg. _una respeciende_); which may mean either that it was to the east of Mamre, or that it lay facing it. The latter seems to be the true meaning. Machpeleh is situated on the shelving bank of a little valley, and probably the oak
of Mamre stood on the other side of the valley, facing the cave, while the town of Hebron lay a little farther up to the north-west (comp. xxii, 17, 19; xxi, 9; xlix, 20; i, 13). The identity of Machpeleh with the modern Haram being established (see Machpe
there can be little difficulty in fixing the posi
of Mamre with certainty. Mammon was a patron of science and liter
and is praised by Eastern critics for his talents and liberality. His capital, Bagdad, was in the day of the great centre of the world of learning and science. He died in 838. See Weil, _Gesch. d. Chalifen_, II, chap. vii; Hammer-Purgstall, _Literaturgesch. d. Araber_.

Mam' re (Heb. Mam're, מַמְרֶה, fath.; Sept. Μαμβρίχ; Josephus_ _Μαμβρίχ, Am. i, 10, 2; Vulg. Mambr_), the name of an Amoritish chief who, with his brothers Aner and Eschol, was in alliance with Abraham (Gen. xvii, 24). B.C. cir. 2000. In the Jewish traditions he appears as encouraging Abraham to undergo the covenant from which his brothers would have dissa
ed him, by a reference to the deliverance he had already experienced from far greater trials—the furnace of Nimrod and the sword of Chedorlaomer (Beek, _Leben Abrahami_, p. 36). Hence (בַּמְרֵה, Sept. Μαμβρίχ, _Mambr_., in the Auth. Vera., "the oaks of Mamre," "plain of Mamre" (Gen. xxiii, 18; xviii, 1), or simply "Mam're" (xxiii, 17; xxxv, 27), a grove in the neighbor
of Hebron. It was here that Abraham first dwelt after the call. (Gen. xiv, 13; Rev. iv, 11). The divine an
engaged him with the warning of Sodom's fate (Gen. xvii, 1); it was in the cave of the field opposite this place that he deposited the remains of Sarah (Gen. xxiii, 17, 19); where he himself was buried (Gen. xix, 4). He was the Jacob (Gen. xlix, 20; i, 13). In later times the spot is said to have been visited by several Jews from Hebron, still marked by a reputedly sacred tersebith (Joseph. War, iv, 9, 7; Eusebius, _Prap. Eran_., v, 9; Sozomen, _Hist. Eccl._, i, 18; Eusebius, _Onomast., s. v._ "Apyv_, Aroboe); and later travellers likewise (Samuel, _Trav. Fèid._, ii, 14, 3, in the _Gesta Dei per Francem_, i, 248; Troilo, _Trav., p. 418_ speaking of a very venerable tree of this kind near the ruins of a church at Hebron (see _Reeland, Palaest._, p. 712 sq.). Dr. Robinson found here, at a place called Ramet el-Khalil, one hour distant from Hebron, some ancient remains, which he regards (in accordance with the local tradition) as probably marking the site of Abraham's sepulchre (Rechesarches, i, 318). He saw the venerable oak near Hebron which still passes with the Mohammedans for the tree under which Abra
pitched his tent (Rechesarches, ii, 429), but which he accepted as a tempe (ib. 443). See _Oak_. Accordin
Schwartz, "North of Hebron, and sideward from Halhul, is a plain about two and one half miles in length, which the Arabs call Elon, no doubt the ancient dwell
place of Abraham" ( _Palestine_, p. 109). See He

Mam' re, "Mamre is stated to have been at Hebron, for we read that Isaac came unto Isaac's father, to Mam
re, to Kirjath-Aresh, which is Hebron, where Abraham and Isaac sojourned ( 27). The relative positions

the great Haram, which covers the cave of Machpeleh (Stanley, _Leyden_, p. 166 sq.; Hitter, _Pal._, and _Syri._, iii, 222 sq.). The tradition which identified Mamre with Ramet el-Khull may have originated in the existence of a grove of venerable oaks on that spot, just as now the great oak a mile or more west of the town is called "Abraham's Oak." ( _Fortier, Hanbok_, i, 70)." See _Abraham_.

Mam'ru'hus (Μαμπρούς, Vulg. Malechnas), given (1 Exod. ix, 20) by corruption for _Malluch_ (q. v.) of the Heb. list (Ezra x, 29).

Man is the rendering mostly of four Hebrew and two Greek words in the English Version. They are used with as much precision as the terms of like import in other languages. Nor is the subject merely critical; it will be found connected with accurate interpretation. In our treatment of the subject we shall supplement what we have stated under the article Adam.

1. _Adam, adam_, is used in several senses. (a.) It is the proper name of the first man, though Gesenius thinks that when so applied it has the force rather of an appellative, and that, accordingly, in a translation, it would be better to render it the man. It seems, however, to be so used by Luke as a proper name in the genealogy (iii, 38), by Paul (Rom. v, 14; 1 Tim. ii, 13, 14), and by Jude (ver. 14). Paul's use of it in 1 Cor. xv, 45 is remarka
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bly clear: "the first man Adam." It is so employed throughout the Apocalypse without exception (2 Esdr. iii, 6, 10, 21, 26; iv, 30; vi, 54; vii, 11, 46, 48; Tobit viii, 6; Ecles. xxxiii, 10; xi, 1; xlxi, 16), and by Josephus (ut infra). Gesenius argues that, as applied to the name of the article above without exception, it is doubtless often thus used as an appellative, but the exceptions are decisive: Gen. iii, 17, "to Adam he said," and see Sept., Deut. xxxii, 8, "the descendants of Adam;" if I covered my transgressions as Adam (Job xxxi, 28), "and unto Adam he said," etc. (Job xxxi, 28). Gesenius, moreover, examined the context, and seems to refer to a primeval revelation not recorded in Genesis (see also Hos. vi, 7, Heb., or margin). Gesenius further argues that the woman has an appropriate name, but that the man has none. But the name Eve was given to her by Adam, but, as it would seem, under a change of circumstances; and though the divine origin of the word Adam, as a proper name of the first man, is not recorded in the history of the creation, as is that of the day, night, heaven, earth, seas, etc. (Gen. i, 5, 8, 10), yet its divine origin as an appellative is recorded (comp. Hel., Gen. i, 26; v, 1); from which state it soon came a proper name. Dr. Lee thinks from its frequent occurrence, but we would suggest, from its peculiar appropriateness to the "man," who is the more immediate image and glory of God (1 Cor. xi, 7). Other derivations of the word have been offered, as עִם, "to be red" or "red-haired," and hence some of the rabbinists have inferred that the nation was so called. The derivation as old is that of Josephus, who says that "the first man was called Adam because he was formed from the red earth," and adds, "for the true virgin earth is of this color." (Ant. i, 1, 2). The following is a simple translation of the more detailed (Hebrew) account given by Moses: Gen. ii, 4, 7, 18-25, of the creation of the first human pair, omitting the paragraph concerning the garden of Eden. See COSMOGONY.

This (the) genealogy of the heavens and the earth, when the day and night, the heaven and earth, the sea and the land were made, in such a way that Jehovah God made earth and heavens. Now no shrub of the field had yet been [grown] on the earth, and no plant of the field had yet sprung up—for Jehovah God had not yet caused it to rain upon the earth, nor was there any man to till the ground, but only the seven days of creation. Then Jehovah God formed the man, dust from the ground, and blew into his nostrils the breath of life; and that man became a living creature.

But Jehovah God said, "[It is] not good (that) the man be alone; I will make him a helper fit for him." Now Jehovah God had formed from the ground every living (thing) of the field, and every bird of the heavens; and Jehovah God brought them before the man to see what he would call it; so whatever the man called it (as a) living creature, that was [its] name; thus the man gave names to all the beasts of the field and to the fowl of the heavens, and Jehovah God gave to every living (thing) of the field; yet for man (there was) not found a helper as his counterpart. Then Jehovah God caused a lethargy to fall upon the man, so he slept; and he took one of his ribs, but closed flesh instead of it; and Jehovah God built the rib which he took from the man for a woman, and brought her towards the man. Thenupon the man said, "This now [is] bone from my bones, and flesh from my flesh; this (being) shall be called Woman (אשה, viril), because from man (אשה, vir) this (person) was taken; therefore will a man leave his father and his mother and cling to his wife; and they shall become one flesh." Now they were both of them naked, the man and his wife; yet they were not mutually ashamed (of their condition).

It is the generic name of the human race as originally created, and afterwards, like the English word man, person, whether man or woman, equivalent to the Latin homo and Greek ἄνθρωπος (Gen. i, 26, 27; v, 2; vii, 21; Deut. iii, 24; iv, 18, 16; Rom. xii, 5, 20, 20; 1 Cor. xii, 10), and even without regard to age (John xvi, 21). It is applied to people only, the "human persons or women" (Numb. xxxi, 35, Sept. ἄνθρωπος ἄνδρων ἀπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν). Thus is ἄνθρωπος means a woman (Herod. i, 84); a man (Exod. xvi, 12; Acts xiii, 18); a person (Acts xv, 2). It is a Hebrew word present in the Hebrew text of the original manuscripts of the Old Testament (Acts i, 28). (c) It denotes man in opposition to woman (Gen. iii, 12; Matt. xii, 10), though more properly, the husband in opposition to the wife (compare 1 Cor. vii, 1). It is, though used very rarely, for those who maintain the dignity of human nature, a man, as we say, meaning one that deserves the name, like the Latin vir and Greek ἄνδρας: "One man in a thousand have I found, but a woman," etc. (Eccles. vii, 29). Perhaps the word was first applied to the original gender, as in the context: Ps. xi, 1, 2, 8; xiv, 2, etc. The latter passage is often adduced to prove the total depravity of the whole human race, whereas it applies only to the more abandoned Jews, or possibly to the more wicked Gentile adversaries of Israel. It is a description of the "fool," or wicked man (ver. 1), and of persons of the same class (ver. 1, 2), "the workers of iniquity, who eat up God's people like bread, and called not upon the name of the Lord" (ver. 4).

For the true view of Paul's quotations from this psalm (Rom. iii, 10), see McKnight, ad loc.; and observe the use of the word man in Luke v, 20; Matt. x, 17. It is applied to the Gentiles (Matt. xxvii, 22; comp. Mark x, 33, and Mark ix, 31; Luke xvii, 32; see Montesinos, ad Deutomath. Phil. i, 221). (f) The word is used to denote other men, in opposition to those already named, "and a brother of his and other men" (Gen. viii, 20), i.e. the Egyptians. "Like other men" (Ps. lxxxii, 5), i.e. common men, in opposition to better men (Ps. lxxxii, 7); men of inferior rank, as opposed to עִם, men of higher rank (see Hebrew, Isa. ii, 9; v, 15: Ps. liii, 2; liii, 10; Prov. viii, 4). The phrase "son of man," in the Old Testament, denotes man as frail and unworthy (Numb. xxviii, 19; Job xxv, 6; Ezek. ii, 1, 8); as applied to the prophet, so often, it has the force of "O mortal!"

2. עִם, ish, is a man in the distinguished sense, like the Latin vir and Greek ἄνδρας. It is used in all the several senses of the Latin vir, and denotes a man as distinguished from a woman (1 Sam. xvii, 53; Matt. xxiv, 21); as a husband (Gen. iii, 16; Hos. ii, 16); and in reference to excellent mental qualities. A beautiful instance of the latter class occurs in Jer. v, 1. "Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and see the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man, if there be any that executeth judgment, that seeketh the truth; and I will pardon," etc. This reminds the reader of the philosopher who went through the streets of Athens with a lighted lamp in his hand, and being asked what he sought, said, "I am seeking to find a man" (see Herodot. ii, 120; Homer, Il, 259). A man of this sort (Prov. viii, 4; Ps. cxii, 4, etc.), a courtier (Jer. xxxvii, 7), the male of animals (Gen. vii, 2). Sometimes it means men in general (Exod. xxvi, 29; Mark v, 44).

3. עִשְׂפָן, mosh, mortals, בּוֹרֵית, as transient, perishable, liable to sickness, etc. - "Let not man [margin, "mortal man"] prevail against thee" (2 Chron. xiv, 11).

"Write with the pen of the common man" (Isa. viii, 1). This is in my heart, even from the days of my youth, and of my inheritance, among the nations, among the sons of the east. (Isa. viii, 5; ix, 19, 90; Isa. ii, 7; Ps. ciii, 15). It is applied to women (Josh. viii, 26).

4. גֶּבֶר, vir, man, in regard to strength, etc. All etymologists concur in deriving the English word "man" from the superlative powers and faculties with which man is endowed above all earthly creatures; so the Latin, vir, and Greek ἄνδρας. In the Hebrew text of the original manuscripts of the Old Testament it is applied to man as distinguished from woman: "A man shall not put on a woman's garment" (Deut. xxii, 5), like ἄνδρας in Matt. vii, 9; John i, 6; to men as distinguished from children (Exod. xvi, 16; Acts xxv, 21); to a male (Job iii, 5; Sept. ἄνδρας). It is much used in poetry: "Happy is the man" (Ps. xxxiv, 9; xi, 5; iii, 9; xxiv, 12). Sometimes it denotes the species at large
MAN.

MAN'asheh (Mawasip, prop. i. q. Menahem; comp. Mawasips, Josephus, Antiq. xi. 11, 1), a Christian teacher at Antioch, who had been educated with Herod Antipas (Acts xiii. 1; see Kuttalos, ad loc.). A.D. 44. He was evidently a Jew, but nothing else is known of him beyond this passage, in which the epithet πορφοφός may mean either πορφυράττω (Herod was brought up, however, at Rome, Josephus, Antiq. xvii. 1, 8) or faster-brother, as having the same nurse (see Walch, D. G. Hist. c. 201). Some identify him with the person above named by Josephus, others with a Menahem mentioned in the Talmud (see Lightfoot, Harm. of N. T. Test. ad loc.), but in either case on very slender grounds.

MANAGERS, a committee of members appointed annually in many Presbyterian churches, intrusted with all merely secular affairs as to property and finance.

MAN'ath (Heb. Manna'ath, פַּנָּח, rest), the name of a man and of a place.

1. (Sept. Mavoscyd.) The second named of the five sons of Shobal, the son of Seir the Horite (Gen. xxxvi. 23; 1 Chron. i. 40), B.C. cir. 1297.

2. (Sept. Mavoscyd v. r. Mavoscydi.) A town of Shobal's tribe, whose descent is traced to Esau, of the tribe of Benjamin, appear to have been expelled from Geba by an act of his father Bela (1 Chron. viii. 6), the context would seem to indicate some locality in the land of Moab. See SHAHARAIM. Some refer it to the Ma'nuchah of Judah (Judg. ix. 46, A. V., with ease; comp. 1 Chron. vii. 52, 54), but with little probability. See MARCENARIUS.

MAN'athite (1 Chron. ii. 59). See HATTI-HAMMУNACHOTH.

MAN'asu'sis (Mawasips v. r. Mawasips, Vulg. Manasses), given (1 Esdr. ix. 81) in place of the Manasseh (q. v.), 4, of the Hebrew list (Ezra x. 30).

Manas'asch (Heb. Menashshēh, מֶנָּשֶׁה, who makes to forget; see Gen. xxii. 51; Sept. Josephus, and N.T. Marka'sis; “Manassas” in Matt. i. 10; Rev. vii. 6), the name of four men and of a tribe descended from one of them; also of another man mentioned by Josephus.

1. The elder of the two sons of Joseph, born in Egypt (Gen. xxii. 51; xlvi. 20) of Asenath, the priest's daughter of Heliopolis. B.C. 1882. He was afterwards, together with his brother, adopted by Jacob as his own (xlviii. 1), by which act he became the head of a tribe in Israel. B.C. 1856. See JACOBS. The act of adoption was, however, accompanied by a clear intimation from Jacob that the descendants of Manasseh, although the elder, would be far less numerous and powerful than those of the younger brother. The result corresponded rather with this intimation. See EPHRAIM. He married a Syrian concubine, by whom he had several children (1 Chron. vii. 14). See MACAH. The only thing subsequently recorded of him personally is that his grandchildren were “brought up on Joseph's knees” (Gen. i. 28). The ancient Jewish traditions are, however, less reticent. According to them Manasseh was the steward of Joseph's house, and the interpreter who intervened between Joseph and his brethren at their interview; and the extraordinary strength which he displayed in the struggle of Simeon first caused Judah to suspect that the apparent Egyptians were really his own flesh and blood (see Targums Jerusalem and Pseudojohon. on Gen. xlii. 23; xliii. 15; also the quotations in Weis's Bibl. Legends, p. 68, note).

MANASSEH, THOUGHT OF.—On the prophetic benediction of Jacob, above referred to, although Manasseh, as the representative of his future lineage, had, like his great-uncle Esaü, lost his birthright in favor of his younger brother, he received, as Esaü had, a blessing only inferior to the birthright itself. Like his brother, he was to increase with the fertility of the fish which swarmed in the great Egyptian stream, to “become a people, and also to be great”—the “thousands of Manas-
Nh no less than those of Ephraim, indeed more, were

to become a proverb in the nation; his name, no less

than that of Ephraim, was to be the symbol and the ex-

pression of the richest blessings for his kindred.

The position of the tribe of Manasseh during the

march to Canaan was with Ephraim and Benjamin on

the west side of the sacred tent. The standard of the

three sons of Rachel was the figure of a boy, with the

inscription "The cloud of Jehovah rested on them un-

til they went forth out of the camp" (Targ. Pseudojon.

on Numb. ii. 18). The chief of the tribe at the time of

the census at Sinai was Gamaliel ben-Pedahurah, and its

numbers were then 52,200 (Numb. i. 10, 35; ii. 20, 21;

vii. 51-55). The numbers of Ephraim were at the same

date 40,500. Forty years later, on the banks of the Jordan,

these proportions were reversed. Manasseh had then

increased to 52,700, while Ephraim had diminished to

52,500 (Numb. xxvi, 34, 37). On this occasion it is

remarkable that Manasseh resumes its position in its

catalogue as the eldest son of Joseph. Possibly this is

due to the prowess which the tribe had shown in the

conquest of Gilead, for Manasseh was certainly at this

time the most distinguished of all the tribes. Of the three

who had elected to remain on that side of the Jordan,

Reuben and Gad had chosen their lot because the country

was suitable to their pastoral possessions and
tendencies. But Machir, Jair, and Nobah, the sons of

Manasseh, were no shepherds. They were pure war-

riors, who had taken the most prominent part in the

conquest of those provinces which up to that time had

been conquered, and whose deeds are constantly referred

to (Numb. xxxvi, 39; Deut. iii. 13, 14, 15) with credit

and renown. "Jair, the son of Manasseh, took all the

tract of Argob... sixty great cities" (Deut. iii. 14, 4).

"Nobah took Kenath and the daughter-towns thereof,

and called it after his own name" (Numb. xxxvi, 42).

"Beauss: Machir was a man of war, therefore he had

Gilead and Bashan" (Josh. xvii, 1). The district which

these ancient warriors conquered was among the most
difficult, if not the most difficult, in the whole country.

It embraced the hills of Gilead, with their inaccessible

heights and impassable ravines, and the almost imper-

nible tract of Argob, which derives its modern name of

Lejah from the secure "asylum" it affords to those who

take refuge within its natural fortifications. Had they

not remained in those wild and inaccessible districts, but
gone forward and taken their lot with the rest, who

shall say what changes might not have occurred in the

history of the nation, through the presence of such en-

ergic and warlike characters as are here mentioned, in the

eminence whom we can with certainty identify as Man-

nasses, such as Gideon and Jephthah—for Elijah and

others may with equal probability have belonged to the

neighboring tribe of Gad—were among the most re-

markable characters that Israel produced. And Josue,

in giving the list of the judges of the land of "seven

children of Israel other than those of the tribe of

Benjamin, that established hereditary monarchy in their own line" (Stanley, S. and P. P. c. 230). But, with the one exception of Gideon, the warlike tendencies of Manasseh seem to have been confined to the east of the Jordan. There they threw exceedingly, pushing their way northward over the rich plains of Jaulin and Jezreel—the Gaala-
nitias and Itureas of the Roman period—to the foot of Mount Hermon (1 Chron. x, 23). At the time of the

coronation of David at Hebron, while the western Manas-

seh sent 18,000, and Ephraim itself 20,000, the easter-

n Manasseh, under Zelobaph and Reuben, sent a

number of 120,000, thoroughly armed—a remarkable
demonstration of strength, still more remarkable when

we remember the fact that Saul's house, with the great

Abner at its head, was then residing at Mahanaim, on

the banks of the Jordan, under the command of Gilead and

outwardly prosperous, a similar fate awaited them in

the end to that which befell Gad and Reuben; they

gradually assimilated themselves to the old inhabitants

of the country—they "transgressed against the God of

their fathers, and went a-woring after the gods of the

people of the land, whom the Lord destroyed before them" (ver. 25). They relinquished, too, the settled mode

of life and the definite limits which beset the members

of a federal nation, and gradually became Bedouins of

the wilderness, spreading themselves over the vast de-

tails which lay between the allotted possessions of their

tribe and the Ephraimites, and which had from time

immortal been the hunting-grounds and pastures of the

wild Hagarites, of Jetur, Nephib, and Nodab (1 Chron.

v. 19, 22). On them first descended the punishment

which was ordained to be the inevitable consequence of

such wrongdoing. They, first of all Israel, were carried

away by Puil and Tgath-Pisbes, and settled in the As-

eyran territories (ver. 26). The connection, however,

between east and west had been kept up to a certain de-

gree. In Bethhean, the most easterly city of the ci-

ty-Judah, Manasseh, on the two portions all the

wealth of which had fallen into the hands of the

pro-

inces were there for all matters sacred and secular (1 Chron.

xxvi, 32); and Solomon's commis-

nariat officer, Ben-Geber, ruled over the towns of Jair

and the whole district of Argob (1 Kings iv, 13), and

transmitted their productions, doubtless not without

their people, to the court of Jerusalem.

The genealogies of the tribe are preserved in Numb.

xxvi, 28-34; Josh. xvii, 1, etc.; and 1 Chron vii, 14-18.

But it seems impossible to unravel these so as to accu-

rately, for instance, which of the families remained east of

Jordan, and which advanced to the west. From the

fact of the fortification (or family of Gideon), Hepher

(probably Ophrah, the native place of the same hero),

and Shechem (the well-known city of the Bene-Joseph)

all occur among the names of the sons of Gilead, the son

of Machir, it seems probable that Gilead, whose name is

so intimately connected with the eastern part of the

immediate progenitor of the western half of the tribe.

Nor is it less difficult to fix the exact position of the

territory allotted to the western half. In Josh. xvii.

14-18, a passage usually regarded by critics as an ex-

ceedingly ancient document, we find the two tribes of

down the strip that only one portion had been al-

loated to them, viz. Mount Ephraim (ver. 16), and that

they could not extend into the plains of Judah or Ez-
MANASSEH

Ibid., because those districts were still in the possession of the Canaanites, and scorched by their chariots. In reply Joshua advises them to go up into the forest (ver. 13, A.V. "wood")—into the mountain which is a forest (ver. 18). This mountain clothed with forest can surely be nothing but the various spurs and offshoots of Carmel, the "mountain" closely adjoining the portion of Ephraim whose richness of wood was so proverbial. It is in accordance with this view that the majority of the towns of Manasseh—which, as the weaker portion of the tribe, would naturally be pushed to seek its fortunes outside the limits originally bestowed—were actually on the slopes either of Carmel itself or of the contiguous ranges. Thus Taanach and Megiddo were on the northern spur of Carmel; Ilbean appears to have been on the eastern continuation of the range, somewhere near the present Jenin. En-Dor was on the slopes of the so-called "Little Hermon." The two remaining towns mentioned as belonging to Manasseh formed the extreme eastern and western limits of the tribe: the one, Bethshean (Josh. xvii, 11), was in the hollow of the Ghor, or Jordan Valley; the other, Dor (ibid.), was on the coast of the Mediterranean, sheltered behind the range of Carmel, and immediately opposite the bluff or shoulder which forms its highest point. The whole of these cities are specially mentioned as standing in the allotments of other tribes, though inhabited by Manasseh; and this, with the absence of any attempt to define a limit to the possessions of the tribe on the north, looks as if no boundary-line had existed on that side, but as if the territory faded off gradually into those of the two contiguous tribes from whom it had borrowed its fairest cities. On the south side the boundary between Manasseh and Ephraim is more definitely described, and may generally be traced with tolerable certainty. Their joint possessions were bounded by the territory of Asher on the north and Issachar on the north-east (xvii, 10), but the division line between the two kindred tribes is defined by a place called Asher (ver. 7), now 'Ass, twelve miles north-east of Nablus. Thence it ran to Michmetha, described as facing Shechem (Nablus); then went to the right, i.e. southward, to the spring of Tapuaah, and so double to the Jordan. In the opposite direction it fell in with the watercourses of the torrent Kanah—probably the Nahr Falaik—along which it ran to the Mediterranean. See Tanneh.

From the indications of the history, it would appear that Manasseh took very little part in public affairs. They either left all that to Ephraim, or were so far removed from the centre of the nation as to have little interest in what was taking place. That they attended David's coronation at Hebron has already been mentioned. When his rule was established over all Israel, each had its distinct ruler—the western, Joel ben-Pedaliah; the eastern, Ithdo ben-Zechariah (1 Chron. xxvii, 20, 21). From this time the eastern Manasseh fades entirely from our view, and the western is hardly kept before us by an occasional mention. Such scattered notices as we do find have almost all reference to the part taken by members of the tribe in the reforms of the good kings of Judah—the Jehovah-revival under Asa (2 Chron. xvi, 9)—the Passover of Hezekiah (xxv, 1, 10, 11, 18), and the subsequent enthusiasm against idolatry (xxvi, 1)—the restoration of Josiah (xxixv, 6), and his restoration of the buildings of the Temple (ver. 9). It is gratifying to reflect that these notices, faint and scattered as they are, are all colored with good, and exhibit none of the repulsive traits of that most repulsive heathenism into which other tribes of Israel fell.

A positive connection between Manasseh and Benjamin is implied in the genealogies of 1 Chron. vii, where Machir is said to have married into the family of Huppim and Shuppim, chief houses in the latter tribe (ver. 15). No record of any such relation appears anywhere else.

The following are all the Biblical localities in both

Map of the half-tribe of Manasseh—West.
sections of the tribe, with their preserved modern representatives:

Aphek. Town. Pit.
Ashtaroth. do. Zeb Aserath?
Ashtaroth-karmn or Beetheroth. do. Mekareth?
Bethsaida. do. (El-Arei)?
Bethel. do. (El-Arei)?
Guder or Gergesa. do. Um-Ketla.
Geshur. District. Jebel (Tell-e-Peera?)
Golan. City. N. part of Gilead?
Jabrob or Jizur-jiordan. do. S. of Jordan.
Karmn. Town. See Ashtaroth.
Kenath or Nahb. do. Keneath.
Toth. do. Be-Soreath.
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Abel-meholah. Town. (Khurber-esh-Shukh?)
Adam. do. (N. of Bethshan?)
Abeer. Springs. Bir of Shelih Selim?
Aner. Town. See Tanash.
Armageddon. Valley. See Megiddo.
Beth-barrak. Ford. (Near Jisr-Damleh?)
Beth-shittah. do. Suctoah.
Bezek. do. (Khurber-Malah?)
Bun. do. See Nebi.
Cesarea. do. Kairanah.
Dor. do. Tantura.
Durhan. do. Dothan.
Edrei. Town. Endur.
Endor-tappach. do. See Astarah.
Gilead. do. See Gilboa.
Hermon (Little). do. Mount of El-Eldah?
Jehoshaphat or Jehoshaphat. Altar. See Gerizm.
Morch. Town. See Hazor.
Shamir. do. Ramah.
Taanach. do. Tsaml?
Taanach-thelah. do. Ain Tana?
Tappach. do. (Tell-Hamah?)
Tibnah. do. Tel Mard.
Tappach. District. Around Alalf?
Zarethan or Zarkah; also Zereshah or Zeredath, Zer-
renath. Town. (8 of wady Oaseh?)

2. According to the usual reading of the text in Judg. xiii, 30, Manasseh was the father of Gershom, who is named as the father of Jonathan that acted as priest to the Danites at Laish; but besides that this would not make him a Levite, and, in addition to the fact that Gerazah is a Levitical name, the reading is marked as suspicious (7 T. 2, 2, Sept. M. A. 1547), and should doubtless be corrected to "Moses," as in the Vulg. and many codices of the Sept. as Jonathan.

3. The fourteenth separate king of Judah, son and successor of Hezekiah, who began to reign at the early age of twelve years, and reigned fifty-five years. B.C. 657-642. For the synchronisms with profane history, especially of Assyria, Babylon, and Egypt, see Chronology.

The reign of this monarch is thus longer than that of any other of the house of David. There is none of which we know less. In part, it may be, this was the direct result of the character and policy of the man. In part, doubtless, it is to be traced to the abhorrence with which the following generation looked back upon it as the period of lowest degradation to which their country had ever fallen. Chroniclers and prophets pass it over, gathering from its horrors and disasters the great, broad lessons in which they saw the foot-prints of a righteous retribution, the tokens of a divine compassion, and then the spirit of their enemies will often say no more. This is in itself significant. It gives a meaning and a value to every fact which has escaped the sentence of oblivion. The very recitance of the historians of the O. T. shows how free they were from the rhetorical exaggerations and inaccuracies of a later age. The struggle of opposing worshipst must have been fierce under Manasseh as it was under Antiochus, or Decius, or Dio-
cletian, or Mary. Men must have suffered and died in that struggle of whom the world was not worthy, and yet no contrarian must have been greater than that between the short periods in Kings and Chronicles, and the martyro-
logies which belong to those other periods of persecu-
tion.

1. The birth of Manasseh is fixed (B.C. 799) twelve years before the death of Hezekiah (2 Kings xxii, 1), later times, however, divide the line of descent either that his father was king, or rather either that his son, if he had any at all, died at an early age, or that he returned to his throne at an early age, or that his son, if he had any at all, died at an early age, or that he returned to his throne at an early age.

2. The name Isaiah is changed to "Isaiah the priest," or "Isaiah the servant," or "Isaiah the prophet," or "Isaiah the scribe." The name Isaiah is changed to "Isaiah the priest," or "Isaiah the servant," or "Isaiah the prophet," or "Isaiah the scribe."
syria. But he goes a step further. Not content with independence, he enters on a policy of aggression. He contracts an alliance with the rebellious viceroy of Babylonia against their common enemy (2 Kings xx, 12; Isa. xxxix). He displays the treasures of his kingdom to the ambassador of the king of Persia, in the belief that this would show them how powerful and only he can prove himself. Isaiah protested against this step, but the ambition of being a great potentate continued, and it was to the results of this ambition that the boy Manasseh succeeded at the age of twelve.

The accession of the youthful king appears to have been the signal for an entire change, if not in the foreign policy, at any rate in the religious administration of the kingdom. At so early an age he can scarcely have been the spontaneous author of so great an alteration, and we may infer accordingly that it was the work of the idolatrous, or Ahaz party, which had been repressed during the reign of Hezekiah, but had all along, like the Romish clergy under Edward VI in England, looked on the reform with a sullen acquiescence, and thwarted it when they dared. The change which he knew not how to carry on, and which increased even to yet darker abominations (2 Kings xxii, 7). The awful words of Isaiah (i, 10) had a terrible truth in them. Those to whom he spake were literally "rulers of Sodom and princes of Go- morrha." Every faith was tolerated but the old faith of Israel. This was abandoned and proscribed. The temple of Jehovah was dishonored and profaned. The very Ark of the covenant was removed from the sanctuary (2 Chron. xxxxx, 3). The sacred books of the people were so systematically destroyed that fifty years later men listened to the Book of the Law of Jehovah X, a newly-discovered treasure (2 Kings xxii, 8). It may well be, according to a Jewish tradition, that this fanaticism of idolatry led Manasseh to order the name Jehovah to be erased from all documents and inscriptions (Patrick, ad loc.). All this involved also a systematic violation of the weekly sabbatic rest and the consequent loss of one witness against a merely animal life (Isa. ivi, 2; iviii, 18). The tide of corruption carried away some even of those who, as priests and prophets, should have been steadfast in resisting it (Zeph. iii, 4; Jer. ii, 26; v, 18; vi, 13).

It is easy to imagine the bitter grief and burning indignation of the witnesses of former faith. The fiercest zeal of Huguenots in France, of Covenanters in Scotland, against the badges and symbols of the Latin Church, is perhaps but a faint shadow of that which grew to a white heat in the hearts of the worshippers of Jehovah who spoke out in praise of the emotion of glory (Jer. ii, 10-25; Ewald, Gesch. Jer. iii, 666). The result was a debasement which had not been equalled even in the reign of Ahaz, uniting in one centre the abominations which elsewhere existed separately. Not content with sanctioning their presence in the Holy City, as Solomon and Rehoboam had done, Manasseh defiled it with the sanctuary itself (2 Chron. xxxix, 4). The worship thus introduced was, as has been said, predominately Babylonian in its character. "He observed times, and used enchantments, and used witchcraft, and dealt with familiar spirits, and with wizards" (ver. 6).

The worship of the "host of heaven," which each man celebrated for himself on the roof of his own house, took the place of that of the Lord God of Sabaoth (2 Kings xxii, 12; Isa. lxv, 3, 11; Zeph. i, 5; Jer. viiii, 2; xiii, 12; xxii, 29). With this, however, there was associated the old Molech worship of the Ammonites. The fires were rekindled in the valley of Ben-Hinnom. Tophet was (for the first time, apparently) built into a stately fabric (2 Kings xvi, 8; Isa. xxx, 38, as compared with Jer. vii, 31; xiii, 5; Ewald, Gesch. Jer. iii, 667). Even the king himself, inwardly distressed, when the Molech was rekindled, received a horrible fire-baptism dedicating them to Molech (2 Chron. xxxiii, 8), while others were actually slaughtered (Ezek. xxiii, 37, 89). The Baal and Asharoth ritual, which had been imported under Solo-
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godless generation (Isa. lvii, 1-4). Long afterwards the remembrance of that reign of terror lingered in the minds of men as a guilt for which nothing could atone (2 Kings xxiv, 4). The persecution, like most other personal outrages, with entire want of purpose, was for a time successful (Jer. ii, 90). The prophets appear no more in the long history of Manasseh's reign. The heart and the intellect of the nation were crushed out, and there would seem to have been no chroniclers left to record this portion of its history.

3. The book of Josiah. In the next natural sequence of events, there are indications that the neighboring nations—Phœnicians, Moabites, Ammonites—who had been tributary under Hezekiah, revolted at some period in the reign of Manasseh, and asserted their independence (Zeph. ii, 4-17; Jer. xlvii, xlviii, xlix). The Babylonian alliance bore the fruits which had been predicted. Hezekiah had been too hasty in attaching himself to the cause of the rebel prince against Assyria. The rebellion of Merodach-Baladan was crushed, and then the wrath of the Assyrian king fell on those who had supported him. See EASAR-HADDON, and Captivity, according to ordinary during the constant war between Assyria and Egypt, Manasseh adhered to the policy of his father in making common cause with the latter power. One or the other of these causes, although not stated by the sacred historian, brought into Judæa an Assyrian army, under the great Sennacherib. And this time the invasion was more successful than that of Sennacherib. The city apparently was taken. The miserable king attempted flight; but was discovered in a thorn-braze in which he had hidden himself, was laden with chains, and sent a messenger to Babylon, on the part of the king, to the Assyrians, where he was cast into prison. His name Has been discovered on the Assyrian monuments (Journ. of Sac. Lit. April, 1859, p. 75). See NINEVEH, here, at last, Manasseh had ample opportunity and leisure for cool reflection; and the hard lessons of adversity were well and wisely learned. He saw and deeply impressed the evil of his reign—he became as a new man—he humbly besought pardon from God, and imploring that he might be enabled to evince the sincerity of his contrition by being restored to a position for undoing all that had been the business of his life to effect. His prayer was heard. His captivity is supposed to have lasted a year, and he was then restored to his kingdom under certain obligations of tribute and allegiance to the king of Assyria, which, although not expressed in the account of this transaction, are alluded to in the history of his successors (Isa. lxx, 1-18; compare Prophecies of Manasseh and Kings, p. 362). See MANASSEH, PRAYER OF.

Two questions meet us at this point. (a) Have we satisfactory grounds for believing that this statement is historically true? (b) If we accept it, to what period in the reign of Manasseh is it to be assigned? It has been urged in regard to (a) that the silence of the writer of the books of Kings is conclusive against the trustworthiness of the narrative of 2 Chronicles. In the former there is no mention made of captivity or repentance or return. The latter, it has been said, yields to the temptation of pointing a moral, of making history appear more in harmony with his own notions of the divine government than it actually is. His anxiety to deal leniently with the successors of David leads him to invent at once a reformation and the captivity which is represented as its cause (Rosenmuller, Bid. Allenach, s, 3, p. 191; Hitzig, Biblical Archa., p. 180). It will be necessary in dealing with this objection to meet the sceptical critic on his own ground. To say that his reasoning contradicts our belief in the inspiration of the historical books of Scripture, and is destructive of all moral history that is carried on with entire ungeness of purpose, and, however strongly it may influence our feelings, we are bound to find another answer. It is believed that the answer is not far to seek. (1) The silence of a writer who sums up the history of a reign of fifty-five years in nineteen verses as to one alleged event in it is surely a weak ground for refusing to accept that event on the authority of another historian. (2) The omission is in part explained by the character of the narrative of 2 Kings xx-xv. The writer deliberately turns away from told history of the days of Manasseh, lest he should offend in the personal biography of the king. He looks on the reign only as it contributed to the corruption and final overthrow of the kingdom, and no after repentance was able to undo the mischief that had been done at first. (3) Still keeping on the level of human probabilities, the character of the writer of 2 Chronicles, obviously a Levite, and looking at the facts of the history from the Levitical point of view, would lead him to attach greater importance to a partial reinstatement of the old ritual and to the cessation of persecution, and so give them in proportion a greater prominence. (4) There is a peculiarity in the history which is, in some measure, of the nature of an undesigned coincidence, and so confirms it. The captains of the host of Assyria take Manasseh to Babylon. Would not a later writer, inventing the story, have made the Assyrian, and not the Babylonian, on the point of the event, the cause of the captivity? But, if the latter were chosen for the sake of harmony with the prophecy of Isa. xxxix, have made the king of Babylon rather than of Assyria the captor? As it is, the narrative fits in, with the utmost accuracy, to the facts of Oriental history. The first attack of Babylon to assert its independence, and without difference, on the captivity of that of Manasseh (the first or second of that name; compare Easar-Haddon, and Ewald, Gesch. Isr. iii, 675), and for a time the Assyrian king held his court at Babylon, so as to effect more completely the revolution of the rebellious province, was terminated by the vassalage of Judah to Assyria, and is the intervention of the Assyrian king in 2 Kings xvii, 26, just at the same time. The king is not named there, but Ezra iv, 2, 10, gives Amassper, and this is probably only another form of Ammannar, and this Easar-Haddon (compare Ewald, Gesch. iii, 675); Tob. i, 21 gives Easar-bedon, and the name is derived from Asia thus becomes part of the same policy as the attack on Judah. On the whole, then, the objection may well be dismissed as frivolous and vexatious. Like many other difficulties urged by the same school, it has in it something at once captious and pusillanimous. Those who lay undue stress on the fact in the spirit of a clever boy asking puzzling questions, or a sharp advocate getting up a case against the evidence on the other side, rather than in that of critics who have learned how to construct a history and to value its materials rightly (comp. Keil, Commentaries, pp. 263, 264), and other historical province, we have a sober German critic accepting it as true, and place Manasseh's captivity under Easar-haddon (Bertheau, ad loc.). Bertheau suggests that some support to the account may be found in 2 Kings xx, 17, sq. For other discussions of the alleged improbabilities of the Biblical narrative, see Dahler, De idee Chronic. hist. p. 139; Grumbacher, Chron. p. 199, 210; Religionsgesch., ii, 234; Rosenmüller, Allerth. ii, 181; Keil, Apologie der Chron. p. 425; Hävernick, Einleitung, ii, 221; Stud. u. Krit. 1860, vol. iii.

(b) The circumstance just noticed enables us to return an approximate answer to the other question. The death of Easar-haddon's Babylonian reign is calculated as being in B.C. 680-677; and Manasseh's captivity is supposed to have lasted one period, a period of twenty-two years of his reign as the exact date. 4. The period that followed is dwelt upon by the writer of 2 Chronicles as one of a great change for the better. The discipline of exile made the king feel that
the gods whom he had chosen were powerless to deliver, and he turned in his heart to Jehovah, the God of his fathers. The compassion or death of Esar-haddon led to his release, and he returned after some uncertain interval of time to Jerusalem. It is not improbable that he, as a man of the city, had obtained refuge among the oppressed adherents of the ancient creed, and possibly had brought into prominence, as the provisional ruler and defender of the city, one of the chief members of the party. If the prophecy of Isa. xxii, 15, received, as it probably did, its fulfillment in Shebna's sharing the captivity of his master, and gaining, without extraneous help, such belief that we may refer to the same period the noble words which speak of Eliakim, the son of Hilkiah, as taking the place which Shebna should have vacant, and rising up to be "a father unto the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah," "the key of the house of David on his shoulder."

The return of Manasseh was at any rate followed by a new policy. The old faith of Israel was no longer persecuted. Foreign idolatries were no longer thrust, in all their foulness, into the sanctuary itself. The altar of the Lord was again restored, and peace-offerings and thank-offerings sacrificed to Jehovah (2 Chron. xxxiii, 15, 16). But beyond this the reformation did not go. The ark was not restored to its place. The book of the law of Jehovah remained in its concealment. Satisfied with the fact that they were no longer worshipping the gods of other nations by name, they went on in the same mode of worship essentially idolatrous. "The people did sacrifice still in the high places, but to Jehovah their God only" (ibid., ver. 17).

5. The other facts known of Manasseh's reign connect themselves with the state of the world round him. The Assyrian monarchy was tottering to its fall, and the king of Judah seems to have thought that it was still possible for him to rule as the head of a strong and independent kingdom. If he had to content himself with a smaller territory, he might yet guard its capital against attack by a new and virulent enemy, which had been before its weak side (comp. Zeph. i, 10), "to the entering in of the fish-gate," and completing the tower of Ophel, which had been begun with a like purpose by Josiah (2 Chron. xxvii, 8). Nor were the preparations for defence limited to Jerusalem. "He put captains of war into all the fenced cities of Judah." There was, it must be remembered, a special reason for this attitude, over and above that afforded by the condition of Assyria. Egypt had emerged from the chaos of the Dodecarchy and the Ethiopian intrusive, and again become strong again. It was not content with the possession of Ethiopia as a reward of its former arms. Northwards, he attacked the Philistines, and the twenty-nine years' siege of Azotus must have fallen wholly or in part within the reign of Manasseh. So far his progress would not be unacceptable. It would be pleasant to see the old hereditary enemies of Israel, who had lately grown insolent and defiant, meet with their masters. About this time, accordingly, we find the thought of an Egyptian alliance again beginning to gain favor. The prophets, and those who were guided by them, dreaded this more than anything, and entered their protest with a distinctness of manner. As far as we can judge, the time of such a protest, the time of such a desire for Egyptian help, the time at which, in the light of the events of the Assyrian wars, the idea of such a help could seriously be entertained, we see no reason to doubt that it was in the time of Manasseh. It is, indeed, the very time when his pretended reformation is most likely to have been made, to have been the more easy to accomplish and the more forcible to be thrown against the people, who might have had no idea of a real reformation, or might have had one without the wish, and might have come to the conclusion that the king could not seriously intend to execute it, as he had been treated and trusted, and the prayer of the people (see Jer. xi, 14, 16) is to allude to some such state of things. In return for this, Manasseh, we may believe, received the help of the chariots and horses for which Egypt was always famous (Isa. xxxix, 1). (Comp. Aristea, Epit. ad Philoocr. in Haecamp's Josephus, ii, 104).

If this was the close of Manasseh's reign, we can well understand how to the writer of the books of Kings it would seem hardly better than the beginning, leaving the history of Judah to the times of its wars or worse evils than itself. We can understand how it was that in the death he was buried as Azab had been, not with the burial of a king, in the sepulchres of the house of David, but in the garden of Uzza (2 Kings xxi, 20), and that, long afterwards, in spite of his repentance, the Jews held his name in abomination, and that of the three kings (the other two are Jeroboam and Ahab) who had no part in eternal life (Sanhedr. xi, 1, quoted by Patrick on 2 Chron. xxxiii, 18).

Indeed, the evil was irreparable. The habits of a serious and religious mind had become a part of the life of the people; and though they might be repressed for a time by force, as in the reformation of Josiah, they burst out again, when the pressure was removed, with fresh violence, and rendered even the zeal of the best of the Jewish kings fruitful chiefly in hypocrisy and unreality. The intellectual life of the people suffered in the same degree. The persecution cut off all who, trained in the schools of the prophets, were the thinkers and teachers of the people. The reign of Manasseh witnessed the close of the work of Isaiah and Habakkuk at its beginning, and the youth of Jeremiah and Zephaniah at its conclusion, both in the prophetic writing and the evangelic half-century of debasement. The most fearful symptom of all, when a prophet's voice was again heard during the minority of Josiah, was the atheism which, then as in other ages, followed on the confused adoption of a confounded polytheism (Zeph. i, 12). It is surely a strained, almost a fantastic hypothesis, to assign (as Ewald does) to such a period two such noble works as Deuteronomy and the book of Job.

Nor was this dying out of a true faith the only evil. The systematic persecution of the worshippers of Jehovah accustomed the people to the horrors of a religious war; and when they in their turn gained the ascendancy, they used the opportunity with a fiercer sternness than had been known before. Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah in their reforms had been content with restoring the true worship and destroying the instruments of the false. In that of Josiah, the destruction extends to the priests of the high places, whom he sacrifices on their own altars (2 Kings xxiii, 20).

6. But little is added by later tradition to the O.T. narrative of Manasseh's reign. The prayer that bears his name among the apocryphal books can hardly, in the absence of any other reference, be made identical with that referred to in 2 Chron. xxxiii, and is probably rather the result of an attempt to work out the hint there supplied than the reproduction of an older document. There are reasons, however, for believing that there existed at some time or other a fuller history, more or less legendary, of Manasseh and his conversion, from which the prayer may possibly have been an excerpt, preserved for devotional purposes (it appears for the first time in the Apostolical Constitutions) when the rest was rejected as worthless. Scattered here and there, we find the one or another member of such a work. Among the offences of Manasseh, the most prominent is that he places in the sanctuary an άγαλμα παραπτώμων of Zeus (Suidas, c. v. Μανασσής; Georg. Synecellus, Chron. n. i, 404). The charge on which he condemns Isaiah to death is that of blasphemy, not that he was the "Lor (Isa. vi, 1) being treated as a presumptuous boast at variance with Exod. xxi, 20 (Nic. de Lyra, from a Jewish treatise: Jebamoth, quoted by Amaana, in Orati Sacri on 2 Kings xxi). Isaiah is miraculously rescued. A cedar opens to receive him. Then comes the order that the cedar should be cut down. That which made this sin the greater was that the king's mother, Hezphoniah, was the daughter of Isaiah. When Manasseh was taken captive by Merodach and taken to Babylon (Suidas), he was thrown into prison
and fed daily with a scanty allowance of bran-bread and water mixed with vinegar. Then came his condemnation. He was encased in a brazen image (the description suggests a punishment like that of the bull of Pe-rillus), but he repented and prayed, and was released from his suffering, and escaped (Su%th and Georg. Synecletus).

'And the Lord heard the voice of Manasseh and pitied him,' the legend continues, 'and there came around him a flame of fire, and all the iron about him (vulgo sp PL ablQ mi-nipOl were melted, and the Lord delivered him out of all distress.' (Consp. Auct. in letter. v compare Jud. Afric. ap. Routh, Rel. Sacce. ii. 298). Then he returned to Jerusalem and lived righteously and justly.

4. An Israelite of the descendants (or residents) of Pahath-moab, who repudiated his foreign wife after the exile (Ezra x. 33). B.C. 459.

5. Another Israelite of Hashbon who did the same (Ezra x. 33). B.C. 459.

Manasseh Ben-Joseph Han-Israel, one of the most distinguished Jewish theologians of the 17th century, was born at Lisbon, Portugal, in 1634, at a time when the Iberian peninsula was a place of torture for all non-Roman Catholic believers, but more particularly the Jews. Joseph, his father, a rich merchant, feared the power of the inquisitors, and, like many religiously persecuted, turned towards hospitable Holland for an asylum for himself and his family. The household fled to Amsterdam, and finally to a new home. Ben-Joseph was placed under the instruction of the celebrated Isaac Uziel, then rabbi at the Dutch capital. So rapid was his progress and so unbounded the confidence of the Jews of Amsterdam in Manasseh ben-Israel, as he is commonly called, that on the death of Uziel, when only eighteen years old (1652), he was deemed a worthy successor of the departed rabbi. In 1656, in need of means to meet the expenses of his father's family, largely dependent upon him for support, he established the celebrated Amsterdam Hebrew printing-office, which a few years later he printed his own maiden production, and in 1658 finally came before the public with the first volume of his great and justly celebrated Conciliator, or Harmony of the Pentateuch (see below), in which upwards of two hundred and ten Hebrew works, and fifty-four Greek, Latin, Spanish, and Portuguese authors, both sacred and profane, are quoted. His fame was now established in all Europe, and his authority accepted not only by the Jews, but even Christian scholar, acknowledged his scholarship, and wrote to him from far and wide, requesting explanations of difficulties which they found in the Hebrew Scriptures and Jewish history. The celebrated Vossius, Dionysius, Hugo Grotius, Huet, Episcopius, Sobrier, Frankenberg, Thomas Fuller, Nathaniel Honesius, et al., were among his correspondents. He solicited their influence in behalf of his suffering brethren, and was thereby enabled to petition the Long Parliament (1650) to readmit the Jews into England, whence they had been expelled ever since 1290. Shortly after, he dedicated The Hope of Israel to the English Parliament, which was gratefully acknowledged in a letter written by Lord Middlesex, addressed To Most Noble and敬爱 Lord. Encouraged thereby, Manasseh came over to England in 1655; presented a 'Humble Address' in behalf of his coreligionists to Cromwell; published in London, 1656, his Vindication of Jews, in answer to those Christians who opposed the readmission of Jews into that country; and through Cromwell, with all his power, could not carry through the measure permitting Jews to settle in England (see Jews), he granted to Manasseh ben-Israel a pension of £100 per annum, payable quarterly, and commencing Feb. 20, 1656 (comp. Carlyle, ii, 163). Manasseh, however, did not long enjoy this generous gift, for he died in Middleburg in 1657, on his way back to Amsterdam. Gritz (Gesch. d. Juden, x. 18, 94-186) rather belittles Manasseh's literary ability. He regards him as "a man of much information, but of little thought," and yet his acquaintance with Manasseh is founded mainly on Kayserling's biography. An encyclopedical knowledge was displayed by Manasseh in his writings: this should certainly not stand against him. His most important works are (1) יבשכ , in Hebrew, being an index to all the passages of the Hebrew Scriptures in the Mid- dle Ages, on the Pentateuch, and the Five Megilloth (Amsterdam, 1688); (2) Conciliorium, conceptionis locorum S. Scripturae, quàe quum lateris eis contentur, etc. (in Spanish, Amst. 1632-1654. 4 vols.; vol. 1 translated into Latin by Vossius, Amst. 1633, and the whole into English by Lindo, London, 1842); (3) De Creaturae, in manuscript in Spanish (in Amsterdam, 1663. 4); (4) De Resurrezione Mortuorum, Libri tres (in Spanish, Amsterdam, 1638); (5) פַּדְרָא יִשְׁמָאֵל, De Termino Vite (in Latin, Amsterdam, 1639; translated into English by Thomas Pococke, London, 1699); (6) פדרת ישמעאל, four books on the immortality of the soul (written in Hebrew, Amst. 1661; new ed. Leips. 1682). These are valuable contributions to Biblical literature, naisuch as the Manasseh, and in them all the passages from the Hebrew Scriptures which, according to the explanations of the ancient rabbis, teach the immortality of the soul and the resurrection; (7) יִדְרָא יִשְׁמָאֵל, Pietro Gloria o de la Estatua de Nebuchadnezer (Amst. 1655), an exposition of Daniel's dream, written in Spanish, which the immortal Rembrandt did not think it below his dignity to illustrate, and through his own press several beautiful and correctly-printed editions of the Hebrew Scriptures; wrote a Hebrew grammar, entitled יִדְרָא יִשְׁמָאֵל, Grammatica Hebrae, dividida en guia libros, which has not as yet been published; and left us over four hundred well-written sermons in Portuguese. See First, Biblioth. Jud. ii. 354, 355, 356; Smend, Catalogus Librorum, veteris et novi testamenti, othere Bodleiana, vol. 1645-1652; and especially the valuable biographies by Kayserling, Jahrbuch für die Geschichhte der Juden (Leips. 1861), ii, 85 sq.; and by Carmoly, in the Revue Orientalie (Brussels, 1842), p. 299-349; C. D. Ginsburg, in Kritto, iii, s. v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxxiii, 145 sq.

Manasseh (Μάνασσής), the Greek form of the name Manasseh, and, as such, applied not only to those mentioned in the O.T., but to another in the Apocrypha.

1. The son of Joseph by that name (Rev. vii. 6).
2. The king of Judah (Matt. i, 10; and so in "the Prayer" thus entitled).
3. The son of Hashbon (1 Esd. i, 33; comp. Ezra x. 33).
4. A wealthy inhabitant of Bethulia, and husband of Judith, according to the legend. He was smitten with a sunstroke while superintending the labours in his fields, leaving Judith a widow with great possessions (Jud. viii. 23; ix. 2; xvi. 22-24); and was buried between Dothan and Beal-hamom. See Judith.

Manasses, the Prayer of, one of the shorter apocryphal pieces appended to the O.T. (In the following account we mainly follow the articles on the subject in Kittü and Smith's Dictionary). Though wanting in the early printed editions of the Sept., it must have been included in the ancient MSS. of the Sept., as is evident from the fact that there exists an Ante-Hieronymian Latin version of it. It is found in the Codex Alexandrinus, and the Greek text was first published in Robert Stephens' edition of the Biblia Latina (Paris, 1632), and an English version of the same was printed in 1656. It was also printed in the Apostolical Constitution (1658); it was then published by Daendels in 1682: inserted in the fourth volume of the London Polyglot, with the various readings of the Codex Alexandrinus. Fathers of Catechumens (1672); in the Libri apoc. V. T. (Francof, ed. M. 1848, Halle, 1749); in the editions of the Apocrypha by Reiske (1780), Michaelis (1741); and after the text of the Cod. Alexandrinus in the editions of the Sept by Grabe and Beelinger.
MANASSES

I. Title and Position.—This apocryphal production is called the prayer of MANASSES (ἐπιθυμία Μανασσέως), or hymn of prayer (πράσδωθος γιὰ ὑπήργιον), because it purports to be the supplications which this monarch offered to God when captive in Babylon, mentioned in 2 Chron. xxxiii, 12, 13. Its position varies in the MSS., printed editions of the text, and in the versions. It is more generally found at the end of Psalter, with the same hymns and prayers, as in the Codex Alexandrinus, the Zurich MS. of the Psalms mentioned by Fritzsche, and in the Ethiopic Psalter, published by Ludolf (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1701); in the three Latin MSS. by Sabatier it is placed in the Vulgate, in 2 Chron. (Sabad, Biblioth. Lat. iii, 1808); in the editions of the Vulgate formed after the Trident. Canon of the Bible it is usually put at the end of the N.T., succeeded by the third and fourth books of Esdras. Luther placed it as the last of the Apocrypha, at the end of the O.T., while Matthew's Bible, which first inserted it among the Apocrypha, and which is followed by the Bishop's Bible and the A.V., puts it before the Maccabees.

II. Contents, Author, Date, Original Language, etc.—It opens with an appeal to the God of the faithful patriarchs and ancestors, and is described by the author as Creator of all things, before whose power every one trembles, and whose wrath no sinner can endure, and speaks of his proffered pardon to the penitent (ver. 1–8). Thereupon the repentant king confesses his sins, humbles himself on account of them, prays for pardon, and promises to lead a life of gratitude and praise (ver. 9–15).

Many writers have seen nothing in this prayer to militate against its being the penitential dirge of the penitent Manasses; on the contrary, they think that the simplicity and appropriateness of its style, the earnest and touching manner in which it is expressed, go far to show that it is not literally "his prayer unto his God" rendered into Greek, that prayer formed the basis of the Greek. It is, indeed, certain that the prayer was still extant when the Chronicles were compiled, that the chronicles saw it in the book of the Kings of Israel (2 Chron. xxxiii, 18), and that later writers, as well as tradition, constantly refer to it (compare Sanhedrin, 101; 103a; Jerusalem Sanhedrin xvii; Mivraha Rabboh on Lev., Parsha xxx, p. 150; on Deut., Parsha ii, or ch. iv, 26, p. 216, ed. Sulzbach; Chaldee Paraphrase of 2 Chron. xxxiii, 11, etc.; Const. Apost. ii, 22). We may more reasonably conclude, however, that it is the embodiment of these traditions. See MANASSEH, 8.

The Greek text is undoubtedly original, and not a mere translation from the Hebrew, for even within the same page there are three passages where the same parenthesis is found (ἀποκτένους κ.κ., ἄνωθεν κ.κ., παρασκευαζόμενον κ.κ.), the writer was well acquainted with the Sept. (τὰ κατόπτρα τῆς γῆς, τὸ πέλαγος τῆς χρυσοκοπίας σου, πῦρ δὲ ἡ δύναμις τῶν ὀρέων), but beyond this there is nothing to determine the date at which he lived. The allusion to the patriarchs (ver. 8, ἵκισε; ver. 1, εἰσίσταται αἰτῶν τέκνων) appears to fix the authorship on a Jew, but the clear teaching on repentance points to a time certainly not later before the Christian era. The most likely indication of the place at which the prayer was written. All that we know is that reference is made to it in a fragment of Julius Africanus (circa A.D. 221), that it is given at length in the Apostolical Constitutions (ii, 22), a work attributed to Clement Romanus, but generally believed to be of the 3d or 4th century, and that the whole complication of it shows it to be an ante-Christian production, compiled most probably in the first century B.C. The Latin translation which occurs in Vulgate MSS. is not by the hand of Jerome, and has some remarkable points (including omnipolita, importa, omnium virtutum colorum), but there is no sufficient internal evidence to show whether it is later or earlier than his time. It does not, however, seem to have been used by any Latin writer of the first four centuries, and was not known to Victor Tunenensis in the sixth (Ambrosius, iv, 986, ed. Migone).

III. Canonicality.—This prayer was considered by many of the ancients as genuine, and used as such for ecclesiastical purposes. It is quoted as such by the author of the Sermons on the Parishes and Publicans; in the sixth volume of Chrystocleti's works; by Anthony the monk (ii, 94); Theodoretus to Simeon, Catochephanes Ceraneumus (Homil. ii and livi); by Freculcus, George Syncellus, and George the sinner, in their Chronicies; by Suidas (Lex. v. v. Μανασσεός); and by Anastasius Sinaita (in Psalms vii); and is still placed by the modern Greek Edit. in the N.T. (2 Chron. v. ii). But the fact of its non-occurrence in the Heb. text, and its uniform rejection by the Jewish Church, clearly stamp it as apocryphal. It was never recognized in the Roman Church as canonical, and has, therefore, been omitted in the ancient editions of the Sept. For this reason it is also omitted from the Zitriz Version, and Coverdale's Bible, which follows it, as well as from the Geneva Version; but it is retained among the Apocrypha in Luther's translation, Matthew's Bible, and in the Bishop's Bible, and, in the A.V., it is in the Maccabees.

IV. Versions and Exegetical Helps.—Greek and Latinmetrical versions of this prayer have been reprinted from Fabricius, in his edition of the books of Sirach, Wisdom, Judith, and Tobit (Leips. 1691). A Hebrew version is mentioned by Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebrea, i, 778, a very beautiful and valuable version, with valuable notes, is reprinted in the Hebrew Annual, entitled Birew H-itim (Vienna, 1814, v, 12 sqq.; important literary notices are given by Fabricius, Codex Pseudepigraphus V. T. i, 1100 sqq.; Bibliotheca Graeca (ed. Harles), iii, 732 sqq.; Müller, Erklärung des Gebet Manasses (S. xxvii, 1278); and especially Fritzsche, Kurzgefasste exegetische Handbuch z. d. Apokryphen d. A. T. i, 157 sqq. (Leips. 1851). See APOTHELYA.

Manasseh (Μανασσῆς, Manassé, patronymic from MANASSEH, used collectively; Sept. Μανασσι, Auth. Vern. "Manasses," "of Manasseh"); a descendant of Manasseh, or a member of that tribe. Deut. iv, 49; xxxix, 6; 2 Kings x, 20; 1 Chron. xxvii, 89.

Manby, Peter, an Irish theologian, was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, became chaplain to Dr. Michael Boyle, afterwards archbishop of Dublin, and at length dean of Perry. In the reign of James II he embraced the popish religion, in vindication of which he wrote a number of treatises; these were reprinted to remove him from being expelled to England, and died at London in 1697. Manby published several controversial tracts in favor of the Roman Catholic religion.—Hook, Eccles. Biog. vii, 214, s. v.

Manchec is a name given in the 16th century to the wafers used in the mass.—Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. xvi, 843.

Manchuria. See MANTCHURIA.

Manclius, George Wilhelmus, one of the prominent ministers of the Reformed Church in America, and a sturdy opponent of the movements for securing its independence of the Church in Holland. He was settled in Bergen County, N. J., at Schraalenburgh and Paramus (1730–82), and at Kingston, N. Y. (1732–56 or 59). He possessed much ability and learning, but it was alleged that "consciences smothered" under his orthodox preaching. His bounds, however, claims, however, claim the saintly spirit which show him to have been "a faithful, learned, industrious, and zealous preacher of the Gospel, one who did not fear to declare the whole counsel of God: and that it was, on the other hand, his opposition to an illiterate ministry and to herself, his independence of the office of teaching, and of reproducing vice, and his general zeal and fidelity which induced certain of his enemies to misrepresent him." He left 420 members in full communion of his Church. He died Sept. 6, 1762. See Corwin's Manual of the Reformed Church, p. 150. (W. J. R. T.)

MANDEANS. See MENDZAEANS.
MANDATA DE PROVIDENDO. See EXPECTANIA.

Mandeville, Bernard de, a sceptical writer in the English tongue, was born of French extraction about 1670 at Dort, Holland, and went to England near the opening of the 18th century. He practiced medicine in London, but does not appear to have had much success as a physician, and depended mainly on his literary successes. He died in London in 1733. In the article Deuss (q. v.), the name of Mandeville has not been inserted "because his speculations" (see works below), as Farrar says (Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, p. 185, note 65), "did not bear directly on religion." Upon morality, however, Mandeville exerted so great an influence that it cannot pass him unnoticed. His attacks on Christian morals already reveal him to have been a champion of Deism. The doctrines laid down in several of his works is nothing more nor less than a further elucidation of the assertion of Bayle in (Pensées diverses), that Atheism does not necessarily make man vicious, nor a state unhappy, because dogmas have no influence on the acts of men. Superior observation of society led Mandeville to the belief that many institutions of public weal derive their strength and support from prevailing immorality. This view he developed in a poem entitled Sir John Florboury, or The Earnest Honest (1714), to which he afterwards added long explanatory notes, and then published the whole under the new title of The Fable of the Bees. However erroneous may be its views of morals and of society, it bears all the marks of an honest and sincere inquiry on an important subject. It exposed Mandeville, however, to much obloquy, and, besides meeting with many answers and attacks, was denounced as injurious to morality. It would appear that some of the hostility against this work, and against Mandeville generally, is to be traced to another publication recommended by the licensing committee, On the matter and manner of which are certainly exceptional, though it must at the same time be stated that Mandeville earnestly and with seeming sincerity recommends his plan as a means of diminishing immorality, and that he endeavored, so far as lay in his power, by affixing a high price and in other ways, to prevent the work from having a general circulation. Mandeville subsequently published a second part of The Fable of the Bees, and several other works, among which are two entitled Free Thoughts on Religion, the Church, and Nationalities, and An Inquiry into the Origin of Honor and the Usefulness of Christianity in War. "The Fable of the Bees, or Private Vices Public Benefits, may be viewed in two ways, as a satire on men and as a theory of society and national prosperity. So far as it is a satire, it is sufficiently just and pleasant; but viewed in its entirety as a treatise on the character of a great civilized society, it is altogether worthless. It is Mandeville's object to show that national greatness depends on the prevalence of fraud and luxury; and for this purpose he supposes a "beehive of bees," possessing in all respects institutions similar to those of man, he details the various frauds, similar to those among men, practiced by bees upon another in various professions; he shows how the wealth accumulated by means of these frauds is turned, through luxurious habits, to the good of others, who again practice their frauds upon the wealthy; and, having already assumed that wealth cannot be gotten without fraud and cannot exist without luxury, he assumes further that wealth is the only cause and criterion of national greatness. His hive of bees having thus become wealthy and great, he afterwards supposes a mutual jealousy of frauds to arise, and fraud to be by consent disposed of; and he again assumes that wealth and luxury immediately disappear, and that the greatness of the society is gone. It is needless to point out inconsistencies and errors, such, for instance, as the absence of all distinction between luxury and vice, when the whole theory is based on the obviously false observations; and the long dissertations appended to the fable, however amusing and full of valuable remarks, contain no attempts to establish by proof the fundamental points of the theory. In an "Inquiry into the Origin of Moral Distinctions," contained in The Fable of the Bees, Mandeville contends that virtue and vice, and the feelings of moral approbation and disapprobation, have been created in men by their several governments, for the purpose of maintaining order and preserving their own political systems. As it is probable as it seems that such a proposition as this should be seriously put forth, it is yet more so that it should come from one whose professed object was, however strange the way in which he set about it, to promote good morals; for there is nothing in Mandeville's writings to warrant the idea that he sought to promote "the sacred interest of truth" (English Cyclopedia, s. v.). This book was translated into French, as well as the other writings of Mandeville, and contributed in no small degree to the corruption of French society, and helped forward the sad days of the Revolution. (J. H. W.)

Mandeville, Henry, D.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Kinderhook, N. Y., March 6, 1804; graduated at Union College in 1826, and at New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1829, and ordained in 1830, by the Classis of Albany in 1829. His ministry was chiefly spent in the Reformed Church in the State of New York, viz., at Shawangunk, 1829-31; Geneva, 1831-34; Utica, 1834-41. From 1841 to 1849 he was professor of moral philosophy and belles-lettres in Hamilton College, N. Y. While in this position he published a series of text-books on eloquence and English literature, which evince his thorough scholarship and "aptness to teach." From Hamilton College he was called to the Government Street Presbyterian Church, Mobile, Ala., where he died of yellow fever in 1858. He was a man of large frame, imposing presence, and cultivated manner. He was a brilliant pulpit orator, a powerful reasoner, a successful preacher and professor, and a faithful pastor. He gloried in the cross of Christ, and devoted all of his fine powers to his work. His published works, in the Bible, the Reformed Church, and other revivals, are a matter of tradition, which was delivered before the Society of Inquiry of the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, N. J., in 1847, is a masterpiece of reasoning and eloquence, and a worthy memorial of the author's genius, piety, and zeal for personal and universal Reconciliations; Corwin's Manual, s. v. (W. J. R. T.)

Mandingo is the name of an African people, the nation of the Wagaraeans—according to Barth, comprising some 6,000,000 or more. Strictly speaking, however, Mandingoes should be termed only the inhabitants of the most south-westerly territories belonging to the great West African race of the Waangoras (sing. Wagora), and inhabiting a district extending in lat. from 8 to 12° N., and between the west coasts and the head waters of the Senegal and Niger. Their original seat is said to be Manding, a small mountain country in the eastern sources of the Senegal, whence, partly by conquest and partly by emigration, they have spread themselves over a most extensive tract of country, and now consist of a variety of tribes. They are black in color, tall and well shaped, with regular features, and are, generally speaking, a fine race, capable of great endurance, and of possessing a disposition well adapted to the pursuits of the hunter, trader, and warrior; and remarkable for their greediness, and for their industry and energy. The language of the Mandingo prevails from the Senegal coast up to Sago on the Niger. A grammar of the language was compiled by R. Maxwell Macbrair, in 1860, under the title of "Religious Belief, etc.—Of the neighboring nations, the Mandingoes were the first who embraced Islamism.
The greater portion of them are now Moslems, and are zealous propagators of their religion. Those of the Mandrake tradition in the neighboring religion have a very peculiary idea of marriage. With them it is merely a form of regulated slavery, and there is no marriage ceremony observed to eunice union (Caillé, *Travels*, i, 850). Most generally the female partner is chosen, and under her management (Gray, *In African*, p. 85). They have also, according to Park (*Travels*, i, 267), a very peculiar idea of the Deity, whom they regard as "a remote, and of so exalted a nature, that it is idle to imagine the feeble suplications of wretched mortals can reverse the decrees and change the purposes of the Deity." Neither do they, as a general thing, have any confidence in any belief in the hereafter, of which they assert that "no man knows anything about it."

*Mandra*, a name given to a monastery in the Greek Church. *See Archimandrite.*

Mandrake (only in the plur. *margin*), *dudaim*, from בִּדָּא, to be hot, from their amatory properties; whence the sing. בֶּדָא, a pot or boiling vessel, hence a bucket, Jer. xxiv, 1, occurs in Gen. xxx, 14-16: "Reuben went out in the days of wheat harvest, and found mandrakes in the field, and brought them home to his mother Leah. Then Rachel said to Leah, Give me of thy son's mandrakes;" "And Jacob came out of the field in the evening, and Leah went out to meet him, and said, Thou must not go in unto my son's mandrakes; and he lay with her that night." The only other passage is Cant. vii, 13: "The mandrakes give a smell, and at our gates are all manner of pleasant plants." From the above passages it is evident that the *dudaim* were collected in the fields, that they were fit for gathering in the wheat harvest in Mesopotamia, where the first occurrence took place; that they were found in Palestine; that they or the plants which yielded them diffused a peculiar and agreeable odor; and that they were supposed to be possessed of aphrodisiac powers, or of assisting in producing conception. It is possible that there is a connection between this plant and the love-charms (ץָנֵיה) which seem to have been worn by Oriental brides (Cant. i, 2, iv, 10; vii, 12; comp. i, 12), like smelling-bottles (Isa. iii, 20, "tablets"); perhaps these contained an odoriferous mandrake mixture. From this it is manifest that there is little to guide us in determining their method of use is alluded to at such early periods, especially as no similar name has been recognized in any of the cognate languages. Hence interpreters have wasted much time and pains in endeavoring to ascertain what is intended by the Heb. *dudaim*. In the LXX. this word is translated by "violet," others "lilies," "jasminas," "truffles or mushrooms;" and some think that the word means "flowers," or "fine flowers." Bochart, Calmet, and Sir Thomas Browne suppose the citrons intended; Celsius (*Hierobot.*, i, 20); but see, on the contrary, Oudem. *p. 99*) is persuaded that it is the fruit of the *loe-tree*; Hiller that *cherries* are spoken of; and Ludolf (*Hist. *Edh.*, i, 9, etc.) maintains that it is the fruit which the Syracans call *mausc* (that is, the plantain), resembling in figure and taste the Indian fig; but the generality of modern authors and commentators understand mandrakes (not the melon so called, "mele dudaim," but the mandradora) by *dudaim*.

The ground upon which the mandradora has been preferred is that the most ancient Greek translator interprets the Hebrew name in Gen. xxx, 14 by mandrake apples (μάρδακρα *μάρδακρα*); and in the Song of Solomon by mandrakes, *μαρδάκρα* and commentators understand mandrakes (not the melon so called, "mele dudaim," but the mandradora) by *dudaim*.

The second of these puts *lafock*; the two latter *ybruchin*, which names the same *lafock* (cf. *Plut.* *Deis.* p. 189; *Synesius*; *Cassian*; *Lycophron* p. 1591). The earliest notice of *μαρδάκρα* is from Hippocrates, and the next by Theophrastus (*Hist. *Plant.* vi, 2). Both of these, C. Sprengel (*Hist. *Rei.* *Herb.* i, 98, 92) suppose, intend *Atropa mandragora*. Dioscorides (*iv.* 76) notices three kinds: (1) the female, which is supposed to be the Mandradora Berolton; (2) the male, *Mandravegra vernalis* of the same botanist (these two are, however, usually accounted varieties of *Atropa mandragora*); (3) a kind called *morion*. It has been inferred that this may be the same plant as the mandradora of Theophrastus, which, by some authors, has been supposed to be *Atropa belladonna*. To all of these Dioscorides ascribes narcotic properties, and says of the first that it is also called *Cirroza*, because it appears to be a root which promotes venery. Pythagoras named the mandradora *anarthromorphon*, and Theophrastus, among several other qualities, ascribed to it the power of ripening, and also its tendency to excite to love. Its fruit was called *love-apple*, and Venus herself Mandragorita. But it is not easy to decide whether the same plant refers to all the above; the plant in question, or plants. (See *Lycophron* *vii.* 238; *Bip.* *Schol.* *Hist. *Plant.* p. 411, tom. ii, p. 478.) Hebrews on materia medica give *madragosaic* as a synonym for *ybruch*, or *ybrus*, which is said to be the root of a plant of which the fruit is called *lufack*. This, there is little doubt, must be the above *Atropa mandragora*, as the Arabians are not merely known only to the plants of Dioscorides, and on this occasion they quote him as well as Galen, and ascribe narcotic properties to both the root and the fruit. D'Herbelot (*Bibl. *Oriens.*, i, 72) details some of the superstitions respecting this plant, which originated in the East, but which continued for a long time after inSaly reared by authors in Europe. (See Schubert, iii, 116; Schulz. *Leit.* v, 197; *Burchardt*, i, 411.) By the Arabs it is said to be called *infaah al-arham*, or devil's apple, on account of its power to excite voluptuoseness. If we look to the works of more modern authors we find a continued existence of the same statements. Thus Mariti, in his *Travels* (ii, 195), says that the Arabs called the mandrake plant *gabrochak*, which is, no doubt, the same name as given above. At the village of St. John, in the mountains, about six miles south-west from Jerusalem, this plant is found at present, as well as in Tuscany. It grows low, like lettuce, to which its leaves have a strong resemblance, except that they have a dark-green color. The flowers are purple, and the root is for the most part forked. The fruit, when ripe, in the beginning of May, is about the size of a small apple, exceedingly red, and of a most agreeable odor; our guide thought us fools for suspecting it to be unworthy. He ate it freely himself, and it is generally valued by the inhabitants as exhilarating to their spirits and a provocative to venery. Maudrell (*Trav.* p. 85) was informed by the chief priest of the Sanhedrim, that it was much esteemed for its medicinal virtues. Hessequist also seems inclined to consider it the *dudaim*, for, when at Nazareth, he says (Trav. p. 185), "What I found most remarkable in their villages was the great quantity of mandrakes that grew in a vale below Nazareth.""The fruit was now ripe. From the season in which this mandrake blossoms and ripens its fruit, one might form a conjecture that it is Rachel's *dudaim*. These were brought her in the wheat harvest, which in Galilee is in the month of May, about this time, and the mandrake was not in fruit." Dr. Thomson (*Land and Book*, ii, 380) found mandrakes ripe on the lower ranges of Lebanon and Hermon towards the end of April. On the 15th of May, Schuls also found mandrakes on Mount Tabor, which, as he says, "have a delightful scent, and whose taste is equally agreeable, although not to every body. They are almost globular, and yellow like oranges, and about two and a quarter inches in diameter. This fruit grows on a shrub resembling the mallow; and the fruit lies about the stem, as it were about the root, after such a manner a single plant may yield six to ten fruits, or even more. The color is so beautiful that no orange can equal its brilliancy." This fruit, which a recent traveler describes as of an "insipid, sickish taste," is by the Arabs of other
MANETHO (Μανέθω), of Alexandria, a native of Egypt, of humble origin, and a grammarian and a writer of histories. His works are not extant in their original form, but fragments of them have come down to us through the Middle Ages, and are preserved in the works of later writers, such as Eusebius, Athanasius, and John of Damascus. Manetho's chief work is a history of the Egyptian kings, called the "Chronicles," which is the most important source for the history of Egypt in the 3rd century BC. Manetho's "Chronicles" is divided into eight parts, each part being devoted to a different period of Egyptian history. His work is characterized by its rich detail and its attempt to chronicle the events of Egypt's past in a systematic and comprehensive manner. Manetho's "Chronicles" is considered one of the most important works of its time, and it has been a source of information for later historians and scholars.
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opoli. In addition to these works, Manetho is also said to have written, 1, 'Iepq BiBiatq, on the Egyptian religion; 2, Ἡπὶ ἀρχαίας τιμὶς εἰς ηπὶ τίμιας, on the ancient rites and ceremonies of the Egyptians; 3, Φαναρίων ἱστορίας (Laertius, Proem. s. 10), probably the same work as that called by Suidas ἱστορίας; 4, BiBiatq ἱστορίας, on the history of Egypt, which is very doubtful. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s. v.; English Cyclopædia, s. v. His name is introduced here on account of the importance of his work on Egyptian history in determining the list of ancient Egyptian kings. See Dows in J. A. S. E. for an examination of his authority. It has been re-examined by one class of writers, and almost wholly set aside by others, according to their own preconceived theories. See Pharaoh.

Authenticity of Manetho's History.—Manetho was a learned priest at the court of the first Ptolemy, according to Plutarch (de Is. et Os. c. 29), who cites a religious work of his in Greek, which is quoted also under various names by Elian, Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry, and other later writers (Fruin, Manethonis Sekenretis Reliquiae, p. 153 sq.); Partethy, Plutarch über Isis u. Osiris, p. 180 sq.). Josephus (Ant. i. 14—16, 26, 27) gives two accounts which may be fused into one by a literal correspondence with Coptic version of the Aigyptiaca, "a work composed in Greek by Manetho the Sekenret, from materials which he professes to have rendered from the sacred records;" of which history all else that is extant is a catalogue of Egyptian dynasties, presumably compiled in the 12th or 13th cent. B.C. by an Egyptian, called Manetho. It is noted by many as the Egyptian history, and by some as the Egyptian history of Josephus. (Josephus, Ant. i. 486 sq.) better meets the difficulty by supposing that the original work, never widely known, was so early lost that even in the 1st century all that survived of it was a bare abstract of its names and numbers, and (in this respect) nos passages relating to the "Hypseus" and the "Iepes," with a list of seventeen reigns, which some Jewish writer had extracted on account of their Biblical interest, and beyond which Josephus knew nothing of Manetho. Whatever be the explanation, the fact is that it is only through Jewish and Christian writers that we ever hear of Manetho as a historian. Of these, Theophilus Ant. (ad Autolyc. ii. 30, 31, c. 181) does but copy Josephus. Clemens Alex. nowhere names Manetho. A history of "the Acts of the Kings of Egypt, in three books"—not, however, by Manetho, but by "Ptolemy the Mendesian"—is indeed known by a name, but it is from second-hand from Tzq (see c. 181, p. 129, as perhaps Justin Martyr before him (ad Gr. 8), quotes Ptolemy, not directly, but from Apion. In short, it is plain, comparing these passages and Eusebius. (Pr. Eccl. iii. 11, 12), that the story of the foundation of Alexandria is known of this Ptolemy of Mendes; and Apion, as far as we know, makes no mention of Manetho. In what relation the work of Ptolemy may have stood to Manetho's, as there is no evidence to show, it is idle to speculate; and, indeed, the question with which we are concerned would remain as much as it is even were it proved that "Manetho" is a borrowed name, and the Egyptians a product of Roman times. For the important point is, not who wrote the book, and when, but what is its value? It may not be genuine, nor so old as it pretends to be, and yet may contain good materials, honestly rendered from earlier writings or original records, probably as available in the time of Domitian as they were under the Ptolemites; and, in fact, existing monuments do furnish so considerable a number of names unquestionably identical with those in this, that to reject this altogether, and deny it all historical value, would betoken either egregious ignorance or a reckless scepticism that can shut its eyes to manifest facts.

Chronological Value of Manetho's History.—The text of the Catalogue of Thirty-eight Kings is of constant importance; and records cannot be held to warrant the assumption that it is to be depended upon where these fail. For the monuments which attest, also correct its statements. Monuments prove some reigns, and even dynasties, contemporary, which in the list are successive; but we have no means of ascertaining what was truly consecutive and what parallel, where monuments are wanting. Their dates are always in years of the current reign, not of an era. From Cambyses upward to Ptolemy, and his immediate predecessor, Taracus—Tirhaka, the chief of the Edomites—within seventy years (see Chronology, sec. iii.). Hence up to Ptolemy there is only one century, as too scanty to yield any determination. For dyn. xxi., headed by Seosonchis—Shishak, the records are copious: dates on spis-tele, of which Mariette reports seven in this dynasty, prove that it lasted much more than the 120 years of Africanus. But even then the text must be formed into a canon, and the epoch of Seosonchis can only be approximately given from the Biblical synchronism, "In 5 Rehoboam Shishak invaded Judah"—in what year of his reign the monument which records the conquest does not say; although the epoch of Rehoboam is, to B.C. 931, a mere point by the Biblical historians. The inscription is dated 21 Shishak, but does not indicate the order or time of the several conquests recorded. The attempt has been made to prove from Bib-
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dical data that the invasion was in the 20th year. Thus:

It was while Solomon was building Millo (2 Kings xi, 27) that Jeroboam fled to "Shishak, king of Egypt" (ver. 40). This work began not earlier than 24 Solomon (vi, 32), so the invasion in that or the next could be in the 20th year; if Jeroboam was immediately appointed over the forced labor of his tribesmen; if he presently conceived the purpose of insurrection, encouraged by Ahijah; if his purpose became known to Solomon almost as soon as formed; if, in short, his flight into Egypt was not later than 20 Solomon; and, lastly, if Shishak became king in that year, then 5 Beoboom (i.e., 45 Solomon) will be 20 Shii-
shak. This is a specimen of much that passes for chronol-
ogy, where the Bible is concerned. Some light is
thrown on the dynastic connection of dyn. xxii and
xxiii by discoveries by Mariette in Egypt, which proves the fact of numerous contemporary
reigns throughout Egypt at that time (Brugsch's Zeit-
schrift, July, 1863; De Rouge, Jiscr. du rov Tatschi Meri Amian, 1864). But it helps the chronology little or noth-
ing. In dyn. xx, xxi, is another gap, at present not to be
bridge over. The seven-named Tantises of xxii (Afr. 180, Eun. 121 years) seem to have been military
kings; and that they were partly contemporaneous with
xx and xxi may appear from the absence of apis-stela,
of which xx has nine, xxi seven. Dyn. xx, for which the text, consisting of its own name or name of its
kings, all bearing the name Rameses, beginning with R.
III, and five of them his sons, probably joint-kings.
The apis-inscriptions furnish no connected dates, nor can any
inference be drawn from their number, since Mariette
reports no less than five in the first reign. For dyn.
xxi (Schon), xxi, xxi (Amon), the materials, written and
monumental, are most copious; yet even here the means
of an exact determination are wanting: indeed, if fur-
ther proof were needed that the Manethonic lists are
to be not implicitly trusted, it is furnished by the monu-
mental evidence of contemporary reigns which in the
lists are successive. It is certain that the last two
kings, Amenemhet and Amenemhet III, have been
owned by all competent inquirers, that in the part
of the succession for which the evidence is clearest and
most ample, it is impossible to assign the year at which
any king, from Amenemhet to Tirhakah, began to reign.

No ingenuity of calculation and conjecture can make amends
for the capital defects—the want of an era, the inade-
quacy of the materials. The brilliant light shed on this
point or that, does but make the surrounding darkness
more palpable. Analysis of the lists may enable the inquirer, to the most, to divine the intentions of their
authors, which is but a small step gained towards the truth
of facts.

But it has been supposed that certain fixed points
may be got by means of astronomical conjunctions as-
signed to certain dates of the vague year on the monu-
maments: Thus: (i) A fragmentary inscription of Takelut
II, 6th king of dyn. xxii, purports that "on the 20th
Mesor of the 15th year of his father" (Seonsk II, accord-
ing to Lepsius, Age of XXII Dyn., but Oroskon II, ac-
cording to Brugsch, Dr. Hincks, and v. Gumpach), "the
heavenly was invisible, the moon struggling . . . . ."
Hence Mr. Cooper (Athenæum, 11 May, 1861) gathers,
that on the day named, in the given year of Seonsk II,
there was a lunar eclipse, which he considers must be
that of 16th March, B.C. 801. Dr. Hincks, who at first
also made the eclipse lunar, and its date 4th April, B.C.
945, now contends that it was solar, and the only possi-
bile date 1st April, B.C. 927 (Journal of Soc. Lit. Jan.
1863, p. 333-376; compare J. Jan. 1864, p. 409 sq.).
In making it solar, he follows M. v. Gumpach (Hät. Antiq.
of the People of Egypt, 1863, p. 29), who finds its date
11th May, B.C. 927. Unfortunately the 25th Mesor of
that year was 10th March. This is the only au-
mental notice supposed to refer to an eclipse: not worth
much at the best; the record, even if its meaning was
certain, is not contemporary.

(ii) In several inscriptions certain dates are given to
the "manifestation of Sothis," assumed to mean the}

protests against this story as a mere figment, prompted by Egyptian malignity, and labors to prove it inconsistent with Manetho's own list: unsuccessfully enough, for, in fact, Amenophis (Ammenophites, Aftr.) does appear there just where the story places him, i.e. next to Sethos and Ramesses II, with a reign of nineteen years and six months. The monuments give the name Menepthah, and his son and successor Seti = Sethos II, just as in the story. The names are not fictitious, whatever may be the value of the story as regards the Israelites. This Menepthah, then, son and successor of Ramesses the Great, is the Pharaoh of the Exodus according to Lepsius and Bunsen, and of late accepted as such by many writers, learned and unlearned. Those to whom the name of Manetho is not voucher enough, will demand independent evidence. In fact, it is alleged that the monuments of the time of Menepthah attest a period of depression: no great works of that king are known to exist; of his reign of twenty years the highest date hitherto found is the fourth; and two rival kings, Amenmessu (the Amenemesses of the lists) and Si-phtra, are reigning at the same time with him, i.e. holding precarious sovereignty in Thebes during the time of alien occupation and the flight of Menepthah (Bunsen, Ag., Stelle, iv, 208 sq.). That these two kings reigned in the time of Menepthah, and not with or after Sethos II, is assumed without proof; that the reign of Ramesses II was followed by a period of decadence proves nothing regarding the entire canonical chronology as to an event so memorable as the final expulsion of the hated "Shepherd" (Shasu), who so often figure in the monumental recitals of earlier kings (c. g. of Sethos I, who calls them Shasu u p'kamana-kur, "shepherds of the land of Canaan") as anything so strongly against the story as any merely negative evidence can do it. More important is the argument derived from the mention (Exod. i, 11) of the "treasure-cities Pithom and Raamases," built for the persecuting Pharaoh by the forced labor of the Hebrews; the Pharaoh (says Rosellini, Mon. Storici, i, 294 sq.) was Ramesses II, son of Sethos I, who gave one of the cities his own name. (Comp. Ewald, Gesch. ii, 66, note.) Lepsius, art. Aegypten, in Herzog's Enzyklop., calls this "the weightiest confirmation," and in Chronol. der Ag., i, 867-868, enlarges upon this argument. Raamases, he says, at the eastern, as Pithom (Pithoymou) was certainly at the western end of the great canal known to be the work of Ramesses II, and the site of the city bearing his name is further identified with him by the granite group disinterred at Abu Kelab, in which the deified king sits enthroned between the gods Bes and Thoth. On a similar idea, he urges that the settlement in Palestine must have been subsequent to the conquests made in that country by Ramesses III, first king of the 20th dynasty. To this it may be replied, (1) that we have no clear information as to the route of the invaders; if it was either through the desert, along the coast of Egypt, or to the land of Zin (the Lebanons), perhaps, were not directly affected by it. (2) The expeditions so pompously described on the monuments (as in the Statistical Table of Karnak, Thothmes III, and similar recitals of the conquests of Ramesses II and III; also the account of the great campaign of the Mr. Bird, in Trans. of the E. S. Lit. ii, 817 sq.) certainly did not result in the permanent subjugation of the countries invaded. This is sufficiently shown by the fact that the conquests repeat themselves under different kings, and even in the same reign. Year
by year the king with his army sets out on a gigantic rabitz, to return with spoil of cattle, slaves, and produce of the countries overrun. (3.) If the lands of the tribes were thus overrun, it may have been during one of the periods of servitude, in which case they suffered only as the vassals of their Canaanite overlords, or other foreigners. That this may probably have been the case is sufficient to deprive of all its force the argument derived from the silence of the monuments, and of the book of Judges.

There remains to be noticed one piece of documentary evidence which has quite recently been brought to light. Dr. R. H. Charles (Zeitschr. f. d. alt. u. neu. Testament, 1862, 4th dissertation, p. 114) re-prints what he calls that "one set of the Leyden hieratic papyri, now publishing by Dr. Leemans, consists of letters and official reports. In several of these, examined by M. Chabas, repeated mention is made of certain foreigners, called Apuraj, i. e. Hebrews, compelled by Ramses II to drag stones for the building of the city Raamses." In his Mélanges Egyptiens, 1862, 4th dissertation, M. Chabas calls them Aperu. It is certainly striking, as Mr. Birch remarks (in Revue Archéol. April, 1862, p. 291), that "in the three documents which speak of these foreigners, they appear exactly in the same kind of connection to which the Hebrews were subjected by the Egyptians; it is also important that the papyri were found at Memphis. But the more inviting the proposed identification, the more cautious one must be. It is best not to make the statement that in an Egyptian writing we may be that the name in Apetu; and as B and P have distinct characters, one does not see why the "b of "should be rendered by p. (The case of Epy had been is different; see below.) It seems, also, that the same name occurs as late as the time of Raamses IV, where it can hardly mean the Hebrews. Besides, the monument of Thothmes III above mentioned leads to quite a different conclusion. Where the evidence is so conflicting, the querier who seeks only truth, not the confirmation of a foregone conclusion, has no choice but to reserve his judgment.

The time of this Memephtha, so unhesitatingly proclaimed to be the Pharos of the Exodus, is placed beyond all controversy—so Bunsen and Lepsius maintain—by an invaluable piece of evidence furnished by the Theon, the Alexandria mathematician of the 4th century. In a passage of his unpublished commentary on the Almagest, first given to the world by Larcher (Herodot, ii, 553), and since by Biot (Sur la période Subélique, p. 18, 192 sq.), it is stated that the Soehi Cycle of Astronomical which, as it ended in A.D. 188, commenced in B.C. 1822 (20th July), was known in his time as "the era of Memephtha" (την ἑκατέρτον Μεμέφθης). There is no king of this name: read Μεμεφεχής—so we have Memephtha of the 19th dynasty, the king of the leper-story, the Exodus Pharos. Lepsius, making the return begin in B.C. 1328, places the exode at B.C. 1314 = 15 Memephtha, in accordance with the alleged thirteen years' retirement into Ethiopia and the return in the fourteenth or fifteenth year. Certainly the precise name Memephtha does not appear in the list; but that name may have been used for the purpose of distinguishing some particular king from others of the same name; and there is reason to think which was actually the case. (1.) The king Tethmosis or Thothmes III repeatedly appears on monuments with the addition to his royal legend Mem-ri, "Beloved of Re." With the article Mem-pr, and with the preposition Mem-ap-pr, which last is precisely Thoth's Memphite. (2.) The acknowledged confusion of names in that part of the 18th dynasty where this king occurs—Memephtha, Mem-pr, Akhuanames (Amenenem)—then Memphragousthous (A.A.E.F. of Josephus is evidently an error of copying for M. M. P.: in the list ibid. the 5th and 6th names are Μυροπρος, Μεσσαροδωμος)—is perhaps best explained by supposing that the king was known by his list as distinctively as well as his family name. (3.) In Pliny's notice of the obelisks (H. N. xxxvi, 64), that known to be of Thothmes III is said to belong to Memephtha, which, says Bunsen (iv, 180), "would be the popular distinctive name given to this Thothmes.

Just so! And in the statement of Theon the king is presented as a familiar person, the subject of popular distinction. It is not known to have been associated with a name, current among the Egyptians in the time of Antoninus, to the effect that the Soehi Cycle, then ending (A.D. 188), commenced in the reign of Thothmes III. The existence of popular distinction under such a tradition is attested by a number of scarabs, evidently of Roman workmanship, referring to the Soehi Cycle, and in which the royal legend of this monarch appears. These are sufficient grounds for believing that the Memephtha of Theon is no other than Thothmes III, and that his reign was supposed (rightly or wrongly) to include the year B.C. 1822. It may be, also, that when Herodotus was told that Meleae lived about 900 years before the time of his visit to Egypt—a date not very wide of B.C. 1227—Thothmes was named to him by his popular distinctive appellation Mem-pr, only confused with Mersanes, Prascho, of the Labyrinth and its Lake. (Other explanations of the name Memephtha may be seen in Böckh, Manetho, p. 691 sq.; Biot, Recherches, interprets it as the name of Memphite; Mem-woa, importing the name of the place, 20th July, the day of the rising of Sirius and epoch of the cycle, is true only for the latitude of Memphis.) What has been said is sufficient to show that there is no necessity for altering a letter of the name; consequently that the time of Memephtha is not defined by the authority of Theon. Dr. Rougé emphatically rejects Lepsius's notion of Memephtha (Rèv. Archéol. x. 664; Journal Asiatique, Aug. 1858, p. 268). He thinks the year 1822 lies in the reign of Raamses IV. In support of his date, B.C. 1314, for the exode, Lepsius (p. 695) has an account deduced from the modern Jewish chronology (Hillel's Mundane Ewv), in which he says that it is the precise year assigned to that event. Hillel, he is confident, was led to it by Memephtha's Egyptian tradition, which gave him the name of the Pharos, and this being obtained would easily give him the time. Bunsen, though finally settling on the year B.C. 1320, had previously declared with Lepsius for B.C. 1314, "decided by the circumstance that a tradition not compatible with the usual chronological systems of the Jews, but which cannot be accidental, places the exode near the date that the ancient astronomer, Apollonius of the Sedei Olan Rabbi, to admit of no doubt" (iv, 386). It admits of more than doubt—of absolute refutation. Hillel's whole procedure, from first to last, was simply Biblical. Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks gave him B.C. 425 for 11 Zeedekiah; thence up to 6 Hesekiah he found the sum = 183 years; for the kings of Israel the actual numbers were 345, of which he made 240 years; then 37 years of Solomon; 480 years of 1 Kings vi, 1, added to these, made the total 890 years, whence the date for the exode was B.C. 425 + 890 = 1315. But that this date, if correct, is only a probable date for the exode is demonstrable (Revue of Lepsias on Biblical Chronology, by H. Browne, in Arnold's Theolog, Critic, i, 59-59, 1851). Yet, though the process by which Hillel got his date is so transparent, it is spoken of as "an important tradition" by those who take ready-made conclusions second-hand, without inquiry into their real grounds. So Duncker, Gesch. des Alterthums, i, 196, note; Dr. Wil- liams, in Essays and Reviews, p. 68. It is alleged that an indication confirmatory of the low date assigned by these writers is furnished by the assertion of a monarch Memephtha, which occurs in connection with that history (Exod. xii, 2; xiii, 4; xxii, 16; xxxiv, 18; Deut. xvi). This argument proceeds on the presumption that Abih is the Hebraized form of the Egyptian Epyf, Copic Epyfis, of which the Arabic rendering is also Abih. The Egyptian
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"a made-up thing, systematically carved to shape, and therefore really fabulous." Whether or not the original "Manetho," as some supposed, was confined to himself, and was convinced upon a cyclical plan, we have but the lists as they come to us finally from the hands of Annianus and Pandorus through Synesius. It may be observed, however, that the cardinal dates given by Dicranarchus, which we have from a dependent source, imply that the cyclical treatment of Egyptian chronology was at least as old as the alleged time of Manetho ("Cycles," etc., u., a., soc. 4, 16, 24, 36).

For literature additional to the above, see under Egypt; also Fruit, "Disertatorio Historica de Manethone" (Leyd. 1847, 4vo); Bickh, "Manetho," (3d ed.); A. H. von Sagona, "Manetho, di Origine unserer Gesch." (Gottha, 1865, 8vo); A. M. Prob. Rev. Jan. 1866, p. 180.

Manger is the rendering found in Luke ii, 7, 12, 16, of the term παρατήρητος, used to designate the place in which the infant Redeemer was cradled, which seems to denote a "crib" or "stall" for feeding cattle, as it is rendered in Luke xxi, 15 (see Horrell Miscell. Crit. Leon. 1788, bk. ii, ch. xvii). It is employed in the Sept. in a similar sense for the Heb. דַּעְנָה, Job xxxix, 9; Isa, 1, 8; also by Josephus, Ant. viii, 2, 4; comp. Lucan, Tim. p. 14; Xenophon, Eph. iv, 1. Gennadot (Beiträge zur Sprach- und characterenfrage, p. 229) is in favor of translating the word crèbe everywhere here, and quotes Ezek. xi, 16 (Lev. a. v.), Philo (De somnii, p. 872, b. ed. Colon. 1618), and Sybile. Eryth. (ap. Lactantius, vii, 24, 12) to that effect. Schleusner (Lex. a. v.) says it is any enclosure, but especially the vestibule to the house, where the cattle were encloset, not with walls, but with boards; but in common Greek the word undoubtedly often refers to a trough hollowed out to receive the food for horses, etc. (see Homer, Ι.L., 571; x, 568; xxiv, 280). The Peshito Version evidently so understands it. On the other hand, it is doubtful if such a contrivance as a proper manger could be found in the East, or was known to the khanhs or "inna" of the description alluded to in the text. See Caravanserai.

"Stables and mangers, in the sense in which we understand them, are of comparatively late introduction into the East (see the quotations from Charlin and others in Harmers Best, ii, 205), and, although they have furnished material to modern painters and poets, did not enter into the circumstances attending the birth of Christ, and are hardly less inaccurate than the "cradle" and the "stable" which are among some descriptive "heresies." We are therefore doubtful here to regard the term as designating the lodge or projection in the end of the room used as a stable, on which the hay or other food of the animals of travellers was placed. (See Strong's Harmony and Ezra, of the Gospels, p. 14.) Several of the stables mentioned stand for the purpose of "lying in a cave," and it was a "cave and stable" itself was in a cave, and the identical manger in which the infant Jesus is traditionally stated to have lain is still shown by the superstitions monks, being no other than a marble sarcophagus; but the whole story is at variance with the narrative in the Gospels. (See Mel- don, De pseuto Christi, Jan. 1662.) See BURTHELM. Tavernier, speaking of Aleppo, states that "in the ca- ravanserai, on each side of the hall, for persons of the best quality, there are lodgings for every man by him- self. These lodgings are raised all along the court, two, or three stories high, with just behind which are the stables, where many times it is as good lying as in the chambers. Right against the head of every horse there is a niche with a window into the lodging-chamber, out of which every man may see that his horse is looked after. These niches are usually so large that three men may lie in them, and here the servants dress their victuals." In modern Oriental farm-houses, however, something corresponding to a Western "manger" may be found.

"It is common to find two sides of the one room where the native farmer resides with his cattle fitted up with these mangers, and the remainder elevated a foot or two to the feet higher for the accommodation of the family. The
mangers are built of small stones and mortar, in the shape of a box, or, rather, of a kneading-trough, and when goats, sheep, and other animals are kept there with hay in the summer, they do very well to lay little babies in" (Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 89). See STABLE.

Mangey, Thomas, D.D., an English theologian, was born at Leeds in 1684; was educated at St John's College, Cambridge; held successively the livings of St Mildred, Bread Street, London; St Nicholas, Guildford, and St. Mithion, in Middlesex; in complaint to Dr. Robinson, bishop of London; in 1721 was presented to the fifth stall in the cathedral of Durham, and was advanced to the first stall in 1723; became D.D. in 1726, and died in 1755. Dr. Mangey published a number of Sermons, and three treatises. His most valuable edition of the works of Philo Judaeus: Philo Judaei Opera omnia que reperiri potuerunt (Lond. 1742, 2 vols. fol.).—Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. a.v.; Hook, Eccles. Bibi. vii, 222.

Manhättains or Haagleitnerians: the name of a party in the Romish Church, especially in the archbishopric of Salzburg, from 1814 to 1829, whose founder and chief was a young priest named Caspar Haagleitner, of Hofgarten; and its most distinguished and active member was Sebastian Mani, of Westendorf (known also by the name of Manhart, from one of his estates). In 1814 he was appointed the prince-bishop of Chiemsee and the coadjutor of Salzburg as ecclesiastical authorities in the diocese. The clergy submitted with the exception of Haagleitner, who refused to recognise them, and showed symptoms of heresy. He left Hofgarten and went to Tyrol, where he created some religious and political troubles, and gained a number of followers. At the peace of Schönbrunn the Tyrol fell again into the hands of the French, and Haagleitner was taken a prisoner to Kuusstein and Salzburg. He finally succeeded in making good his escape; and when, in 1819, he recovered the Bavarian and a tyrol, he was appointed vicar at Wörgl. Here he continued his intrigue, and succeeded so well that the people came to consider him as the only true priest in the country, the others having failed to do their duty by submitting to the dictates of Napoleon. Manhart assisted Haagleitner greatly in propagating his doctrines in Westendorf, Hofgarten, and Kirchbichl, and their effect was felt even long after Haagleitner had been removed from Wörgl. Manhart held meetings in his own house, preaching himself, or allowing his wife to preach, as well as a woman from Hofgarten. The administrator of the diocese of Salzburg, and afterwards the archbishop Augustin Gruber, sought in vain to reconcile them with the Church; they were asked to be instructed by the pope himself in case they were in the wrong, and for this purpose the House went to Rome in 1825. The difficulty ended soon after.—Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, viii, 741.

Mānī (Māi, Vulg. Bami), given (1 Esdr. ix. 80) by error for Bani (q. v.) of the Heb. list (Exra x. 29).

Māni, Manōra, or Manōchōruṣ (entitled Zendik, Sadducee), the founder of the heretical sect of the Manicheans, is said to have flourished in the second half of the 3d century. Little is known with regard to his early history and accounts transmitted through two distinct sources—the Western or Greek, and the Eastern—are legendary and contradictory on almost every important point. According to the most probable supposition, he was a native of Persia, and was born about 214. His real name appears to have been Curbius, and his was the name of a rich man of Ctesiphon, who bought him when he was but seven years of age, and him carefully educated, and at her demise left him all her wealth. Among the books she left him is said to have found the writings of Scythianus, which has been given to her by one of the latter's disciples named Terebinthus, or Buḍa. —As Exeter, he is said to have been in Persia at this time in great ferment. The progress of Christianity had awakened the opposition of all the heathen religions from the Indus to the Euphrates. Persia was the most powerful among them. Mani, with the aid of the emperor, cast great terror among the Persians, and in the month of ChImpact he proclaimed himself to be the prophet promised by Christ. It is said that the attempt was looked upon with favor by king Sapor and by Hormizd, but this appears doubtful. Followers soon gathered, and three of the new sect—Thomas, Buddas or Addas, and Herman—propagated the doctrines, the first in Egypt and throughout the East Indies. Herman only was sent with Mani to assist him. While they were away the son of Sapor fell ill, and Mani, who had been highly spoken of as a physician, was called to attend him; but, not succeeding, he was thrown into prison. Mani bribed his keeper and succeeded in escaping, but was pursued and captured, and publicly executed.

There are other accounts, however, which make Mani the scion of a noble magian family, and a man of extraordinary mental powers and artistic and scientific abilities—an eminent painter, mathematician, etc. According to one account, he embraced Christianity, and became presbyter at a church in Ebrur or Abvajr, in the Persian province of Hazirdi. He purposed to purify Christianity of its alleged Jewish corruptions, to demonstrate its unity with Persia, and thereby to make the perfect universal religion. He gave himself out to be the Paraclete, and styled himself in ecclesiastical documents "Mani, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the election of God the Father. These are the words of salvation from the eternal and living Source." He was persecuted by king Sapor I., he sought refuge in foreign countries, went to India, China, and Turkistan, and there lived in a cave for twelve months, during which he claimed to have been in heaven. He reappeared with a wonderful book of drawings and pictures, called Erslshen or Erteken-Mani. Nothing doubt during his residence in these countries he was acquainted with Buddhism, and had decided to incorporate some of its best points in his syncretistic religion (comp. Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, i, 288 sq.). After the death of Sapor (A.D. 272) he returned to Persia, where Hormes, the new king, who was well inclining to religion, received him with favor, and, in order to protect him more effectually against the persecutions of the magi, gave him the stronghold of Dehshereh, in Susiana, as a residence. After the death of this king, however, Bahram, his successor, entrapped Mani into a public disputation with the magi, for which purpose he invited to his castle; but he was seized and flayed alive, A.D. 277. His skin was stuffed and hung up as a terror at the gates of the city Jondishapur.

Among the works of Mani may be reckoned four books, sometimes ascribed to Terebinthus and sometimes to Scythianus, entitled the Mysteries, the Chapters or Heads, the Gospel, and the Treasure. In the Mysteries Mani endeavored to demonstrate the doctrine of two principles from the mixture of good and evil which is found in the world. He grounded his reason on the argument that if there were one sole cause, simple, perfect, and good, and the highest degree of being, corresponding with the nature and will of that cause, would show simplicity, perfection, and goodness, and everything would be immortal, holy, and happy like himself. The Chapters contained a summary of the chief articles of the Manichaean scheme. Of the gospels nothing certain can be asserted. Beausebre, apparently without sufficient grounds, considers it as a collection of the meditations and pretended revelations of Mani. The Treasure, or Treasure of Life, may, perhaps, have derived its name from the treasure hid in a field wherein he proposed to bury the same.
have fragments still extant in St. Augustine, who undertook to refute it. His works appear to have been original, and the doctrine, so far as we know it, seems to have been extinguished. For his doctrine, etc., see **Manichæism**. (J. H. W.)

**Manichæism.** As we have seen in the life of **Mani** (q. v.), the origin of Manichæism, as well as the history of its founder and propagator, is matter of obscure and confused tradition. Although it utterly disclaimed being denominational Christian, it was reckoned among the heretical doctrines of the Church. It was intended, as we have already indicated in the sketch of Mani, to blend the chief doctrines of Parseism, or rather Magism, as reformed by Zoroaster, with a certain number of Buddhist views, under the outward garb of Biblicism. Theologically speaking, it was a new, confused, explained allegorically and symbolically, was made to represent an entirely new religious system, and one wholly at variance with Christianity and its fundamental teachings (comp. Hardwick, **Christ and other Masters**, ii, 369 sq.; and see the references there for Lassem and others).

**Doctrines.**—Like Magism, Manichæism holds that there are two eternal principles from which all things proceed, the two everlasting kingdoms, bordering on each other—the kingdom of light under the dominion of God, and the kingdom of darkness under the demon or Ape (Pers. Beelde, the Evil), the Good, the Light, the Bad, the Matter, or Archon, each inhabited a region akin to their natures, and excluding each other to such a degree that the region of Darkness and its leader never knew of the existence of that of the Light. This dualism was in accordance with the teaching of the original doctrines of Christianity; it was condemned by the Council of Chalcedon. The zodiac and the twelve stages of the world—had sprung (emanated) from the Primeval Light; while “Darkness,” filled with the eternal fire, which burned but shone not, was peopled by “demons,” who were constantly fighting among themselves. In one of these contests, pressing towards the outer edge, as it were, of their region, they became aware of the neighboring region, and with this united attack, and succeeded in taking captive the ray of Light that was sent against them at the head of the hosts of Light, and which was the embodiment of the Ideal or Primal Man (Christ). A stronger son (the Holy Ghost) then hastened to the rescue, and redeemed the greater and better part of the captive Light (Jesus Immanuel). The smaller and fainter portion, however (Jesus Passibilia), remained in the hands of the powers of Darkness, and out of their power, that idea of God or man which has been the mortal man. But even the small fraction of light left in him (broken in two souls) would have prevailed against them had they not found means to further divide and subdivide it by the propagation of this man (Jesus) into the world—by concealing the Light by burying it under dark “forms of belief and faith, such as Paganism and Judaism.” Once more, however, the Original Light came to save the light buried in man—to deliver the captive souls of men from their corporeal prison. On this account there were created two sublimes beings, Christ and the Holy Ghost. Christ was sent into the world clothed with the shadowy form of a human body, and not with the real substance, to teach mortals how to deliver the rational soul from the corporeal body, and to overcome the power of malignant matter. But again the demons succeeded in defeating them by the rays of their light. Obscuring their minds, even those of the apostles, so that they could not fully understand Christ’s object, his career of salvation was cut short by the demons seducing man to crucify him. His sufferings and death were, naturally, only fictitious. He was suffered to remain in the state of the man he once was, and his crucifixion allowed himself to become an example of endurance and passive pain for his own, the souls of Light. But to carry out the intended salvation of men Christ, shortly before his crucifixion, gave the promise recorded by John (xvi, 15), that he would send to his disciples the Comforter, who would lead them into all truth. In his promise, the Manicheans maintain, was fulfilled in the person of Mani, who was sent by the God of Light to declare to all men the doctrine of salvation, without concealing any of its principles under the veil of metaphor, or under any other covering.

Mani, like Christ, surrounded himself with twelve apostles, and sent them into the world to teach and to preach his doctrine of salvation. To carry out his work more successfully, and to make converts also of the Jews, he rejected the authority of the Old Testament, which, he said, was the work of the God of Darkness, whom the Jews had worshipped in the place of Light, and also a good part of the New Testament, upon the ground that many of the books had been grossly interpolated, and were not the productions of the person whose names they bear. As strictly conforming only his own writings, and such parts of the New Testament as answered his purpose, he says Baur (**Manich. Religionsystem**, p. 576), “in the writings of the New Testament seemed to concur with the dualism set forth by Mani was accounted among the most genuine ingredients in the doctrines of Christianity, and Mani and his adherents were very glad to cite for the confirmation of their own doctrines and principles passages like Matt. vii, 18; xiii, 24; John i, 8; vii, 44; xiv, 50; 1 Cor. xiv, 4 (comp. Eph. xiv, 4, 7, 8); 1 Thess. iv, 7 (57, 58); and especially those in which the Apostle Paul makes the opposition between flesh and spirit. As they found, however, so much in the New Testament which not only did not confirm the Manichean doctrines, but stood in open opposition to them, they were obliged, in accordance with their principles, to introduce into the original doctrines of Christianity, to regard all passages of this kind as a distortion and falsification of Christianity. Accordingly, they laid down the rule that the written records of Christianity ought not to be received unless conditioned integrity and authenticity was subjected to a previous scrutiny, with a view to ascertain how far they exhibited the genuine substance of Christianity; and this was limited to those portions which bore the character of Manicheism, so that, following this criterion, whatever did not harmonize with their own doctrines was rejected without hesitation, because original Christianity could not contradict itself.”

Mani also taught that those souls which obeyed the laws delivered by Christ, as explained by himself, the Comforter, and struggled against the lusts and appetites of a corrupt nature, would, on their death, be delivered from the bonds of their spirits, and be clothed in the light and sun and moon—“the two light-ships for conducting the imprisoned light into the eternal kingdom of light”—would ascend to the regions of light; and that those souls which neglected to struggle against their corrupt appetites would either be sent to the regions of darkness or be captured by the demons of other beings, until they had expiated their guilt. Belief in the evil of matter led to a denial of the doctrine of the resurrection. “These ideas,” says Donaldson (**Christian Orthodoxy**, p. 148), “they (the Manicheans) worked out in a manner peculiar to themselves, and with results decidedly unfavorable to the integrity and authenticity of the New Testament. They could accept neither the doctrine nor the facts of revelation, unless they could regard them as a reflex of their own dualism. Without wishing to reject Christianity, they made their own system the standard of measurement, and lop-sidedly appreciated the religion of the Occident, in which it did not fit the religion of light and darkness. The identification of Christ with Mithras led, of course, to a profession of Docetism, namely, to the assertion that our Lord’s sufferings on the cross were not real, but apparent only. One has that had no real human body, no double nature, but only a fantastic semblance of corporeity, in which his essence, as the Son of Everlasting Light, was presented to the eyes of men. Accordingly, Christ had no human birth, and his apparent sufferings were really inflicted on him by his enemy, the Spirit of Darkness; and in this resolving the life of Jesus into a series of Illusory appearances, the Manicheans take from Chris-
Manichaeism

Manichaeism is a religious movement that emerged in the 3rd century CE, founded by the Persian prophet Mani. It was a dualistic religion that believed in a conflict between good and evil, with the ultimate goal of achieving salvation through knowledge and spiritual development. Manichaeism spread throughout the ancient world, influencing various cultures and religions.

Characteristics of Manichaeism

1. Dualism: Manichaeism is based on the concept of dualism, which posits a fundamental conflict between light and darkness. This dualism is seen in all aspects of life, from the natural world to human society.

2. Gnostic Elements: Manichaeism incorporates elements from Gnosticism, a form of early Christianity that emphasized the material world as a prison of evil. Manichaeism teaches that humans are locked in this prison and must escape through knowledge and spiritual development.

3. Manichaean Gospels: The Manichaean Gospels are a unique collection of religious texts that were written in various languages, including Syriac, Coptic, and Greek. These texts contain the teachings of Mani and his followers.

4. Manichaean Art: Manichaeism also had a significant impact on art and architecture, with many examples of Manichaean art found in churches and other religious buildings.

5. Manichaean Cosmology: Manichaeism has a complex cosmology that is based on the dualism of light and darkness. The universe is divided into two realms, each ruled by a deity: the Celestial Father, who is associated with light, and the Illuminator, who is associated with darkness.

6. Manichaean History: Manichaeism spread rapidly in the early centuries of the Christian era, and its influence can be seen in various cultures throughout the world. However, it was eventually suppressed by the early church, and its followers were often persecuted.

7. Manichaean Symbols: The Manichaeans used many symbols to represent their beliefs, including the Cross, which was seen as a symbol of the conflict between light and darkness.

8. Manichaean Practices: Manichaeism had a strict set of practices that its followers were expected to follow, including celibacy, poverty, and asceticism.

Manichaeism was a significant religious movement that had a lasting impact on the development of various cultures and religions. Its teachings and symbols continue to influence modern thought and philosophy.
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specta untrustworthy), in Routh's Religions sacrae, v. 2-206. The Oriental account of later date, indeed (the 11th and 10th centuries), but drawn from ancient sources, are collected in Herbel, Bibl. Orient. (Par., 1679), s. v. Mani. See Titus Bostrensis (about 660), Karăș Mustață, Epiphanius, Hier. p. 66 (drawn from Archelaus); Za-

chagali, Monumento Ecclesiaco Greco e Latino (Rome, 1895), 41; also (about 11th century) the article on T. Gennisi contra Manichaeos; De dacibus abominabilius Manichii; De Vera religione Epistolae fundamenta contra Faustinum; Fabricius, Biblioth. Graec. v. 284; Beau-

sobre, Histoire cristi, de Manichée et du Manichéisme (Amst. 1794, 6 vol.); Ch. Desclerck, De la vraie Religion des Manichéens. Religionen westen nach den Quellen untersucht (Tub., 1831); Fligtel, Mani, seine Leb. u. seine Schriften (Leipzig, 1862); Trebesch, Uber den Kanon die Kritik, u. die Exegete der Manichäer (Ber., 1892); Golditz, Entstehung d. manisch. Religionssystema (Leipzig, 1887); Reichlin-Meldeggy, Theologie d. Mongerei Mani u. ihr Uebergang (Frankf. 1883); V. de Wagner, Manich. indigentias cum brevi totius Man.

nich. adnotationibus, e foeminae descriptis (Leipzig, 1827); P. de Lagarde, Tit Manichæi contram Manich. libri quattuor Syriace (Berlin, 1869); Stud. und Krifl. v. 8, 676 sq. (review of Baer). In any case, see the final section (272 sq.) to the Manichaic. Ch. Hist., ii, 707 sq.; Schaff, Ch. Hist., § 78; Donaldson, Christian Orthodoxy, p. 127 sq.; Haag, Hist. der Dogmen Christia (see Index); Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, i, 240 sq., 552, 553; Pressensé, L'historie du Dogme (Paris, 1889), chap. ii. (J. H. W.)

Manipa, the name of a monstrous idol worshipped in India. The name of Tangu and Mani, a king of Katury. It has nine heads, which rise pyramidal, there being three in the first and second row, then two, and one at the top of all. A bold, resolute young fellow, dressed in armor, and prompted by enthusiastic courage, on certain days of the year, runs about the city Tanchath, and kills every one he meets in honor of his god. By such outrageous sacrifices as these the devotees imagine they extremely oblige Manipa.—Kircher, China illustr.; Broughton, Bibliothec Hist. Sac. s. v.

Maniple, an article of dress introduced when the use of the stole as a handkerchief fell into disuse. It now represents the cord with which our Lord was bound to the pillar at his scourging.—Walcott, Sac. Archael. s. v.; Siegel, Archael. s. v. Maniple.

Manitou is the name of any object used as a fetish or amulet among some tribes of the American Indians—those of the North and North-west. "The Illinois," wrote the Jesuit Marest, "ador a sort of genius which they call the Manitou; to them it is the substance of the earth, the spirit that rules all things. A bird, a buffalo, a bear, a feather, a skin—that is their Manitou." "If the Indian word manitou," says Pallfrey, "appeared to denote something above or beside the common aspects and agencies of nature, it might be natural, but it would be rash and misleading to confound its import with the Christian, Mohammedan, Jewish, Egyptian, or Greek conception of the Deity, or with any compont or selection from some or all of these ideas." See Indians.

Manley, IRA, a Congregational minister and home missionary, was born about the year 1780; was a graduate of Middlebury College, studied law, was admitted to the bar, and left a fine practice to enter the ministry. He was a home missionary for sixty years, and a pioneer in all good enterprises. The last twenty years of his life were spent in Wisconsin. He died at Keene, Essex County, N. Y., Feb. 6, 1871. —New Amer. Cyclop. 1871, p. 569.

Man'ius, the name of one of the ambassadors who is said to have written a letter to the Jews confirming whatever concession Lydias had granted them. Four letters were written to the Jews, of which the last is from "Quintus Memmius and Titus Manlius (Gr. Tiroo Masion Tifos, Eng. Titus Manlius), ambassadors (σπευδόρατος) of the Romans" (2 Macc. xii, 34). There is not much doubt that the letter is a fabrication, as history is entirely ignorant of these names. Polybius (Relig. xxxi, 6, 5), for about eighteen times quotes and Maimon Sergius who were sent to Antiochus IV Epiphanes about B.C. 163, and also (Relig. xxxi, 12, 9) Cn. Octavius, Spurius Lucretius, and L. Aurelius, who were sent into Syria in B.C. 162 in consequence of the contention for the guardianship of the young king Antiochus. Antiochus V Eupator, the successor of T. Manlius, received the same treatment as T. Manlius, and Polybius, Relig. xxxii, 1, 2. The employment of this Seleucid era (B.C. 160), and in this year there was a consul of the name of T. Manlius Torquatus, who appears to have been sent on an embassy to Egypt about B.C. 164, to mediate between the two Ptolemies, Philadelphus and Euergetes (Livy, xilii, 11, y. Polybius, Relig. xxxii, 1, 2). The employment of this Seleucid era as a date, the absence of the name of the city, and especially the fact that the first intercourse of the Jews and Romans did not take place two years later, when Judas heard of the fame of the Romans (1 Macc. vili, 9) makes it altogether impossible that the document is from authentic.

The three other letters do not merit serious attention (2 Macc. xii, 10-33). See Wernwag, De fad. Lib. Mac.

Manly, BASHI, D.D., a Baptist divine and educator of note, was born in Chatham County, N. C., Jan. 28, 1796. At the age of sixteen he became a member of a Baptist Church, and not long after began speaking in public, though he was not regularly licensed till 1818. He preached his first sermon in Beaufort, S. C., and must have made a favorable impression, for he at once received an offer of aid from a society for the education of ministers, and commenced his studies. In December, 1819, he entered the junior class in South Carolina College, and graduated with the highest honor in 1821. He immediately entered into an engagement to preach in the Edgefield District, and was ordained in March, 1822. A Church was formed at Edgefield Court-house about a year later, of which he was pastor for three years, gaining for the denomination a reputation as a powerful preacher in South Carolina. He was called in 1826 to the pastorate of the Baptist Church in Charleston, and continued there eleven years, during which time he not only sustained and extended his reputation as a preacher, but was active in the cause of liberal and theological education, effecting the establishment of which is now known as King's College, South Carolina University, at Greenville, S. C. At that period theological instruction was included in the plans of this and similar institutions. Dr. Manly lived to see the Baptist of the South concentrate their energies upon the establishment and support of a single theological seminary. He took a lively interest in this matter, partly, no doubt, from a sense of the disadvantages under which he had himself labored; for, though a good scholar, he was a self-educated theologian. He was chosen in 1887 to the presidency of the University of Alabama, and administered offices for about eighteen years with emi-

nent ability and success. In 1855 he returned to Charleston, and to the pastoral office over one of the four churches that now existed in place of the one to which he had formerly ministered. He was subsequently engaged as a missionary and evangelist in Alabama, and as a pastor at Montgomery. He died at Greenville, S. C., Dec. 21, 1868. As a preacher, Dr. Manly was emi-

nently popular. His discourses, though instructive and convincing, were also charged with the elements of emotional power, and, with all his success as a preacher, this was the work in which he was most delighted. Dr. Manly wrote a "treatise on Moral Science," which was for years a text-book in Southern colleges. It indicated
MANN, Cyrus, an American Congregational minister and author, was born at Oxford, N. H., April 8, 1785; was educated at Dartmouth College (class of 1806); was principal of Gilmanton Academy two years; teacher of the Troy high-school one year; city schoolmaster from 1810 to 1814; pastor of the Church at Westminster, Mass., from 1815 to 1841; then of Robinson Church, Plymouth, three years; next a teacher at Lowell several years; finally, from 1832 to 1836 acting pastor of the North Falmouth Church. He died at Shrewsbury, Mass., Feb. 9, 1859. M. Mann published An Epitome of the Evidences of Christianity:—History of the Temperance Reformation:—Memoir of Mrs. Myra W. Allen; and some Sermons.—Dake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. p. 595.

Mann, Horace, L.L.D., one of the most prominent educators in our country, a philanthropist whose name deserves to be honored by every American,—"a soul whose life was a galvanic thrill along the muscles of our age"—was born, of very humble parentage, at Franklin, Mass., May 4, 1796. Though not privileged with the advantages of a careful training in his early boyhood, he yet managed to acquire a good knowledge of the so-called "common branches." At the age of twenty he resolved to secure for himself the advantages of a collegiate training. His instructors hitherto, they tell us, he had found to be "very good people, always willing to give him what was necessary for his health, never strong, and now undermined by a life of the most intense and unremitting activity. The fiery soul consumed the body at last, Aug. 2, 1859.

Mann on the Relation of Religion to Education.—Mr. Mann had been reared under the influence of the Calvinistic faith. While yet a youth he had cherished an aversion to this orthodoxy because, as he tells us, it had taught him to look upon God as "infinite Malignity personified." When, at the mature age of forty, just as he entered on his work as an educator, he fell in with Combe's Constitution of Man, he at once became a convert. From that time on, he taught, as an anthropological, and philosophical and moral doctrines, the prevalence of which would, in his view, "produce a new earth and not a new heaven." Believing what is called the "evangelical faith," at that time ruling New England, to be in its influence derogatory to the character of God, and dawning and enabling to the mind of man, he conceived it to be his task to vindicate the former and to emancipate the latter. Especially he reproved his countrymen's "foul spirit of orthodoxy," so far as it entered the domain of the public schools, and this he believed to be "the greatest discovery ever made by man." "Other social organizations," he says, "are curative and remedial; this is a preventive and antidote. There is no form of the Physical mode of teaching, the physical and moral frame invaluable to them. Let the common school be expanded to its capabilities, let it be worked with the efficiency of which it is susceptible, and nine tenths of the crimes in the penal code will be abolished—men would walk more safely by day—every pillow would be more inviting by night—property, life, and character held by a stronger tenure
MANN

all rational hopes respecting the future brightened. It
was obvious that these glowing anticipations were born
of something more, if not better, than reading, writing,
and arithmetic. "Education was, in Mann's view, a word
of much higher import than that popularly given to it.
"It is a function to call out from within all that was di-
viously placed there, to develop the truth that the present
'generation has had." Herein lay the greatest defect
of the system he sought to establish in our schools.
Stamping with the name of bigotry all religious views
that did not coincide with his own, regarding orthodox-
ly as the great thyroid by which man was enslaved,
he would introduce a system of Christian education
based on a doctrine respecting virtue and vice, rewards and penal-
ties, time and eternity, constituting the basis of his
theories and schemes of popular education, which meant
nothing else than the substitution of natural religion
for the moral. How far his system attained to this aim
we may judge by the prevalence of the doctrines of the
so-called "liberal theology" in the Eastern States, par-
ticularly in Massachusetts. In the West he must cer-
tainly have been disappointed. Though more than a
thousand schools sat at his feet in Antioch, he was
only in a very moderate degree succeeding in spreading
"a religionism from whose features the young would not
turn away." But if Mr. Mann failed in meeting that
success which a person of his indomitable will, uncom-
mon energy, and rare acquirements must have looked
for and desired, we would not in the least detract from
the value of his labors in behalf of education among the
masses, and the greatness of his services to common-
school education in America.

Besides his annual reports, a volume of lectures on
education, and voluminous controversial writings, his
principal work is Slavery. Letters and Sketches (Boston,
1851). Since his death all his writings have been
published and published by his wife, under the title The
5vo). See Life of Horace Mann, by his wife (Boston,
1865, 12mo); Thomas, Dict. Biog. and Mythol.; Prince-
tes's Biog.; 1866 (Aug.). (J. H. W.)

Mann, William, D.D., an American educator of
note, was born in Burlington County, N. J., about
the year 1784. While young he was placed in a print-
 ing-office, where he remained until his fourteenth year.
Though unable to attend school a single day, he ac-
quired a thorough education by private study. He was
consecrated in his 25th year, joined the Methodist Episco-
pal Church, and shortly after became a local preacher.
The principal part of his life after this time was devoted
to teaching. He was for some years principal of Mt.
Holly Academy, in his native state. Subsequently he
removed to Philadelphia, where he maintained a high
reputation for his success in teaching the classics. The
degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Dickinson
College. He died in Philadelphia July 4, 1867.—New
Am. Cyclop. 1867, p. 567.

Manna (מָנָה, man, according to Gesenius, a portion,
from the Arabic; but a different derivation is alluded to
in the passage where it first occurs [see Thyn, De orii-
gine voca Manna, etc., Vitebm, 1641.]), the name
given to a species of grass which was requisite to be
declared by the Israelites to eat. It was the usual food
for forty years during their wanderings in the desert.
The same name has in later ages been applied to
some natural productions, chiefly found in warm, dry
countries, but which have little or no resemblance to the
original manna. This is first mentioned in Exod. xvi.
It is there described as being first produced after the
eighth encampment in the desert of Sin, as white like
hoar frost (or of the color of biellium, Numb. xi, 7),
round, and of the bigness of coriander seed (pud).
It fell with the dew every morning, and when the dew
was exhaled by the heat of the sun, the manna appeared
alone, lying upon the ground or the rocks round
the encampment of the Israelites. "When the children
of Israel saw it, they said one to another, What is it for
them, seeing they knew not what it was" (Exod. xvi, 15). In
its usage and supposed effect, much has been inaccurately
translated—which, indeed, is apparent from the
other two parts of the sentence contradicting each other
("It is manna; for they wist not what it was"). The
word occurs again in Exod. xvi, 15, 31, 33, 35; Numb. xi,
6, 7, 9; Deut. vii, 20; 13; Josh. vii, 2; 15; Judges vii, 20; 1
and lxviii, 24. In the Sept. the substance is almost
always called manna (μαννα), and so the N. Test. always:
John vi, 31, 49, 58; Heb. iv, 4; Rev. ii, 17; also the
Apocrypha, Wisd. xvi, 20, 21) instead of man (μᾶς,
Exod. xvi, 31, 32, 35). Josephus (Ant. iii, 1, 6), in
giving an account of this substance, thus sounds with
the textual etymology: "The Hebrews call this food
manna (μαννα), for the particle man (μᾶς) in our lan-
guage is the asking of a question, 'What is this?'" (Heb.
 CLLūM "םמוא, man-ns.) Moses answered this question by
telling them, "This is the bread which the Lord hath
given you." (Exod. xvi, 29, 30). We are further informed that
the manna fell every day, except on the Sabbath. Every
sixth day, that is on Friday, there fell a double quantity
of it. Every man was directed to gather an omer (about
three English quarts) for each member of his family;
and the woman was afterwards to have been measured
out at the rate of an omer to each person: "He who
gathered much had nothing over, and he who gathered
little had no lack." That which remained ungathered
dissolved in the heat of the sun, and was lost. The
quantity collected was intended for the food of the cur-
cent day only; if any were kept till the morrow, it
corrupted and bred worms. Yet it was directed that
a double quantity should be gathered on the sixth day
for consumption on the Sabbath. It was found that
the manna kept for the Sabbath remained sweet and
wholesome. It was also observed, that it corrupted at other
times if kept for more than one day. The same man-
er as they would have treated grain, they reduced it to
meal, kneaded it into dough, and baked it into cakes,
and the taste of it was like that of wafers made with
honey or of fresh oil. In Numb. xi, 6—9, where the de-
scription of the manna is repeated, an omer is men-
tioned as being directed to be preserved as a memorial to future
generations, "that they may see the bread wherewith I have
fed you in the wilderness;" and in Josh. v, 12 we learn
that after the Israelites had encamped at Gilgal, and
"did eat of the old corn of the land, the manna ceased
on the morrow after, neither had the children of Israel
manna any more."

This miracle is referred to in Deut. vii, 9; Neh. ix,
20; Ps. lxviii, 24; John vi, 31, 49, 58; Heb. iv, 4.
Though the manna of Scripture was so evidently mirac-
ulous, both in the mode and in the quantities in which it
was produced, and though its properties were so dif-
ferent from anything with which we are acquainted,
yet, because its taste is in Exodus said to be like that of
wafers made with honey, many writers have thought
that they recognized the manna of Scripture in a sweet-
ish exudation which is found on several plants in Arabia
and Persia. The name manna, or mamos, is applied to
this substance by the Arab writers, and was probably so
applied even before their time. But the term is now
almost entirely appropriated to the sweetish exudation
of Fruicus rotundifolius, a plant which is called in the
Arabic language Fraxinus rotundifolia. These, however, have no rela-
tion to the supposed manna of Scripture. Of this one
kind is known to the Arabs by the name of guzybion,
being the produce of a plant called gzuz, which is as-
certained to be a species of Fruicus. The same spe-
cies seems also to be called türfa, and is common in
different parts of the coast of Arabia. It is also found
in the neighborhood of Mount Sina. Berchuard,
while in the valley wady el-Shaik, to the north of Mount Serbal, says: "In many parts it was thickly overgrown with the tamarisk or tarfa; it is the only valley in the Peninsula where this tree grows at present in any quantity, though some small bushes are here and there met with in other parts. It is from the tarfa that the manna is obtained; and it is very strange that the fact should have remained unknown in Europe till M. Seetzen mentioned it in a brief notice of his 'Tour to Sinai,' published in the Mines de l'Orient. The substance is called by the Arabs waasa. In the month of June it drops from the thorns of the tamarisk upon the fallen twigs, leaves, and thorns which always cover the ground beneath the tree in the natural state. The Arabs use it as they do honey, to pour over their unleavened bread, or to dip their bread into; its taste is agreeable, somewhat aromatic, and as sweet as honey. If eaten in any quantity it is said to be highly purgative." He further adds that the tamarisk is one of the most common trees in Nubia and throughout the whole of Arabia; on the Euphrates, on the Astaboras, in all the valleys of the Hejaz and Heja it grows in great quantities, yet nowhere but in the region of Mount Sinai did he hear of its producing manna. Ehrenberg has examined and described this species of tamarisk, which he calls T. masnifera, but which is considered to be only a variety of T. gallica. The manna he con-

siders to be produced by the puncture of an insect which he calls Coccus mannisparus. Others have been of the same opinion. When Lieut. Welsted visited this place in the month of September, he found the extremities of the twigs and branches retaining the peculiar sweetness and flavor which characterize the manna. The Bedouins collect it early in the morning, and, after straining it through a cloth, place it either in skins or gourds; a considerable quantity is consumed by themselves; a portion is sent to Cairo, and some is also disposed of to

the monks at Mount Sinai. The latter retail it to the Russian pilgrims. "The Bedouins assured me that the whole quantity collected throughout the Peninsula, in the most fruitful season, did not exceed 150 wgas (about 700 pounds); and that it was usually disposed of at the rate of 60 dollars the wga." (Traves in Arab. i, 511).

Another kind of manna, which has been supposed to be that of Scripture, is yielded by a thorny plant very common from the north of India to Syria, which by the Arabs is called Al-agyi, whence botanists have constructed the name Albagii. The two species have been called Albagii Maurorum and A. desertorum. Both spe-

cies are also by the Arabs called saker-kher, or "camel's-thorn;" and in Mesopotamia agal, according to some authorities, while by others this is thought to be the name of another plant. The Albagii Maurorum is remarkable for the exudation of a sweetish juice, which concretes into small granular masses, and is usually distinguished by the name of Persian manna. The late professor Don was so confident that this was the same substance as the manna of Scripture that he proposed calling the plant itself Manna Hebrew. The climate of Persia and Bokhara seems also well suited to the secretion of this manna, which in the latter country is employed as a substitute for sugar, and is imported into India for medicinal use through Caubul and Khurasan.

In Arabian and Persian works on Materia Medica it is called Furunculis. These two, from the localities in which they are produced, have alone been thought to be the manna of Scripture. But, besides these, there are several other kinds of manna. Burckhardt, during his journey through El-Ghor, in the valley of the Jordan, heard of the Beiruk honey. This is described as a substance obtained from the leaves and branches of a tree called Gork or Caravakh, of the size of an olive-tree, and with leaves like those of the poplar. When fresh this grayish-colored exudation is sweet in taste, but in a few days it becomes sour. The Arabs eat it like honey. One kind, called Shir-kiski, is said to be produced in the country of the Uzbekies. A Caubul merchant is-
formed Dr. Boyle that it was produced by a tree called
Gundeldeh, which grows in Candahar, and is about twelve
feet high, with jointed stems. A fifth kind is produced on
Calotropis procera, or the plant called Ashur. The
sweet exudation is by Arab authors ranked with sugar,
and called Shukur-al-ashur. It is described under this
name by Avicenna, and in the Liber de素质兹物um it is
called Zemawal-dusur. A sixth kind, called Bedd-
bkhish, is described in Persian works on Materia Medica
as being produced on a species of willow in Persian Khoo-
rassan. Another kind would appear to be produced on
a species of oak, for Niebeluh says, "At Merdin, in Meso-
potamia, it only eats the kind of oak not included in the
larval food of the tree called Ballot et Ajis (or, according
to the Aleppo pronunciation, Ajas), which I take to be of
the oak family. All are agreed that between Merdin and
Diarbekir manna is obtained, and principally from those
trees which yield gall-nuts." But the most remarkable
sweetish exudation found on the larch, which is called
Manna brunitica, as there is also one kind found on
the cedar of Lebanon. Indeed a sweetish secretion
found on the leaves of many other plants, produced
sometimes by the plant itself, or by others of the
punctures of the same plant, is produced also in the same
sweetish exudations, being evaporated during the heat of
the day in still weather, may afterwards become deposited,
with the dew, on the ground and on the leaves of plants,
and thus explain some of the phenomena which have been
observed on rose-water and according to Col. Chesney, "The most remarkable production
in ancient Assyria is the celebrated vegetable known
here by the name of manna, which in Turkish is most
expressively called Kudret-el-Esna, or 'the divine
sweetmeat.' It is found on the leaves of the dwarf oak,
and also, though less plentifully and scarcely so good,
on those of the tamarisk and several other plants. It is
occasionally deposited on the sand, and also on rocks
and stones. The latter is of a pure white color, and
appears to be more esteemed than the tree manna. It
is collected chiefly at two periods of the year, first in the
early part of spring, and again towards the end of au-
:.

Manna is the emblem or symbol of immortality (Rev.
ii, 17): "I will give him to eat of the hidden manna;"
.. the true bread of God, which came down from heav-
en, referring to the words of Christ in John vi, 61, a
much greater gift than any others. The Jews of the Holy
Israelites with manna in the wilderness. It is called
hiddens, or laid up, in allusion to that which was laid up
in a golden vessel in the holy of holies of the tabernacle
(comp. Exod. xvi, 33, 34, and Heb. ix, 4)."

S. Liebestorf, De Manna (Vitexem, 677); Zeichb.,
De miraculis Manna israelitica (Gerh. 1770); Hobeisel,
De vasculo Manna (Gen. 1715); Schramm, De urna
Manna (Herb. 1723); Fabri Historia Mannae, in Fabri
et Reiski Opusc. med. Acad. (Hal. 1775), p. 121; Har-
wick, in Asiatic Researches, xiv, 182; Frederic, in Tran-
sact. of the Lit. Society of Bombay (Louis. 1819), i. 261;
Ehrenberg, Symbol. Phyn. (Berl. 1802); Martius, Phyn-
aceae, p. 237; Oedem, Summ. vol. i; Buxtorf, Exerc.
( Basel, 1659), p. 385 (and in Ugolini, Theaur. vol.
(viii); Rosenmuller, Athlaceum, iv, 816 sq.; Kittel, Ditto
Bible Illustr. ad loc.; Triatarum, Not. Hist. of Bible, p. 862;
comp. Robinson's Researches, i, 470, 559; and other
Oriental travellers.

Mannheimer, Isak Noa, one of the most cele-
bated of modern Jewish pulpit orators and theologians,
was born at Copenhagen, Denmark, Oct. 17, 1788.
His father was the reader of the synagogue of the Danish
capital, and, anxious to afford his Isak all the advan-
tages of modern culture, placed the child in a school at
the tender age of three years and a half. When only
nine years old, Isak was introduced to the study of the
Talmud, and at the age of responsibility (thirteen) was
sent to Germany to study the Talmud in a traditional
state. As a youth he studied the Talmud at Berlin, and
his secular studies, also, he made rapid progress, and
promised much for the future. In 1808 he entered the
academy, and by 1814 he was ready to pass his ex-
amination for admission to the university. Here he de-

duced himself to the study of philosophy, philosophy, and
the Oriental languages. Scarcely had his course been
completed when the government offered him employ-
ment as catechist of the Jewish society of his native
place; he accepted the proffered position, and served
his people to their great satisfaction. About this time
the reformation movements among the Jews of North-
ern Europe were taking place, and Mannheimer became
one of the leaders in the progressive step. He was es-
specially encouraged by a personal acquaintance with
the German-Jewish reformer Jacobson, whom he met
in Berlin, whither he was sent on a mission from the
Jews of the Temple. But, by the interference of the
government, the reform movement was greatly barred there.
and, after a vain struggle with the orthodox, he ac-
cepted a call from Vienna in 1824, and removed to the Austrian
capital in June, 1825. Austria, which was always slow
to grant religious liberty to non-thenomists, was not
and not up to this time recognized the Jews as a religious
sect, and, without authority to act as pastor, Mannhei-
mer was called to perform substantially similar duties
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in the official capacity of "principal of the Religious School" ("Dиректор der Wiener Kaiserlich Königl. öf-

tenischen israelitischen Religionsschule"). Though personal-

decidedly in favor of the reform movement in-

agurated by Jacobson and others, he felt it his duty, in

this respect, to assume the conservative position, and, by

his moderation and wisdom succeeded in building up

one of the best Jewish congregations in Germany.

His great oratorical talent did much to swell the number of

his auditors, but his success as a leader of the Jews of

the Austrian capital is due solely to his determination "to

produce no ripples in the Jewish camp." He served

his people faithfully to the end of his terrestrial course.

March 17, 1865. His influence on the Jews of Germany,

however, still remains, and will be felt for years to come.

During the stormy days of 1848 he represented his peo-

ple in the nation's council, as a deputy from Lemberg

(Vienna). His humane principles are manifest in his ex-

pressions for the abolition of capital punishment.

"Isaak Nos Mannheimer," says Grätz (Gesch. d. Juden

xi, 438), "might be called the embodied nobility of the

Jews. He was a perfect man. . . . The inner and outer

man were one, as was the wisdom, the love, the

life and practical safety, poetical talent and sober sense;

childlike goodness and hitting sarcasm, gushing oratory

and earnest charity, love for Judaism and a special liking

for reform, were in his being most harmoniously blend-

ed in."

Mann was one of the few Hebrew writers among his He-

brew brethren. Unfortunately, however, but few of his

sermons were ever printed. For a list of them see Kay-

serling, Bibliothek jüd. Kultursehner, Jahrgang i (Berl.

1870), p. 291. His other works consist of a translation of

the Jewish Prayer-book for Sabbath and holy-days

(Nidur and Mordker), a few polemical tracts, and a

translation of part of the Bible for Solomon's German

version.

For the study of homiletics his sermons are valued by both Christian and Jewish divines. See, be-

sides Grätz and Kayserling, Ehrenthel, Jüd. Charakter-

biographien, i (1875); Wolf, Jüd. Geschichte (Vienna,

1865); the same, Gesch. d. israelit. Cultuurge-

meinde in Wien (1861); Geiger, Zeitgesch., iii, 167 sq.

(J. H. W.)

Manning, James, D.D., a Baptist minister, was born at Elizabeth-town, N. J., Oct. 22, 1788, and was edu-

cated at Princeton College (class of 1762). Soon after

the completion of his course, he was ordained as pastor of a Baptist Church in Morristown, N. J., but

he remained only a year, and then became pastor of the

Baptist Church in Warren, R. I. During his minis-

ty there he instituted a Latin school, which seems to have

been one of the great bloomers of the summer of

1762. He was afterward pastor of the Brown University,

having been chiefly instrumen-

tal in the procuring of the charter in 1764. He

was appointed its first president and professor of lan-

guage in 1765, when the college went into operation at

Warren, whence it was removed to Providence in 1770,

and was given the name it now bears. President Man-

ning remained connected with the college until his de-

ath, July 29, 1791. During his residence at Prov-

idence, however, he was also pastor of a church for twen-

ty years, absenting himself only for some six months in 1772. He was a member of the General Assembly of Congress for Rhode Island.

"Dr. Manning was equally known in the reli-

gious, political, and literary world. Nature had given

him distinguished abilities. The resources of his genius

seemed adequate to all duties and occasions. He was

of a kind and benevolent disposition, social and commu-

nicative in habit, and excelling in manners. His life

was a scene of labor for the benefit of others. His piety,

and his fervent zeal in preaching the Gospel, evinced

his love to God and man. With a most graceful form,

a dignified and majestic appearance, his address was

manly, familiar, and engaging, his voice harmonious

and his manners becoming. He was the acknowledged

head of the college; not for a moment did he lose his

grip on the church; yet, with all his powers, he was the

mild, yet energetic. He lived bel-

oved and died lamented, beyond the lot of ordinary

men. The good order, learning, and respectability of

the Baptist churches in the Eastern States, under God,

are much owing to his personal influence, and assiduous

attention to their welfare" (Benedict, ii, 186). See Guild

(R. H.), Life, Times, and Correspondence of Dr. James

Manning (1864, 8vo); Sprague, Annals, vi, 88.

Manning, Owen, an English clergyman, was born at Oundle, Northamptonshire, in 1717; was educated at

Queen's College, Cambridge, of which he became fel-

low in 1741; became prebend of Lincoln in 1769; in

1783, vicar of Godalming, Surrey; in 1769, rector of Pepp-

pernarrow, and died in 1807. Mr. Manning published

Text (revised) and TOm. M. on Jewish Suf-

jects (1812, 2 vols. 12mo).—Discourse On Jewish

Race, Rom. iii. 28; published by Rev. J. H. Todd, with a

discourse of Abp. Sharp's (1829, 8vo); and several works

of a secular character.—Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer.

A nth. a. v.; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. a. v.

Manus, according to Tactius, the name given by

the Germans to the son of the earth-born god Tisco.

From his three sons they derived their three great tribes,

the Ingavones, the Isakavones, and the Hermiones.

Manus belongs, not to the Teutonic people alone, but
to the great mythus of the origin of the human race,

common to the whole Aryan family, and, like the Hinde

Manus, the name is esteemed as a symbol for the

inhabitants of the earth endowed with reason.

The name is derived from the Aryan root *man-*, to


Athenarch, vol. vi.

Manno 'th (Heb. Manno'îch, 1757, rest, as in Gen.

vii, 9, and often; Sept. Marni; Josephus Marwysy,

iv, v, 6, 7, where the Biblical narrative is greatly em-

broidered).—Manno was the father of Samsam, of the

tribes of Dan, and a native of Zorah (Judg. xiii, 22-23;

xvi, 31). B.C. 115. The narrative of the Bible (xiii.

1-28), of the circumstances which preceded the birth of

Samsam, supplies us with very few and faint traces of

Manno's character or habits. He seems to have had

some occupation which separated him during part of

the day from his wife, though that was not field-work,

because it was in the field that his wife was found by

the angel during his absence. He was hospitable, as

his forfather Abraham had been before him; he was a

worshipper of Jehovah, and reverent even to a degree

of fear. We hear of Manoah once again in connection

with the marriage of Samson and the Philistine of Tim-

nath. His father and his mother communed with him

thereon, but to no purpose (xiv, 2, 3). They then

accompanied him to Timnath, both on the preliminary

visit and to the marriage itself. (Judg. xvi, 9, 10, 11)

Manoah appears not to have survived his son: not he,

but Samsam's brothers, went down to Gaza for the

body of the hero, and bringing it up to the family tomb

between Zorah and Eshtaol, reunited the father to the

son (xxvi, 31) whose birth had been the subject of so

many prayers and so much anxiety. Milton, however, does

not take this view. In Samson Agonistes Manoah bears

a prominent part throughout, and lives to bury his son.

See Samson.

Manse, the Scottish name synonymous with our

word "parish." It was chosen to do honor to Scotland and

corporations with unswa-

dowed churches, is the property of the Church, erected

and maintained by it. In the Established Church it is

built and maintained by law, and belongs to the heritors.

Dunlop says, "While manes and houses which had be-

longed to the popish clergy were still standing, these

manse's manse in the church, nor was he resorted to an

order of designation, similar to that prescribed by the

act of 1588 as to glebes, seems to have been followed.

See Glebe. A minister accordingly was not allowed

to have a manse designed to him within the precincts

of an abbey or bishop's palace if there was another

or vicar's manse in the church; nor was he entitled to

any house which, though erected on Church lands, had not

of old belonged to any kirkman, or incumbent serving

at the church. Where there is none a manse in a parish

Digitized by Google
the minister is entitled to have designed to him by the presbytery of the bounds half an acre of land for the manse, offices, and garden, and to have the heritors ordained to erect a manse and offices thereon. The statutes regarding manses require that they shall be situated near the parish church; and in general the manse and glebe are contiguous. The presbytery are, of course, in the formation of a new manse, entitled, in the first instance, to fix its situation; and even in the case of an old manse to be rebuilt they may fix on a new situation, always, of course, within the ground or glebe allotted to the minister. The act of 1655 provides that where complete houses or buildings are sold by the minister, he shall build competent manses to his ministers, the expenses thereof not exceeding one thousand pounds, and not being beneath five hundred merks; and it has been questioned whether, in respect of the phrase "competent manses," heritors can be compelled to expend a greater sum than one thousand pounds Scots on the erection of a manse." Hill says, "The law of Scotland provides the minister of every country parish with a dwelling-house, called a manse, a garden, a glebe of not less than four acres of arable land, designed out of lands in the parish, at the expense of the ministers above the glebe, for one horse and two cows; and with the out-houses necessary for the management of his small farm. As the act of James VI, par. 3, c. 48, declares that the manse and glebe shall be marked and designed by the archbishop, bishop, superintendent, or commissioner of congregations, or such minister as shall be appointed, with two or three of the most knowing and discreet men of the parish, build competent manses to the ministers; and as, by the settlement of presbyterian government in Scotland, the presbytery has come in place of the bishop, all applications concerning manse and glebes are made, in the first instance, to the presbytery of the bounds. After taking the regular steps suitable to the nature of the business, which, as a civil court specially constituted for that purpose, are called to discuss, the presbytery pronounce a decree; and various passages of the act determine this discussion before the Court of Session, is binding upon all concerned." Prior to the Reformation, canon xiii ordained that every parish should have a dwelling for the minister, built at the expense of the parsons and their clergy; but it afterwards became a heavy burden on the vicars. By the General Assembly of 1663 ministers having manses were required to live in them.

Mansel, Henry Longueville, one of the leading English divines of our day, noted particularly for his ability as a philosopher of the Hamiltonian school, was born in 1820 in the parish of Cosgrove, Northamptonshire, of which his father was then rector. He was educated at Merchant Taylors' School, and later at St. John's College, Oxford, where he graduated in 1843. He was shortly after ordained, and served the Church in various parishes until 1856, when he was appointed reader in moral and metaphysical philosophy at Magdalen College, Oxford, and in 1859 became the Wykeham professor. In 1867 he was made regius professor of ecclesiastical history, and at the same time also canon of Christ Church, Oxford. In October, 1869, he was appointed dean of St. Paul's, London, and died in the English metropolis in 1871. His works are: Aldrich's Logic, with Notes (1849)—Prolegomena Logica (1851)—article "Metaphysics," in the 8th ed. of the Encyclopaedia Britannica (1867), afterwards published separately—The Limits of Religious Thought (1855)—The Philosophy of the Conditioned (1865), in reply to Mill's Review of Hamilton's Philosophy. He was also one of the editors of Sir William Hamilton's Lectures. Mansel wrote in a clear and elegant style. His Bampton Lectures occasioned much controversy, both theological and philosophical. In the first one mentioned, On the Limits of Religious Thought, which passed through a number of editions, both in England and in this country, he takes as the basis of his arguments Sir William Hamilton's position that religious belief is 'incognizable and inconceivable.' This treatise of Mansel is regarded as "one of the most important applications of the Hamiltonian philosophy to questions of religion." Farrar (in his Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, p. 470) thus speaks of The Limits of Religious Thought: "It is a work which is valuable for its method, even if the reader differs (as the author of these lectures does in some respects) from the philosophical principles maintained, or occasionally even from the results attained. It is an attempt to reconstruct the argument of Butler from the subjective side. As Butler showed that the difficulties which are in revealed religion are equally applicable to natural, so Mr. Mansel wishes to show that the difficulties which the mind feels in reference to religion are parallel with those which are felt by it in reference to philosophy. Since, therefore, the abstract or negative tone has passed over philosophy. The phenomenon are now studied in the mind, not in nature; in our mode of viewing, not in the object viewed. Hence Butler's argument needed reconstructing on its psychological side. Mr. Mansel has attempted to effect this; and the book must be read in this light. The difficulty is due to the minds of those who are diametrically opposed to its principles and results. Even if the details were wrong, the method would be correct, of studying psychology before ontology; of finding the philosophy of religion, not as an attempt, object, and theorema, but as a theorma, but subjectively, by the analyses of the religious faculties; learning the length of the sounding-line before attempting to fathom the ocean." See The Nation (N.Y.), Jan. 10, 1867, p. 27 sq.; Grose, Review of M. M. Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy (Lond. 1868, 8mo), p. 43 sq.; McCosh, Intuitions of the Mind (see Index); Porter, Human Intuít (Index). See HAMILTON, SIR W. J. (H. W.)

Manso, J. Dominico, a noted Italian prelate, was born in Lucca Feb. 16, 1622; entered the Church at an early age, and was for a long time professor of theology at Naples. As a result of the persecutions of the Inquisition, he was imprisoned, and died Sept. 27, 1769. He was distinguished for his historical and philosophical acquisitions, as also for his zeal as a compiler. Among his principal works are Supplemenum collectionis conciliar. et decr. Nicol. Coleti (Lucca, 1746, 6 vols.); also own very complete collection, Sacrorum conciliorum constinentia, collecto, etc. (Florent. et Venet. 1759-88, 31 vols.), which was continued after his death. He published also a valuable edition of St. Baluzi Attealaeum (Lucca, 1761, 2 vols.), and the splendid Lucca edition of Baronius's Annal. Eccles., with the continuation by Raynaldus (1738-56); a new edition of Natalis Alexandri Historiae eccles. Vet. Novæ Test. (Lucca, 1748-52), and of J. A. Fabricii Biblioth. Lat. med. et inf. art. (Patavii, 1754). He also published the 2d edition of the important Memoria della Gran Comunità Mattita da Fr. M. Fioretti (Lucca, 1756), in which he made many interesting additions. He wrote also De epochis conciliorum Sacrosanct is et Sirmiensium. See Ant. Zatti, Commentar. de vita et scriptis J. D. Mansi (Ven. 1772); Anton. Lombardi, Storia della letteratura Italiana nel secolo xviii (Modena, 1802); Sarteschi, De Scriptoribus Concereg. Matria et, p. 825; Saxii Onom. lit. VII, 4 sq.; Bann, Neues histor. biog.-lit. Handb., iii, 488; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxii, 259; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, ix, 1. See MACHLI.

Mansarni ( matérasing), a class of functionaries who were not only keepers of churches, but especially bailiffs or stewards of the glebes or lands belonging to the Church or the bishop. See Doorkeepers.
I. Manuselaticum. See Taxa.

Manuselater (1722), mercatre des, a murderer, du-
zoopovo, 1 Tim. i, 9, as sometimes rendered, one who by an accidental homicide was entitled to the benefit of asylum (Numb. xxxvi, 6, 12; elsewhere usually "slayer"). See BLOOD-REVENGE. One of the most peculiar provi-
sions in the statute respecting the manuselater was the life-long imprisonment of the convicted man in one of the cities of refuge: 'He shall abide in it until the death of the high-priest, which was anointed with the holy oil.' After that he was allowed to 'return into the land of his possession' (ver. 28). Different reasons have been assigned by commentators for making the one who committed the murder independent on the others, which is unnecessary to particularize. As the enactment was intended for the whole body of the people, and is recorded in Scripture without any explanation, the most simple view that can be taken of it is likely to be the nearest to the truth. One thing, however, all knew respecting the anointed high-priest, viz. that he was the head and representative of the whole community in matters pertaining to life and death; and as some limitation would evidently require to be set to the restraint laid on the manuselater, the thought would naturally communi-
cate itself to the people to make responsibility for an accidental death cease and determine with the death of him who stood nearest to God in matters of that description. In the general relations of the community a change had entered in that respect, which touched all individuals, and it was fit that it should specially touch those who had been casually benefitted from the freedom of life.

The principle on which the 'man-selater' was to be allowed to escape, viz. that the person slain was regarded as 'delivered into his hand' by the Almighty, was obviously open to much wilful perversion (1 Sam. xxxvi, 4, 18; xxvi, 6; compare Philo, De Spec. Leg. iii, 21; ii, 230), though the cases mentioned appear to be a sufficient sample of the intention of the lawgiver.

a. Death by a blow in a sudden quarrel (Numb. xxxvi, 22).

b. Death by a stone or missile thrown at random (Is. ii, 22, 23).

c. By the blade of an axe flying from its handle (Deut. viii, 5).

d. Whether the case of a person killed by falling from a roof unprovoked with a parapet involved the guilt of manslaughter on the owner is not clear; but the law seems intended to prevent the imputation of malice in any such case, by pronouncing, as far as possible, the occurrence of the fact itself (Deut. xxii, 8) (Michaelis, On the Laws of Moses, arta. 223, 280, ed. Smith).

In all these and the like cases the manuselater was allowed to retire to a city of refuge. See ETR or RESTUIE. Besides these, the manuselater may be mentioned as cases of homicide:

a. An animal, not known to be vicious, occasioning death to a human being, was to be put to death, and regarded as unclear. But if it was known to be vicious, the owner also was liable to fine, and even death (Exod. xxii, 28, 31).

b. A thief overtaken at night in the act might lawfully be put to death, but if the sun had risen the act of killing him was to be regarded as murder (Exod. xxii, 3, 2).

Other cases are added by the Mishna, which, however, are included in the definitions given above (Shul, ii, 1, 2, 3; Maimon, ii, 2; compare Otho, Lex. Rabba, a. v. Homicida). See MURDER.

Manus Ecclesiæ. Manus is in reality equivalent to locus, ad quos manus, the residence including the portion of land belonging to it (see Manus), and both expressions are sometimes used the one for the other (see Du Fresne, a. v.; Grimm, Deutsche Redakteurhüter, p. 536; Eichhorn, Deutsche Redthefgeschichte, vol. i, § 84; Guérard, Politique de l’abbé Irénison (Paris, 1844, 4to.), article 7 in Die rechtliche Natur der Zehnten (Breslau, 1831, p. 174). But in opinion that manus ecclesiœ is derived from manumansio or mancipium, from the slaves in early times becoming free in obtaining an estate, a manus hereditaria. But, putting aside the philo-
dical difficulties, we find that the manus were properties with which serva (plebe adscripti) or even freemen were invested on some conditions, hence the distinction between manus serviles and ingenuæ (Grimm, p. 187; Eichhorn, vol. i, § 84).

In the 9th century the whole of France was divided into manœ, as the taxes were based on this, and as well as the obligations of military service (see Capacitare, i, p. 803, c. 1, a. 807, 411; Pert, Monumenta Germaniae, iii, 119, 172; Walter, Corpus juris Germanici, ii, 228; Hincemari Remensis Annales, ad a. 866, 677). The Church itself was not free from these taxes, but paid according to the number of manses it held (see Patrologia, a. 812, cap. 11; Pert, iii, 176).

"Ut de rebus unders censum ad partem regia exarere solebat, si ad aequum ecclesiam traditum sunt, aut tradatur propriis heredibus, aut qui eas reiuniert retinet, vel illum censum peresolvat," with the exception of those which they held from the liberty of the king, and which were given with such immunities; as also the mansis forming the dos of a church, and given to it at its foundation. See IMMUNITY. In this case the immunity covered the whole manœ (manus integer), and it became the duty of the incumbents to see that their privilege was not infringed (see Capacitare Wormatiæ, a. 829, cap. generalia, no. 4; Pert, iii, 550). This principle was also adhered to afterwards, so that both Gratian (see c. 24, 25, can. xxiii, qu. viii) and Raymundus à Penaforte (c. i, x, de censibus, iii, 89) considered it well to recall these encroachments on the part of the manœ. The size of the manœ of a military ecclesiœ of the.size remains the same; yet it was at all times calculated so as to afford a dos competens to the church, the income from which would be sufficient to defray the expenses of wor-
shop and to supply the greater part of the requisites of the clergy (see Ziegler, De dote ecclesiasticæ iagnosce, p. 420, to Ap. Wittzem, 1886, 4to., chap. viii, sec. 7).

If we study the history of the establishment of Christianity in the different countries, we find that many adopted these principles of the French law. Thus in Prussia, at the foundation of churches, they were each endowed with a number of farms. In the parishes of Kuln and Thorn receiving besides forty hides. When in 1249 peace was made with the heathen Prussians, a stipulation required that each new church should receive a dos of eight hides (see Voigt, Gesch. Preussen's, ii, 289, 580). The later documents on the subject (see Voigt, Codex diplomatiæ Prussicae) show that this custom was observed in after times. This practice of church endowments was continued notwithstanding the changes introduced by the Reformation.


Mant, Richard (1, D.D., an English prelate and commentator, was born at Southampton, Feb. 12, 1778; was educated at Winchester and Trinity College, and Christ Church, Oxford; became fellow of Oriel College in 1788; vicar of Great Coggeshall, Essex, in 1810; of St. Botolph's, Bishop's Stortford, Herts, in 1815; of East Hoursey, Surley, in 1818; Bishop of Killaloe and Killieren, in 1820; was translated to Down and Connor in 1823; and in 1842 succeeded to the See of Chichester. He died Nov. 2, 1848. He published, in conjunction with D'Oyly, An Edition of the Bible, with Notes (1817):

Eight Sermons:—An Appeal to the Gospel, or an In-
quiry into the Justice of the Charge that the Gospel is not unpreach ed by the National clergy, 1812, 8vo; 4th ed. 1816, 8vo; reviewed in the London, Quarterly Rev., 526, 874, and xxv, 470;—The Book of Common Prayer, se-
lected, with Notes (1829, 4to; abridged, 2 vols. 8vo; 5th ed. 1840, 4to);—The Book of Psalms in an English Met-
rical Version, with Notes, critical and illustrative (1834, 8vo);—Biographical Notices of several eminent clergymen and others, and five Sermons, and other productions on various subjects. See Allibone.
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Mant. Richard (3), D.D., an English divine, who

flourished in the latter part of the 18th and beginning

of the 19th century; was educated at Trinity College,

Oxford, and became rector of All Saints, Southampton.

He died in 1817. He published a sermon entitled Pub-

lic Worship in Ireland (1798); — Order for the Violation of

the Sick, from the Book of Common Prayer (1805, 12mo):—

Eight Sermons on the Occurrences of the Passion Week

(1807, 12mo); — Guide to the Understanding of the Church


s. a.

Mantichuria, a Chinese territory in Eastern Asia,

extending between lat. 42° and 58° N., is now the pos-

session partly of the Chinese and partly of the Russians.

It is bounded, according to its present limits, by the

Amur on the north; by the Usuri and the Sungacha on

the east, separating it from the Russian maritime ter-

ritory of Oroschi; by the Shan-Altin range on the south,

separating it from Korea; and by a portion of the Khin-

gan Mountains, the river Sira-Muren, and the district of

the upper Sungari, which separate it on the west from

the desert of Golob. Previously to the recent incursions

of the Russians on the north, the area of this territory

was about 682,000 square miles. Since the treaty of

Nov. 14, 1860, the Russians possess all the territory east

of the Usuri and north and east of the Amur, and the

Chinese possession is reduced to about 578,000 square

miles, of which Taurabou is held at from 3,000,000 to

4,000,000. Mantichuria is divided into three pro-

vinces: Shing-King (formerly Laxong), which

alone contains upwards of 2,100,000 inhabitants, and

the chief town of which, Mukden, is the seat of government

for the three provinces; Girin, or Kirin; and Tsi-tsi-

har. The country is mountainous, densely wooded in the

south, but consisting chiefly of prairies and grass-land in the

north. It is well watered and fruitful in the val-

leys. Chinese form the great bulk of the population.

The Manchus themselves are for the most part soldiers;

they are the present rulers of China, who gradually sub-

jugated the country. They are not a nomadic race like

the Mongols, but are given to agriculture or hunting,

according to the part of their country they inhabit.

They are of a lighter complexion and slightly heavier

build than the Chinese, have the same conformation of

the body as the Chinese, and are considered as of

natives present greater intellectual capacity. Literary

purposes are more esteemed by them than by Mongolo-

lians. They are of the same religious faith as the Chinese,

but they are less under the priesthood.

The Manchus, in short, may be regarded as the most im-

portant race in Central Asia, if not on the continent.

See Williams, Middle Kingdom, i. 135 sq.; Chambers,

Cyclop. s. v. See also China; TARTARY.

Mantolete, a long cape, with slits for the arms, worn

by prelates. Regular bishops wore it without the ro-

chez; and cardinals, vested in rochet and mozzarella,

lay it aside when visiting another of their order. The man-

tolete is a plate cloak, with long, hanging sleeves.—

Walcott, Soc. Archæol. s. v.

Mantle, in the A. V., is the term used to render

four Hebrew words, viz.,

1. נַעַר, addereth, from נַעַר, "ample," and there-

fore probably meaning a large over-garment like the

Roman pallium. The Sept. renders it by μηλαρίς (a

sheep's skin), 1 Kings xix, 10, etc.; διηλείς, Zech. xxiii,

4; and εἰμιλαία, Gen. xxxvi. 4; from the passages in which it

is mentioned we can conjecture its nature. It is used

most frequently (1 Kings xix; 2 Kings ii, 8, 13, etc.) of

Elijah's "mantle," which was in all probability a mere

sheepskin, such as is frequently worn by dervishes and

poor people of Persia, which seems, after Elijah's time,

to have been in vogue among the prophets (Zech.

xxiii. 4). Accordingly, by it only is denoted the cape or

wrapper which, with the exception of a strip of skin or

leather round his loins, formed, as we have every reason
to believe, the sole garment of the prophet. The Bap-

tist's dress was of a similar rough description, and we see

from Hez. xi, 37 (νυχοτής, νυχις δίμανος) that such garments were regarded as a mark of poverty

and persecution. The word addereth twice occurs with

the epithets μηλαρίας, "airy" (Gen. xxv, 25; Zech. xiii, 4). On

the other hand, it is sometimes undoubtedly applied to

royal and splendid robes, and is even used to mean

"magnificence" in Ezek. xxvii, 8 ("vine of magnificence")

and Zech. xi, 3. It is the expression for the "goddly

Babylonish garment" stolen by Achaz, and the "robe"

worn by the king of Nineveh (Josh. vii, 21; Jonah iii,

6). The difference between the two meanings of the

word is, that while "addereth" or "airy" mantle is so opposite is doubtless to be found in the etymology

of the word (from נַעַר, ample), or in the notion of a dress

richly lined or trimmed with costly stuff. See Rom.

2. מַלְּשִׁי, melši, which in the A. V. is variously ren-

dered "mantle," "robe" or "cloak;" and in the Sept.

מלֶשֶׁה, melše, מַלְּשִׁית, melšešit, מַלְּשָׁה, melšash, מַלְּשָׁהוּת, melšashošt. Josephus

calls it μελεῖ. It is a general term derived from מַלְּשִׁית,

to cover, and is most frequently applied to "the robe of

the ephod" (Exod. xxviii, 4, etc.; Lev. viii, 7), which is

described as being open at the top, to the breast, and

having holes for the insertion of the arms (Joseph. Ant.

iii, 7, 4; Jahn, Bibl. Arch. sec. 122; Braunius, De Vest.

Sacc. p. 426; Schröder, De Vest. Mul. p. 237, etc.). It

was worn, however, not only by priests, like Samuel (1

Sam. ii, 18; xv, 27; xxvii, 14), but by kings and prince-

ses (1 Sam. xxiv, 4; David, 1 Chron. xv, 27), and rich

men (Exra, ix, 3–4; Job and his friends, i, 20; ii, 12),

and even by king's daughters (2 Sam. xiii, 18), although

in the latter case it seems to have had sleeves (see Ge-

senius, Theod. p. 611). Properly speaking, the melši

was worn under the similar, or outer garment, but that

it was often itself used as an outer garment seems prob-

able from some of the passages above quoted. It is

interesting to know that the garment which Samuel's

mother made and brought to the infant prophet at her

annual visit to the holy tent at Shiloh was a miniature

of the official ephod. The counterpane of the

great prophet wore in mature years (1 Sam. xv, 27), and by

which he was on one occasion actually identified. When

the witch of Endor, in answer to Saul's inquiry, told

him that "an old man was come up, covered with a melši,"

this was sufficient to enable the king in whose presence

he stood—Saul perceived that it was Samuel" (xxviii, 14).

3. מַלְּשַׁח, melšaḥ, semikuš (Judg. iv, 14), the garment (marg.

"rug," or "blanket") used by Jael to fling over the weary

Sisera as a coverlet (Sept. מַלְּשַׁח, but כְּפִיךְ appears
to have been the reading of Origen and Augus-

tine). The word is derived from מַלְּשַׁח, impomer, and is

evidently a general term. Hosechus defines מַלְּשַׁח

לָחֶף, t. e. a large cloak woolly on both sides. Hosechus dif-

fers from Virgil in this, for he says κονιάνας ἵππικα

καὶ ἵππικον ἵππικα, i. e. woolly on one side, the Scythian,

on Aristophanes, adds that it was a Persian, and Pollux

that it was a Babylonian robe (Rosenmüller, Schol. ad loc.).

There is, therefore, no reason to under-

stand it of a curtain of the tent, as Faber does. Since

the Orientals constantly use a covering when bed-

ding, the rendering "mantle," though inaccurate, is not

misleading (compare Ruth iii, 9; Ezek. xvi, 8, etc.). In

the above passage the Hebrew word has the definite ar-
MANTLE

It is prefixed, and it may therefore be inferred that it was some part of the regular furniture of the tent. The clue to a more exact signification is given by the Arabic version of the Polyglot, which renders it by al-kafifah, a word which is explained by Dory (Dictionnaire des Vétérans Arèbes, p. 292), on the authority of Ibn Batuta and other Oriental authors, to mean certain articles of a thick fabric, in shape like a plaid or shawl, which are commonly used for beds by the Arabs: "When they sleep they spread them on the ground. For the under part of the bed they are doubled several times, and one longer than the rest is used for a covering." On such a bed, on the floor of Heber's tent, no doubt the weary Sisera threw himself, and such a coverlet must the semikah have been which Jael laid over him.

4. מְשָׂפָתָם, maṣaṭpah'k, occurs only in Isa. iii, 22. It was some article of female dress, and is derived from מָשָׂא, to weave. Schröder, the chief authority on this subject, says it means a large exterior tunic with sleeves.

Manton, Thomas, D.D., one of the most eminent of the Puritan divines of the 17th century, was born in 1620 at Lawrence-Lydiard, Somerset, England. His father and both his grandfathers were ministers. He was educated at Wadham College, Oxford, and received orders from bishop Hall before he had attained the age of twenty, being regarded by the good prelate as a extraordinary young man. The greatness of his character displayed itself even at this early age. Believing that admission to deacon's orders constituted authority to preach, he steadfastly refused priest's orders after having received deacon's. On staying a short time at Colyton, in Devonshire, he removed to London, and was presented in 1643 with the living of Stoke-Newington, near London. Here he prepared and afterwards published his Expositions of James and Jude. (The former was published in 1651; edited by Sherman, 1640, royal 8vo; edited by M'Donough, 1842, 8vo; the latter was published in 1658, 4to; new ed. 1838, 8vo.) During the Revolution he was frequently called to preach before Parliament, where he had the courage to speak against the death of the king, though he gave great offence. In 1658 he was chosen preacher of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, where he had a numerous congregation of persons of great note and rank, and was eminently successful in his ministry. Joining in the Rebellion, he became one of the chaplains to the protector, and one of the committee for examining ministers under the commonwealth. However, to prove that the Restoration in 1660, was chosen one of the king's chaplains, and was also honored by Oxford at this time with the degree of D.D. by special request of king Charles II. In 1661 he was offered the deanship of Rochester, but this post he refused. Like Baxter, he clung to the last to the hope that a scheme of reconciliation might be carried for the Presbyterians; and he had yielded so far as to receive episcopal institution from Sheldon to permit the reading of the Common Prayer in his church, but when he clearly saw that there was peace only within the Establishment, and by an utter abandonment of all Puritan principles, he left the deanship, content to remain in the position he was then filling. The passing of the Act of Uniformity forced him into the ranks of the Nonconformists. Efforts were made by Calamy, Manton, and Bates, the leaders of those Presbyterians who still hoped for redress, to secure their rights from the king by personal interview, and they even received encouragement from Charles II of a favorable change, who "promised to restore them to their employments and places again, as pitying that such men should lie vacant." (Stoughton, i, 302.) But the king proved false, and the Puritans lost their places. Among the Nonconformist ministers who would not quit the pulpit until forced was Thomas Manton. Deprived of a church, he opened his rooms in Covent Garden, and there gathered a congregation. Here the Oxford oath was tendered to him, and on refusal he was committed a prisoner to the Gate-house, and was kept confined for six months. He died Oct. 18, 1677. Perhaps few men of that age had more virtue and fewer failings; but his only trust was in the Lamb of God. As a preacher he was most highly esteemed by his contemporaries, who call him "one of the best preachers in England." As a practical expositor of Scripture he was perhaps never surpassed. He left numerous writings, chiefly sermons and expositions. A collective edition of his works was published in 5 vols. 8vo, in 1681-84-88-83-1701, with Life by Dr. William Harris; but this collection is incomplete. A list of all his productions is given by Darlington, Cyclop. Bibliog. i, 1953-56. The publication of a complete collection of his works, prepared under the superintendence of the Rev. Thomas Smith, D.D., and others, with full indexes and an original memoir by the Rev. C. Ryle, was begun in 1869, and is to be completed in 20 vols. demy 8vo, in 1874. See the excellent article in Allibone's Dictionary of British and American Authors, vol. ii, s. v.; Hook, Ecclesiastical Biogr. vol. viii.

In-door Dress of a modern Egyptian lady, showing the back Veil and the Mantle.

worn next to the pallium (De Vest, Mul. xv, 247-277). In this same verse, and in Ruth iii, 15, occurs the word רֶפָּאָה, repha'ah, which appears to have been a sort of square covering like a plaid (Michaelis, Suppl. p. 1021; Rosenmiller, Schol.; Isa. iii, 22). We cannot find the shadow of an authority for John's very explicit statement, that both these words mean the same article, דֹּאָה being the fashion for the winter, and רֶפֶּה for the summer; though his assertion that "it covered the whole body from head to foot" may be very true (Jahn, Bibl. Arch. sect. 127).

For other terms, such as רַבִּים, simah (Gen. ix, 23 etc.), יָבָאָה (Matt. xxviii, 28), στολή (Mark iii, 38 etc.), see Dress. The φακόν (A.V. cloak) to which St. Paul makes such an interesting allusion in 2 Tim. iv, 13, seems to have been the Latin ponsula (comp. הוֹנֵת), a sort of travelling-cloak for wet weather. A great deal has been written about it, and at least one monograph (Stocho, Dissert. de Paulio Ponuli, Lugd. 1709). Even in Chrysonom's time some took it to be the φακόν, but a sort of travelling-cloak, and Jerome, Theophylact, Grotius, etc., shared in this opinion (Schleusner, Lex. N. T. s. v. φακόν). See Cloak.
MANTUA
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MANUEL

a. v.; Middleton, Evangelical Biography, iii, 429. (J.
H. W.)

Mantua, an Italian province, formerly an independ-
ient duchy, had a high reputation in the time of the
Romans. After sharing the fate of the rest of Northern
Italy, it was seized by the Gonzagas about the com-
mencement of the 16th century. The last duke of the
house of Gonzaga, who lived at Padua in 1706, where
Mantua fell into the hands of Austria. In 1859 the
province was given up to Italy, but the town of Mantua
was not restored to Italy until 1866, since which time
Mantua has formed a province of the new kingdom of
Italy. See Italy. The city of Mantua is noted in eccle-
siastical history for a council held there in 1067 to judge
pope Alexander II for a charge of simony
brought against him. Alexander II took an oath to
deny the accusation, and, proving the validity of his
election, was recognised as the proper incumbent of the
papal chair; while Honorius II (q. v.), the anti-pope,
was unanimously condemned as simoniacal. See Land-
don, Manuel of Councils, p. 890.

Mantuan, Baptist, a famous Italian monastic and
poet, was born at Mantua in 1448; joined the Carmel-
ites, became general of the order, quitted it in 1516, and
developed himself for the remainder of his life to belles-
lettres. He died in 1516. His works were published
in Paris in 1518 (3 vols. fol.), with the Commentaries of
S. Murroni, S. Brant, and J. Badius; and at Antwerp
in 1576 (4 vols. 8vo), under the title, J. Baptiste Man-
tuanus, Carmelitae, theologi, philosophi, poeta, et oratoris
clarissimus, opera omnia, pluribus libris aucta et restituita.
—Gri. Biog. Dict. ix, 91, s. v.

Manz, Felix, a Baptist martyr of the early part of
the 16th century, and a leader of the Reformation in
Germany, was a native of Zirich. In 1519 he studied
Hebrew with Zwingle, under Carlstadt, and was
intimate with that reformer, and also with Myconius, Cap-
ito, and other leaders of the Swiss Reformation. About
1522 he objected openly to the doctrine of infant bap-
tism, to the tithes, exorcism, and other peculiarities of
the Romish Church, and thus failing to harmonize with
the opinions of Zwingle, he was led to a separation from
the party of that reformer, and became connected with the
Baptists. In 1528 he preached publicly on the subject
of baptism. In the three disputes held at Zirich in
1525, Manz appears to have taken part, and after that
of March was thrown into prison, from which, however,
he escaped. He afterwards preached in different parts
of Switzerland; in 1526 he was imprisoned in the tower of
Welsenberg, and in 1528 he was arrested by the order of
the magistrate of Zirich, and, refusing to recant, was

Manu (from the Sanscrit man, to think; literally, the
thinking being) is the name of the reputed author of the
most renowned law-book of the ancient Hindus, and
likewise of an ancient Kalpa sutra (q. v.). It is mat-
ter, however, of considerable doubt whether both works
belong to the same individual, and whether the name
Manu, especially in the case of the author of the law-
book, was intended to designate a historical personage.
In several passages of the Vedas (q. v.), as well as of the
Mahabharata (q. v.), Manu is spoken of as the progeni-
tor of the human race, and in the first chapter of the
law-book ascribed to him he declares himself to have been
produced by Viraj, an offspring of the Supreme Being,
from the portion of the Rudra. Hindu mythology, moreover, recognises a succession of Manus, each of whom created, in his own period, the world anew
after it had perished at the end of a mundane age. The
word Manu—kindred with our man—belongs there-
fore, properly speaking, to ancient Hindu mythology, and
it was consecrated with the renowned law-book in
order to impart to the latter the sanctity on which its
authority rests. This work is not merely a law-book in
the European sense of the word; it is likewise a system of
cosmogony, or, as Sir William Jones has it, "com-
prises the Indian system of duties, religious and civil."
It propounds metaphysical doctrines, teaches the art of
government, and, among other things, treats of the state
of the soul after death. The chief topics of its twelve
books are the following: Creation; 2. Education and
the duties of a pupil, or the first order; 3. Marriage and
the duties of a householder, or the second order; 4.
Means of subsistence, and private morals; 5. Diet, puri-
fication, and the duties of women; 6. The duties of a
priest and ascetic, and the duties of the third and
fourth orders; 7. Government, and the duties of a king
and the military caste; 8. Judicature and law, private
and criminal; 9. Continuation of the former, and the
duties of the commercial and servile castes; 10. Mixed
castes, and the duties of the castes in time of distress;
11. Penance and expiation; 12. Transmission and final
beatitude. It is the opinion of Maine (Ancient Law)
and other eminent scholars that the code of Manu was
never fully accepted or enforced in India, and remained
always an ideal of the perfect Brahminic state. It is
supposed, however, to have been written about B.C. 900 or
1000. The text of this work has been published in several editions
both in India and Europe. An excellent English transla-
tion of it was made by Sir W. Jones (Calcutta, 1786; 2d
ed., by Haughton, Lond. 1825), and a very good French
translation by the Sieur Declanges (Paris, 1782). See Johntzen, Ueber das Gesetzbuch des Manu (Berl.
1868); Max Muller, Chips from a German Workshop
(Index to vol. ii); Elphinstone, Hist. of India (8d ed.,
p. 226 sq.; Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 1, 194
sq.; James Freeman Clarke, Ten Great Religions, p. 100
sq. See Hinduism.

Manuductor is the name of an ecclesiastical officer
whose duty it was to give the signal to the choristers
to sing, to mark the measure, beat the time, and regu-
late the music. The word means to lead by means of
the hand; and the officer was so called because he was
required to stand in the middle of the aisle, and to guide
the choir by the motions of his hand. The Greek
Church has an officer who performs similar services,
who is called Mesochoras, because he is seated in the
midst of the choir.

Manuropulus (μανυροπολός), of Sa-
rantenus (Σαραντώνς), or The
Philosopher, a Greek ecclesiastic who flourished in the 12th and 13th centu-
ries, acquired a high reputation by his philosophical
attainments. He was appointed patriarch of Constantin-
ople on the death of Maximus ii, and held the
chaplacy of the patriarch from five to seven years. He
died about A.D. 1221. Three synodical decrees of a Manu-
el, patriarch of Constantinople, are given in the Jus
Greco-Romanum of Leunclavius (ib. iii, p. 238, etc.),
who assigns them to Chriatopolus, and is followed by Cave
and Oudin, who have confounded Chriatopolus with an-
other Manuel (of Constantinople). Le Quien objects to
this judgment of Leunclavius, as not founded on evi-
dence, and, with better reason, adjudges them to Manu-
el Bryennius. Ephe柔as of Constantinople celebrates Chriatopolus as "an exact observer of the law-
book, one of the three most learned (of his time)" (Gree.
Ephe柔as. De Patriarcha (Charitop. vol. 2, 10, 251, ed. Bonn); Anonymous [supposed by some to be
e Niceph. Callist.], De Patriarcha Charitopolitani Carmen Iambicium, and Patriarchie Charitopolioe, apud
Labbe, De Histor. Byzant. tom. ii, p. 124 (Scriptor. et
Script. Eccles. iii, p. 267); Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, i, col. 278; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 1240, ii, 297 [ed. Oxford, 1749-42]; Oudin, Com-
ment. de Scriptorib. et Script. Eccles. iii, p. 177)—Smith,
Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s. v.

Manuel (Μανουήλ) (C AINMANOUÉL) em-
peror of Constantinople, from 1143 to 1160, was
the fourth son of John II, and was born about A.D. 1120.
Two of his elder brothers, Alexias and Andronicus, both
died before, and a special declaration of the
emperor appointed Manuel as his successor, to the preju-
dice of his third son, Isaac Sevastocrator. As soon as
Manuel ascended the throne, he surrounded himself with
the bravest warriors of the West, and soon became fore-
most even among them for his courage. His reign was
a succession of triumphs, sometimes in the East and
sometimes in Europe. Conrad III and Louis VII having informed
him that they were preparing a new crusade, Manuel,
although apparently disposed to help them, gave secret
information to the Turks of the approaching danger.

The relation which Manuel Comnenus sustained to the
Church of Rome is of special interest to us. His
Latin subjects he treated with kindness, embellished
their churches, and readily did all they asked of him.
This generous disposition on the part of Manuel
Comnenus towards the Latins encouraged pope Hadrian IV
(1154-1159) to make overtures for a union of the East-
ern with the Western Church, but the plan failed of
success because of the objections of the Greek patriar-
ch to acknowledge the supremacy of the pope of Rome.
See GREEK CHURCH.

After Hadrian's death Manuel entered into correspondence with Alexander III, de-
claring his adherence to the Crusades, and offered as-
sistance. The German emperor, Frederick I, had taken
sides with the rival pope Victor, and Manuel embraced
this opportunity to urge upon Alexander the claims of
the Greek emperor to the Roman crown, promising in
return to lend the pope his assistance in establishing the papal power in all Italy, as well as in the
union of the Latin and Eastern Church. So long as the
pope was in danger from the invading Allemanni, he acted as if he felt inclined to acknowledge the true representative of Constantinople.

But after the establishment of peace and
friendship with Frederick, Alexander "spoke a more
peremptory language, confirmed the acts of his prede-
cessors, excommunicated the adherents of Manuel, and
pronounced the final separation of the churches, or at
least the extinction of Constantinople and Rome" (Gibbon,
v. 401). Manuel died Sept. 24, 1180, and it is said to have
been deeply versed in theology, but "was certainly
rather a great talker than a great thinker on religion." See

MANUEL OF CONSTANTINOPLE. There were two Manuel Comnenus, father Constantine, Manuel I (Chari-
topolus), and Manuel II, the subject of the present arti-
cle. Cave, Oudin, and others seem to have confounded the two, for they state that Manuel Chari-
topolus succeeded Germanus II in A.D. 1240. Chari-
topolus was the father, not his successor; Manuel II was his successor, though not immediately, for the
brief patriarchate of Methodius II and a vacancy in the see, of considerable but uncertain length, intervened.
Manuel's death is distinctly fixed as having occurred
two months before that of the emperor John Alexius Vatatzes, A.D. 1255, Oct. 30. The duration of his pa-
triarchate is fixed by Nicephorus Callistus, according to
Le Quien, at eleven years; but the table in the Protryp-
tico of Labbe assigns to him fourteen years, so that A.D.
1240 or 1244 may be assumed as the year of his acces-
sion. He kept up the spirit of the council of 1243, and the other older authorities are preferred.

Manuel held, before his patriarchate, a high place among the ecclesiastics of the Byzantine
court, then fixed at Nice, and was reputed a man of piety and holiness, "though married," and of a mild and
gentle disposition, but by no means learned. The three
Sententiae Synodalium of the patriarch Manuel given in
the Jus Græco-Romanum undoubtedly belong to this
patriarch, not to Chariopolus, for the second of them,
De Translantam Episcoporum, is expressly dated July,
Indict. 8, A.M. 6576, as of Constantine. = A.D. 1240. Some
works, however, especially a letter to the pope, are
innocent by "Manuel Patriarcha CPhO," probably belong to Manuel
of Constantinople (Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, i. col.
279; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 1240, ii, 297 [ed. Oxford, 1740-42]; Oudin, Comment de Scriptorior. et Script. Ec-
des. iii, col. 177; Fabricius, Bibl. Græc. xi, 668).—Smith,
Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s. v.

Manuel HOLONOSUS, a Byzantine ecclesiastic of the
18th century, about 1691 or 1692 was cruelly mutilated
by the cutting off of his nose and lips, by order of the
ambitious Michael Paleologus, because he had expressed
grief at the deposition, persecution, and banishment of
Joannes Lascaris, emperor of Nicea, by Palaeologus, his successor in the empire. Holobulus was then con-
finned to the monastery of the Precursor, where, having
excellent abilities and opportunities, he pursued his studi-
es with success. About A.D. 1267 Germanus III, bish-
op of Constantinople, procured for him the appointment of teacher of church history in the school of young ecclesiastics and prevailed upon the emperor to remit his punishment and allow him to quit the monastery. Germanus also con-
ferred on him the ecclesiastical office of rhetor, reader
and expounder of the Scriptures. When the emperor
Paleologus attempted a reconciliation of the Greek and
Latin churches, he sought the counsel of Holobulus, but
he declared against the plan of reconciliation. This
brought upon him the emperor's indignation, and he
was obliged to take refuge in the church sanctuary to
escape violence from the emperor's courtiers; was ban-
ished from the city, and himself excommunicated by the
archbishop of Athens. He died A.D. 1278; was afterwards taken back to Constantin-
ople, and beaten and paraded ignominiously through the
streets. In A.D. 1288, after the accession of Andronicus II, Paleologus, son of Michael, who pursued with
respect to the union of the churches an opposite policy
to that of his father, Holobulus appeared in the Synod
of Constantinople, in which Ioannes Vexius was deposed
from the patriarchate of Constantinople, and he took part
in the subsequent disputations with that chief of the
Latinizing party. Little else is known of Holobo-
s. v.

MANUEL PALAEOLOGUS. See FERRARA; FLORENCE;
SYRACUS.

Manuel, NICOLAS, or NICOLAS, sometimes called
DEUTSCH, one of the most prominent characters in the
ecclesiastical history of Switzerland, in the age just pre-
ceding the Reformation, was born at Bern in 1484. His
real name is conjectured by his biographer, Dr. Gries-
eisen, to have been Alemans, but, as he was illegitimate, it
was, for family reasons, changed anagrammatically into
that of Manuel. It is further conjectured that he was
brought up by his maternal grandfather, Thutrin Frick-
art. He was an artist by profession, but he excelled
also as a theologian and philosopher. He was teaching at Colmar, under the successors of the celebrated
Martin Schöns, until the fame of Titian attracted him
to Venice, where, about 1511, he became one of his pupils: he is the Emanuelle Tedesco of Riddoli and other Italian
writers. He is said to have assisted Holbein, in 1514,
in his "Dances of Death," but this is very improbable,
as he was himself employed at that time in painting the
same subject in the cloister of the Dominican convent
at Bern. It was executed in fresco or distemper. The
picture consisted of forty-six subjects, forty-one of which
were the actual festivals; 14; 14; and 18 of them have
been destroyed, but the compositions are preserved in prints and copies: the wall on which it was painted was pulled
down in 1660. Manuel was an active reformer, and
many of these designs are reflections upon the abuses
of the Roman Church. He also ornamented his own
house with a large freedom in the worship of his own
worshiping idols. But of these and several other of his
works nothing now remains, except some small water-
color copies preserved in the library at Basle. How-
ever, either because his pencil did not bring him suffi-
ciently for the maintenance of himself and his po-
itical ardor, he was induced to engage in military and
public affairs. He served, as quartermaster or commis-
ary, among the Swiss allies who assisted Francis I in his
expedition against Milan, 1522, and was present both at
The storming of Novara and the battle of Biaccoes. In the following year he was chosen landvogt of Erlach, and from the year 1526 distinguished himself by his zeal in the cause of the Reformation. From this period he was entirely devoted to that cause, and to his various public employments. He died in 1560, while only forty-six years of age. He adorned himself in 1509, by various popular poems and songs in the Swiss dialect, full of humor and sharp satire. He is said by some to be the author of a song, which originated in the early part of the 16th century, deriding the inhumanity of the Virgin Mary. But though this be doubtful, it is certain that Ťaman himself wielded his pen in support of the Reformation by attacking the gross abuses of the clergy and the licentiousness of monastics. His Fastnachtsspiele, or Dramatic Morality and Mysteries, which he began to compose in 1520, and finished in 1522, is derived from their knowledge of manures from Egypt, but they doubtless adopted and preserved the customs which existed among the previous inhabitants of the country. In the parable of the fig-tree which had for three years been barren, and which the proprietor therefore doomed to be cut down, the gardener is represented as praying for delay, until he should "dig it out and dung it" (Luke xiii. 7). To explain this, Lightfoot quotes the following from the Talmud: "They lay dung to m-stien and enrich the soil; dig it under the roots of trees; pluck up the trunk and throw off the leaves; sprinkle leaves, and smoke under the trees to kill vermin." In addition to the various modes of irrigation, the soil was likewise enriched by means of ashes; to which were added the straw, stubble, husks, or chaff, together with the brambles and grass that overspread the land during the sabbatical year; all being reduced by fire and used as manure (Prov. xxiv. 31; Isa. vii. 23; xxxii. 10). The burning over the surface of the field forms a good preparation for sowing the seeds of noxious herbs (Jahn, Bibl. Arch. § 57). Dung-hills are mentioned in 1 Sam. ii. 8; Ezra vii. 11; Dan. ii. 5; iii. 29, and one of the gates at Jerusalem was called the Dung-gate, from dung being carried out there (Neh. ii. 13). That the soil was manured with dung, we learn from 2 Kings ix. 37; Psa. lxxxiiii. 10; Jer. viii. 2; ix. 22; xvi. 4; xxv. 33; Luke xiv. 35. The Israelites had comparatively few horses and few swine, two sources of excellent strong manure. Their animals consisted chiefly of oxen, camels, asses, sheep, and goats. The dung of the cow and camel was used to a considerable extent for fuel, and the dung of the sacrificial was directed to be burned—circumstances calculated to diminish the supply. That salt was used for manure we learn from Matt. v. 13 and Luke xiv. 34, 35, and it would appear that salt was sometimes sown by itself on the land, at others mixed in the dung-hill. From the Talmud we learn that a dung-hill in a public place exposed the owner to the payment of whatever damage it might occasion, and any person might remove it as a nuisance. Dung might not, during the seventh year, be transported to the neighborhood of the fields intended to be made manured. Under certain restrictions it was, however, permitted to fold cattle, for the sake of their manure, upon the lands that required it in the sabbatical year, and it is from this only we learn that the practice existed among the Jews, who would seem more properly to have fold ed their sheep within walled enclosures (John x. 1-4), the occasional clearance of which must have afforded a principal supply of manure. It would seem that gardens, except a few old rose-gardens, were not allowed within the walls of Jerusalem, on account of the manure which they would have required, and "because of the stench," as the Mishnah states, this produced, as well as because of that arising from the weeds thrown out from gardens. From another passage of the Talmud we are informed that the surplus blood of the sacrifices offered in the Temple, that is to say, the blood which was poured out at the foot of the Stone altar, after the sacrifices had been duly sprinkled, was conducted by a subterranean channel to the outside of the city, and was sold to the gardeners as manure for their gardens; by which we are to understand that the gardeners were allowed to use it on paying the price of a trespass-offering, without which it could not be appropriated to any common use after having been dedicated at the altar. See Dung.

Manuscripts, Biblical. These are either Hebrew or Greek; we shall treat of them separately, referring for details to subordinate articles, where they are discussed more copiously.

1. Hebraic Manuscripts.—These are divided into (a) Synagogue rolls or sacred copies, and (b) Private or common copies.

(a.) The synagogue rolls contain the Pentateuch, the appointed sections of the prophets, or the book of Esther, which last is used only at the Feast of Purim. The three are never put together, but are written on separate rolls. They are in the Chaldee or square Hebrew character, without vowels and accents, accompanied with the puncta extraordinaria, and having the unusual forms of certain consonants. The parchments are prepared in a particular manner by the hands of Jews only, and made from the hides of clean animals, which, when duly wrought, are joined together by thongs made out of the same material. They are then divided into columns, the breadth of which must not exceed half their length. These columns, whose number is prescribed, must be of equal length and breadth among themselves, and contain a certain number of words, each line having no more than three words. The Talmud contains strict rules concerning the material, the color, the ink, letters, divisions, writing instrument, etc., which are closely followed, especially in the Pentateuch. These rules are extracted from the Talmud, and translated in Adler's Bibl. Hebr., p. 498. Deuteronomy is written in square, the rest in round characters. (From Jerusalem, 1779, 8vo.) The minuteness of such regulations renders it a most irksome task for the sofer or scribe to write out a synagogue roll. The revision of the Torah, as the synagogue roll is often called, must be undertaken within thirty days after its transcription, else it is unfit for use. Three mistakes on one side or skin are allowable; but should there be four, or should there happen to be an error in the open and close sections of the law, in the position of the words in Exodus v and Deut. xxii, which are the only portions of the Pentateuch written in poetical order, to the whole copy is worthless. The great beauty of penmanship exhibited in these synagogue copies has always been admired. They are taken from authentic exemplars, without the slightest deviation or correction. Seldom do they fall into the hands of Christian scribes, since when they cease to be employed in the synagogue, they are either burned or carefully laid aside, lest they should be profaned by coming into the possession of Gentiles.

(b.) Private MSS. are written partly in the square or Chaldee character, partly in the Rabbinical. They are held in far less esteem, for a manuscript roll is not wont to be denominated profane (pesutil). Their form is entirely arbitrary. They are in folio, quarto, octavo, and duodecimo. Of those written in the square character, the greater number are on parchment, some on
paper. The ink of the letters is always black, but the vowel points are usually written with ink of a different color from that of the consonants. Initial words and letters are frequently decorated with gold and silver colors. The prose parts are arranged in columns; the poetic in parallel numbers. Some copies are without columns. The columns are not always occupied with the Hebrew text alone; for a version is frequently added, which is either written in the text after the manner of verses, or in a column by itself, or in the margin in a smaller character. The number of lines is not prescribed by the copyist. The upper and lower margin are filled with the Great Masorah, and sometimes with a rabbinical commentary; as also with prayers, psalms, and the like. The external margin is for corrections, scholia, variations, notices of the haphturoth (sections from the prophets), parashoth (sections from the law), the commentaries of the rabbis, etc. The inner margin, or that between the columns, is occupied with the Little Masorah. The single books of the O.T. are separated from one another by spaces, except the books of Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, which are written continuously. The sections of the law and prophets are numbered. In the MSS. of different countries the books are differently arranged. These copies generally pass through various hands before they are finished. The consonants proceed from the sopher or scribe. When the same person writes both consonants and vowels as frequently the case—he never makes them at the same time—the former are finished before he begins to append the latter. The Keria in the margin uniformly proceeds from the vowel-writer. It is probable that these copies were in no instance made by Christians.

The square character employed in the MSS. of which we have spoken has varieties. The Jews themselves distinguish in the synagogue rolls—1. the Tum letter, with sharp corners and perpendicular coronal, used among the German and Polish Jews; 2. the Velde letter, more modern than the Tum, and rounder, with coronal and valley found in the printed copies of the Spanish and Oriental Jews. See OLD TESTAMENT.

2. The age of Hebrew MSS. is not easily determined. It is true that they often contain subscriptions giving an account of the time when they were written, and the name of the scribe, or also of the possessor. But these accounts are often ambiguous, occasionally incorrect. Where they are altogether wanting it is still more difficult to discover the age. In the latter case the character of the writing, the color of the ink, the quality and complexity of the parchment, the absence of the Masorah, of the vowel-points, of the unusual letters, etc., have been chiefly resorted upon. Still, however, such particulars are uncertain marks of age. The oldest Hebrew MS. known to Kenmott or De Rossi was 634 of De Rossi, a mere fragment, containing small portions of Leviticus and Numbers. According to its former possessor, it belongs to the 8th century. So much uncertainty attaches to the internal marks adopted by these two Hebrews that the ages to which they assign several Hebrew MSS. are gratuitous. Since Pinner examined a number of MSS. belonging to the Bible Society of Odessa, older ones are now known. (For the dates of his MSS., see below.) In the imperial

public library at St. Petersburo there is a collection of Hebrew MSS. made by Mr. Firkowicz, containing several very ancient ones. The oldest date is in a roll found in a Karaite synagogue in the Crimea, viz. A.D. 488; but that date is very suspicious. Several fragments of rolls give, as the dates of purchase or dedication, A.D. 689, 781, 789, 798, 808, 815, 842, 848.

3. A few of the oldest Hebrew MSS. may be briefly described here. We begin with the Hezali or Hililil Codex (αβκλ), one of the most ancient and most celebrated codices of the Hebrew Scriptures, which derived its name from the fact that it was written at Hilla (τηλαια), a town built near the ruins of ancient Babel. Others, however, maintain that it was called Hililil because the name of the man who wrote it was Hililil. But whatever uncertainty there may be about the derivation of its name, there can hardly be any doubt that it was written A.D. 600, for Sakkuto tells us most distinctly that when he saw the remainder of it (cir. A.D. 1500) the Codex was 900 years old. His word was, "In the year 4560, on the 26th of Ab (1196, better 1197), there was a great persecution of the Jews in the kingdom of Leon from the two kingdoms that came to besiege it. It was then that the twenty-four sacred books which were written long ago, about the year 600, by R. Moses ben-Hililil (on which account the Codex is called Hililil), in an exceedingly correct manner, and after which all the copies were corrected, were taken away. I saw the remaining two portions of it—viz. the earlier and later prophets—written in large and beautiful characters, which were brought to Portugal and sold in Africa, where they still are, having been written 900 years ago. Kimichi, in his Gramman on Numb. xv, 4, says that the Pentateuch of this Codex was extant in Toletti" (Juchaiusin, ed. Filipowski, Lond, 1857, p. 220). The Codex had the Talmudic vowels and accents, Masorah and Nikud glosses, and it served up to A.D. 1150 as a model from which copies were made. The Codex which Haja had in Babylon about A.D. 1000 was conveyed to Leon, in Spain, where the greater part of it became a prey to the fury of the martial hosts who sacked the Jewish dwellings in 1157. The celebrated grammarians, Jacob ben-Eleazar, fixed the renderings of the Biblical text according to this Codex, and the older philologists frequently quote it. Comp. Gritz, Geschichte der Juden (Lpz, 1859), vi, 182, 229; Frits, Geschichte des Kardhatthuma (Leipiz, 1869), i. 22, 138; Kimichi, Rodicam Liber ed. Biscusiak et Lemberi (Leoveli, 1867), p. 26. See Jacob ben-Eleazar, No. 1, Pinner. This is a Pentateuch roll on leather, containing the five Mosaic books complete. It has no

Odesse Mm., No. 1 of Pinner (Mal. iv, 6).
The variations in the text from the Masoretic recension are few and
considerable. The MS., according to the subscription,
was purchased in 1868. The text 590 years. The roll
must have been written upwards of 1280 years. It
was brought from Derbend, in Daghestan, and is now at St.
Petersburg. If the subscription be genuine, it is the
oldest MS. known, except that one in the Firkowicz col-
collection dated 468. (See Rule, Kuranzit, p. 100 sq.)
11, De Rossi, quart. 1. This is but the fragment of a
MS., containing Lev. xxi, 19-Num. i, 50. It is on
parchment, without the vowel-points, Masorah, or
Keria. It has also no interval between the parashiot or
sections. But there are sometimes points between the
words. There are, in De Rossi's manuscript of the 8th
century, and interspersed by age. The character of
the letters is intermediate, approaching the German. It
is now at Parma.

No. 5, Pinner. This is a roll of the Pentateuch, but
incomplete. The writing begins with Numb. xiii, 19.
The form of the letters is very different from the present
style. It is carelessly written, words and letters be-
ing frequently omitted. The subscription states that
it was written A.D. 483.

No. 11, Pinner. This is a fragment of a synagogue
roll, written with De Rossi, quart. 26. It is from
No. 503, De Rossi, in quarto. This is a MS. of the
Pentateuch, made up of different pieces. It begins with
Gen. xiii, 15, and ends with Deut. xv, 12. There is a
chiasm in it from Lev. xxi, 19 to Numb. i, 50, because
De Rossi separated this portion, thinking it to be older
than the rest, and characterized it as an independent
fragment by the No. 634. The vowel-points are at-
tached, but not throughout, evidently by the same hand
as that which wrote the consonants. There are no traces
of the Masorah or Keri. Sometimes its readings have
a remarkable agreement with those of the Samaritan
text, and ancient versions. De Rossi places the various
pieces of which it is made up in the 9th and 10th cen-
turies.

No. 3, Pinner, small folio. This MS. contains the
greater and lesser prophets, on 226 leaves. Every page
is written in two columns, between which, as well as
below, and in the outer margin, stands the Masorah.
Every column contains twenty-one lines. After each
verse are two points, to which, without any interval, a
new verse succeeds. The vowels and accents, as well
as the greater and lesser Masorah, are wholly different
from those of the Samaritan text, and ancient versions. De
Rossi places the consonants. The first page has a twofold pointing, viz.
above and below, but this does not occur again except
occasionally in verses or words. From Zech. xiv, 6 to
Mal. i, 13 there is no punctuation, and the first three
verses of Mal. i, 12 have no points at all in the
manner now usual. The whole Codex is very cor-
rectly written. The form of the consonants differs con-
siderably from the present text. The various readings
of this MS., according to Pinner's collation, are numer-
ous and important. The date is 916. Two others in
the same collection, Nos. 15 and 17, have the same vowel
and accent system, i.e. the Babylonian or Eastern, which
developed in the 6th century, and from which, in the
7th, that of the Western, or the school of Tiberias,
was developed. Pinker has written ably on the subject
(Einleitung in das Babylonisch-Hebräische Punktations-
system, etc., Wien, 1868), reviewed by Fürst in the Zeits-
chrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, xlviii,
31 sq.

No. 13, Pinner, folio. This is an incomplete MS.,
consisting of 116 leaves, on good parchment, containing
the text from Mal. vi, 10 to the end, and the books of Kition
Each page has three columns, between which, as also
at the sides of the text, stands the Masorah. The vowels
and accents are different from those now in use. The
text has many important readings; and the Masorah
dictated in these have no points at all in its first verse;
and 2d succeeds 1st Kings without a vacant
space between. An inscription states that the MS. was
purchased in 1868. It is obviously an important codex.
Codex 590, Koenen, folio. This MS. contains the Prophe-

Prophets and Hagiographa on parchment. The text
has the vowel-points, but apparently from a later hand.
The margin does not exhibit the Masorah, but variations
are noted here and there. Some books have the final
Masorah, others, the consonants only; and they are
arranged in the order, Jeremiah and Ezekiel coming
before Isaiah, and Ruth before the Psalms. Accor-
ding to the subscription, it was written A.D. 1019, or
1018 by another reckoning. The MS. is in the impe-
rial library of Vienna.

Pinnock's Bible, folio. A MS. containing the Pent-
ateuch, Prophets, and Hagiographa, on good parch-
ment. Every page has three columns, except in Psalms,
Job, and Proverbs, where there are but two. The text
is furnished with vowels and accents, two points stand-
ing after each verse. The letters and accents are like
those in No. 3 of Pinner. The Great and Little Masor-
rah are in the margins. Being a Karaite MS., it has
not been written with great accuracy. Words and
veres are sometimes repeated. It is highly ornamented
with gold and silver colors. The Codex states that it
was written in the year 1010.

The most important and oldest Hebrew MSS. collated
by Kennicott, Bruns, De Rossi, Pinner, and others, are
described in Davidson's Biblical Criticism, i, 846 sq.;
and his Text of the Old Testament considered, etc., p. 98
sq. See also the third section of Tychsen's Tintenm de
Moravia Codicum Hebraeorum Vet. Test. note, in his
Handbuch der Hebräisch-Biblischen Handschriften (Rostock, 1786,
8vo), in which the learned writer ex-
amines the marks of antiquity assumed by Simon, Jab-
lonski, Wolf, Houbigant, Kennicott, and Lillienthal,
and shows that the Masorah alone is a certain index for
determining the age and goodness of Hebrew MSS. See
also the same writer's Beurtheilung des Hebräischen und des
den Hebräisch-Biblischen Handschriften (Rostock, 1786,
8vo), in which the mode of determining the age of MSS.
adopted by Kennicott, Bruns, and De Rossi is rejected;
and Schnurrer's Dissertation Inauguralis de Codicibus He-
braeorum Vet. Test. utate difficultier determinanda (Tub-
ingen, 1772, 4to), reprinted in his Dissertationes Philo-
logico-Criticae (Gottha at Amsterdam, 1790, 8vo).

Private MSS. written in the Robbénichen character are
much more recent than the preceding, none of them be-
ing older than 500 years. They are on cotton or linen
paper, in a cursive character, without vowel-points or
the Masorah, but have the consonants.

The MSS. found among the Chinese Jews are partly
syagogue rolls, partly private copies, whose text does
not differ from the Masoretic. The Pentateuch of the
Malabar Jews, brought from India to Englisten by the
late Dr. Buchman, and described by Mr. Yeats, is redu-
bles, on the whole, the usual synagouge rolls of the Jews,
except that it is written on red skins. Its text is the
Masoretic, with a few unimportant deviations.

Eight exemplars are celebrated among the Jews for
their correctness and value. They are now lost, but ex-
tracts from them are still preserved. From Jewish writ-
ings, and from the margin of some MSS., where a refer-
ence is made to them, we learn that they were highly
prized for their singular accuracy. They formed the
basis of subsequent copies. They are, 1. The Codex of
Hillel (see supra, No. 1); 2. The Codex of of the
Codex of Israel; 4. An Egyptian Codex; 5. Codex Sinai;
6. The Pentateuch of Jericho; 7. Codex Sanubki; 8. The
book Taggin.

For a more copious account of Hebrew MSS. we refer
to Eichhorn's Einleitung (Introduction), vol. ii; Kenn-
Niciott's Disquisitiones Criticæ, folio; and Alt's
Polyglott, separately edited by Dathe and Wrangham;
Tychsen's Texten; De Rossi's Variae Lectiones Vet.
Test. etc.; and his Scholia critica in V. T. libros, etc.;
De Wette, Lehrbuch der Historisch-Kritischen Einle-
bung; Davidson, and described by Mr. Yeats, and added
Intro. to the Old Test., in Horne. See OLD TESTAMENT.
A complete description of these MSS. is given in the great critical editions of the N. T.; here only those can be briefly noticed which are of primary importance.

(a) Uncials.
B, Codex Sinaiticus (Cod. Frld. Aug. of the Sept.) at St. Petersburg, obtained by Tischendorf from the convent of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai, in 1859. The fragments of the Sept. published as Cod. Frld. Aug. (1866) were obtained at the same place by Tischendorf in 1858.
N. The N. T. is entire, and the Epistle of Barnabas and parts of the Shepherd of Hermes are added. The whole MS. was published in 1862 by Tischendorf, at the expense of the emperor of Russia. It is probably the oldest MS. of the N. T. and of the 4th century (Tischendorf, Nov. Cod. Sin. 1860). See Sinaitic Manuscript.

A, Codex Alexandrinus (British Museum), a MS. of the entire Greek Bible, with the Epistles of Clement added. It was given by Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, to Charles I in 1629, and is in the British Museum. It contains the whole of the N. T. with some chasms: Matthew xxv. 6; ἀδικοῖα; John vi, 50; ἐν ἐννεαδίας, 52; λέγει; 2 Cor. iv, 13; ἐπιστολαὶ; 6, 8; ἐν ἐννεαδίας. It was probably written in the first half of the 4th century. The N. T. in this MS. is supposed to have been added in 1796 (fol.), and with some corrections by Cowper (1800, 8vo). Compare Wetstein, Proleg. p. 13–30 (ed. Latzki).

See Alexandrian Manuscript.

B, Codex Vaticanus (No. 1209), a MS. of the Greek Bible, which seems to have been in the Vatican Library almost from its commencement (cic. A.D. 1450). It contains the N. T. entire to Heb. ix. 14, καθά: the rest of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Apocalypse were added in the 15th century. Various collations of the New Testament were made by Bartolomeo da Prato (1469), by Niccolò Benenti (cic. 1729), whose emendation was in part revised by Ruelle (1726), and by Sich (1788). An edition of the whole MS., on which Mai had been engaged for many years, was published three years after his death in 1858 (5 vols. 4to, ed. Vercellone; N. T. reprinted, London and Leipzig). Mai had himself kept back the edition (printed 1824–1838), being fully conscious of its imperfections, and had prepared another edition of the N. T., which was published also by Vercellone and others in 1859 (8vo). This was revised by Tischendorf (Lpz. 1867). The whole of Codex B is to be regarded as a well-preserved MS. of the N. T., and the part has already appeared (Rome, 1868), nearly complete. The MS. is assigned to the 4th century (Tischendorf, N. T. p. xxxvi–cxlit). See Vatican Manuscript.

The Apocalypse in these last editions is taken from Codex Vatonicus, 2966 (formerly Codex Basilius, 105), in the Vatican Library. It belongs to the 8th century (see Tischendorf's N. T. p. cxli sq. [7th ed.]).

C, Codex Ephraemi rescriptus (Paris, Bibl. Imp. 9), a palimpsest MS. which contains fragments of the Sept. and of every part of the N. T. In the 12th century the original writing was effaced, and some Greek writings of Ephraem Syrus were written over it. The MS. was brought to Florence from the East at the beginning of the 16th century, and came thence to Paris with Catherine de Medici. Wetstein was engaged to collate it for Bentley (1716), but it was first fully examined by Tischendorf, who published the N. T. in 1845; the O. T. fragments in 1845. The only entire books which have perished are 2 Thess. and 2 John, but lacunae of greater or less extent occur constantly. It is of about the same date as the Codex Alex. See EPHRAEM MANUSCRIPT.

D (of the Codices), Codex Bezae (University Library, Cambridge), a Graeco-Latin MS. of the Gospels and Acts, with a small fragment of 3 John, published to the University of Cambridge by Beza in 1581. Some readings from it were obtained in Italy for Stephen's edition, but afterwards Bezae was lost, and it was found at the seat of Lyons in 1562, in the Monastery of St. Ireneus. The text is very remarkable, and, especially in the Acts, abounds in sim-
gular interpolations. The MS. has many lacunae. It was
edited in a splendid form by Kipling (1873, 2 vols. fol.),
but so imperfectly that it has been published anew
under the care of the Rev. F. H. Scrivener (Camb.1884,
4to). The MS. is referred to the 6th century. Comp.
Credner, Beiträge, i, 452-518; Bornemann, Acta Apost.
litaurorum, 1848; Schulz, De Codice D, contempt 1827.
D (of the Epistles), Codex Claromontanus, or Region
(Imperial Library at Paris, 107), marked by the
same letter of the alphabet as the preceding,
containing a different part of the N. T., viz., all Paul's Epis-
tles with the exception of the Acts. It is a Greek-
Latin MS., written stichometrically, with accents and
breathings, but without division into words.
According to Montfaucon, it belongs to the 7th century,
but Tischendorf assigns it to the 6th. The text was edited
by the latter scholar in 1852, and is very valuable.
Various correctors may be traced, but it is easy
to distinguish them. The first readings are of course
the principal ones (see the prolegomena to Tischendorf's
dition). See ClerMONTMaNuSCRIPT.
E (of the Gospels), Codex Basilianus (K, iv, 85 in
the public library of Hamborn), containing the
first two books, with a very few chasms in Luke's.
In some parts smaller writing has taken the place of
the older. It belongs to the middle of the 8th century,
and was collated by Tischendorf in 1843. See his description in
the Studien und Kritiken for 1844. See BASILIAN MANuSCRIPT.
F (of the Gospels), Codex Borelli, now in the library
of Utrecht, containing the Gospels, but with many
chasms. It was collated and described by Herings,
whose work was published by Vinke (1845). The MS.
belongs to the end of the 9th century. See Borelli's
MANuSCRIPT.
G (of the Epistles), Codex ColoniaM, containing a few fragments of the
Gospels, Acts, and Epistles, found among the scholia
of Codex Coelain, 1, which has the Octoechos, with
the book of Kings. They were edited by Tischendorf in
his Monumenta Sacra inedita (1846), p. 400 sq. The
fragments belong to the 7th century. See COELAIN MANuSCRIPT.
F, in the British Museum, 17,138, a rescript
fragment from the Nitrian desert, containing a few places
of John's Gospel, which were deciphered and published
by Tischendorf in his Monum. crit. ed. vol. ii. The text agrees
with the most ancient and best authorities. Tischendorf
assigns the fragment to the 4th century; it rather belongs
to the 5th.
F, (of the Epistles), Codex AugusM, a Greek-Latin
MS. of St. Paul's Epistles, in the library of Trinity
College, Cambridge. It wants the Epistle to the Hebrews
in Greek and the Romans, 11, 18. Dots are inserted be-
tween many of the Greek and Latin words. The text is
ancient and valuable. It belongs to the 9th century.
In 1842 and 1849 it was collated by Tischendorf, and
edited by Scrivener (1859). See AUGMANN MANuSCRIPT.
G (of the Gospels), Codex Hordwicus, 5604, in the
British Museum), a MS. of the four Gospels, but imperfect
in many places. It belongs to the 9th or 10th cen-
tury, and was collated by Tregelles and Tischendorf.
G, (of the Epistles), Codex BoernerM, a Greek-Latin
MS. of Paul's Epistles, now in the Royal Library of Dres-
den. It has the same chasms as F, AugusM, with which it agrees remarkably, so that both texts seem to
have proceeded from the same source. They belong to
one country and age—probably to Switzerland and the
9th century. Matthei published it in 1781, 8vo. See BOERNER MANuSCRIPT.
H (of the Gospels), Codex Seidellii, 11, a MS. of the
gospels in the public library of Hamburg. It is
imperfect in many places, belongs to the 9th or 10th
century, and was collated by Tregelles in 1856.
H, (of the Acts), Codex Museum (136 in the Ducal
Library of Modena), a MS. of the Acts, with considera-
tble gaps. Its age is the 9th century. From Acts xxvii,
4 till the end was supplied in uncial letters in the 11th
century. The Pauline and Catholic Epistles were added
in cursive letters in the 15th or 16th century. Tischend-
orf collated it in 1843.
H, (of the Epistles), Codex Coelainus (292 in the
Imperial Library at Paris). This MS. contains frag-
ments of Paul's Epistles. It consists only of twelve
leaves, two of which formerly had been now at Peter-
burg, Amsterdam, and is now at Hamborn, collated by
Tischendorf from Mount Athos, containing Col. iii, 4-11. The
fifteen leaves should be put together. It has been col-
lated by Tischendorf, who intends to publish it all. It
belongs to the 9th century. See COELAIN MANuSCRIPT.
I, a MS. in the library of St. Petersburg, found by
Tischendorf in 1839, and collated by Wace and
Gasquet containing the remains of seven very ancient MSS., ex-
hibiting parts of the Gospels, Acts, and two Pauline
Epistles. Tischendorf thinks that the first, second,
and third belong to the 9th century. All are edited by him in
the first volume of Monumenta Sacra, p. 1, etc.
J, See N.
K (of the Gospels), Codex Region, or Cyprus (now 68 in
the Imperial Library of Paris). It contains the four
Gospels complete, belongs to the middle of the 9th
century, and was accurately collated by Tischendorf in
1843. See PARIS MANuSCRIPTS.
K, (of the Epistles), Codex Mosquensis (xxviii in the
Library of the Holy Synod at Moscow), containing the
Catholic and Pauline Epistles. It belongs to the 9th
century, and was collated by Matthei.
L, (of the Gospels), Codex Regius (92 in the Imperial
Library at Paris), containing the Gospels entire with the
exception of five places. The text of this codex
contains very old and good readings, agreeing remark-
ably with B. It belongs to the 8th century, and was
published by Tischendorf in his Monum. Sacra, 1846,
p. 57. See PARIS MANuSCRIPTS.
L, (of the Acts and Epistles), Codex Bibliotheca An-
gelica (A 2, 15 in the library of the Augustine monks
at Rome), a MS. containing the Acts, Catholic Epistles,
and those of Paul. It begins with Acts viii, 10, and
ends with Hebrews xi, 10. Its age is the 9th century.
It was first collated with care by Fleck; afterwards by
Tischendorf and Tregelles.
M (of the Gospels), Codex Region (48 in the Imperial
Library of Paris), containing the Gospels entire. This
MS. has been transcribed by Tischendorf, but is not yet
published. He assigns it to the latter part of the 9th
century. See PARIS MANuSCRIPTS.
M, (of the Epistles), two fragments; one at Hamborn,
the other at London. The former contains some parts of
the Epistle to the Hebrews; the latter, portions of the
Epistle to the Corinthians. Both were published by
Tischendorf in his Annali sacri, p. 174 sq. The
text is both ancient and valuable.
N (of the Gospels), Codex papyrus, the fragment of a
MS., of which four leaves are in the British Museum,
seven in the Vatican, and two at Vienna. Tischendorf
has recently found 80 leaves more, containing about a
third of the entire Gospel of Mark, between vi, 53 and
xx, 8. The letters were silver on purple vellum. They
are larger and rounder than in a B C. The text is in
Manuscripts 725
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two columns. The Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons are placed in the margin. All contain portions of the Gospels. The contents of the twelve leaves were published by Tischendorf in his *Monumenta Iudaica*, which assigns the fragment to the end of the 6th century. See Purple Manuscripts.

N° * [Tisch. 1°] (Brit. Mus. Add. 17, 136), a pilipense of the 4th or 5th century, deciphered by Tregelles, and published by Tischendorf (*Mon. Iudaic. vol. ii*).

N° 1, a few fragments, now at Moscow, of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Tischendorf thinks they may be of the 6th century, but Matthai did not state enough to determine their age.

O, a small fragment, consisting of two leaves, containing 2 Cor. i, 20-22, 12, belonging to the 9th century.

O°, *Codex Mosquensis (cxx. at Moscow)*, a fragment consisting of eight leaves, containing a few parts of John's Gospel; probably of the 9th century. Matthai published the text.

O° 1, the two hymns, Luke i, 46-55 and i, 68-79, in a Latin MS, containing the grammar of Pompeius. They are written in uncial Greek letters, and belong to the 9th century. Tischendorf published them in his *Anecdota sacra et profana*, p. 206 sq.


O°, the hymn of Mary, Luke i, 46-55, contained in the Verona Psalter, and belonging to the 6th century. The Greek is in Latin letters. It was published by Bianchini in the *Patrologia Latina* appended to his *Vindiciam canonarum Scripturam* (Rome, 1740).

O° 1, the three hymns of Luke i and ii, as contained in the Psalter of Turin, written in gold and silver letters, belonging to the 7th century. Tischendorf is about to publish the entire Psalter.

O° 2, the same three hymns in a St.-Gall Codex, 17, written partly in Greek and partly in Latin. Tischendorf assigns the MS to the 9th century.

P (of the Gospels), *Codex Gelasianus*, A (in the library of Wolfenbüttel), a palimpsest MS, containing fragments of the Gospels. In 1762 Knittel published all he could read. In 1834 Tischendorf succeeded in deciphering almost all the portions of the Gospels that exist, which he has published in his *Monumenta Sacra iudaica* (1869). See below, Q.

P 1, (of the Acts and Epistles), a MS. of the Acts, Catholic, and Pauline Epistles, and Apocalypse, belonging to the library of Bishop Uspenski in St. Petersburg. This is a valuable palimpsest, consisting of upwards of 300 leaves. Though belonging to the 9th century, the text, except in I Peter and Acts, agrees with that of the oldest codices. The Epistles were published in 1865, and the Acts and Rev. in 1869, by Tischendorf, in his *Monum. Sacra*.

Q, *Codex Gennasianus*, B, another palimpsest, containing fragments of Luke and John's Gospel, discovered in 1845, and published with the last fragment by Tischendorf is about to re-edit it in a more complete and accurate state. According to him, P belongs to the 6th, and Q to the 5th century. See Wolfenbüttel Manuscripts.

R, a papyrus fragment, containing parts of 1 Cor. i, vi, vii, belonging to the 6th or 6th century.

R°, a rescript MS, belonging to the British Museum, brought from the Nitrian desert, with many other codices, chiefly Syriac ones. The Syriac text of Severus of Antioch was written over it. The forty-eight leaves contain parts of Luke's Gospel. The writing is in two columns; and the Ammonian sections have not the canons of Eusebius. Tischendorf published almost the whole text (for some of it is illegible) in his *Monumenta Sacra iudaica*, vol. ii. Dr. Wright found three leaves overlooking by Tischendorf, of which he gave an account in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* for January, 1864. It is assigned to the 6th century, but may belong to the 7th.

S, *Codex Vaticanus*, 354. This MS. contains the four Gospels entire. It is in the Vatican Library, where Birch carefully copied it twice for the Greek Testament. A subscription to it states that it was written A.D. 949. See Tischendorf, in the *Amulei Vindobonenses* (1847), where a fac-simile better than those of Blanchini and Birch is given.

T, *Codex Vindobonensis* (in the library of the Propaganda at Rome), a MS. of thirteen leaves, containing fragments of John's Gospel. The Greek text has a *Theotic translation* by its side. Giorgi published the text in 1789 at Rome. Tischendorf, who inspected the MS and made a fac-simile of it, assigns it to the 6th century. See Borgian Manuscripts.

T 1, six leaves, containing John i, ii, iii, iv, belonging to the 6th century.

T 2, two leaves, containing Matt. xiv, xv, belonging to the 6th century. The writing and text resemble those of the Pergamian fragments.


T 4, *Fragmentum Wodickanum*, a few leaves, Greek and Sabidiac, whose text was edited by Wöilde (contained in the Appendix to the Codex Alexandrinus, 1789). The copy was done for the Bibliotheca Sacra, 25-32; the place of John the Evangelist, 83-42. Tischendorf has discovered that these fragments are parts of P, published by Giorgi. Hence they belong to the same time.

V, *Codex Monoceros*, formerly Nuziaca in (St. Mark's Library at Venice), a MS. of the Gospels complete, with a text elegantly written. It was first collected accurately by Tischendorf in 1843, and again by Tregelles in 1846. According to Tischendorf it belongs to the end of the 9th or to the 10th century.

V, *Codex Mosquensis* (in the library of the Holy Synod at Moscow), a MS. of the four Gospels, with several chasmas. From John v, 39 has been supplied by a more recent hand of the 18th century, in cursive letters. It belongs to the 9th century, and was twice collated by Matthai.

W 1, two leaves at the end of Codex Regius, now in the Spanish Library of Paris. They contain Luke ix, 34-47; x, 12-22, and are the fragment of a continuous MS. of the Gospels belonging to the 8th century. Tischendorf has edited the whole in his *Monumenta Sacra iudaica*.

W 2, *Neapolitanus rescriptus*, consisting of fourteen leaves which contain fragments of the first three Gospels as old as the 8th century. Tischendorf edited some verses of it in the *Amules Vindobonenses* (1847); and it is described by Scotti. Tischendorf supposes that the leaves belong to the same MS. as V. W 3, three leaves at St. Gall, containing fragments of Mark and Luke. They are a sort of palimpsest, the writing having been effaced, though nothing new was written over. Tischendorf, who copied, and intends to edit these fragments, assigns them to the 9th century.

W 4, fragments of Mark's Gospel, vii, viii, ix, found in Trinity College, Cambridge, belonging to the 9th century.

X, *Codex Monoceros*, in the library of the University of Munich, containing fragments of the four Gospels. Commentaries of several fathers, especially Chrysostom, are inserted. The text, except Mark's, belongs to the 9th or 10th century. Between John ii, 22 and vii, 1, is supplied by a later hand of the 12th century. The MS. was collated by Tischendorf and Tregelles. See Monoceros Manuscript.

X 1, *Codex Patavinius*, No. 225, six leaves containing fragments of John's Gospel, belonging to the 8th century, copied by Tischendorf in 1843, and published in his *Monumenta Sacra iudaica*, 1846. They are now in the Barberini Library at Rome.
Z. Codex Dublinaeus, in the library of Trinity Col-
lege, Dublin, a palimpsest, containing fragments of Mat-
thew's Gospel, and belonging to the 6th century. The
text of this MS. presents ancient and valuable readings.
It was published in fac-simile by Barrett, 1801, 4to, and
Tregelles has since (1853) deciphered the remainder.
(Plate 7, figs. 166 sq.) See Dublinaeus Manuscript.
A, a MS. now in the Bodleian Library, consisting of
157 leaves large 4to. It contains Luke's Gospel entire,
and parts of the other three. The form of the letters
resembles the Codex Cyrilicus or K. Tischendorf, who
got it in the East, assigns it to the 9th century. He
cannot, however, describe it in Apocrypta et profanae.
The second half of this MS. has recently been found,
containing the greatest part of Matthew and John. The
date is 844.
Δ. Codex Sungelmianus, a Greek-Latin MS. in the
library of St. Gall, containing the four Gospels entire,
with the exception of John xix, 17-35. It is very simi-
lar in character to G (Cod. Boernerianus), both belong-
ting to the same age and country, i.e. they were written
in the monastery of St. Gall, in Switzerland, in the
9th century. Reitz published it at Zürich, in fac-simile,
in 1852. The text of this MS., with the codices Augensia and
Boernerianus, are portions of one and the same document.
See Gall, St. Manuscript.
Θ. Codex Tischendorfianus I, in the library of Leip-
zig University, consisting of four leaves, of which the
three external were deciphered by Tischendorf, and the
second by St. Petri of Leipsic. See The Sects of Matthew's
Gospel. Tischendorf assigns them to the end of the 7th century.
He published the contents in his Monumenta Sacra medii
Æevi, p. 1, etc.
θα, a fragment, containing six leaves, with Matt. xxii,
and xxiii, and Mark iv, belonging to the 7th century.
θβ, two leaves, containing Matt. xxvi, 19-24, and John
xviii, 29-35, belonging to the 6th century.
θε, a small fragment of the 8th century, containing
Luke xi,
θη, a fragment of Matt. xxvi, of the 6th century.
θθ, four leaves, containing Matt. xxvi, xxvii, Mark i
and ii. Of the 6th century.
θι, a fragment of John vi, belonging to the 6th century.
θς, a Greek-Arabic MS., containing three leaves, with
Matt. xiv and xxv, belonging to the 9th century.
A, a MS. in the Bodleian Library, containing the Gospels
of Luke and John entire. It consists of 157 leaves,
and belongs to the 9th century. Tischendorf and Tre-
gelles have collated it.
Ι, a valuable MS. of the Gospels, almost complete,
brught by Tischendorf from the monastery of St.
Petersburg. It belongs to the 9th century. (See Tischendorf's
Notitius editionis codicis Bibliorum Sinaitici, etc.,
p. 51.)
Ξ, Codex Zacynthius, a palimpsest containing frag-
ments of Luke's Gospel, belonging to the committee of
the British and Foreign Bible Society. It is of the 6th
century, and is accompanied by a catena of the 12th.
Tregelles transcribed and published the fragments
(1861). See Zacynthian Manuscript.
Such are the uncial MSS. hitherto collated. Their number
is not great; and every year is adding to it.
There are known upwards of a hundred uncials, includ-
ing evangelistaria and apocali. (See the table below.)
4. The number of the curvata MSS. (minuscule) in
existence cannot be accurately calculated. Tischendorf
catalogues about 500 of the Gospels, 290 of the Acts and
Catholic Epistles, 250 of the Pauline Epistles, and a lit-
tle less than 100 of the Apocalypse (exclusive of lection-
aries); but this enumeration can only be accepted as a
rough approximation. Many of the MSS. quoted are
only known by old references; still more have been
"imperfectly preserved to a recent currency; few only have been
thoroughly collated. In this last work the Rev. F. H. Scriv-
ener (Collation of about 20 MSS. of the Holy Gospels,
Camb. 1853; Cod. Aug. etc., Camb. 1859) has labored
with the greatest success, and removed many common
errors as to the character of the latter text. His sum-
mary is as follows: 

Among the MSS. which are well known and of great value
are the following the most important:

A. Primary Codices of the Gospels:
1. (Act. 1) Paul 1; βαπτισματι, K. III. B. 10th. century Very
valuable in the Gospels. Collated by Roth and Tregelles.
Coll. by Tregelles.
Scrivener, 1800, but as yet unpublished.
4. (Act. 81; Paul 37; Apoc. 14; Cod. Leicestrensis). 14th.
century. The text of the Gospels is especially valuable. Coll.
by Tregelles, 1853, and by Scrivener, 1850, who published
his collation in Cod. Aug., etc., 1850.
5. (Rev. 15; Matt. 73; Mark 84). 13th. century. Coll. by
Griesbach, Symb. Crít. I, etc., 1819.
6. (Acts 19; Paul 71; Apoc. 66; Cod. Vaticana, 550). 13th.
century. This MS. was long thought to belong to Alderan
and was probably used by him in his edition. Coll. by
by Burkhol.
century. Coll. by Alter.
by Matthew.
century. Coll. by Scrivener, 1850, but as yet unpublished.
by Marbull, De Scholiis Sept. (Add. 1706.)
11. (Rev. 10; Matt. 188; Apoc. 46; Venice, Bibl. S. Marcii, 17th.
century. The text of the Gospels is especially valuable.
13. (Rev. 10; Matt. 188; Apoc. 46; Venice, Bibl. S. Marcii, 17th.
century. The text of the Gospels is especially valuable.
Rist., 1505. 18th. century. Coll. by Scrivener, 1850.
15. (Acts 36; Matt. 75; Paul 33; Brit. Mus. Harl. 5657,


5. MSS. are sometimes divided by the critics of Germany into 1. Such as were written before the practice of stichometry, a mode of dividing the text in lines or clauses. See STICHOMETRY. 2. The stichometrical, 3. Those written after stichometry had ceased. So Hug and De Wette, in their Introductions to the N.T. According to this classification, N, A, B, and, C belong to the first class; D, E, etc., to the second; and by far the greatest number to the third. We have alluded to them under the two great heads of scandal and carter. In examining MSS. and comparing their characteristic readings, it is not easy in every instance to arrive at this true original form of a passage. Many circumstances are to be taken into account, and many cautious to be observed. They are more useful in detecting interpolated passages than in resoter.

Specimens of Greek MSS. from the 10th to the 14th century, now in the British Museum: Fig. 1 is from the Harleian Evangelistary, No. 2290, and contains John 1, 1, 8 (Scrivener, Intro. p. 218, No. 1160). The text is from Add. 69, 603, and contains Acts xxii, 18-20 (Scrivener, p. 34). Fig. 2, from the Harleian Evangelistary, No. 2290, contains John 1, 1-3 (Scrivener, p. 157, No. 1160). Fig. 4, from Burney Lectionary, 93, contains John 1, 1-3 (Scrivener, p. 340, No. 1160).
ing the correct reading. The reading of an older MS is preferable castis paireix. In determining the age of a MS, internal marks are chiefly followed, such as the form of the letters, the divisions, abbreviations, the nature of the lines, the presence or absence of the accents, etc. These particulars, however, are not safe criteria. Age alone, however, amidst the value of the text of a MS. The copyist may have been guilty of negligence or inattention. In proportion to his accuracy or carelessness the authority of the codex will be greater or less. Again, a document certainly copied from one which is very ancient will have greater authority than an earlier taken from another of later date. A MS. of the eighth century may have been directly copied from one of the fifth, and consequently the former will be entitled to greater estimation than one belonging to the 7th century transcribed from one of the 6th. In determining the value of a codex, it is necessary to consider the country where it was written. Griesbach and others prefer the African; Scholz, the Constantino-politan. Those written in Egypt are the best. With respect to Hebrew MSS., it is admitted by all that the Spanish are the best. The Italian, again, are superior to the German. The number contained in the greater number of MSS. is preferable to that of a less number. Mere majority, however, is not a safe criterion. A majority arising from independent sources, or, in other words, of those belonging to different recensions, can alone be relied upon. But here again this is proceeded as to the number of recensions belonging to Greek MSS. Some have proposed four, some three, others two. Besides, the same MS. may belong to a different recension in different parts of itself. In others, the characteristic readings of two or three recensions are mingled together, rendering it difficult to determine which recension or family preponderates. Hebrew MSS. belong to one and the same recension. It is true that some have distinguished them into Masoretic and Ane-masoretic, but the existence of the latter is a mere fiction. One great family alone, viz. the Masoretic, can be distinctly traced. Since the time of Lachmann's first edition, greater importance has been attached by N. T. critics to the age of MSS. It has been the object of his followers in the same department to adhere for the most part to the oldest copies. This is right within certain limits. The true text of the N. T., as far as we can now obtain it, lies in the MSS. of the 4th till the 8th centuries, accompanied and modified by the testimony of ancient versions and fathers during that period. But within this period we can easily distinguish MSS. of a second order in goodness, viz. E, P, Ω, i, K, M, S, U, V, from those of the first class, N, A, B, C, Z (see Davidson's Biblical Criticism, vol. ii). See CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

Ma'och (Heb. Moek, מֹאֵך, compressed; Sept. Ἄμπαο, Vulg. Maocch), the father of the Achish king of Gath to whom David repaired for safety (1 Sam. xxvi. 2). B.C. ante 1054. By many he has been confounded with the Maacah of 1 Kings ii. 89. See Achish.

Ma'on (Heb. Maon, מֹאָן, habitation, as often: Sept. Maono), the name of a man and of a place. See also MAONITE.

1. The son of Shammi, the tribe of Judah and family of Caleb, and the "father" (i.e. founder) of Bethzur (1 Chron. ii. 45). B.C. prob. post 1618.

2. A town in the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv. 50), which gave name to a wilderness (part of the desert) of Judah, in which is not sufficient to express the whole extent of the place, as from Saul, and around which the curialh Nabal had great possessions (1 Sam. xxiii. 24, 25; xxv, 3). Josephus calls it Emma (ἐμμα, οντως, Maon). Iryb and Mangels were in the neighborhood in 1818, but did not detect this other and ancient names. Robinson finds it in the present Ma'in, which is about seven miles south by east from Hebron. Here there is a conical hill about 200 feet high, on the top of which are some ruins of no great extent, consisting of foundations of hewn stone, a square enclosure, the remains probably of a tower or castle, and several cisterns. The view from the summit is extensive. The traveller found here a band of peasants keeping their flocks, and dwelling in caves and huts. Researches in the West of Palestine, with this identification De Saulcy (Narrative, i, 441) and Schwartz (Palestine, p. 106) agree. See Maonite.

Ma'onite (Heb. same word as Ma'on, usedcollectively; Sept. and Vulg. interpret Xoxaao [v. r. Maadu], Chamaan, Auth. Vers. "Maonites"), an Arabian tribe mentioned in connection with the Amalekites, Sidonians, Philistines, and others as having houses and villages in the Hebrews (Judg. xii. 12). They are the same as the MAONITES (מֹאָן), Meimon, the plural of Ma'on; Sept. Misraio, confounding them with the Ammonites; Vulg. Ammonita, and tabernaculis; Auth. Vers. "Meonim," and "the tabernacles," elsewhere mentioned in a similar connection (2 Chron. xxvi. 27; 1 Chron. iv. 31). See also MAONITE. At the present day there exists a town called Ma'an, with a castle, in Arabia Petraea, to the south of the Dead Sea (see Seetzen, in Zach's Monat. Correspond. xvii, 382; Burchhardt, Travels in Syria, p. 457). Prof. Robinson says, "Ma'an, the well-known town on the route of the Syrian highway, and wady Musa, is much better known as the probable seat of the Maonites mentioned in the Scriptures. Abulfeda (Syr. p. 14) describes Ma'an as inhabited by Ommiades and their vessels" (Researches, ii, 572). That the Minus of Arabia (Diod. Sic. iii. 42; Polyb. vii. 7, 23; Strabo, xvii. 769) is a different people has long since been shown by Bochart (Phyleg. ii, 25). Traces of the name Ma'on are found in several localities besides that of the above passages. It is given to a town in the south of Judah, now identified with the ruins of Tell Main (Porter, H. H. H. B. S. and P., p. 61). In pronouncing a prophetic curse upon Moab, Jeremiah mentions Beth-memon (xliv. 29), which may perhaps be the same as the Beth-baal-memon of Josh. xiii. 17, and the Baal-memon of Numb. xxxi. 38, and would thus be identical with the ruin Main, three miles south of Heshbon. See BETH-BAAL-MEON. Hence "it is probable that all those names indicate the presence of an ancient and powerful nomad tribe, which was allied to the Phoenicians (or Sidonians), whose earliest settlements were in the vale of Sodom, and with the Amalekites who dwelt in the wilderness of Paran. When these Moanites migrated eastward, leaving their name at Ma'an in the south of Judah, where they may have had their headquarters for a time, and again at Beth-memon, on the plateau of Moab, and also at the large modern village above described.

Maor. See New Zealand.

Maphria is in the Syrian Church the highest episcopal dignity after the patriarch of Antioch. The jurisdiction of the maphria extends over Chaldea, Assyria, and Mesopotamia. His residence was formerly at Tabris, beyond the Tigris, but since this see has ceased with that of Mosul it is at the latter place. Naas (Aned. Hist. of the Eastern Church, p. 162) says that "the maphrias are now only nominally distinguished from the other metropolitans."

Mapletoft, John, D.D., an English minister, was born at Margaret-Ing, Huntingdonshire, in 1631; received his education at Westminster School and Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1653; and in 1658 became tutor to Josephus, earl of Northumberland; in 1660 entered upon the study of medicine, and finally practiced it with great success, filling at one time the chair of physic in Gresham College, London. Having turned his attention to the study of divinity, he took, in 1690, both the Bachelor and Master of Arts, and in the latter year presented to the rectory of Braybrooke, in Northamptonshire, by lord Griffin; in 1684 was chosen lecturer of Ipswich; and in 1685 vicar of St. Lawrence, Jewry.
MAPPA

and lecturer of St. Christopher's, in London; received his D.D. in 1698, and in 1707 was chosen president of Sion College. He died at Westminster in 1721. Dr. Mapleton published Principles and Duties of the Christian Religion (2d ed., corrected and enlarged, Lond. 1715, 8vo), and other minor pieces upon moral and theological subjects.

MAPPA, the name of the linen cloth with which the communion table, and subsequently the altar, was covered. It came to be considered essential that this cloth should be of linen, according to some, in commemoration of the linen cloth in which the body of the Lord was wrapped. This, however, it seems would apply better to the corporate (q.v.). Opus of Milene, in De schismate Domitiiarum, speaks of this custom as general. In the Roman Catholic Church there are a number of regulations concerning the mappa, which is always to be blessed by the bishop, or by some one commissioned by him for the purpose—Piller, Universal-Lexikon, x, 818; Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, ix, 7.

Ma'ra (Heb. Mara'), מַרָּא, for מַר, better, as explained in the context; Sept. μαραία, Vulg. Mara, id est amara, a symbolic name proposed for herself by Naaomi on account of her misfortunes (Ruth i, 20). See Ruth.

Mara, a famous diva of Hindu mythology mentioned in the history of Guatama (q.v.).

Marabuts, a name given to the descendants of the Maravives (q.v.; see also Mohammedans), or Almoravides, a certain Arabic tribe which, in 1025, founded a dynasty in the north-western parts of Africa, and held Morocco and Spain for a considerable period. The Almohades having put an end to their temporal dominion, the Moors resorted to this exercise of spiritual superiority over the Moamen negroes in Barbary, the coast of Guinea, etc. At present the Marabuts form a kind of priestly order, officiating at mosques and chapels, explaining the Koran, providing the faithful with amulets, prophesying, and working miracles. They are looked up to with great awe and reverence by the common people, who also allow them a certain vague license over their goods and chattels, their wives not excluded. The Great Marabout ranks next to the king, and the dignity of a Marabout is generally hereditary. One of the most eminent Marabouts of our day is the celebrated Mohammedan warrior Abd-el-Kader, who was born in 1807, and in 1832 opened the contest against the French to expel the latter from African territory, which resulted so unsuccessfully to the Mohammedan cause.

Marafoschi, Prospero, an Italian prelate, was born Sept. 29, 1653, at Macerata; entered the priesthood while yet a youth; became canon of St. Peter's at Rome, and later bishop in parishes of Cyrene. He enjoyed the favor and confidence of several of the incumbents of the papal chair. Clement XI, in 1721, gave him the archiepiscopal see of Cesarea and Capadocia; Benedict XII created him cardinal in 1724, and in 1726 made him vicar-general of Rome. He died Feb. 24, 1732—Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxi, 347.

Ma rah (Hebrew Marah', מַרָּה, bitterness, from the taste of the water; Sept. θρήσκος, Æpirix, Vulg. Mara), a brackish fountain, forming the sixth station of the Israelites, lies some distance from their passage across the Red Sea (Exod. 15, 25; Num. 33, 8). Finding here a well so bitter that, thirsty as they were, they could not drink its water, they murmured against Moses, who at the divine direction cast in a "certain tree," by which means it was made palatable. It has been suggested (Burchart, Syriac, p. 474) that Moses made use of the berries of the plant Ghrâbûd (Robinson says [1, 26] the Peganum veniam of Forskål, Flora Exot. Ag. Arab. p. lxvi; more correctly, the Nitria triandra of Desfontaines, Flora Atlant. i, 372), and which still, it is implied, would be found to operate similarly. Robinson, however (i, 67), could not find that this or any tree was now known by the Arabs to possess such properties; nor would those berries, he says, have been found so early in the season as the time when the Israelites reached the region. It may be added that, had any such resource ever existed, its eminent usefulness to the supply of human wants would hardly have let it perish from the traditions of the desert. Further, the expression 'the Lord showed' seems surely to imply the miraculous character of the transaction. With regard to the care of the water, it has been well argued (Kitto, Pictorial History of the Holy Land, p. 289) that no example really proves consistent or satisfactory; neither is there any tree in that region or elsewhere now known which possesses such virtue in itself, or which is used for a similar purpose by the Arabs. We are therefore compelled to conclude, as indeed, the narrative spontaneously suggests, that the shrub selected was indifferent, being one nearest at hand, and that the restorative property ceased with the special occasion which had called for its exercise, leaving the well to resume its acrid taste as at present found. The name Marah, in the form of Almara, is now borne by the barren bed of a winter torrent, a little beyond which is still found a well called Howara, the bitter waters of which answer to this description. Cams will drink it, but the thirsty Arabs never partake of it themselves, as it is said to be the water which they drink in the shore of the Red Sea which they cannot drink. The water of this well, when first taken into the mouth, seems insipid rather than bitter, but when held in the mouth a few seconds it becomes exceedingly nauseous. The well rises within an elevated mound surrounded by sand-hills, and two small date-trees grow near it. The basin is six or eight feet in diameter, and the water about two feet deep. (See Burchardt, Trav. in Syria, p. 472; Robinson, Researches, i, 96 sq.; Bartlett, Forty Days in the Desert, p. 80; and other travellers.) "Wi- sely, in a word," says Dr. Burchardt (p. 473), "that a still bitterer well lies east of Marah, the claims of which Tischendorf, it appears, has supported. Lepsius prefers scaky Gharâbûd. Prof. Stanley thinks that the claim may be left between this and Howara, but adds in a note a mention of a spring south of Howara 'so bitter that neither men nor camels could drink it,' of which Dr. Grau (ii, 524) was told. The Ayoun Mousa, wells of Moses, of which local tradition assigns to Marah, are manifestly too close to the head of the gulf, and probably spot of crossing it, to suit the distance of 'three days' journey.' The soil of the region is described as being alternately level, stony, and sandy; under the range of the Gebel Wardan chalk and clints are plentiful, and on the direct line of route between Ayoun Mousa and Howara no water is found (Robinson, 477)."

See EXODUS.

Mar'alah (Heb. Maralah, מַרָּלָה, a trembling; Sept. Mapalakh), a place on the southern boundary of Zebulon, but apparently within the bounds of Issachar, west of Sarid and east of Dabbazeth (Josh. xix, 11). These indications point to some locality not far from the present Miya'el, although the name would seem to agree better with that of the neighboring site, Melek. The latter place agrees with the identification of Porter, who places it near Nahal Dalek, and who thought that Mahabal is a little village on four miles south-west of Nazareth, on the top of a hill, containing the ruins of a temple, and other vestiges of antiquity. In the surrounding rocks and cliffs are some excavated tombs (Handbook, p. 885). See Nahalah.

Maran-atha (Mapal 63, from the Aramean ܢܓܓ, nara' athak, our Lord comes, i.e. to judge, Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. coll. 1248) and the somewhat modern variant, a phrase added to the sentence of excommunication by way of appeal to the divine Head of the Church for ratification (1 Cor. xvi, 22). See ANATHEMA. "In the A.V. it is combined with the preceding 'anathema,' but this is unnecessary; at all events it can only be regarded as adding emphasis to the previous
adornment. It rather appears to be added as a weighty watchword to impress upon the disciples the important truth that the Lord was at hand, and that they should be ready to meet him (Alford, Gr. Text. ad loc.). If, on the other hand, the phrase be taken to mean, as it may, 'our Lord has come,' then the connection is, 'the curse will remain, for the Lord has come who will take vengeance upon him.' The definition 'Maran' is explained by a tradition that the Jews, in expectation of a Messiah, were constantly saying Maran, i.e. Lord; to which the Christians answered Maran 아가, the Lord is come, why do you still expect him? (Stanley, Corinthienses, ad loc.)."

"Maran" is one of the names used to designate the new Christians of Spain, i.e. those Jews (q.v.) who, during the religious persecutions under Roman rule, publicly avowed conversion to Christianity and yet privately confessed the religion of their fathers, as e.g. the family of Maimonides (q.v.). The name owes its origin to the fact that not only Jews, but also Moors (q.v.) made a feigned profession of conversion to the Christian faith. See INQUISITION; SPAIN.

"Maranrubius, Prudentius, a noted French theologian, was born, according to Winer (Theol. Literatur, p. 651), at Seznanne, whilst Le Cerf (Bibliotheque de la Cong. de St. Maur, p. 298) and Zedler (Universallexicon, s. v.) state that he was born at Douai in Hainaut. He was educated at the University of Louvain. After spending some time in England, he returned to France, and died at Rouen in 1627. He is perhaps best known for his "Mémoires de Trévoux," which was dedicated to the French King. He was a zealous supporter of the Reformation, and his works are still studied by students of theology."

"Maran, Pedro de, a Spanish Jesuit and missionary, flourished near the close of the 17th century. In 1675 he went to Bolivia, and later to Mexico, and labored among the Indians of the Potosi province, among the savages of America, and finally became superior of all the missions of the Jesuits in this quarter. He wrote Arte de la Lengua Mozo, con su vocabulario y catecumenos (Lima, 1701, 8vo)."

"Marbank, Johann, an eminent German Protestant theologian, was born at Lindau Aug. 24, 1521, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg, where he commenced his study of theology. He became successively dean at Jena in 1540, preacher at IVry in 1544, and at Strasburg in 1548. He was afterwards sent by the latter city to the Council of Trent, together with Seiden. In 1555 he was appointed chief priest and professor of theology. Here he labored to introduce the Lutheran doctrines in the place of the Reformed, whereby he became involved in numberless controversies. In 1556 he was employed by the elector Henry to organize the Reformation in the Palatinate, and in 1557 was present at the Diet of Worms. He ceased preaching in 1558, and died deacon of Thomas College, March 17, 1581. He wrote Chnstlicher und wohlrathlicher Unterricht von d. Worten d. Einsetzung d. heil. Abendmala, etc. (Strasb. 1565, 8vo), and other similar works, all upholding the ultra-Lutheran views. See also quaint, Synthesis Constitutum de L'eglise Catholique, a work addressed to the Emperor Charles V. Strasburg sous la direction de Marbach (Strasb. 1857); Pacher, Universal-Lexikon, x. 852; Hertzog, Real-Encycl. ix. 10."

"Marbeck, or Marbecke, John, the composer of the solemn and now venerable notes set to the "Prices" and Responses in use in the cathedrals of England, to our day with only slight modifications, was organist of Windsor during the reign of Henry VIII and his successor. A zeal for religious reformation led him to join a society in the dispensation of that object, of which a great number of were a priest, a singing-man of St. George's Chapel, and a tradesman of the town. Their papers were seized, and in the handwriting of Marbeck were found notes on the Bible, together with a concordance, in English. He and his three colleagues were found guilty of heresy, and condemned to the stake. The others were executed according to their sentence; but Marbeck, on account of his great musical talents, and being rather favored by Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, was pardoned, and lived to witness the triumph of his principles. He published a book of a dissertations, and a dissertation upon the important object of the title of the Book of Common Prayer, added. The colophon is 'Imprinted by Richard Grafton, printer to the kings majestie, 1550, cum privilegio ad imprimendum solium' (a verbis reprint was given by John Pickering, London, 1649, sig. A1). His name is also his Concordia of the Whole Bible (1560, folio), the first complete work of the kind in English; and, in 1574, The Lives of Holy Saints, Prophets, Patriarchs, and others; and, subsequently, his other books connected with religious history and controversy. See Allibone, Dict. of Biblical and Amer. Authors, vol. ii. s. v.; English Cyclop. s. v.

"Marble is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of two forms of the same Heb. word, and is thought by some to be signified by others differently rendered. סִּלָּה (séláh),
MARBLE
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Eolith. 1,6, Sept. πάρον; Cant. v, 15, Sept. μαρμάρωσις), or πέτρα (στοιχεία, 1 Chron. xxix, 2, Sept. πάρον), so called from its whiteness, undoubtedly refer to a pure kind of marble, μαρμάρωσις (Rev. xviii, 12). Primary limestone, or marble, is a simple rock, consisting of carbonate of lime. In its pure state, it is granular, crystalline, and of a color varying from pure white to gray and yellow. Sometimes found in massive lumps, or beds, or large nodules, with little or no appearance of stratification; more generally, however, it is regularly stratified, and these strata alternate with other rocks, and are of all varieties of thickness. The texture varies from a highly crystalline, of a large or finer grain, to a compact and even earthy. Other substances are sometimes combined with the simple rock, which modifies its appearance and texture, such as mica, quartz, hornblende. It is never found in veins, except in the form of regular crystals, and, in this respect, it exactly resembles the calcite. As a generation rule, it may be said, they, like the primary cherts, are almost desitute of organic bodies. Like the strata which it accompanies, beds of limestone are often bent and contorted, evidently from disturbance below. The colors vary from a pure white, which constitutes the strata of the limestone, to various shades of brown, black, and green. These tints are derived from a carbonaceous matter or oxide of iron, or an admixture of other minerals.

Several other terms occur in Eolith. i, 6, as the names of stones in the pavement of the magnificent hall in which the Agasares feasted the princes of his empire. That rendered "white" marble, is ταῖς, dar, which some take to signify Parians marble, others white marble; but nothing certain is known about it. In Arabic, the word dar signifies a large pearl. Now pearls were certainly employed by the ancients in decorating the walls of apartments in royal palaces, but were also used in the pavements of even royal dining-rooms is improbable in itself, and supported by no examined example. The Septuagint refers the Hebrew word to a stone resembling pearls (σημωνίας λίθος), by which, as S. D. Michaeels conjectures, it intends to denote the Alabastri of Pliny (Hist. Nat., xxxi, 7, 8), which was a kind of alabaster with the gloss of mother-of-pearl. See Alabaster.

The θησος (bath); Sept. θησοφαητήρ, "red" marble) of the same passage was, Gesenius thinks, the recrinite, or half-phenyl of Egypt. The θησος (socke-reth; Sept. Πιερος λίθος, "black" marble) is likewise there mentioned with the other kinds of marble for forming a pavement. Gesenius says, perhaps tortoiseshell. Others, from the rendering of the Syriace, think it refers to black marble. It was probably some spotted variety of marble. See Mineralogy. The pavement in the palace of the Agasares was no doubt of mosaic work, the floors of the apartments being laid with painted tiles or slabs of marble, in the same way as Dr. Russell describes the houses of the wealthy in modern times. In those a portion of the pavement of the courts is of mosaic, and it is usually that part which lies between the fountain and the arched alcove on the south side that is thus beautified. See House.

"The marble pillars and tessel of various colors of the palace at Susa came doubtless from Persia itself, where marble of various colors is found, especially in the province of Hamadan, Susiana (Marco Polo, Travels, p. 78, ed. Bohn; Chadwell, Fug. iii, 290, 308, 358, and viii, 253; P. della Valle, Toneri, ii, 256). The so-called marble of Persia is Alabaster from which Josaph calls Λαβαστρος λίθος, may thus have been limestone—(a) from near Jerusalem; (b) from Lebanon (Jura limestone), identical with the material of the Susa Temple at Beaelkho; or (c) white marble from Arabia or elsewhere, (Josaph, Ant. viii, 3, 2; Diod. Sic. ii, 52; Pliny, H. N. xxxvi, 12; Jamison, Mineralogy, p. 41; Räumer, Pol. p. 28; Volney, Trav. ii, 241; Kitto, Phys. Geog. of Pol. p. 73, 88; Robinson, ii, 438; iii, 508; Stanley, S. and P. p. 407; Thackeray, i, 426; ii, 146). In all these cases the stone was not marble seems probable from the remark of Josephus, that whereas Solomon constructed his buildings of "white stone," he caused the roads which led to Jerusalem to be made of "black stone," probably the black basalt of the Hauran, and also from the account of the Temple of the Herodian or Aelia Capitolina, which was μεγάλος λευκός και μαρμάρως (Josephus, Ant. i, c. 1, and War, v, 5, 16; ii, 6; Kitto, ut sup. p. 74, 75, 80, 89). But whether the 'costly stone' employed in Solomon's buildings was marble or not, it seems clear, from the expressions both of Scripture and Josephus, that some, at least, of the 'great stones,' whose weight can scarcely have been less than forty tons, must have come from Lebanon (1 Kings v, 14-18; vii, 10; Josephus, Ant. viii, 2, 9). There can be no doubt that Herod, both in the Temple and elsewhere, employed Parian or other marble. References to the building still exist in the Jerusalem of Josephus (Josephus, Ant. xv, 9, 4, 6, and 11, 3, 5; Williams, Holy City, ii, 330; Sandys, p. 190; Robinson, i, 301, 806). See Stone.

1. The Marburg Bible is the name given to an edition of the holy scriptures, published at Marburg (1712, 4to), under the direction of Prof. Dr. Horch (with the assistance of several scholars, particularly of inspector Schoffer, in Berleburg). It contains the text of Luther's, corrected by comparison with the original texts, and gives, in the introductions and in the headings, commentaries on the most important allegorical and prophetic (by Cocceius). The Marburg Conference, a gathering of all the reformed theological leaders, held at the city of Marburg, Oct. 3, 1529, and designed to bring about, if possible, an agreement between Luther and Zwingli and their adherents. The gathering of Philip of Hesse and the noblest princes of the Reformation days, believing that the dissensions in the Protestant camp should be allayed, directed all his energies towards the conciliation of the two reformed factions, caused by a difference of opinion as to the proper observance of the eucharistic ceremony. With a sense of the importance of this view, he invited the theologians of both parties to meet for the purpose of comparing their opinions in a friendly manner. Melanchoth had already, in 1529, at the Diet of Spires, declared his readiness to attend such a conference (Corp. Ref. i, 1030 and 1078), and even had gone so far as to declare that he attached no special importance to the differences concerning the Eucharist (Corp. Ref. i, 1046). Philip of Hesse now applied to Zwingli (Zwingli Opp. viii, 287), who also expressed his willingness to come (Zwingli Opp. viii, 662). Luther, however, was least strongly opposed to the plan, fearing that some might result in more harm than good; but the landgrave persisting, Luther finally consented, and on Sept. 30, 1529, Luther, Melanchoth, Cruciger, Jonas, Mykonius, and Musius, accompanied by the Saxon counsellor Eberhard, went to Marburg, where they held the Conference. The Swiss theologians had arrived the day before; among them, Zwingli, professor Rudolph Collin, (Ecolampadius, Sturm, Bucer, and Hedio. Osander, Brent, and Agricola arrived only on October 2. A number of other theologians and eminent persons from all parts of Germany were present, among whom Prince Zimmern. The difference between Luther and Ecolampadius, and Zwingli and Melanchoth, the public debates commenced. "In the first place, several points were discussed touching the
divinity of Christ, original sin, baptism, the Word of God, etc., regarding which the Wittenbergers suspected the orthodoxy of Zwingle. These were all secondary matters with Zwingle, in reference to which he dropped his unchurchly views, and declared his agreement with the views of the eccumenical councils. But in regard to the article of the Lord's Supper he was the more pertinacious. When John w., 83, 'The flesh prof-
itheth nothing,' he argued the absurdity of Luther's view (Kurtz). Luther had insisted upon the literal interpretation of the expression, Hoc est corpus meum. Both parties disputed without arriving at any better appreciation of each other's views. 'Agreement was out of the question,' Luther declared. See Galler, 253. See himself ready to maintain fraternal fellowship, but Lu-
ther and his party rejected the offer. Luther said, 'Ihr
haben einen andern geist erwir.' Still the conference,
while failing in its main object, was not entirely fruit-
less. 'Luther found that his opponents did not hold
as offensive views as he supposed, and the Swiss also
that Luther's doctrine was not so gross and Caperma
tic as they thought.' Both parties engaged to refrain in future from publishing injurious pamphlets against each other as they had formerly done, and agreed 'to ear-
nestly desire to lead them to a better understanding
of the truth.' At the request of the landgrave,
Luther drew up a series of fifteen articles (Articles of
Marburg), containing the common fundamental prin-
ciples of the Reformation, which were subscribed to by
the Swiss. The first four were especially pronounced
unanimous consent to the eccumenical faith of the Church
against the errors of papists and Anabaptists.
In the fifteenth the Swiss conceded that the body and
blood of Christ were present in the sacrament, but
they could not agree to his corporeal presence in the bread
and wine' (Kurtz). The Articles of Marburg were sub-
sequently used as a basis for the Confession of Augsburg
(q. v.). See L. J. K. Schmitt, Dass Religionsgespräch z.
Marburg (Marb. 1840); A. Eberhard, D. Gesch. der Dogma
v. a. Abendmahl, ii, 268; Hasenkamp, Hessische Kirchen-
gesch. ii, 1, p. 35 sq.; H. Hepp, II. Johannes Marburger
Arz. (Cassel, 1847 and 1854); Krauth, The Conserva-
tive Reformation (Philadelphia, 1871, 8vo), p. 85 sq. 427;
Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, i, 904, 814; GISyler,
since the Reformation, p. 72 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encylo-
pedia, i, 19 sq. (J. H. W.)

Marbury, Edward, an English minister of the 17th century, became rector of St. James's, Garlickhithe, London, in 1618; subsequently rector of St. Peter's, Paul's Wharf, and retired from public labors during the Civil War. He died about 1650. Published—A Commentary on Habakkuk (Lon. 1649, 4to)—A Commenta-
ry on Habakkuk (1650, 4to).—Allibone, Dict. of Brit.
and Aner. Authors, e. v.

Marca, Pierre de, a French Roman Catholic the-
ological and historian, was born at Pau, in Bearm, Jan.
24, 1693. He was of good family, was brought up by the
Jesuits of Auch, and afterwards studied law at Toul-
house. In 1613 he became member of the Council of
Pau, and when, in 1621, this body was erected into a parliament by Louis XIII, he was appointed its president,
as a reward for his services to Romanism. After
the death of his wife, which occurred in 1628, he entered
the Church. In 1639 he was made counsellor of state.
Cardinal de Richelieu having commissioned him to re-
ply to Herem's Optatus Gallus, Marca composed De
Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii (Paris, 1641 sq.), which
is his ablest work, and was rewarded by the bishopric of
Conseran, to which he was appointed in 1648. The pope,
however, would not approve the Gallican writer as in-
campent of the episcopal office, and the appointment
was not sanctioned at Rome until Marca had recalled the
work in 1651. In 1652 he was appointed one of the six
bishops of Toulouse; later was transferred to the archi-
episcopal see of Paris, and there died in the year of his
transfer, 1662. He wrote also Dissertatio de Primata
Legumam et cotieris primaticias (1644, 8vo)—Relation
of ce qui s'est passé depuis 1638 dans la casse des
églises au sujet des congs propositions (Paris, 1657, 4to).
This was unfavorable to the Jansenists, and was refuted
by Nicole in his Belgia percursor, and some other
writers. Collections of some other writings of Marcio
on divers subjects were published by Baluze (1669 and
1681, 2 vol., 8vo), and Blaise (1668, 4to), who, how-
ever, brought out the best edition of Marca's De Concor-
dia (Paris, 1688, and often). See Galleria Christiana, vola.
i and vii; De Paget, Vie de Pierre de Marca; Bompart,
Eloge de Marca (Paris, 1672, 8vo); De Longuere, Dis-
sertations diverses; Mercure de France, 1644 to 1692;
Piaquet, Vie de M. de Marca; C. J.梨, De Legumam
Générale, xxxiii, 374; Herzog, Real-Encyklopaedia, ix, 17 sq

Marcella, Sr., is the name of two saints in the Romish Church. (1) One of these was a Roman widow, the
intimate friend of Paula and of Eustochius, and a pupil of the noted Church father Jerome, who said of her that we could judge of her merits by her no-
noble disciples. Marcella was a Christian, and deeply
learned in the Scriptures. She was greatly opposed to
the errors of Origen, who mingled the dogmas of Ori-
ental philosophy with the truths of Christianity. On
difficult passages of Scripture she consulted Jerome; but
she herself came forth free from all perversities of the
Gnostic, and her answers were always dictated by pru-
dence and humility. She died A.D. 409, soon after Rome
was taken by the Goths, from the effects of the assau-
tault and abuse of the troops of Alaric. She is commemo-
rated annually in the campalistry of the Church in Alexandria, flourished in the days of the em-
peror Severus. She is commemorated June 28.

Marcellian, a sect of heretics who flourished to-
wards the close of the 4th century; so called from Mar-
cellus of Ancyræ, whom the Arians unjustly accused of
reviving the errors of Sabellius. Epiphanius informs us that they are at the same time the followers of Origen and of Sabellius; they denied the
justness of charging Marcilus of Ancyræ with the heretical tendencies of the so-called Marcellians.
The latter denied the three hypostases, holding the Son
and the Holy Ghost as two emanations from the divine
nature, to exist independently only until the perform-
ance of their respective offices, and then to return again
into the substance of the Father. See MARCELLUS OF
ANCYRÆ.

Marcellus, a noted female pupil of Cappocrates
(q. v.), commenced teaching at Rome the Gnostic system
of her instructor, in 160, under Anicetus, and met with
so great success in it, A.D. 163, that she was invited to
Epiphanius, (Har. 27, 6) that her followers and pupils
were designated Marcellinists. This is the sect mentioned
by Celsus (Orig. c. Celum, vol. v), and are not to be mis-
taken for the followers of Marcellus of Ancyræ, the Mar-
cellins. Origin asserts that he could find no trace of
the Marcellinists. Another Marcella was the sister of
Ambrose, and a strict ascetic. Herzog, Real-Ency-
klopaedia, i, 20; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, s, 855.

Marcellinus, a native of Rome, son of Projectus, is
said to have been made bishop of Rome May 3, 296.
As he lived in a period of violent persecution, we have
but little certain information concerning him; the acts
of a synod said to have been held at Sinuessa in 308
(published by Manzi, Colla, 1, 250 sq. and Hardouin, Coll.,
Conc. i, 217 sq.) relate as follows: Dionelitian had suc-
cceeded in compelling the hitherto steadfast bishop to
come with him into the temple of Yesta and Isis, and to
offer up incense to them; this was afterwards proclaim-
ed by three priests and two deacons who had witnessed
the deed, and a synod was assembled to investigate the
affair at Sinuessa, at which no less than three hundred
bishops were present—5 a number quite impossible for
the time that country. For other accounts of this time
(see H. R. Smith, in Dillinger's Fabke, p. 82, foot note).
Marcellinus denied everything for the first two days, but
on the third came in, his head covered with ashes, and made
a full confession, adding that he had been tempted with gold. He was beheaded. He is commemorated on June 29. See Gregorii Turon. Lib. de gloria mart. c. 59.

IV. MARCELLUS, bishop of Die, in France, was born at Avignon of Christian parents, and religiously brought up. He was ordained by his brother, who was bishop of Die before him. At the time of his election another was also appointed, but he was taken to the church by his brother, and enthroned there. On this occasion, it is said, a dove was seen to descend upon his head. He was thrown into prison by the Arians for opposing their views, and died there in the beginning of the 6th century. He is commemorated on April 20. See Marcellus, lib. de gloria confit. c. 70. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, ii. 22; Pierer, Universal Lexicon, x. 856. (J. N. P.)

Marcellus, bishop of Ancrta, in Galatia, noted for the part he took in the Synod of Ancyra (314 or 315), held at the end of the persecution of Maximin (see Ancyra), made himself conspicuous at the Council of Nicea (325) by his homoussian views, and was upheld by Athanasius and the whole Western Church. He next find him at the Council of Tyro (355), where he opposed the condemnation of Athanasius, and of Maximus III, patriarch of Jerusalem. In the Council of Jerusalem, he was present, and he declared against the consecration of Arius to communion. At the Council of Constantinople, in 386, the Arians having the majority, Marcellus was deposed with the ascent of the emperor, who had been prejudiced against him. After the death of Constantius (337), he returned to Rome as a prisoner; people, senators, and clergy were divided; they fought and murdered in the streets, and Laurentius maintained himself for several years in possession of part of the churches. Synmachus was accused by his opponents of grave offences. . . . The hostile party were numerous and influential . . . and therefore the adherents of Synmachus caught at this time of showing that the inviolability of the pope had been long since recognized as a fact and announced as a rule. . . . This was the time at which Eunomius wrote his apology for Synmachus, and this, accordingly, was also the time at which the Synod of Sirmium, as well as the Constitution of Sylvester, was fabricated. Marcellus is commemorated in the Roman Church April 24. See Pagi, Crit. in annales Buronii ad annum 302, p. 18; Paprock, Acta Sancta in Propyl. Magn. t. viii; Xavier de Marco, Dietae diaiou postficii di errrorum. Fidei et Populi Romani, Concilios eccles. i, 118; iii, § 10, note 2, where the main authorities against the fable are cited. (J. H. W.)

Marcellus, St. (martyr). Aside from Marcellus I, pope of Rome (q. v.), and Marcellus of Apamea (q. v.), there is no occasion now to refer to a martyr of that name, the more important of which are: I. Marcellus who perished during the persecution of Antoninus Philosopher. Having refused to participate in a repast with the prefect Priscus, and resented with the latter and his guests on account of their idolatry, he was half buried in the ground, in the open air, and died thus after three days. The year 140 is given as the date of his death; he is commemorated on September 4. See Surius, T. V. Gregorii Turon. Lib. de gloriamart. c. 58; Ruinart, Acta primorum martyrum, p. 73.

II. Marcellus, the chief of the Trojan Legion, who, for refusing to participate in heathen sacrifices at Tingis, in Mauritania, was beheaded by order of the governor, Aurelianus Agriola, in 270. See Surius, vol. v; Ruinart, p. 302 sq. He is commemorated on Oct. 20.

III. Marcellus, who suffered at Aragon, in France, or under Aurelian. He was a native of Rome, son of a heathen father and a Christian mother, who brought him up a Christian. When of age, he fled to Aragon on account of the persecution of Aurelian. Here he won some conversions, and was appointed the attention of the prefect Heracleus. Arrested, he fearlessly confessed his faith, and, after scourging, was roasted on a spit; but as this neither converted nor killed him, he was beheaded. He is commemorated on June 29. See Gregorii Turon. Lib. de gloriamart. c. 59.
self to study. Dividing his fortune among the poor, he went to Ephesus, and there attempted to support himself by copying books. He subsequently joined abbot Alexander at Constantinople, and was afterwards chosen as his successor. To avoid this honor, Marcellus fled to a neighboring convent until another abbot had been selected, and then returned and was made dean. The new abbot became a hermit, however, under the authority of his dean, and obliged him to perform menial service. Marcellus cheerfully submitted; but after the death of John he was again appointed abbot. Under his direction the convent acquired such reputation that it had to be moved to a new site and enlarged, and other convents intended to be governed by pupils of Marcellus. He died in 485.

See Fleury, Hist. ad a. 448; Herzog, Real-Encylopädie, ix, 25; Lardner, Works (see Index).

Marcellus I, Pope, son of Benedict, a Roman priest, succeeded Marcellinus (q. v.) as bishop of Rome (according to Pagi, June 50, 308), but held that position only during eighteen months. He endeavored to restore ecclesiastical discipline, which had become much relaxed during the persecutions. For this purpose he organized in Rome twenty dioceses, the incumbents of which were to administer to converts from heathenism the sacraments of baptism and penance. They were also bound to attend to the burial of the martyrs. By command of Maxentius, who had ordered him to resign his office of bishop and to sacrifice to idols, he was imprisoned, and condemned to serve as a slave in the imperial stables. After nine months he was freed by his clergy, as he resided in the house of a hermit named Lucinius, who, it is said, converted that house afterwards into a church. Maxentius was so angry when he heard of it that he commanded the church to be turned into a stable, and condemned Marcellus to the lowest employment about the stables. Marcellus is said to have made a complaint to the Senate on the 16th of January. Herzog, Real-Encylopädie, ix, 21; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, x, 855. (J. N. P.)

Marcellus II, Pope, succeeded Julius III, April 9, 1555, but died twenty-two days afterwards. He was a native of the Papal States, and was originally named Marzio Cervini. He was first secretary of Paul III, and chaplain of Cardinal of Santa Croce. By appointment from pope Julius III, he took part in the Council of Trent as cardinal legate, and evinced in that capacity great talents, as well as moderation. His election gave rise to many hopes, which were specially crushed by his death, the result, no doubt, of poison. He was noted for the minor but curious circumstance of his refusing to comply with the ancient custom by which the pope, on his election, lays aside his baptismal name and assumes a new one. Marzio Cervini retained on his elevation the name which he had previously borne. See Herzog, Real-Encylopädie, ix, 21; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, x, 855; Chambers, Cyclop.; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, viii, 459; Riddle, Papacy (see Index); Artaux de Montor, Hist. des Souverains Pontifes Romains, s. v.

Marcellus, Aaron A., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in Amsterdam, N. Y., May 11, 1799; was prepared for college by the Rev. Drs. Van Zandt and Spencer, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; graduated at Union College, N. Y., in 1826, afterwards followed teaching, and for some years had charge of the Female Seminary in Syracuse, and subsequently of Schenectady. He removed to New York, and was for a short time superintendent of the Orphan Asylum; but, feeling that his duty pointed in the direction of the ministry, he entered the Theological Seminary of the Reformed (Dutch) Church at New Brunswick, N. J., and graduated in 1830. He was licensed by the New York Classis, and in July, 1830, became pastor of the Reformed (Dutch) Church at Freehold, N. J., and in 1839 of Schaghticoke; missionary near the Dry Dock, New York; principal of the Lancaster County Academy, Pa.; pastor at Freehold, N. J., in 1889; of the Church in Greenville, N. Y., in 1856; and in 1859 removed to Bex- gen, N. J., where he labored as a teacher until he died, May 24, 1860. Mr. Marcellus was courteous and refined in manners, an earnest preacher, and an excellent instructor of youth. See Wilson, Pref. Hst. Almanac, 1861, p. 202.

Marcheshvan (מְרַשְׁכֶּשֶׁן), Marcheshvan, of the later Hebrew: Josephus, Ant. Maporouvan, i, 3, 8; the Macedonian Μαρτις is the name of that month which was the eighth of the sacred and the second of their 12th year of the Jews, and began with the new moon of our November. There was a fast on the 6th in memory of Zeodediah's being blinded, after he had witnessed the slaughter of his sons (2 Kings xxvii, 7). This month is always spoken of as a time of fasts and of the celebration of the Day of Atonement; designation; except once, when it is called Bul (בּול, Kings vi, 38; Sept. Baad). According to Kimchi, Bul is a shortened form of the Hebrew בּול, "rain," from בּל, the signification of rain-month is exactly suitable to November in the climate of Palestine. Others derive it from בּל, Beney, availing himself of the fact that the Palmyrene inscriptions express the name of the god Baal, according to their dialect, by Baal or (בּאל, 'אָל), has ventured to suggest that, as the months are often called after the deities, Bul may have received its name from the Baal of Baalbec, as Genesis, p. 182). The rendering of the Sept. might have been appealed to as some sanction of this view. He supposes that Marcheshvan is a compound name, of which the syllable mar is taken from the Zend Amrata, or its later Persian form Mardad, and that cheshvan is the Persian cheshm, "autumn," both of which are names belonging to the same month (L. c. p. 136 seq.). See Bul.

Marchetti, François, an eminent French writer and archaeologist, was born at Marsilles about the opening of the 17th century; was educated at a college of the "Fathers of the Oratory," entered their order in 1630, and became one of the ablest members. He died at his native place in 1688. Of his works the following are of particular interest to us: Paraphrase sur les Epîtres de Saint Pierre (1689), and Traité sur la Mission avec l'explication de ses cérémonies.

Marchetti, Giovanni, an Italian ecclesiastic of note, was born at Empoli, in Tuscany, in 1758, of humble parentage. After struggling for years to secure the advantages of a thorough education, he entered the priesthood in 1777. Later he took up the pen in defence of the rights of the Roman see. His works, which made him known as a brilliant writer and a learned student, attracted the attention of pope Pius VI, who accorded him a pension and invested him with different offices. In 1798, after Rome had been proclaimed a republic, he was banished. In 1799 he was conducted to Florence, where he endured imprisonment for one month. On his return to Rome (1800) he opened an academy of theology. When the excommunication of the emperor Napoleon by Pius VII became known (1809), Marchetti and cardinal Mattei, accused of aiding the pope in this violent act, were imprisoned in the castle of St. Angelo. Some time after Marchetti obtained permission to go to his native town. He returned to Rome in 1814; in 1822 was appointed vicar of Rimini; in 1826 became secretary of the Assembly of Bishops, and died Nov. 15, 1829. Among his works, which have been translated into many languages, we find Saggio critico sopra la storia Eclesiastica di Firenze (Rome, 1780, 12mo)—Critica della Storia Eclesiastica e de discorsi di Flavio (Bologna, 1782, 2 vols. 12mo)—Eccetàzioni Cispiamiche circa il battesimo degli eretici (Rome, 1787, 8vo)—Del concilio di Sarzica (Rome, 1785, 8vo)—Il Christianesimo dimostrato (Rome, 1795, 8vo)—Strattemmenti del famiglie sulla storia della religione con le sue prove (Rome, 1800, 2 vols. 8vo)—La Provvidenza (Rome, 1797, 12mo)—Metamorfosi ver-
MARCION

From da Basilide Ferronita nel terminus del secolo xviii (Florence, 1739, 8vo):—Il ci e il no, parallelo delle dottrine e regole ecclesiastiche (Rome, 1801, 8vo):—Lessoni sacre dall' insegnamento del popolo di Dio in Caneo fino alla schiavitù di Bablonia (Rome, 1808-8, 12 vola, 8vo):—Della Chiesa quanto allo stato politico della città (Bologna, 1798, 8vo):—La Giansone dell' uomo (Rome, 1826, 8vo). He also contributed many articles to the Giornale Ecclesiastico (Rome) from 1788 to 1788. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxiii, 491.

Marpion (Marpion), founder of the sect of Marcionites, flourished near the middle of the 2nd century. He was a native of Sinope. According to Tertullian, he was a pilot. Some critics have expressed their doubts that so learned a man should have followed such a trade, but nothing proves Marcion having been a very learned man. He seems to have at first connected himself with the Stoics, and, although his father was a bishop (probably of Sinope), he long inquired into the merits of Christianity before becoming a convert to it.

He either retained some of his former views, or else indulged in new speculative views which caused him to be excommunicated by his own father. Epiphanius, who was one of those who had that letter of the Church's was driven out for having seduced a young girl (not credited any longer by modern scholars, as Beausobre and Neander), affirms that he afterwards endeavoured to regain admission into it by affecting to be deeply penitent, but his father rejected him again. Marpion went to Rome, where he arrived, according to Tilmont, in 142, or, according to Lipsius (Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theologie, 1847, p. 77), in 143 or 144, but more probably, in 138, as St. Justin mentions his residence in Rome in his Apology, written in 135. According to St. Epiphanius, Marpion's first step upon reaching Rome was to ask readmission into the Church, but he was refused. The same writer further states that Marcion aimed to succeed Pope Hyginus, who had just died, and that his regret at having failed was the cause of his accepting Gnosticism. These Oriental doctrines were then preached at Rome by a Syrian named Cerdon. Marcion joined him, and proclaimed his intention of creating an abiding schism in the Christian Church. Quite different is the statement of Epiphanius. Marpion, says he, was at first received into the Church at Rome, and professed at first orthodox views, but being of a speculative turn of mind, he prying, theorising intellect constantly led him into opinions and practices too hostile to the opinions and practices of the Church to escape opposition, and he was therefore constantly involved in controversies, in which he often lost his real views. Later reports of his dealings, he was finally cut off from communion with the Church, "in perpetuum discidium relegatus." He continued to teach, still hoping to become reconciled with the Church. Finally he was offered reconciliation on the condition of returning with all his followers, but died while endeavoring to do so. His disciples were then but few, and did not hold all the doctrines afterwards maintained by the Marcionites, who flourished as a sect, in spite of untold persecution, until the 6th century, particularly in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria. The main disciples of his discipline and followers were Apelles, Lucas, Paulus, Basilus, and Potitus.

The fundamental point of Marcion's heresy was a supposed irreconcilable opposition between the Creator and the God of the Christians, or, in other words, between the two religious systems, the Law and the Gospel. His theological system is but imperfectly known. St. Epiphanius accuses him of recognising three first principles, one supreme, ineffable, and invisible, whom he calls good; secondly, the Creator, thirdly, the devil, or perhaps matter, source of evil. According to Theodoret, he admitted three, the good God, the evil God which governs matter, and the evil which governs matter, i.e., the devil. It is proved that Marcion believed in the eternity of matter, but it is uncertain whether he considered the Creator as first principle, or as, in some degree, an emanation of the good God. At any rate, he considered them as essentially antagonistic. This conclusion he arrived at because he could not find in the O.T. the love and charity manifested in the Gospel of Christ. He therefore made the Creator, the God of the O.T., the author of evil, "malorum factorem," by which he meant suffering, pain, death, even a martyr's, as freeing them from it. They denied the resurrection of the body, and, notwithstanding Epiphanius's assertion, it appears doubtful whether they believed in the transmigration of the soul. They supposed that the sins of others, if the sins of every day diminished the effect of that sacrament; but this custom, which is not mentioned by Tertullian, was probably introduced after the death of Marcion. Women were allowed to baptise persons of their sex, and the new converts were admitted to witness the mysteries. To make the Scripture agree with his views, Marcion rejected a large portion of the N.T. He looked upon the O.T. as a revelation of the Creator to the Jews, his chosen people, which not only differed from, but was entirely opposed to Christianity. He admitted but one Gospel, and that a truncated version of Luke's, the first four chapters of which he rejected, making it to commence by the words: In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, God came to Capernaum, a town in Galilee, and spoke on the Sabbath. He carefully omitted all the passages in which Christ acknowledged the Creator as his Father. Among the Epistles, he admitted those to the Romans, 1st and 2nd to the Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1st and 2nd to the Thessalonians, Philon, and some part of a supposed Epistle of St. Paul to the Laodiceans. After these two editions of the N.T., he interpolated to suit his views. Marcion also composed a work entitled Antithesia; it is a collection of passages from the O. and the N.T. which he looked upon as contradictory. In reality, the system of Marcion bore a close resemblance to that of Mani (q.v.); it was an attempt to explain the origin of evil. Marcion, as afterwards Mani, thought to solve the problem by supposing two first principles; but there is this essential difference between them, that while Marcion based his system on the Scriptures, interpreted with daring subtlety, Mani derived his from Persian and Jewish dogmas or traditions. See Tertullian, Contro Marcionem, libri v; De Præscriptione Hereticae; Justin, Apologia; Ireneaus, Adversus Haereses; Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, iii, 8; St. Epiphanius, Panarion; Igitur, De Heresiciarum, sect. ii, c. 7; Cave, Historia Literarum, i, 54; Theodoret, H. E., ii, 868; Beausobre, Histoire du Monachisme, lib. iv, c. viii; Lardner, Hist. of Heresies, vol. ii, c. x; Emig, Darstellung des marcionitischen Systems, from the Armenian by Nes- man, in the Zeitschrift für hist. theol., 1854; Hahn, Ab- herrschaa Marcionis (1848), d. v. plene Marcionis, antiqua Marcionis (1882); Becker, Examen critique de l' Exempie de Marcion (1837): Ritchel, Das Evangelium Marcionis u. d. Evangel. des Lukas (1846); Hilgenfeld, Krit. Unters. von d. Evang. Justin's u. Clements. Hom. u. Mar.
Marcionites. See MARCION.

Marcionites or Marcites, a sect of heretics in the 2d century, who also called themselves the Pervecti, and made profession of doing everything with a great deal of liberty, and without any fear. This doctrine they borrowed from Simon Magnus, who, however, was not their chief; for they were called Marcites, from one Marcus, who confessed the priesthood and the administration of the sacraments on women.

Marcok, Johann van, a distinguished Dutch theologian, was born Dec. 21, 1556, at Sneek, in Friesland, and educated at the University of Leyden. His early reputation was such that before the completion of his twenty-first year he was appointed to the professorship of theology at Franeker. In 1682 he removed to Groningen, where he entered into a controversy with the Methodist preacher. In 1690 he accepted a theological chair at Leyden, and in 1720 succeeded the younger Spanheim as professor of ecclesiastical history. He died Jan. 30, 1731. He wrote several works on dogmatic theology, which are highly esteemed in the Reformed Church, and made various valuable contributions to the interpretation of the Scriptures. His principal works are: De Syphilitia carminibus (Frankf. 1682, 8vo); — In Apostolpin Commentaria seu analysis exegetica (Lugd. Bat. 1699, ed. auct. 1699, 4to); — In Canticum Salomonis Commentaria seu analysis exegetica cum analysis cum auctoritate (Lugd. Bat. 1703, 4to); — In principios quasdam portas Pentateuchis Commentarius seu ultimorum Jacobis, reliquis superiorum Biblii et novissimorum Mosis analysis exegetica (Lugd. Bat. 1713, 4to); — Commentarius seu analysis exegetica in Proprietas minores (Amsterd. 1696-1701, 6 vols. 4to). A selection from his works was published at Groningen in 1748, in 2 vols. 4to. See Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. vol. iii. 4, v. v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. vol. ii. 4, v. v.

Marcius. See MARC.

Marcovich of Marcoville, Jean de, a French writer on church discipline, who flourished in the second half of the 16th century at Paris, is the author of several works of interest to the theological student. Among them the following deserve special mention: L'origine des tems des Juifs, Chretiens, et Gentils (Paris, 1563, 8vo); — La diversite des opinions de l'homme (1563, 8vo); — Chretien arretissans aux refroidis et escrasis de la vraie et ancienne Eglise Catholique (1571, 8vo), a work in which Marcovich, though displaying great attachment to the Roman Catholic Church, condemns her conduct towards the Protestants. See Hoefer, Nouve. Biog. Generale, xxiii. 509.

Marcouman, a Germanic tribe of the Suevi brought across the Helvetic border to the Marcomannen, and from the Rhine to the Danube. They are first mentioned by Julius Cesar in his Gallic wars (i. 51), who reckons them among the forces of Ariovistus, king of the Suevi. The conquests of the Romans brought them into dangerous proximity to the Marcomannen, and induced the latter to seek a new home in modern Bohemia. They were led by Marobodius, a man of noble rank among them, trained in the Roman armies, and he became their king after the conquest of Bohemia. The Marcomannen quickly acquired influence, and were greatly strengthened by their settlement in a fertile and populous region, so that their power became threatening to the empire. Tiberius concluded a treaty of peace with them, which secured the empire against an attack, but turned against them the hatred of the remaining Germanic tribes. Led by Arminius, these enemies defeated the Marcomannen in A.D. 17, after which date their history presents an almost uninterrupted succession of conflicts. They defeated the emperor Domitian (Dio Cassius, lxvi. 7), and in A.D. 164 advanced to Aquileia, in Italy. The fruits of a decisive victory over them, won by the generals of Aurelius, were lost by a treaty which the emperor Commodus concluded with them (A.D. 180), and they continued to make frequent irruptions into the neighboring provinces of the empire, penetrating in A.D. 270 even to Milan, besieging Aesinoa, and threatening Rome itself. Their name gradually disappears from history after the 5th century, when the migration of more distant barbarians brought a succession of new peoples into their land.

It is not definitely known how or when they became acquainted with Christianity. Their frequent incursions must have brought them into contact with its disciples, some of whom must have been among their prisoners of war. A statement in the life of St. Ambrose, by Paulinus—which, however, is not confirmed by any contemporaneous author—that in the time of that bishop an Italian Christian had visited the Marcomannen, and had awakened the interest of their king in Christianity to an extent that led her to apply to Ambrose for instruction. He sent, in compliance with her request, a work in the form of a catechism, by which both she and the king were led to embrace Christianity towards the close of the 4th century. See Schröck, Kirchengesch. vii. 347; Hefele, Gesch. d. Einführung des Christenthums im süd-west. Deutschland, vol. vii; Tacitus, Annal. Dio Cassius, Hist. Rom. 1, 54, and Greek and Roman historians of this period. See also Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, ix, 112; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Letz. A., v. v. (L. M.)

Marcosians or Colobarianas, an ancient sect in the Church, making a branch of the Valentinians. Irenæus speaks at large of the leader of this sect, Marcus, who, it seems, was reputed a great magician. The Marcosians had a great number of apocryphal books, which they held as canonical, and of the same authorship as other books they picked up at random, titles touching the infancy of Jesus Christ, which they circulated as authentic histories. Many of these fables are still in use and credit among the Greek monks. See VALENTINIANS.

Marcus (Col. lv. 10; Philm. 24; I Pet. v. 18). See MARK.

Marcus, Pope, one of the early bishops of Rome, succeeded Sylvester Jan. 18, 336; but little is known either of his life or administration. Anastasius states that by him the bishop of Ostia was first appointed to ordain the bishop of Rome. He died October 7 of the same year in which he had been chosen, and was buried in the cemetery of Balbina, which was thenceforth called after his name. "His body," says Bower, "has since been worshipped in the church of St. Lawrence at Florence, though no mention has been made by any writer of its having been translated thither." Novae relates that Marcus bore the title of cardinal-bishop, and that with him originated his dignitary of the Church of Rome. He is also by some writers believed to have been the first pontiff to order the reading of the Nicene confession of faith, after the Gospels, in the celebration of mass. See Bower, History of the Popes, i, 114;

Marcus of Alexandria, a patriarch of Alexandria, flourished early in the 13th century, and was particularly well versed in ecclesiastical law. He proposed certain questions for solution on various points of ecclesiastical law or practice. Sixty-four of these questions, with the answers of Theodorus Balsamon, are given in the *Jos. Orientale* of Boneddini, p. 237, etc. (Paris, 1573, 8vo), and in the *Jos. Graeco-Romanum* of Leunclavius, i, 382-394 (Frankfort, 1586, fol.). Some MSS. contain two questions and solutions more than the printed copies. Fabrius suggests that Mark of Alexandria is the Marcus of Justinian's *Code* in *MSS*. *Codex in Monumentis*, of Macarius Chrysophuscelus, extant in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.—Cave, *Hist. Lit.* ad ann. 1208, ii, 279 (ed. Oxford, 1740-42); *Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Marcus of Arles, a bishop in the Eastern Church, was one of three prelates sent to Rome, A.D. 342, by the emperor Constantius II, to satisfy the Western emperor Constans of the justice and propriety of the deposition of Athanasius of Alexandria and Paulinus of Constantinople. Marcus and his fellow-prelates are charged with having deceived Constans by presenting to him the confession of faith, not of their own, that of Arius or Eusebian confession, lately agreed on at the Synod of Antioch, but another confession of orthodox confession, yet not fully orthodox, which is given by Socrates. Marcus appears to have acted with the Eusebian or Semi-arian party, and took part on their side, probably in the Council of Philippopolis, held by the prelates of the East after their accession from Sardica (A.D. 347), and certainly in that of Sirmium (A.D. 388), where a heterodox confession of faith was drawn up by him. The confession which is given as Marcus's by Socrates is believed by modern critics not to be his. They ascribe to him the confession agreed upon by the Council of Ariminum, A.D. 389, and also given by Socrates. During the short reign of Julian, Marcus, then on old man, was cruelly tortured in various ways by the heathen populace of Arles, who were irritated by the success of his efforts to convert their fellow-townsmen to Christianity. He appears to have barely survived their cruelty. His sufferings for the Christian religion seem to have obliterated the discredit of his Arianism, for Gregory Nazianzen has eulogized him in the highest terms, and the Church honors him a martyr. See: *Athanasius, De Synodis, c. 24, s. v.*; *Socrates, Hist. Eccl.* ii, 18, 30, 37, with the notes of Valesius; *Socianus, Hist. Eccl.* iii, 10, iv, 17; v, 10; *Theodoret, Hist. Eccl.* iii, 7; Gregory Naz. *Oratio in Bolland, Acta Sacra* Mart. iii, 77, etc.; *Tillemont, Memoires*, vol. vi and vii; *Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Neander, *Hist. of Chr. Ch.* ii, 61, 61.

Marcus Aurelius. See Aurelius.


Marcus Erenitaa (*Epimartyr, the Acetic, called also Mabonos, Ayyab, and Aemeryte or Exercitator*), a disciple of Chrysostom, and contemporary of Nilus and Isidore of Pelusium, was a celebrated Egyptian hermit of the Scythian deserts, who lived at the close of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th century. From early manhood he was noted for his piety, meekness, and ascetic vir-
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a Christian life, and especially how to restrain anger and flashy lusts. Ascetic exercises are rejected as a means, and books to Jesus recommended as Scripture. The way to virtue and true Christanity. Annexed is a reply from Nicholas, returning thanks for this counsel. 5. Brief reflections of a pious and mystical character, generally bearing on some passage or expression of the divinity, treated in Meditations were from the first interpretation. A state of mystical ecstasy, in which the soul is lost to all created things, and in an ecstasy of love is wholly absorbed in God, is characterized as the most exalted spiritual condition, and ascetic duties are accounted only secondary values. Another tract upon the subject of fasting, is wanting in the older editions, and was first published in 1748 by Remondini. It possibly formed a part of 6, which closes abruptly.

7. General questions of Christian morality: a discussion with a jurist as to the possibility of reconciling capital punishment with Christian principles, and a discussion of the nature and use of prayer, of the various ways to honor God, of the desire to please men, etc. 8. A mystical dialogue between the soul and spirit concerning sin and grace, chiefly remarkable because of its decided rejection of the doctrine of original sin, and of its clear and precise statement of the doctrine of the Greek fathers respecting sin and human freedom. We are to seek the source of our sinfulness neither in Satan, Adam, nor other men. No power can compel us to good or evil, but rather the condition of every person is that which he has chosen from the time of creation.

The same passions which seduced Adam and Eve still exist in human nature, and produce a like result in every soul that, in the exercise of its freedom, submits to their control. The conflict with sin is therefore a struggle against our own will, in which Christian virtue consists in keeping our commandments to the extent of our power. 9. Christ's relation to Melchisedek. This tract is directed against a class who regarded Melchisedek as a divine being; probably the Origenistic sect founded in Egypt by Hieraca, who were said to regard Melchisedek as the holy spirit or the inspiration of the spirit. While combating such views, the tract reveals a tendency to Monophysitism, in ascribing to the human nature of Jesus all the attributes of the Godhead. These tracts of Marcus Aurelius reveal to us the memorials of a partly ascetic, partly ecstatic mysticism, which was especially cultivated among the Egyptian monks, and which aimed to spiritualize the practices of Monachism. In its excess of piety feeling over dogmatic conceptions, it contained the seeds of many diverse systems of dogmatism and ethics. Monophysitism had essentially its root in the teaching of Origen, and as early as the first two centuries. These writings are found, in curious juxtaposition, Pelagianism and Augustinianism, the strongest assertion of human freedom and of the sole efficiency of grace in the work of salvation, the evangelical view of justification by faith, and the Roman Catholic doctrine of works. Hence Bellarmine and other Roman Catholics supposed that modern heresies had forged these writings, while Protestant writers have remarked their Pelagian cast. The tracts of Marcus were in the 17th century placed in the Index, as "caute legenda." They are chiefly important as a connecting link between the mysticism of Macarius and that of the Areopagite and Maximus Confessor.

Eight of the above mystical treatises are λόγοι ἄγαλμας, "equal to the number of the universal passions." A Latin version of all together was prepared by Joannes Picus (Paris, 1563, 8vo; later editions in Bibliad.) a Greek version by another Macarius, with the title of Λόγοι τοῦ Ἱερουσαλημίου (Paris, 1563, 8vo). Both versions were reprinted in the first volume of the Auctorium of Ducortus (Paris, 1624, folio), in the eleventh volume of Bibliad. Patrum (Paris, 1654, folio), and in the eighth volume of the Bibliad. Patrum of Galland. Marcus Aurelius was probably the author also of the tract Ἡπί ηπίστατος, De Jejunio; Latin version by Zinus (Venice, 1574, 8vo). Two of Marcus's tracts—the first and second, viz. Ἡπί ηπίστατος, De Jejunio; De Deis Spirituali, and Ἡπί τῆς εὐγνωμονίας, Λύπας καὶ Ἑγκαταλείπους, Deis qui pati posse ipsis opes suaque frustra. They were published together by Vincentius Ospopos, with a Latin version (Hagenau, 1581, 8vo). The first was reprinted in the Microprosopikon (Basil, 1550), and in the Orthodoxoographe (Basil, 1555). The tract De Jejunio, and another, De Melchisedek, were devoted to the subject of fasting. Another tract upon the subject of fasting, is wanting in the older editions, and was first published in 1748 by Remondini. It possibly formed a part of 6, which closes abruptly.

MARCUS EUGENIUS. See Eugenius.

MARCUS OF GAZA, the biographer of St. Porphyry of Gaza, lived in the 4th and 5th centuries; was probably a native of Proconsular Asia, whence he travelled to Palestine, there became acquainted with Porphyry, and then lived at Jerusalem some time before A.D. 388. Porphyry sent him to Thessalonica to dispose of his property in those parts, and after his return Marcus appears to have been the almost inseparable companion of Porphyry, by whom he was ordained deacon, and sent (A.D. 398) to Constantinople to obtain the emperor Arcadius an edict for destroying the heathen temples at Gaza. He obtained an edict to close, but not to destroy them. The edict was not effectual, and he was put down heathenism; and Porphyry went in person to Constantinople, taking Marcus with him, and they obtained an imperial edict for the destruction both of the idols and the temples of the heathen. Marcus afterwards returned with Porphyry to Gaza, where he probably remained till his death, of which we have no account.

He wrote the life of Porphyry, the original Greek text of which is said to be extant in Mss. at Vienna; it has never been published. A Latin version, Vita St. Porphyrii Episcopi Gesseni, was published by Lipomannus in his Vita Sanctorum ; by Suris, in his De Probatis Sanctorum Vitae ; and by the Bollandists, in the Acta Sanctorum Februa, iii, 643 sq., with a Commentarius Praecussus and notes by Hensenius. It is given also in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland, ix, 259 sq. See Fabri, Biblioth. Graeca, x, 516; Cave, Hist. Lit. ad ann. 421, i, 403; Oudin, De Scriptoris. Ecles. i, col. 999; Galland, Bibl. Patrum, Proleg. ad ix, c. 7; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s. v.

MARCUS THE HERESIARCH, sometimes called the Gnostic, a teacher of Gnosticism in the 2d century, thought by Jerome to be a native of Egypt; by Labriolinus, of Proconsular Asia; and by those who are not were that Jerome's conjecture is correct, seems probable from the statement of Irenaeus that Marcus was a disciple of Valentine. The followers of Marcus were called Marcusianae. His peculiar tenets were founded on the Gnostic doctrine of same; professing to derive his knowledge of these same, and of the production of the universe, by a revelation from the four primal emanations in the system of same, who descended to him from the region of the ineffable and invisible in the form of a female. He set forth his system in a poem, in which he introduced the divine conception in the following words: "The same one immortalizable and marvelous symbol of worship. He prominently developed in his system the idea of a λόγος τοῦ ὄντος, of a word manifesting the hidden divine essence in the creation—creation being a continuous utterance or becoming expressed of the ineffable. See Irenaeus, A. de Haeresis, i, 8-18; Epiphanius, De Haeresibus, 8; Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., 11, 16; Philastrias, De Heresiarch, post Christianum, c. 14; Pseudo-Dionysius, De Haeresibus, i, 9-15; Jerome, Comm. ad Intr., iv, 4, 5; Ep. ad Thoer. 29; Itigius, De Haeresiarchia, lect. ii, c. 6, § 4; Tillemont, Mémoires, ii, 291; Lardner, Hist. of Heresies, book ii, c. 7;
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Neander, Hist. of the Christ. Ch. i, 440; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. i, 147; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. s. v. See Marcionites; Valentinians.

1. Marcus the Heretic (sometimes confounded with Marcus the Emperor), a native of Memphis, in Egypt, flourished in the 4th century. He is said by Isidore of Seville, and Sulpicius Severus in Histor. Sacra, to have been a skilful magician—a Manichæan, perhaps personally a disciple of Manes, and the originator of the doctrine of the Priscillianists. See Priscillianus.
   He travelled to Spain, and is said to have disclosed his doctrine to a rhetorician, and to his wife Agape; from them these doctrines were communicated to Priscillian (see Priscillian), who, by embodying them in systematic form and giving them spread, became the founder of the sect.—Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. s. v.; Neander, Christl. Hist. ii, 710.

2. Marcus Hieromonachus, said by Oudin to have been a monk of the convent of St. Saba, near Jerusalem, flourished in the opening of the 11th century. He wrote Συναγωγή τίς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, De Didasia ex Typico orientate, contained in the Typicum, or ritual directory of the Greek Church (Tevskev) in the churchnuts of the two churches of the Eastern Churches (see fasting week of the Greek Church). A letter addressed to St. Saba, but which Oudin supposes to have been drawn by Marcus himself, and produced by him as the work of St. Saba, in order to obtain for it an authority which had appeared in its own name, would not have secured. A Life of Gregory of Agrigentum is supposed to be by the same author as the Typicum. See Cave, Hist. Lit. vol. ii; Disserth, ii, 38. This commentary is said to have been the arrangement of a typicum, ascribed to St. Saba, but which Oudin supposes to have been drawn by Marcus himself, and produced by him as the work of St. Saba, in order to obtain for it an authority which had appeared in its own name, would not have secured. A Life of Gregory of Agrigentum is supposed to be by the same author as the Typicum. See Cave, Hist. Lit. vol. ii; Disserth, ii, 38. Oudin, De Scriptoriis, Eccl. ii, col. 584, etc.; Fabricius, Bibliogr. Græc. x, 232, 678; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. s. v.

Marcus, bishop of Otranto, probably of the 8th century. Allatius says he was a comonomarch or steward of the great Church of Constantinople before he became bishop, which seems to be all that is known of him. He wrote Τὸ μεγάλῳ αὐθίνῃ ἀφορίστικον, Ημνυμα Αριστοκλικαῖς in Magnum Sabbatum, s. in Magno Sabbato Capita Verbum, published by Aids Manutius, with a Latin version, in his editions of Prudentius and other early Latin poets, Poetae (Venice, 1601), 4 vols. A Latin version of the hymn is given in several editions of Bibliotheca Patrum.—Fabricius, Bibliogr. Græc. xi, 177, 677; Cave, Hist. Lit. ad ann. 750, i, 680; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s. v.

Mardochæus (Mapchocæus), the Sept. or Greek equivalent of Mochoçai (q. v.), in the Apocrypha; namely, (a), the uncle of Esther, in the apocryphal addi-
tions (Esth. x, 1; xi, 2, 12; xii, 1-6; xvi, 13; 2 Macc. xv, 36). The 14th of the month Adar, on which the feast of Purim is celebrated, is called in the last passage "Mardochæus's day" (i Mapchocæi hµµµµ). (b) A Jew who returned with Zerubbabel and Joshua (1 Esdr. v, 8; comp. Ezra ii, 2).

Mardochai, a name borne by many rabbis and Jewish savans. The most renowned of them are the following:

1. Mardochai Ashkenasi, a fanatical adherent of Sabaism, flourishing very near the middle of the 17th century. A man of propprecessing appearance, and remarkably talented as a pulpit orator, he travelled through Hungary, Moravia, and Bohemia, everywhere preaching the Sabbaéthaholic doctrines, and declaring himself a prophet, insisted upon the duty of his people to welcome Sabbatian Rabbis to the vestments of a Messiah. The persecutions which were so frequent at that time in Germany, France, and Spain had softened the hearts of the poor Jews, and they were anxiously looking for relief from some quarter. Finding that his declarations were favorably received, Mardochai finally announced that he himself was the risen Zewi, who had been dead three years, and actually found many adherents, especially in Italy and in Poland. He is said to have lost his reason, and to have died, a poor and forsaken wretch, somewhere in Poland. See Gritz, Gesch. d. Jüd. x, 394 sq.; and in Appendix.

2. Mardochai ben-Elkarar Comik or Comus (or Comiso) flourished in the second half of the 15th century (1400-1490), first at Constantinople, later at Adrianople. A thorough master of mathematics and astronomy, he fell ill and died at the age of 54. He became one of his most ardent admirers and devoted followers. He commented on the sacred writings, and by his generous ways secured the love and admiration of both Karaites and Rabbinites. He also studied the Aristotelian philosophy, introduced by the works of Moses Maimonides, and thus as a philosopher secured no mean reputation. He wrote יְדִיעַת מַעֲשֵׂה, a Commentary on the Pentateuch (1460); a Commentary on Aben-Ezra's התנָךְ וּמוֹדֵעַ; a Commentary on Ezra's התנָךְ וּמוֹדֵעַ; a Commentary on Maimonides's Leviticus, and other logical writings, etc.

3. Mardochai ben-Hillel, a German rabbi, who, while a resident of Nuremberg, was accused of insulting the Christian faith and defending the cabalistic writers, and died a death so scandalous that he could not conduct in 1310. He wrote Mardochai Magnum, a commentary on Alpheus's Compendium Talmudicum (Riva, 1599, 4to; Cracow, 1599, folio, and often)—De Rebus mortuasis (Venice, 8vo). See Auerbach, Berit Abrah., 15; Wetzel, Hist. Nachricht von der Judengemeinde in Nürnberg.

4. Mardochai ben-Nissim, a Polish rabbi, flourished at Cronomi-ostroho, in Sicily, in the second half of the 17th century. He wrote יְדִיעַת מַעֲשֵׂה דְּנָשָׁנָו, or "the friend of Mardochai" (Hamb. 1714 and 1721, 4to, with a Latin transl. by Wolf, in Notitia Karaitorum, a work which contains a complete exposition of the doctrines of the Karaites. Mardochai was himself a Karaite, and wrote this work by special request of the learned Triglid, who afterwards translated this valuable contribution to the history of the Karaites Jews. Mardochai ben-Nissim wrote also דַּעַת מַעֲשֵׂה דְּנָשָׁנָו (published by Neubaser), another work on Karaism. See Wolf, Bibl. Hebr.; Furst, Bibl. Judæca; Gritz, Gesch. d. Jüd. x, 301, and note 5 in the Appendix.

5. Mardochai Isaac Nathan, an Italian rabbi, flourished at Rome near the middle of the 11th century. He was the author of Concordantia Hebraica (Basle, 1581, fol.), Cracow, 1644, 4to, with a German transl. by Rosen; Rome, 1622, fol., with additions by Marco de Calato; London, 1747-49, 4 vols. (fols.); a Latin translation was published at Basle in 1556.

6. Mardochai Japheth Schlesinger, a noted rabbi and learned cabalist, flourished at Prague, in Bohemia, near the opening of the 17th century. He was a pupil of the celebrated Isserles (q. v.), when the latter lived at Cracow. He was a native of Prague, and was born according to Gritz (Gesch. d. Jüd. ix, 485), about 1590, and lived in the capital of Bohemia until the persecutions against the Jews made his stay impossible; he went as a refugee to Vienna, and later returned to Prague, where he was successively rabbi at Groden, Lukin, Kremnitz (1575-1592), and, in a good old age, found a refuge in his native place. He died at Prague about 1612 as rabbi of his people. He wrote יֵדִיעַת מַעֲשֵׂה, a cabalistic treatise, divided into six books, which is believed to have been completely about 1560. It has been frequently referred to as a Zewi at Cracow (1594-1599, 4 vols. fols.); Prague (1609, 1628, 1688, 1701), and Venice (1626 fols.). See Mardochai ben-Alchabarija. See Saad Adanana. (J. H. W.)

Marechal, Ambroise, D.D., a Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Ingres, near Orleans, France, in 1768, and was educated at the seminary of St. Sulpice. He
came to Baltimore in 1792; returning to France, he was from 1803 to 1811 professor in the seminaries of St. Flour, Aix, and Lyons; afterwards became coadjutor to the archbishop of Paris, and was consecrated bishop of Chartres, Dec. 14, 1817. He visited Rome in 1821-2, to procure aid for his Church in Baltimore. He died Jan. 29, 1828.

Marcéchal, Bernard, a noted French writer, was born at Retheil in 1705, and, after completing his studies under the guidance of the congregation of the Benedictines of which he took the vows in 1721; in 1726 he became prior of Beaulieu, in Aragon. After this we know him only as a writer. He died at Metz July 19, 1770. He wrote *Concordances des Saintes Pierres de l'Eglise*, *Grece*, and *Latina*, in which he proposed to overturn many erroneous hypotheses.

Marcéchal, Pierre Sylvin, a noted French atheist, was born at Paris, Aug. 15, 1750, and was destined by his father to the mercantile profession. Preferring a literary life, his father educated him for the profession of law. Pierre, however, was determined to get a livelihood from his friends, and eschewed all personal care. When inclined to work, he would write something for the Bishop of Chartres, and, endowed with rare facility of the pen, and a vivid imagination, he soon gained great notoriety for his excelled writing. Had he remained within his legitimate channels, his name would have had no interest for us; but Pierre, believing that his opinions must be gained at the expense of manhood and morality, courted the tendency of his age, and became a scourge of religion and decency. In imitation of Lucretius, he published the fragments of a *moral* poem, which denies the existence of a God. Not sufficient to provoke public attention to him, he next attacked the Bible, in a more elegant strain, and applied himself to all manner of work to further the interests of atheism. Sad, indeed, was the life of such a being as Pierre Sylvin Marcéchal, and as his life so was his death. When the hour of his departure had arrived, Jan. 18, 1808 (at Montrouge, near Paris), he was heard to exclaim, "Mes amis, la nuit est venue pour moi." His works are noticed in detail in Hoefer's *Biog. Générale*, xxxii, 522 sq.


*Marešah* (Hebrew *Mareschah*), מַרְעֵשָה, fully מַעְרֵשָה, Josh. xv, 44; I Chron. ii, 42; iv, 21; 1 Sam. xii, 24; Maparaz and Mapard, but in 1 Chron. ii, 42, Mapordaic), the name of one or two men, and also of a place, possibly connected with *Mamre*.

1. A person named as the "father" of Hebron among the descendants of Judah, but it is only left to be inferred that he was the brother of Caleb's son Mesha, with whom the Sept. confounds him (1 Chron. ii, 42).

B.C. ante 1191.

2. In 1 Chron. iv, 21, a person of the name of Marešah is apparently mentioned as the son of Laishah, of the family of Shelah, perhaps as being the founder of the city of the same name (B.C. cir. 1612); possibly identical with the foregoing.

3. A town in the tribe of Judah, "in the valley," enumerated with Keilaah and Azhib (Josh. xv, 44), rebuilt (comp. 2 Chron. iv, 21) and fortified by Rehoobaam (2 Chron. xi, 8). The Ethiopians under Zerah were defeated by Asa in the valley of Zepliahath, near Marešah, and Zerah was slain (2 Chron. xiv, 16). It was said to have been placed of the Ephræmus don-Badalav, a prophet who predicted the destruction of the ships which King Jehoshaphat had built in conjunction with Ahaziah of Israel (2 Chron. xx, 37). It is included by the prophet Micah among the towns of the low country which he attempts to rouse to a sense of their duty by the promise of their destruction (Mic. i, 15). Like the rest, the apostrophe to Marešah is a play on the name: "I will bring your heir (goresh) to you, O city of inheritance" (*Mareschah*). The following verse (16) shows that the inhabitants had adopted the headdress and forbidden custom of cutting off the back hair as a sign of mourning. In the time of the Maccabees it was occupied by the Idumæans (2 Macc. xii, 85), but it was laid desolate by Judas on his march from Hebron to Ashdod (1 Macc. v, 65-68; Josephus, *Ant. xii, 8, 6*). About five years later it was again ravaged by the Idumæans, and attached to the province of Syria (ib. xiv, 1, 4). Mareesah was among the towns rebuilt by Gabinius (ib. xiv, 5, 8), but was again destroyed by the Parthians in their irruption against Herod (ib. xiv, 19, 9). A place so often mentioned in history must have been of considerable importance; but it does not appear that it ever again rebuilt (see Reina, *Palest.*, p. 888). The site, however, is set down by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Moraschi) as within two miles of Eleutheropolis, but the direction is not stated. Dr. Robinson (*Bibl. Researches*, iii, p. 354) notes, 'at a mile and a half south of the site of Eleutheropolis, a remarkable *tel* or artificial hill, with foundations of some buildings. As there are no other ruins in the vicinity, and as the site is admirably suited for a fortress, this, he supposes, may have been Mareesah. According to Schwartz (*Pales*., p. 105), the ruins are still known by the Arabs by the name *Maraesah*, probably the *Marash* described by Tobler (*Dritte Wand.*, p. 129) as lying on a gently swelling hill leading down from the mountains to the great western plain, from which it is but half an hour distant (Van de Velde, *Memoires*, p. 383).

Mareus or Marota, Jean de, a most remarkable character in French history, flourished in the 17th century. In his youth he was an inebriate. He has himself left us a picture of his morals in early life, which is by no means an advantageous one; for he owns that, in order to triumph over the virtue of such women as he held to be the interest of their salvation, he made no scruple to lead them to atheistical principles. "I ought," says he, "to weep tears of blood, considering the bad use I have made of my address among the ladies; for I have spent nothing but spare moments in the malicious subtleties, and infamous treacheries, endeavoring to ruin the souls of those I pretended to love. I studied artful speeches to shake, blind, and seduce them; and strove to persuade them that vice was virtue, or, at least, a thing natural and indifferented." But after his conversion Mareus ran into such great extremes in the opposite direction. In short, he became at last a visionary and a religious fanatic, dealing in nothing but inward lights and revelations. Among other things, he promised the king of France, upon the strength of some prophecies, whose meaning he tells us was imparted to him from above, that he should overthrow Mohammedianism and become the promoter of Christian unity, under the leadership of the pope of Rome. But Mareus deserves our attention especially for the relation he sustained to the Jansenists. Appointed inquisitor, he became one of the severest persecutors of Jansenism, and was bent upon the extermination of this heresy from French ground. In *Délices de l'Empir*, one of his productions, he seriously boasts that "God, in his infinite goodness, had sent him the key of the treasures contained in the Apocalypse, which was known but to few before him;" and that, "by the command of God, he was to levy an army of 144,000 men, part of which he had already enlisted, to make war upon the impious and the Jansenists" (p. 76). He died in 1678. See *Gen. Biog. Dict.*, vol. ix, s. v.; Hoefer, *Notiz auf S. Marcelas*, vol. xxxii.
Reformed theologian, was born at Oisemond, Flanders, in 1599; was educated at Geneva and at Paris; studied theology at Saumur and Geneva, entered the ministry in 1620, and was settled at Laon by the Synod of Charleroi. His experience in this place was rather of a peculiar nature. He was stabbed one night, and this attack he considered to be in some way a punishment from God for the violent abuse he had as a young man, and had, in a pamphlet defending the Protestant faith, severely criticized their conduct. In 1624 he accepted a call to Sedan, both as pastor and theological instructor in the school of theology situated in this place, lately so celebrated in history. Before he entered this new position he went to Leyden, and there secured the degree of D.D. in July, 1625. Having made a small tour into England, he returned to Sedan. In 1632 he was called as pastor to Maestricht; in 1686 he removed to Herzogenbusch as minister and professor at the Schola Illustria; in 1640 he had an invitation to a professorship at Franeker, and to another at Groningen in 1642. This last he accepted, and from that time to his death did such great services to that university that it was reckoned one of the most flourishing in the Netherlands. The magistrates of the city confirmed him in his offices and learning, offered him, in 1671, the professor of divinity's chair at Lausanne; and in 1678 the University of Leyden invited him to a like professorship there. He accepted this last, but died before he had taken possession of it (May 10, 1678). Mareczi's literary activity was very great. He was a writer of ability as well as energy, so that of any man of his day. He was an able polemic, and wrote much against the Roman Catholics, the Socinians, the Millenarians, and the Armimians, and even against many of his own confession. Indeed, Marcius was quite a literary pupil. His contest with Vossius, the Utrecht professor, is famous. See VOSHIUS. His ablest work is his Systema theologien (Gron, 1678), in the appendix of which is found a list of all the productions from his pen. Their number is prodigious, and the variety of their subjects shows an unbounded genius. He designed to collect all his works into a body, as well those which had been already published as those which were in MS. He revised and augmented them for that purpose, and had materials for four volumes in folio, but his death prevented the execution of that project. The first volume was to have contained all those works which he had published before settling at Groningen. The second his Opera theologica didactica. The third his Opera theologica polemica. The title of the fourth was to have been Impietas triumphata. Its contents were to have been the "Hydra Socinianismi expugnata," one of the ablest, and certainly most unanswerable, of the Socinian pamphlets against the Fanaticorum eversa," and the "Fabula presdamitarum refutata," three works which had been printed at different times. Marezi's system of divinity was to be so methodical that it was made use of at other academies; indeed, his reputation procured him so much authority in foreign countries as well as his own that a person in Germany who had published some severe censures against Marezi received orders to suppress his book. See Gen. Biog. Dict., vol. ix, s. v.; Bayle, Dict. Hist. s. v.; Marezi; Eggis et Vite professorum Gronin. ; Herzog, Real-Encykl., vol. ix, s. v. (J. H. W.)

MARETS. See MARIES.

MARESOL, JONN GOTTLOB, a German theologian, was born at Plauen, grand-duchy of Saxe-Weim.-Elis., Dec. 25, 1761; studied theology at the University of Leipzig from 1779 to 1788; became thector for three years in a private family; in 1789 became preacher of the University of Göttingen, with the dignity of professor or extraordinary of divinity, and lectured with success on moral philosophy and homiletics; in 1794 was honored by the University of Helmstadt with the doctorate of divinity, and in the same year also accepted a call to Copenhagen as pastor primarius of the German St. Peter's Church, where he was allowed much time for study; but the northern climate injuring his health, he obtained in 1802, by Herder's influence, a position at Jena as superintendent and pastor of the town church, and at the same time commenced lectures on homiletics at the university of that place. He died Jan. 15, 1828. Maresoli was a child of the rationalistic times in which he flourished; but still, with a strong sense of duty, he preached and spread abroad the teachings of the Gospel, and with a spirited language and animating mode of delivery, he became a blessing to many thousands of hearers, and an example and a subject of imitation to thousands of students. His productions were repeatedly reprinted and translated into several languages, and have affected much good. He is justly styled one of Germany's greatest preachers of the 19th century. He wrote Das Christenthum ohne Gesch. u. Einkleidung (1787) — Be- stimmung des Kantoreordens (1798), besides his sermons, published in 1791-1, 1806, 1811, 1819, etc. — Predigt zur Erinnerung an die fortlaufende Wirksamkeit der Re- formation (Jena, 1822) — Homilien (1805) — Nachkla- semae Predigten (1852, and since). See Herzog, Real-Encykl., vol. xx, s. v.; Döring, Kantoreordens d. 19. u. 19. Jahrh. s. v.

Margaret, Sr., the name of several Roman Catholic saints. I. The latest of these was canonized through the intercession of the Dominicans, who have a special interest in her, both before and after her death; she is patronized, however, simply in the neighborhood of her native village, San Severin, in the duchy of Ancona. From the former name of that place, she was called Septimpedia; the practice of such virtues as are common among saints, and which she cultivated during her widowhood, gave her the surname Vibia; and since, in her humility, she would never wear shoes, she received the appellation Discol cata. The only inheritance left to her daughter comprised a pair of shoes and the soles of her shoes. She was canonized in 1298, and the image lost in death and assumed the form of shoes, and which wore the principal relics exhibited in her memory by the Dominicans. She died in 395.

II. The merely beatified saints [see Beatification] of this name belong, without exception, to the mosaic orders; and in their legends the fancy and the jealousy of the monks are equally apparent. The more celebrated are:

1. A beautiful Italian from the neighborhood of Perugia, who had up to her twenty-fifth year led a grossly licentious life; but, after her having been awakened by a startling incident, distingushed herself by turning to a life of the severest penance in the convent of the Francisans at Cortona (hence called Margaret of Cortona).

Her confessor, however, resisted her desire to revisit the scenes of her former shame, accompanied only by an old woman. She is usually represented with the instruments of torture, because in spirit she experienced the entire passion of the Saviour, who refused to designate her his handmaiden, but honored her as his friend.

Her conversations with Christ and the Virgin Mary served to endorsing the more lenient treatment of the Walterists (Act. SS., I. c., p. 548). When she died, in 1297, the Francisans claimed that they saw her soul ascend from purgatory to heaven. In 1628 Urban VIII permitted them to pay her religious honors.

2. As an offset to Margaret of Cortona, the Dominicans raised up one of their tertiaries, a bed girl of Urbino, in whose heart were found, after death, three wonderful stones, bearing the image of the Virgin Mary with the child in the manger (Act. SS., April 13; beatified Oct. 19, 1699).

Other Margaret, including a royal princess of Hungary, Margaret, of a Dominican, Jan. 29, 1747, are obscure. They are found in the Act. SS., under Jan. 22; Feb. 11; March 5, 7, 13, and 22; April 12 and 20; May 15, 18, and 29; and June 4, 10, and 13. — Herzog, Real-Encyclop., 14, 54; Wetsser und Welte, Kirchen-Ise, vi, 685.

Margaret of France, duchess of Berry and Savoy,
daughter of Francis I, was born in 1529, and received a superior education. She was a patroness of the sciences and learned men; and after the death of her father gained a high reputation by her beauty, piety, learning, and amiable qualities. She married Philip II, duke of Saxony, in 1549, and was crowned at the court of Louis XII. Her brother, afterwards Francis I, after he had ascended the throne, employed her in numerous important affairs, and she went to Madrid to attend to him when he was a prisoner there. In 1560 she was married to duke Charles of Alençon, but he dying in 1596, she in 1597 again married, this time Henry d'Albret, king of Navarre, and from this marriage was born Jeanne d'Albret, mother of Henry IV. Henry d'Albret died in 1544, and Margaret continued to govern the kingdom with great wisdom. She died Dec. 21, 1548. She was very handsome and highly talented, and her court was all persecuted for the sake of their religious belief; yet very different opinions have been advanced concerning her personal views. Some consider her a fervent Protestant, whilst others look upon her as a very orthodox Roman Catholic, and still others as a Catholic. The fact seems to be that she observed Roman Catholic practices, although firmly believing in the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ only; she protected the Protestants, without herself leaving the Roman Church; she loved poetry and even pleasure, although strictly moral and truly pious. All these apparent contradictions find a natural explanation in her inclination towards mysticism, verging even on quietism, and resulting in indifference towards the mere externals of religion—a tendency common also to a number of the most distinguished theologians of that time, and one that helps us to understand many otherwise obscure points in the early history of the Reformation in France. Her private character was the object of many attacks, yet none of these accusations have been substantiated; they were all made by her enemies. Margaret of Orleans wrote, to her brother, the Dauphin (1533), which was condemned by the Sorbonne, as it made no mention either of the saints or of purgatory—L'Heptaméron des nouvelles, a collection of tales after the manner of Boccaccio, but intended as moral lessons; they have since been used as a means of improving the supposed immorality of her life. The work was first published under the title Histoire des amants fortunés (Paris, 1558; afterwards by Gruger, Paris, 1569, 2 vols.; Amstel. 1698; Berne, 1780, 3 vols.; Leroux de Lericy, Paris, 1835, 3 vols.; Lacroux, Paris, 1857); in English dress it is published in Bohn's collection, extra volume;—fragments published after her death by Jean de la Haye, under the title Marguerite de la marguerite des Princesse (Lyons, 1547; Par. 1554). Her Correspondance was published by Génin (Par. 1842); also Nouvelles lettres de la Reine de Navarre (Par. 1842). The Hist. de M. de Valois, etc., published at Amsterdam (1656, 2 vols.), is a mere novel. In the library of Rouen there is to be found a MS. of the 17th century, entitled Intrigues secrètes de la reine Marguerite pour stabiliser les erreurs et les nouveautés de Calvin et de Luther dans son royaume de Daun et de Navarre. See Bayle, Dict. Hist. s. v.; Polenz, Gesch. des französischen Calvinismus, i, 199 sq.; Haag, La France Protestante, vii, 228 sq.; Victor Durand, Marguerite de Valois et la Cour de France (1848, 2 vols. 8vo); Miss Freer, Life of Marguerite, Queen of Navarre (1855); Herzog, Real-Encyclop. xiv. (1849), 292 sq.; Pizar, Universal-Lexikon, x, 627; Foreign Quart. Rev. (October, 1842).

Margaret of Scotland, daughter of King Edward III, fled to Scotland with her brother, Edgar Edelings, when William the Conqueror invaded England, and in 1070 there married king Malcolm, who afterwards died fighting against William II of England, she following him only four days later to the grave (Nov. 16, 1058). She was canonized by Innocent IV in 1250, and in 1278 Clement X made her the patron saint of Scotland. According to the statement of her confessor Theodoric, Margaret of Scotland was very active, generous, and even lavish in helping the poor. She had regularly 800 persons dependent on her charity, and did much towards softening the sufferings of the victims of the Scottish nobility. She founded a number of churches, working herself in adorning them, and gained her place in the Martyrology Romanum by her efforts to unite the Church of Scotland with that of Rome, and to civilize the country. She had worked no miracles, but her children were accounted such; among them was David I, "splendor generis," who Romanized Scotland. In after times her cathedral was destroyed by the Puritans, and her relics were scattered; such portions as were subsequently collected were transferred by Philip II to the Escorial. The "toast of Margaret" is named after her; pope Eugenius IV in 1430 attached to it an indulgence of forty days, but with the express condition that this toast should be the last. Margaret is commemorated June 16 by the Church of Rome.—Hernog., Real-Encyclop. ix, 94. (J. C.)

Margaret (or Marjory), Juan de, a Spanish cardinal, was born at Girona about 1415. He belonged to an ancient and illustrious house of Catalonia; one of his ancestors, Béramger, distinguished himself at the siege of Tyre. Margaret became doctor of theology at Girona; in 1435 he was elevated to the episcopal see of Elms. The king of Aragon, Alfred V, employed him in several important diplomatic missions to Naples, and he was so successful that he was made ambassador to pope Pius II. In 1461 Margaret became chancellor at Girona, and in this office mediated peace between Sixtus IV and the king of Naples, Ferdinand I. For his services to the holy see he was honored with the cardinal's hat towards the close of 1448. He died at Rome in 1444. See Hofer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxiii, 548.

Margarita (μαργάριτα, margaritum), the pearl, was the name given in the Greek Church to the vessel in which the consecrated host was kept. Margarite, on the other hand, designated the pieces of the host which the priest placed in a special vessel for the sick. These pieces were dipped in consecrated wine, and given to the sick with a spoon. See Du Fresne, Glos. Lat. ii, 510.

Margaridés. See Pearl.

Margarit, Jesus de (Father Antonio), an early Franciscan missionary to Texas, was born at Valencia Aug. 18, 1657, and died in Mexico Aug. 6, 1726. He was the author of El Peregrino Septentrional Atlante (Valencia, 1742). He is styled "Notario Apostolico," "Comisario del Santo Oficio," "Fundador y ex Guardian de tres Coligios," and "Prefecto de las Misiones de Propagand" Fide en todas las Indias Occidentales." See Hist. Mag. June, 1864, s. v.; Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s. v.

Marguerite of Valois. See MARGARET OF ORLEANS.

Margaritis, Maximus, an Eastern theologian, was born in Crete in 1522; studied divinity at Padua and Venice; became a monastic; in 1589 bishop of Cythera (Cerigo); and died at Crete in 1602. He published Παραλογίαν καί Θείον γίγνεται, as well as a collection of sacred poems in the Greek (Leyden, 1590); and Ἰεράς, Ἄγαλματος, —Regenburger Real-Encyklopädie, vol. iv, s. v.

Marheineke, Philip Konrad, an eminent German theologian and writer, was born at Hildesheim May 1, 1780. He studied theology at Göttingen, where he was made a professor in 1806. He afterwards became
successively professor in the University of Heidelberg in 1807, and professor in the university, and, in 1810, minister of the Trinity Church of Berlin, as colleague of the renowned Schleiermacher. He died in the capital of Prussia, May 31, 1846. Marheineke's studies were devoted to the church's symbols and dogmatics, which he treated from the speculative standpoint of Deist and Hegel. He was, indeed, the head of that fraction of the Hegelian school which asserted the coincidence of the Hegelian philosophy with Christianity. He was equally distant from the strict orthodox views held by the Lutheran, as from Rationalism, or from the old supernaturalism. He wrote Gesch. d. christlichen Moral seit d. Anfange d. Reformation (Nuremberg, 1805); Universalhistorie d. Christenthums (Kiel, 1806); Christliche Symbolik (Kiel, 1810-18, 3 vols.; Grundriss d. christlichen Dogmatik (Hamburg, 1811; 2d ed. 1827); - Institutiones symbolicae (1812; 3d ed. 1880); - Aphorismen z. Erneuerung d. Kirchlichen Lebens (1814); - Predigten (1814-18); - Geschichte d. deutschen Reformations (Berlin, 1816, 2 vols.; 2d ed. 1831-34, 4 vols.); - Grundriss d. christlichen Dogmatik (Hamburg, 1819; other ed. 1827); - Ottomar. Gespräche & Freiheit v. Willens u. göttliche Gnade (Berlin, 1821); - Lekhuch d. christl. Glaubens u. Lebens (Berlin, 1823; 2d ed. 1836); - Betrachtungen ü. d. Leben u. d. Lehre d. Welterlösers (Berlin, 1828); - Uber d. wahre Stufe d. philosophischen Rechts (1828); - Kontaktn. zu der christl. Lehre (Leipzig, 1840); - Entwurf d. praktischen Theologie (Berlin, 1837); - Predigten z. Verheißung d. evangelischen Kirchen gegen d. papistische (1838); - Einleitung in d. überl. Vorlesungen u. d. Bedeutung d. heiligen Philosophie in d. christl. Theologie (Berlin, 1842); - Der pietistische Leben d. christlichen (Maggdeburg, 1842); - Zur Kritik der Schleitheimischen Offenbarungskirkophilie (Berlin, 1843); - Der Erzbischof Clemens August als Friedensmittler zwischen Staat u. Kirche (Berlin, 1844); - Die Reform d. Kirche durch den Staat (1844); - Kurze Erklärung d. Reformation (1846); After his death his lectures were published, under title Vorlesungen über die christliche Dogmatik (1847); über die theologische Moral (1847); über die christliche Symbolik (1848); and über die Dogmengeschichte (1849). See Saintes, Hist. of German Rationalism, p. 254; Kahnis, Mod. German Protestantism, p. 344 sq.; Morell, Hist. of Modern Theology, ii, 195, 200; Brechenmacher, Dogmatik, i, 115 sq.; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, p. 255; and the excellent articles in Wagner, Staats-Lexikon, a. v.; Piezer, Universal-Lexikon, x, 871; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, i, 62.

Maria Angelica de S. Magdalena is the name by which Jaqueline, one of the daughters of Anthony Arnauld (q. v.), was known after she became the princess of the palace of the Duke of Porto Royal. "She at first led a very dissolute life, such as was common at that time in the French numeraries; but in 1609 the fear of God came upon her, and she entered upon a very different course of life; and afterwards becoming intimate first with Francia de Escobar, and then, in 1623, with the abbot of St. Cyran, she conformed herself both to her convent to their views and prescriptions. . . . The consecrated virgins inhabiting it followed with the utmost strictness the ancient, severe, and almost everywhere abrogated rule of the Cistercians; nay, they imposed on themselves more rigors and burdens than even that rule prescribed." Dr. Murdoch's Moslems, Eccles. Hist. bk. iv, cent. xvii, sec. ii, p. ii, ch. i, § 46. See Porto Royal. The relation which this retreat sustained to the Janissaries has been detailed in the article JANISSARIES, CORNELL (2).

Maria Theresa, empress of Austria and Germany, the daughter of Charles VI, was born at Vienna May 13, 1717, and succeeded to the throne, by the "Pragmatic Sanction," Oct. 21, 1740. With her secular history we have nothing to do here, but as to her influence on the interests of Romanism and Protestantism, we must add here a few particulars to the article on Austria. Although she held a position of great responsibility and influence in the Church, she endeavored to correct some of the worst abuses in the Church. She prohibited the presence of priests at the making of wills, abolished the right of asylum in her dominions, and converted towards the Catholicism of Milan, and in 1778 the Order of Jesuits. She also forbade that any person, male or female, should take monastic vows before the age of twenty-five years. She did nothing, however, to ameliorate the treatment of the Protestants in her dominions. She professed personal sympathy with their oppressed condition, but pretended to be unable to do anything for them on account of her coronation oaths and the laws of the country. This was especially the case in Hungary. Maria Theresa died Nov. 29, 1780, leaving as her successor to the throne Joseph II, who is noted for his generous efforts in behalf of his Protestant subjects. See Duller, M. Theresia u. Joseph II (Wiesbaden, 1844); Ramsboth, M. Theresia u. ihre Zeit (Leipzig, 1859 sqq.); Wolf, Oesterreich unter M. Theresia (1855); Cöste, House of Austria, iii, 188 sqq., 241 sqq.; Velses, Memoires of the Court of Austria, ii, 146 sqq. Comp. AUSTRIA; BOHEMIA; HUNGARY.

Mariales, XANTIA, an Italian theologian, was born at Venice at the close of the 16th century. He belonged to a patrician family of the Pinars. He was appointed lecturer at Padua, and afterwards inspector of the schools. These offices he filled till 1624, when he retired in order to give his whole time to politics. His zeal for the Church and his hatred towards France induced his expulsion from his native country twice. He retired to Bologna, afterwards obtained his recall from banishment, and died in April, 1660. We give him place here mainly on account of his many theological productions. The most important are Controversiae ad universam summam Theologiae St. Thomae Aquinatis (Venice, 1624, 2d ed.), — Biblioth. Interpretum ad univ. summ. theol. St. Thomas (Ven. 1660, 4to) — Stravaganz. nuovamente parziali nel Christianissimo regimen di Francia (Col. 1646 4to). — Enormitas inaudita nuovamente esitata in lucr nel Christianissimo regimen di Francia, contra il decoro della seda apostolica Romana in due libri introdotti: Pono: Dello arrogante potestà di Papa in dayina della chiesa Galli- cona; l'altro Del Diritto della Regalità (Ferr. 1648, 4to). — Hoefer, Nouv. Dict. Général, xxxiii, 615.

Mariannus (Μαριαννός, a Greek form of the Heb. מרים), the name of several females of the Herodian family. Maria is detailed by Josephus in the following the two following (see Smith, Dict. of Class. Biogr. &c.): 1. The daughter of Alexander, son of Aristobulus, and of Alexandra, daughter of Hyrcanus, high-priest of the Jews, was the most beautiful princess of her age. She married first the Great Antipas of Galilee, and afterwards Alexander and Aristobulus, and two daughters, Salampos and Cyprus; also a son called Herod, who died young, during his studies at Rome. Herod was excessively fond of Mariamne, who but slightly returned his passion, and at length cherished a deadly hatred towards him. Herod had her put to death, but afterwards his affection for her became stronger than ever. Josephus mentions a tower that Herod built in Jerusalem, which he named Mariamne. See HEROD. 2. A daughter of the high-priest Simon, and likewise wife of Herod from Galilee, who had a sister named Philip, who married first the infamous Herodias, afterwards paramour of Herod Antipas, and the instigator of the death of John the Baptist. See HERODIAN FAMILY.

Maria, Juan, a distinguished Spanish Jesuit, was born at Talavera, in the diocese of Toledo, in 1557. In 1544 he joined the Jesuits, and soon acquired great reputation for his historical, theological, and philosophical learning. In 1564 he taught philosophy at Rome (where the celebrated Bellarmino was one of his pupils), and in 1565 in Sicily; in 1569 he went to Paris, where he remained five years, and lectured on Thomas Aquinas. In 1574 he returned to Spain on account of his health.
When Leon de Castro questioned the orthodoxy of Arias Montanus for introducing rabbinical readings and commentaries into the Plantiniana Regia or Philippinian Polyglot, a new edition of the Complutensis which Montanus had undertaken at the command of Philip II, Mariana silenced the noisy polemic by his historical, ecclesiastical, and Biblical lore, as well as by the fair and candid terms of his dissection. But by the same operation, he lost all chance of preferment, which, however, he was glad to exchange for learned leisure and the gratification of his love of historical research. Mariana published next, in 1599, his imperfect work, De Ponderibus et Mensuris, a subject which his countrymen, Castilian, Aragonese, or Napoletan, had hitherto been treated separately. And the subject so extensive, expressed in classical Latin, met with universal favor and acceptance. A Spanish translation soon became necessary, and fortunately Mariana accomplished the task himself, and carried the work through four successive Spanish editions in his lifetime. Mariana has been charged with credulity; but traditions held sacred in times past, although rejected in the present age—prodigies which formed part of history, and which Mariana could not dismiss with the disdainful smile of modern criticism, are spots which will never obscure the brilliancy of his digressions on some of the most important events of the world—events which appear as great causes when so admirably interwoven with those peculiarly belonging to the history of Spain. The manly feelings of the historian, his noble indignation against crimes, his bold exposure of the misdeeds of princes and their abettors, deserve still higher commendation. Yet he, as well as Ferreras and Maxdeu more recently, has spared a gross instance of queen Urraca's licentious conduct; but, on the other hand, the defence of queen Blanca's highly creditable conduct is placed in a different light. It is true also that Mariana did not always examine all the original authorities, as Ranké observes in the Kritik seiner Geschichtsschreiber; but to institute an inquiry into every minor detail, to comprehend a wide field of inquiry, and yet to open new roads to disjoin old and new paths, would have required the perusal of whole libraries, and a single life would not have been sufficient to complete the undertaking. And if others had been invited, said by the labor of the investigation, a more time than that could have been set aside for the study of history. Mariana and the favorites were found too original and faithful to the living, as in the case of the deestable Fernandez Velasco, of Castile, and his worthy secretary Pedro Manzano. The secretaries, after the death of the new historian, tried to serve his master by his attack on Mariana, entitled De advertencias a la Historia de Mariana. He was discovered, however, and roughly treated by Tamayo Vargas in La Defensa de Mariana. Probably to this criticism may be traced the amendments in Mariana's second Spanish edition of his history, which appeared at Madrid in 1608. It is on this edition, and the various readings selected from the editions of 1617 and 1628, that the edition of Valencia is based.
which contains ample notes and illustrations (1783-96, 9 vols. 8vo). This edition also closes, like the original, with the reign of Ferdinand the Catholic (1516-15). There have subsequently been published at Madrid—1. The edition of Mariana by Keman, translated from the Latin by Romero (1803, fol.); 2. A complete Mariana, continued down to the death of Charles III, 1788, by Sabau y Blanco (1817—22, 20 vols. 4to); 8. Another by the same, brought down to the year 1808 (9 vols. 8vo), with portraits.

The profound erudition of Mariana is also displayed in another publication, his Tractatus Septem (Cologne, 1669). The second of these treatises, De Edificiis Vultur, is an epitome of his report on the fierce controversy between Arias Montanus and Leon de Castro. The fourth, De monochoma Monarchie, presents the indignation of the duke of Lerma and his partners in the system of general peculation and frauds which Mariana exposed. He foretold the calamities which threatened the Spanish nation; and his words, which had been disregarded, were remembered when the opportunity was gone. As a reward for proclaiming such unwelcome truths, at the age of seventy-three he suffered a whole year of judicial trickery, humiliations, and confinement in the convent of St. Francis at Madrid. In searching his papers another exposure was found, entitled Del goberno de la monarquia, or on the duties of a king, in which he also pointed out the means of correcting them. Copies of this MS. had multiplied so alarmingly that, the year after his death, the general of the Jesuits, Vitalasch, issued a circular, dated Rome, July 29, 1684, enjoining the collection of such papers in order to burn them. Still that measure did not prevent its being printed at Bordeaux in 1625, and reprinted elsewhere in several languages. This curious circular was found in the archives of the Jesuits of Valencia at the time of their sudden expulsion from the Spanish dominions in 1767. After his persecution he made an epitome of the Bibliotheca of Photius, translated some homilies, revised his History of Spain, and published a supplement, or, rather, a summary, of concise annals of Spain from 1516 to 1612. At the age of eighty-three he published his Escoria on the Old and New Testament, availing himself of the best Hebrew commentaries, and some valuable and very early MSS., which dated from the age of the ancient Gothic dominion in Spain. This work, though written at this advanced stage of life, "displays a degree of vigor and of learning which might well prove the model of modern Bibliomenont." It secured for him a place among the best commentators in the Histoire Critique de Vieux Testament of the hypercritic father Simon, who is usually unfavorable to Spaniards. Bayle, in his Dictionary, supposes Mariana to be also author of a work Respublica Christiana, but neither Alegambe nor Nicolas Antonio, both of them Spaniards, mentions it. Stevens, the English translator of Mariana's history, mistates some particulars of the author's life, and very unaptly compares him with Raleigh. Mariana left MSS., of at least twice the extent of all his publications. 1. An order of 1528, in the eightieth seventh year of his age and the forty-ninth of his retirement to Toledo. See Mondejar, Adversencias d' Mairana; Juicio y Noticia de las Historiadoras de España; Andrade, Vida de Mariana; Acosta, Vida de Mariana; Andr. Schot., Hispanic. Illustrat. Baroinus, Annual. Eccle- siastic.; Berthelot, Gerard, Pro Senatu Veneto, quoted in Colonhenius, Historia Orientalis; Rene Rapin, Reflexions sur l'Histoire; Nicolas Antonio, Bibliotheca Hispano- monica; Saavedra, Respublica Literaria; Tamayo de Vargas, Vida del P. Juan Mariana; Alegambe, Biblioth. scolastica; Beam, Historia de España; Herder, Vol. v.; Prosper Marchand, Dictionnaire; Fechter, Thesaurus Vivorum cla- rum, i, 847; Wolttmam, Greek u. Politik, 1807, i, 255; Sismondi, Littérature du Midi de l'Europe, iv, 100; Bour- terweck, Hist. de la Littérature Espagnole, 1812, vol. ii; Thicken, History of Spanish Literature, iii, 148; Banke, Zur Krise neuer Geschichtsbereder (1824); Herzog, Real-Encyclopæd. ix, 105 sqq.; Flierer, Universal-Lexikon, x, 884; Eng. Cyclopædia, s. v.; Hoefer, Nouv. biogr. Générale, xxxiii, 618 sq. (J. N. P.)

Marianists, an order of knighthood. See KNIGHT- hood, p. 182 (iv); TRIVONTIC KNIGHTS.

Marianus Scotus, a noted ecclesiastic, was born in Ireland in 1208, and died A.D. 1298; became a pilgrim, travelled on the Continent in 1508, especially in Germany, and frequented the German monasteries of Cologne, Fulda, and Mentz, and died A.D. 1086. Mariana Scotus was the first to correct the inaccurate chronologies of the chronicles in his christographia (3 vols. to 946; continued by Dödecin to 1090). It is part of his Spicilegia Scriptores rerum Germanicumum by Struve and others. The most valuable is the 5d volume, treating of the Carolingian and following emperors. See Haenaeu, De csaugiea, codex chroniar Mariani Scotti (Frankfort- on-the-Oder, 1792).

Marianstein, a noted place of pilgrimage in the Swiss canton of Solothurn, is annually visited by some 60,000 persons. The pilgrimages to this place began in the Middle Ages, and continue unabated to our day. During the first and second French Revolutions the place was occupied by the French soldiers, but the monasteries of the adjoining convent repaired and rebuilt is each time. See Wetzler u. Wele, Kirchen-Lez. xxvii. 767.

Marianzell, a famous place of pilgrimage in Austria, situated on the north border of the crown-land of Styria, twenty-four miles north of Bruck. It consists of a number of inns or lodging-houses, and contains 1200 inhabitants. It is visited by 300,000 pilgrims every year, who come hither to pay homage to an image of the Virgin believed to possess the power of working miracles, which was brought to Marianzell about 1157 by the Benedictine St. Lambrecht. A pilgrim church was first erected there about 1250 by margrave Henry I of Moravia, and in 1285 by Henry I of Hungary a pilgrim church in 1348. The large pilgrim church now standing was built near the end of the 17th century; the miracle-working image is within a chapel, closed by a heavy gate of solid silver. During the great annual procession from Vienna, the greater part of the pilgrims of both sexes spend the night in the woods in drinking, singing, and general riot and debauchery. See Hillisch, Der Pilger u. Tourist nach Mariazell (Vienna, 1855, 8vo).

MARIE A LA COQUER, a visionary, whose real name was Angélique Roussel, born July 22, 1547, at Lauthezor, in the diocese of Autun, France. She boarded on board various transports, and heavenly visions and revelations, besides which she is reported to have worked manifold wonders. She evinced a deep aversion to all evil in her infancy, and from her fourth year maintained an intimate communion with God. On the death of her father, which took place in the eighth year of her age, she entered a convent. Attributing the cure of a disease that had afflicted her during four years to the Virgin Mary, she gratefully adopted the name "Marie," and always used it by preference. She entered the Order of Salesians on the 27th of August, 1671, as a novice, and on the 6th of November, 1872, took the veil. From this time she claimed to be constantly favored with visions and revelations, and is said to have performed many miracles; such were her transports that she carved in large letters the name of Jesus on her breast. Her heart was known to have the title La vie de la vénérable Marie Margarette Maria; but her memory has been kept alive chiefly through the four songs, Vers-Ver, in Œuvres de M. Green (Amster- dam, 1748), i, 9-45. On the 4th of February, 1836, the advocate of the pontifical consistory addressed the ppo, for the first time, on the process of her beatification;
but Talleyrand, as bishop of her native diocese, had already sought to effect her canonization during the last decades of the 18th century.—Hergoz, Real-Encyklop. xxiv, 690; the Revue historique, 22 (1866), 331, by M. Bonnet.

Marie de l'Incarnation, a French female missionary, whose original name was Gignard, was born at Tournai in 1599. She early joined the Ursuline nuns; visited Canada in 1639, where she made many converts among the Indians; and founded a convent of her order. She died in 1677. See Charlesval, Vie de la Mère Marie de l'Incarnation; Biographie Universelle, a. v.

Marletué, a celebrated Hindu sage or demi-god, was, according to one account, the son of Brahma—according to another, the son of Bhrigu. He was the father of Kasyapa. By some he is considered as the god of 'light,' which appears to be the etymological signification of his name. See Moon, Hindu Pantheon; Institutes of Manu, chap. i; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythology, a. v.

Marillac, Charles de, a noted prelate of the Church of Rome, was born at Auvergne, in France, about 1510. He was advocate in the Parliament of Paris when, receiving himself suspected of Lutheranism, he followed John de la Forest, ambassador of France to Constantinople, and thus avoided persecution from the inquisitors. He afterwards became abbot of St. Pieré and archbishop of Vienne; also counsellor in the privy council, and a member of the college of cardinals. He died at Fontainebleau in 1560, and in it he advocated the calling of a national council and a meeting of the states-general, but without much effect. He endeavored to take measures to prevent the mischief threatening the country at that time, but, despairing of success, he became melancholic was preyed upon by disease, and died at his abbey of St. Pieré, in December, 1560.

Mar' in' moth (2 Esdr. i, 2), the Latin form of Mar'in' moth (q. v.).

Marin, Michel Ange, a French ecclesiastical writer, was born of a noble family at Marseilles in 1597. In 1714 he was admitted to the order of the Minimes, was employed in their schools, and four times filled a provincial office. He possessed not only a liking for theology and natural history, but also a natural taste for belles-lettres. His style is a little diffuse and some times weak and incorrect, without being entirely void of elegance. He died April 3, 1767, at Avignon. His works are published in five volumes, in the department of Pezenas, and contain the following:—

- Oeuvres de M. l'Abbé de M. Angue (Paris, 1752 and 1734, 4 vols., 12mo; Aix, 1744:—Conduite Spirituelle de la voie moral (Avignon, 1740, 12mo);—Aide de Dieu de M. l'Abbé de M. Angue (Avignon, 1752, 12mo);—Virginie, ou la vierge chrétienne, histoire Sicilienne (Avignon, 1752, 2 vols., 12mo);—Vie de Pères des déserts d'Orient, avec leur doctrine spirituelle et leur discipline monastique (Avignon, 1761-64, 3 vols. 4to, or 9 12mo; Lyon, 1764, 9 vols., 8vo);—Le Baron de Van Hees, ou la royauté des sociétés (Toulouse, 1764-65, 4 vols.);—Ages de Saint-Amour, ou la ferveur noire (Avignon, 1762, 2 vols. 4to; Marseilles, 1762);—Rhodoile ou l'enfant du bénéédiction (Avignon, 1762, 12mo);—Profite, ou la comédienne aussi (Avignon, 1762, 2 vols. 12mo; Marseilles, 1780);—La Marquise de los Valencés; et la Dame Chrétienne (Avignon, 1765, 2 vols., 12mo);—Lettres austères et morales (Avignon, 1769, 2 vols. 12mo).


Marina de Escobar. See Escobar.

Mariner (mér'n), 1. a seaman, comp. Gr. ὀδό.syn. "an old salt." Ezek. xxvii, 9, 27, 29; Jonah i, 5; Sir w. ὀδό, 1. a seaman. 2. "a seaman in a ship, as in ver. 28." 3. a sailor. See Note.

Marini, Giovanni Filippo, an Italian Jesuit and missionary, was born near Genoa in 1608; resided fourteen years at Tonking, Japan, and died in that country in 1677. He published Della Missione di padri della comp. di Gesù nella provincia di Giappone e particolarmente di quella di Tanshoo (Rome, 1668, 4to); and A Nova e Christiana Accouta di T. Giacomo Ministro, e Lao (1666), considered quite valuable.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, a. v.

Marino, or San Marino, one of the most ancient and most limited republic states of Europe, consists of a craggy mountain 2200 feet in height, situated amid the least fertile part of the Apennines. Its boundaries consist of five provinces formerly belonging to the pontifical states. It possesses a total area of twenty-one miles, and comprises a town of the same name, and several villages in the adjacent territory. The climate is healthy, but, owing to its exposure, high winds and frequent rains prevail. The inhabitants, who are reckoned at 8000, are noted for their hospitality, sobriety, industry, and general morality. They are sensitively jealous of their rights, and cling with tenacity to their territorial and legislative independence. The religion of the country is Roman Catholic. The early history of the republic is very obscure. During the medieval wars of Italy, Marino had its figs pious fews and factions, which seem to have been none the less envomened from the petteiness of the arena in which they were enacted. In 1740 the democratic form of government was securely guaranteed against further usurpations. The rights and privileges of the magistrates were scrupulously respected by Napoleon during his Italian campaign. The government, designated the Sovereign Grand Council (Generale Consiglio Principale), is composed of sixty members, of whom only three are nobles. From this number are selected the smaller "Council of Twelve" (two thirds from the town and the rest from the country), who, with the assistance of a jurisconsult, decide in questions of the second and third instance. The representatives of the state are termed captains-rectors (capi tani reggenti). They are chosen, three from the party of the nobles, the other two from the bourgeoisie. They each hold office for six months. The army, or rather the militia of the republic, numbers 1189 men.

Marinus, a martyr of the second half of the 8th century, is mentioned by Eusebius in his Hist. Eccl. vii, 15. According to this authority, Marinus was a high family, served in the army, and was about to be appointed a centurion of the army of General Gennadius (266-268) when he was denounced as a Christian by one of his fellow-soldiers. Brought before judge Acheaus, he acknowledged his Christian faith, and was given three hours to recant. During this respite he was taken to church by bishop Theoctests, by whom he was given a sword with one hand and the gospel with the other. Between them, Marinus joyfully chose the latter, returned to the judge, to whom he declared his choice, and was at once executed. A Roman senator, Asterius, who was a witness of the execution, carried away the body upon his own shoulders, laid him out in fine clothes, and buried him (see Acta Sanctor. ap. Bolland, t. 1, 3d ed. March). See also MARTIN II and III.

Another St. Marinus is commemorated on the 4th of September. He was a native of Dalmatia, and worked on the bridge of Rimini, when his pious life was noticed by bishop Gaudentius of Brescia, who persuaded him to enter the Church, and made him deacon. Marinus retired on the mountain of Titoano, where he erected a hermitage, and died towards the close of the 4th century. According to the legend, the miracle wrought at his tomb was a number of pilgrims, who, then settled there, and this gave rise to his sanctity.—Hergoz, Real-Encyklop. ix, 108; Pierer, Universal-Lexi- kon, x, 988; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxiii, 769.

Mariolatry (Gr. Mophs, Mary, and lampás, adoration) is the technical term given by the Protestant world to the society which the Romanists term the Virgin Mary. Romanists themselves term this worship Hyperdulia (q. v.), to distinguish it from the worship
paid to God, which they term Latria (q.v.), and adoration paid to saints, Divina (q.v.). In our articles Hyperdulia, Immaculate Conception, and Invocation of Saints, we have already pointed out the great difficulty of bringing distinctions so refined within the comprehension of the common mind, so as to prevent the multitude from mistaking the dispensing of graces instead of the Creator. "As mother of the Saviour of the world," says Dr. Schaff (Ch. Hist, ii, 410), "the Virgin Mary unquestionably holds forever a peculiar position among all women and in the history of redemption; and, from this pure vesture, she reminds us that it is perfectly natural, nay, essential to sound religious feeling, to associate with Mary the fairest traits of maidenly and maternal character, and to revere her as the highest model of female purity, love, and piety. But, on the other hand, it is equally unquestionable that she is nowhere in the N.T. excepted from the universal sinfulness and the universal need of redemption, nor represented as immaculately holy, or as in any way an object of divine veneration." Roman Catholics, however, have insisted upon the adoration, as they term worship in this instance, of the Virgin Mary, holding that Mary has been assumed in the Trinity, so as to make it a Quaternity: that "Mary is the complement of the Trinity" (Pusey, Eirenicon, ii, 167), and that the intercession of Mary is needed for the salvation of the followers of Jesus Christ. We quote the words of Liguori himself: "We must contemplate the humility and charity of Mary, who was the Mediator of Justice, and that by her merits she obtains us all grace and salvation; but we say that Mary is the Mediatrix of Grace; and that receiving all she obtains through Jesus Christ, and because she prays and asks for it in the name of Jesus Christ, yet all the same whenever graces we receive, they come to us through her intercession" (Glories of Mary, p. 124). There is certainly not a word in the Bible, nor in the creeds of the Apostolic Church, nor in the writings of the Church fathers of the first five centuries, to warrant any Christian in assigning such a position to Mary, the mother of Jesus, as the Catholic Church, both Latin and Greek, has dared to bestow upon her. One of the accepted interpreters of the Church of Rome, Liguori, in commenting on the exalted position which the Virgin Mary should hold in the estimation of Latin communions, says that she is Queen of Mercy (p. 13); that she is the Mother of all mankind (p. 28); that she offered her Son to the Father on Mount Calvary (p. 28); that she is especially the mother of repentant sinners (p. 42); that she is the Life (p. 52); that God was reconciled with man through her; that she bears our humility and purifies us (p. 46); that she obtains for us perseverance (p. 59); that she renders death sweet to her clients (p. 68); that she is the Protectress at the hour of death (p. 71); that she is the Hope of all (p. 79); that she is our only Refuge, Help, and Asylum (p. 84); that she is the Propitiator of the whole world (p. 81); that she is the one City of Refuge (p. 89); that it is her office to withhold God's arm from chastising sinners until he is pacified (p. 83); that she is the Comforter of the world, the Refuge of the unfortunate (p. 100); that we shall be heard more quickly if we call upon Mary than if we call upon the name of Jesus (p. 106); that she is our Patroness (p. 106); that she is Queen of heaven and hell, of all saints, and all evil spirits, because she conquered the latter by her virtues, and the devil by her fair humility and holy life (p. 110); that she protects us from the divine justice, and from the devil (p. 113); that in her is all hope of life and virtue, all grace of the Way and Truth (p. 125); that in her we find eternal salvation (p. 125); that no one can enter heaven except by her (p. 127); that all graces of the spiritual life are transmitted by Mary (p. 127); that all gifts, virtues, graces are dispensed by her, to whosoever, when, and as she pleases (p. 128); that from her the world receives every good (p. 128); that she is the Helper of the Redemption (p. 138); that she and her Son redeemed the world (p. 138); that she is the Co-operator in our justification (p. 138); that she is the intercessor instead of the Creator; that God says, "Go to Mary," when we seek for grace from him (p. 156); that the salvation of all depends on the favor and protection of Mary (p. 156); that the other saints intercede with her (p. 167); that all power is given unto her in heaven and earth (p. 145); that God obeys the command of Mary (p. 146); that Mary is omnipotent (p. 146); that the whole Church is under the dominion of Mary (p. 146); that what she wills is necessarily done (p. 147); that her prayers have something of a command in them (p. 151); that Jesus Christ is under an obligation to her to grant all she asks (p. 152); that she is the singular Refuge of the lost (p. 156); that she is the Advocate of the whole human race (p. 161); that her chief office in the world is to reconcile men to God (p. 167); that she is the great Peace-maker who obtains reconciliation, salvation, pardon, and mercy (p. 165); that in her is established the seat of God's government (p. 179); that she delivers her clients from hell (p. 183); that her clients will necessarily be saved (p. 184); that she has power to send her clients from hell to purgatory merely by her intercession (p. 185); that she translates the mortal sins (p. 188); that she consoles, relieves, and succors her clients in purgatory (p. 195); that she delivers her clients from purgatory by applying her merits (p. 195); that she carries away from purgatory all who are in the scapulary on the Saturday after they die, provided they have been chaste and have said her office (p. 196); that she does not suffer those who die clothed in the scapulary to go to hell (p. 185); that Mary leads her servants to heaven (p. 198); that she has the key of the gate of paradise (p. 199); that she is the Way of our salvation (p. 200); that it is for the love of Mary and on account of her merits that God is more merciful under the New than under the Old Dispensation (p. 214); that her powerful intercession sustains the world (p. 214); that she is the Throne of grace to which St. Paul bids us fly (p. 215); that Christ has promised that all who invoke the holy name of Mary with confidence shall have perfect sorrow for their sins, stoning for their crimes, strength to attain perfection, and shall reach the glory of paradise (p. 226), etc.

We will cite for the benefit of our readers some passages which have been translated directly on the field of doctrinal theology. Mary is not only titled by him "Queen, Mother, and Spouse of the King: to her belongs dominion and power over all creatures" (p. 13): "She is Queen of Mercy, as Jesus Christ is King of Justice" (p. 18). "If Jesus is the Father of souls, Mary is also their Mother. On two occasions, according to the holy fathers, Mary became our spiritual Mother. The first, according to blessed Albert the Great, was when she merited to conceive in her virginal womb the Son of God. This was revealed by our Lord to St. Louis, the father of the first order of the Temple, and by St. Bonaventure, and perplexed, and could not understand how Mary, being only the Mother of Jesus, could be said to have brought forth her first-born. God explained it to her, saying that Jesus was Mary's first-born according to the flesh, but that all mankind were her second-born according to the Spirit. That at one time Mary became our spiritual Mother, and brought us forth to the life of grace, was when she offered to the eternal Father the life of her beloved Son on Mount Calvary with such bitter sorrow and suffering" (p. 25). Thus it is that in every engagement with the internal forces we shall always certainly conquer by having recourse to the Mother of God, who is also our Mother, saying and repeating again and again, 'We fly to thy patronage, O holy Mother of God; we fly to thy patronage, O holy
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Mother of God! Oh, how many victories have not the faithful gained over hell by having recourse to Mary with this short and most potent prayer: 'Let it be that great servant of God, sister Mary, the crucified, of the Order of St. Benedict, always overcame the devil' (p. 26). 'Since the very tigers,' says our most loving Mother Mary, 'cannot forget their young, how can we forget these children of our, our, our Blessed Lady herself revealed to sister Mary, the crucified, that the fire of love with which she was inflamed towards God was such that, if the heavens and earth were placed in it, they would be instantly consumed; so that the ardors of the Seraphim, in comparison with it, would seem to his most sacred majesty (p. 81). 'Our Mother Mary, like a S. Francis Solano, who, maddened as it were (but with holy madness) with love for Mary, would sing before her picture, and accompany himself on a musical instrument, saying that, like worldly lovers, he adored her most sweet Queen' (p. 38). 'Let us love her as so many of her servants have loved her, and who never could do enough to show their love. Father Jerome of Texo, of the Society of Jesus, rejoiced in the name of slave of Mary; and, as a mark of servitude, went often to visit her in some church dedicated in her honor. On receptions to which he had been invited, he placed his feet upon the ground of tenderness and love for Mary; then prostrating, he licked and rubbed the paving with his tongue and face, kissing it a thousand times, because it was the house of his beloved Lady' (p. 38). 'Mary is the Mother of repose when she has been tried; and, if her feet implore her mercy, she does not consider the crimes with which he is loaded, but the intention with which he comes; and if this is good, even should he have committed all possible sins, the most loving Mother embraces him, and does not disdain to heal the wounds of his soul' (p. 45). 'My God,' she says, 'I had two sons—Jesus and man; man took the life of my Jesus on the cross, and now the justice would condemn the guilty one. O Lord! my Jesus is already dead; have pity on me; and if I have lost the one, do not make me lose the other also!' And most certainly God will not condemn those sinners who have recourse to Mary, and for whom she prays, since he himself commended them to her as her children' (p. 47). These passages are taken almost at random from Liguori's 'Glories of Mary,' chapter i, which is a paraphrase of the work of the Seraphic Father. These claims are moderate compared with those set up in the fifth chapter, entitled, Of the Necessity of the Intercession of Mary for our Salvation. 'S. Lawrence Justinian asks, 'How can she be otherwise than full of grace when it is the Lady herself who has opened the Gate of heaven, the most true Mediatrix between God and man?' (p. 121). 'That which we intend to prove here is that the intercession of Mary is now necessary to salvation; we say necessary—not absolutely, but morally. This necessity proceeds from the will itself of God that all graces that he dispenses should pass by the hands of Mary, according to the opinion of S. Bernard, and which we may now with safety call the general opinion of theologians and learned men. The author of The Reign of Mary positively asserts that such is the case. It is maintained by Vega, Mendoca, Paciachelli, Segnori, Poiré, Crasset, and by innumerable other learned authors' (p. 122).

Now what have we in holy Scripture to warrant such a position as is here taken by Liguori? Comparison, as distinct from contrast, requires the existence of some similitude, but take any passage in which Mary is mentioned, from the salutation down to the period after the ascension, and there is nothing in any way similar. It only remains, therefore, to contrast instead of comparing. But our readers are so well acquainted with holy Writ that we need not refer them to any other task, but only begging them to remember for things 1. That Mary is just as she is, and not otherwise in the Gospels; 2. That she is not mentioned at all in the Acts after the first chapter, or in the Epistles, although St. Paul has entered so minutely into the economy of the Christian scheme of salvation; 3. That all that prophet and Apostle has said of our Lord is by Romanists transferred to Mary; 4. That all those passages which speak of one Mediator between God and man not only ignore, but exclude the modern doctrine, pronounced by Dr. Scaflit, 'one of the principal points of some of the Romanists' 'Our Mother Mary, the Personification and evangelical Protestantism' (Ch. II, ii, 41). Lest the charge should be brought to our door that we have attributed to the Church of Rome the doctrines held by only a part of her communicants, or even only one of her priests, we continue our quotations from some words of her most learned writer, affirming the manner in which the Roman Catholic is taught to look upon the Virgin: "O thou, our Governor and most benignant Lady, in right of being his Mother, command your most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that he deign to raise our minds from longing after earthly things to the contemplation of heavenly things" (from the Crown of the Blessed Virgin, Psalter of Bonaventura). "We praise thee, Mother of God; we acknowledge thee to be a virgin. All the earth doth worship thee, the spouse of the eternal Father. All the angels and archangels, and all the powers of heaven doth worship thee, and serve thee. To thee all angels cry aloud, with a never-ceasing voice, Holy, holy, holy, Mary, Mother of God. . . . The whole court of heaven doth honor thee as queen. The holy Church throughout all the world doth honor thee, and praises thee, and prays to thee. . . . Thou sittest with thy Son on the right hand of the Father. . . . In thee, sweet Mary, is our hope; defend us forever more. Praise becometh thee; empire becometh thee; virtue and glory be unto thee forever and ever' (from a Parody on The Te Deum, by the same writer). "Whoever believes all things it is necessary that he hold the right faith concerning Mary; which faith, except one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish eternally. . . . He (Jesus Christ) sent the Holy Spirit upon his disciples, and upon his Mother, and at last took her up into heaven, where she sitteth on the right hand of her Son, and never cease to make intercession with him for us. This is the faith concerning the Virgin Mary, which, except every one do believe faithfully and firmly, he cannot be saved" (from a Parody on The Athanasian Creed, by the same writer)." The whole country of Gregory the Great, the people of Rome experienced in a most striking manner the protection of the Blessed Virgin. A frightful pestilence raged in the city to such an extent that thousands were carried off, and so suddenly that there had been no time to intercede, when a miracle took place. It could not be arrested by the vows and prayers which the holy pope caused to be offered in all quarters, until he resolved on having recourse to the Mother of God. Having commanded the clergy and people to go in procession to the church of our Lady, called St. Mary Major, carrying the picture of the Holy Virgin, painted by St. Luke, the miraculous effects of her intercession were soon experienced: in every street as they passed the plague ceased, and before the end of the procession an angel in human form was seen on the Tower of Adrian, named ever since the Castle of St. Angelo. At the same moment the angels were heard singing the anthem, 'Regina Celi,' 'Triumph, O Queen;' Hallelujah. The holy pope added, 'Ora pro nobis Deum,' 'Pray for us,' etc. The Church has since used this anthem to salute the Blessed Virgin in Easter time" (from Alphonse Liguori's The Glories of Mary). Gabriel Biel, Super Canonem Missae, says "that our heavenly Father gave the half of his kingdom to the most Blessed Virgin, Queen of heaven; which is signified in the case of Esther, to whom Ahaseurus promised the half of his kingdom. So St. Mary, so heavenly justice and mercy, retained the former, and conceded to the Virgin Mary the exercise of the latter." Antonius, archbishop of Flore.
ence, goes further yet than Gabriel Biel. We hesitate to record the profane blasphemies which are found in the writings of various popes, prelates, and divines on this subject. Stories of the Middle Ages, many ludicrous, many trivial, one or two sublime, are all penetrated with this single thought, that from Mary, and Mary alone, the salvation and happiness of man was reserved. It was in the very second of death, in the very act of sin, without the Eucharist, without the priest, at sea, in the desert, in the very home of vice, obtain instant and full remission; but, with Elliott (Delegation of Romanists, p. 754), "we refuse to name the vulgar preaching and rude discourses of friars and priests who induce the multitude into this worship, as being too indelicate for the ears of even an intelligent Romanist." The following we take from a Prayer of St. Bernard. "Remember, O most Holy Virgin Mary, that no one ever had recourse to your protection, implored your help, or sought your mediation without obtaining relief. Confiding, therefore, in your goodness, behold me, a penitent sinner, sighing out my sins before you, beseeching you to adopt me for your son, and to take upon you the care of my eternal salvation. Desist not, O Mother of Jesus, the pition of your humble client, but hear and grant my prayer." "Prayer. — O God of goodness, who hast filled the holy and immaculate heart of Mary with the same sentiments of mercy and tenderness for us with which thou hast filled Jesus Christ, thy Son and her Son, was alway overflowing; grant that all who honor this virginal heart may preserve until death a perfect conformity of sentiments and inclinations with the sacred heart of Jesus Christ, who, with thee and the holy Ghost, lives and reigns one God, forever and ever. Amen." "Amen." "And the angel said to Mary. "Thou hast given me in our doubts, consolation in our sorrows, and protection in our dangers! After thy Son, thou art the certain hope of faithful souls! Hail, hope of the desponding and refuge of the destitute, to whom thy Son has given such power that no one who seeks will be immediately done." From the Breviary: "O Holy Mary, succor the miserable, help the faint-hearted, comfort the afflicted, pray for the people, intercede for the clergy, make supplication for the devout female sex; let all be sensible of thy help who celebrate thy holy commemoration." "Grant, we beseech thee, O Lord God, that we, thy servants, may enjoy perpetual health of mind and body, and, by the glorious intercession of Blessed Mary, ever virgin, may be delivered from present sorrows, and come to eternal joy, through your Lord Jesus Christ. The Litany of the Sacred Heart of Mary deserves to be added: "1. Holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us! 2. Son of God, have mercy on us! 3. Holy Ghost, have mercy on us! 4. Jesus Christ, hear us! 5. Jesus Christ, graciously hear us! 6. God, the Father of heaven, have mercy on us! 7. God, the Redeemer of the world, have mercy on us! 8. God, the Holy Ghost, have mercy on us! 9. Holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us! 10. Heart of Mary, conceived without the stain of sin! 11. Heart of Mary, full of grace! 12. Heart of Mary, sanctuary of the Trinity! 13. Heart of Mary, tabernacle of the Incarnate Word! 14. Heart of Mary, refuge of sinners! 15. Heart of Mary, refuge of sinners! 16. Heart of Mary, advocate of the Church, and mother of all faithful! 17. Heart of Mary, after Jesus, the most assured hope of the living! 18. Heart of Mary, queen of angels and of the salvations! 19. Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world, have mercy on us, O Lord! 20. Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world, have mercy on us, O Lord! 21. Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world, have mercy on us, O Lord! 22. Most pure and amiable heart of Mary, Mother of God, pray for us! That our hearts may be inflamed with divine love."

The following is an extract from the ecyclical letter addressed by Gregory XVI to all patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops, bearing date Aug. 15, 1862, affording ample evidence that the same doctrine was approved by the highest authorities of the Roman Church even prior to the promulgation of the dogma of infallibility. "The possession of our see in the Lateran Basilica, according to the custom and institution of our predecessors, we turn to you without delay, venerable brethren; and, in testimony of our feelings towards you, we select for the date of our letter that at which we celebrate the solemn festival of the most Blessed Virgin's triumphant assumption into heaven; that she, who has been through every great calamity our patroness and protector, may watch over us writing to you, and lead our mind by her heavenly influence to those counsels which may prove most salutary to Christ's flock. . . . But that all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most Blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our greatest hope, yes, the entire ground of our hope." (Comp. here Kuts, Journal Sacrd Lit. i. 23; iv. 211; English Review, x, 850 sq.; Christ. Remembrancer, 1855 [Oct.], p. 417 sqq.; especially p. 448 and 449.) In view of such a document emanating from the head of the Church, what account can we make of the declaration of the Roman visars apostolic in Great Britain that "Catholics do solicit the intercessions of angels and saints in matters of grace, and of Christ in heaven; but in this, when done according to the principles and spirit of the Catholic Church, there is nothing of superstition, nothing which is not consistent with true piety. For the Catholic Church teaches her children not to pray to the saints as to the authors or givers of divine grace, but only to solicit the saints in heaven to pray for them in the same sense as St. Paul desired the faithful on earth to pray for him," except to consider it as a document well calculated for a Protestant latitude, but liable to be looked upon in Rome as semi-heretical? "What ideas also are we to entertain of the candor or veracity of those Romanists who cease not, after Bossuet and others, to affirm that 'they only pray to saints to intercede for them'? Here is the head of their Church performing a solemn act of worship to the deified Mary, on a day dedicated to her presumed assumption, invoking her, as his patroness and protector, in a time of great calamity, entreat her to aid him by her heavenly influence to that which would be salutary for the Church. Is this only to pray to her to undertake for us? The leader in this act of devotion has not only given to the church the visible, living, speaking guide of the Church. If this be not idolatry, then idolatry exists only in name" (Elliott, p. 754). Nor do we find in the present pontiff less devotion to the Virgin, if we may base our knowledge on the official documents issued in his name. In the decree of Nov. 8, 1854, Pius IX urges all Catholics, colere, suavescere, erovere beatissimam Dei genitrices, translated as follows by the Tablet (Jan. 27): "Let all the children of the Catholic Church most dear to us hear these words; and, with a most ardent zeal of piety and love, pronounced Swaggering prayer to the most Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, conceived without original sin" —the head of the Roman Catholic Church urging on his subjects a greater zeal and ardor in the worship of Mary than that which St. Alfonso had displayed. In the same decree he states that "the purpose of this devotion" is Mary's "conception." How that act can be an object of devotion, it is difficult intelligently to imagine. But such is Mariology. Not only do we now find the adoration of the Mother of God permitted, but actually commanded. The devotion to the Blessed Virgin, says Cramp (p. 400) justly, "is the most extravagant honor and veneration. The language adopted in addressing 'Queen of heaven' cannot be accrued of the charge of blasphemy, since prayers which are offered directly to her as to a divine being, and blas-
ings are supplicated as from one who is able to bestow them. In all devotions she has a share. The Ave Maria accompanies the Pater Noster. 'Evening, morning, and at noon,' said the Psalmist, 'will I pray unto thee, and cry aloud;' the pious Roman Catholic transposes these services to the Virgin. In tender childhood he is taught to believe in her as the protectress of reversion and the highest affection; throughout life she is the object of his daily regard, and five solemn festivals, annually observed to her honor, call forth his ardent love and zeal, and in the hour of death he is taught to place reliance on her protection. The Ignatian readers will have held on the lip of the Christian Church for, there is not a word about it in the writings of the fathers of the first five centuries. 'We may scan each page that they have left us, and we shall find nothing of the kind. There is nothing of the sort in the supposed works of Hermes and Barnabas, nor in the real works of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp; that is, the doctrine is not to be found in the 1st century. There is nothing of the sort in Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian; that is, in the 2nd century. There is nothing of the sort in Origen. Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius, Cyprian, Methodius, Laure- tius; that is, in the 3rd century. There is nothing of the sort in Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Hilary, Macarius, Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Euphem Syrus, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose; that is, in the 4th century. There is nothing of the sort in Chrysostom, Augustine, and Basil of Caesarea. John Chrysostom, Isidore, Theodoret, Prosper, Vincentius Lirinensis, Cyril of Alexandria, pope Leo, Hilarius, Simplicius, Felix, Galianus, Anastasius, Synnachus; that is, in the 5th century. Nor is there the least trace of Mariolatry among the remains of the Catacombs. Says a writer in the London Q. Rev. July, 1864, p. 86: 'As regards the sacred person of the Virgin, she takes that place only in the art of the Catacombs which the purity of earlier Christianity would lead us to predicate. She is seen there solely in a sculptural and historical sense—in the subject of the Adoration of the Wise Men who found the young child and his mother.' And this even takes its place among the later productions of classic-Christian art; while the subject of the Nativity, which occurs on two sarcophagi, evidently belongs to the last decline of that period. With these two exceptions, no trace of a representation of the Virgin can be found in the mural or sculptural art of the Catacombs. We cannot do better than sum up this portion of our subject in the words of the Rev. E. Tyler, to whose conscientious labors every student of Christian antiquities is so much indebted: 'We have no idea to the present day what the appearance of the Virgin was. The term means the remains of Christian antiquity. Especially have we searched into the writings of those whose works (A.D. 492) received the approbation of the pope and his council at Rome; we have also diligently sought for evidence in the records of the early councils; and we find all the genuine and unsuspected works of Christian writers—not for a few years, or in a portion of Christian-dom, but to the end of the first five hundred years and more, in every country in the Eastern and the Western empire, in Europe, in Africa, and in Asia—testifying that the Virgin's apocryphes knew of no belief in the present power of the Virgin, and her influence with God; no practice, in public or private, of prayer to God through her mediation, or of invoking her for good offices of intercession, and advocacy, and patronage; no offering of thanks and praise made to her; no assumption of power, of temporal glory to her name. On the contrary, all the writers through those ages testify that to the early Christians God was the only object of prayer, and Christ the only heavenly Mediator and Intercessor in whom they put their trust (p. 290). They also testify that the origin of the worship of Mary is to be traced to the apocryphal legends of her birth and of her death, which, in the course of time, decorated the life of Mary with fantastic fables and wonders of every kind, and
thus furnished a pseudo-historical foundation for an unscriptural Mariology and Mariolatry (compare Janus, Pope and Council, p. 84 sq.). It is in these productions of the Gnostics (q. v.) that we find the germ of what afterwards expanded into its present portentous proportion, and furnished the basis of her biographies as early as the 2d or 3d century. But to the honor of the Christian of that day be it remembered that they unanimously and firmly rejected these legends as fabulous and heretical. Witness the conduct of the Church towards the Collyridians (q. v.), and the excesses in the opposite direction it gave rise to by the formation of a sect known as the Antidioecorianianites (q. v.). “The whole thing,” says Epiphanius, when commenting upon the unwarranted practices of the Collyridians, “is foolish and strange, and is a device and deceit of the devil. Let Mary be in honor. Let the Lord be worshipped. Let no one worship Mary” (Heret. lxxix, in Opp. p. 1066, Paris, 1692).

Indeed, down to the time of the Nestorian controversy of A.D. 486, the cultus of the Blessed Virgin, it would appear, was wholly external to the Church, and was regarded as heretical. It was this controversy that first produced a great change of sentiment in men’s minds. Nestorius had maintained, or at least it was the tendency of Nestorianism to maintain, not only that our Lord had two natures, the divine and the human (which was the substance of his tenacious belief that he was two persons), in such a sort that the child born of Mary was not divine, but merely an ordinary human being, until the divinity subsequently united itself to him. This was condemned by the Council of Ephesus in the year 431; and the title Theotokos, loosely translated “Mother of God,” was sanctioned. The object of the council and of the Anti-Nestorians was in no sense to add honor to the Mother, but to maintain the true doctrine with respect to the Son. Nevertheless the result was to magnify the Mother, and, after a time, at the expense of the Son. For now the Mother became a divinity, and in art the representation of the Madonna and Child became the expression of orthodox belief. Very soon the purpose for which the title and the picture were first sanctioned became forgotten, and the veneration of Mary began to spread within the Church, as it had previously existed external to it. The legends, too, were no longer treated as apocryphal. Neither were the Gnostics any longer the objects of dread. Nestorians, and afterwards Iconoclasts, in turn became the objects of hatred. The old fables were winked at, and thus they universally became incorporated into the Christian mythology of the northern nations of Europe, while many of the dogmas which they are grounded upon have, as a natural consequence, crept into the faith. “Thenceforth the Theotokos was a test of orthodox Christology, and the rejection of itamounted to a rejection of all heresy.” The overthrow of Nestorianism was at the same time the victory of Mary-worship. With the honor of the Son, the honor also of the Mother was secured. The opponents of Nestorius, especially Proclus, his successor in Constantinople († 447), and Cyril of Alexandria († 444), could scarcely find predecessors enough to express the transcendent glory of the Mother of God. She was the crown of virginity, the indestructible temple of God, the dwelling-place of the Holy Trinity, the paradise of the second Adam, the bridge from God to man, the loom of the incarnation, the sceptre of orthodoxy; through her the Trinity is glorified and adored, the devil and demons put to flight, the nations converted, and the fallen creature raised to heaven. The people were all on the side of the Ephesian decision, and gave vent to their joy in boundless enthusiasm, amid bonfires, processions, and dances (Schaff, ii. 428). “Is it not exactly the fact that the giving of this title (Theotokos) was the cause of the cultus, for some of the fathers before that time had employed the word to express the doctrine of the incarnation, as the two Gregories did; it was the Nestorian heretics who really drove the Catholic mind to plying her the tribute of devotion; and even then it seems as if the cultus of that time was far more in honor of the Son than of the Mother, more a mode of testifying the belief in the validity of the true doctrine of the incarnation, denied by the Nestorians, than of the Godhead of the Mother.” When she was addressed as the ‘Mother of God,’ when she was represented as the Mother with her infant Son, she appeared, it is true, as the prominent figure; but it was to express clearly the Catholic doctrine of the incarnation—the two natures in one person of Christ. We can see how easily the mind of the worshipper would penetrate further, and, from looking at her merely as the Theotokos, would see in the Mother of God one possessed of a mother’s influence and power” (Christian Remembrancer, 1866, July, p. 186, 187).

From this time the worship of Mary grew apace; it agreed well with many natural aspirations of the heart. To paint the mother of the Saviour an ideal woman, with all the graces and tenderness of womanhood, and yet with none of its weaknesses, and then to fall down and worship that which the imagination had set up, was what might easily happen, and did happen. Evidence was not asked for. Perfection was becoming the mother of the Lord, therefore she was perfect. Adoration “was befitting” on the part of Christians, therefore they gave it. Any tales attributed to antiquity were received as true, and as religious truths. The common run of the saints were accepted as true; and the Madonna reigned as queen in heaven, in earth, in purgatory, and over hell. The mother of the Saviour soon became the Mother of Salvation, as John of Damascus calls her (I Hom. in Ann.); “the common salvation of all in extremity” (ἡ πάντων ὑπὸ τῶν παρόντων τῆς γῆς εἰσόδου). “The alone Mother of God, who art to be worshipped (ἡ προσκυνητὴ) forever.” Nestorianism lived on, and lives still, when other earlier heresies on the nature of Christ—like Ariantism—have died; nay, when those who have always held it, it would seem, in their hearts, and in art, showed their orthodoxy by honoring the Mother of God, their abhorrence of heresy by rendering her worship. Thus arose the story of her assumption, and the festival (Aug. 15) in honor of that supposed event. She then became the Mater Coronata, endowed with power both in heaven and earth. Language was addressed to her such as belonged only to God; e.g. Peter Damian, in a sermon (In Nativ. B. V. M.), speaks thus: “Et data est omnibus potestas in celo et in terra: nil tibi impossible, cui possible est desperatus in spem beatissimissimae nostrae Mariae. Quoniam enim ex omnibus poteris obviam, quia de carne tua carnem suam spiriuitiorem accedis? Accedis enim ante illud suumurum humanae reconciliacionis altare, non solum regnum sed imperia, dominia non ancilia.” Under such teaching as this we need not marvel at the overgrowth of which the cultus was. “From that time,” says Dr. Schaff, “numerous churches and altars were dedicated to the holy Mother of God, the perpetual Virgin; among them also the church at Ephesus in which the anti-Nestorian Council of 481 had sat. Justinian, I, in a law, implored her intercession with God for the restoration of the Roman empire, and on the dedication of the costly altar of the church of St. Sophia he expected all blessings for church and empire from her powerful prayers. His general, Narses, like the knights in the Middle Age, was unwilling to go into battle till he had secured her protection. Pope Boniface IV, in 608, turned the Pantheon in Rome into a temple of Mary ad martres; the pagan Olympus into a Christian heaven of gods. Subsequently even her images (made after an original pretending to have come from Luke) were divinely worshipped, and, in processions, performed countless miracles, before some of which the miracles of the Gospel history grow dim. She became almost co-ordinate with Christ, a joint redeemer, invested with most of his own attributes and acts of grace. The popular belief ascribed to her, as to Christ, a无数 concep-
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ston, a sinless birth, resurrection and ascension to heaven, and a participation of all power in heaven and earth. She became the centre of devotion, cultus, and art, and the popular symbol of power, of glory, and of the final victory of Catholicism over all heresies" (ii, 424, 425).

In the 6th century the practice became general within the Church, both in the East and in the West, and the worship of her was carried on with the post-Nicene period, in which we have brought in this innovation with many others, down to the 16th century, are now found to relate the unsoiled privileges of the Virgin, and with an enthusiasm constantly growing until checked by the opposition of the Reformers, who found in Mary as a mediator with her Son. This devotional enthusiasm was carried to its greatest height by St. Bernard (q. v.), and still more so by Bonaventura (cited above), who, Dr. Wiseman says, was one of the saints and luminaries of the Roman Catholic Church, and every Roman Catholic prayed that he may be enlightened by his teaching and benefited by his prayers. It is Bonaventura who gave the following version of the 51st Psalm: "Have pity upon me, 0 great queen, who art called the Mother of Mercy; and, according to the tenderness of that motherly heart, reproach the impieties with which it runs throughout. The 149th Psalm is—Sing a new song in honor of our Queen. Let her just publish her praises in their assemblies. Let the heavens rejoice in her glory: let the isles of the sea and all the earth rejoice thereupon. Let water and fire, cold and heat, brightness and mystery, everything which is the mother of the Virgin, glorify her; let her praises resound in the triumphant company of the saints. City of God, place thy joy in blessing her, and let songs of praise continually be sung to her by thy illustrious and glorious inhabitants.

Promotion of Mariology by religious Art. —Ever since the condemnation of Nestorius the popular doctrine had found its abest support in art. The representation of that beautiful group, since popularly known as the Madonna and Child, became the expression of the orthodox faith. "Every one who wished to prove his hatred of the arch-heretic exhibited the image of the maternal Virgin holding in her arms the infant Godhead, either in his house as a picture, or embroidered on his garments, or on his furniture, or his personal ornaments—in short, wherever it could be introduced" (Mrs. Jameson, Legends of the Madonna, p. xxi).

With the extension and popularity of the worship of the Virgin, the multiplication of her image, in every form and material, naturally enough spread throughout Christendom, until suddenly checked by the iconoclastic movements of the 8th century [see Iconoclasm], and, descending the Middle Ages, the various Christian nations contributed to the glory and honours of the Mother of the Virgin; but strange fancies were now as freely interpolated in the productions of the artist, which, though themselves but "the reflex influence of that interpolation of new doctrines which had been going on in the Church for so many centuries" (Hill, Eng. Monasticism, p. 329), nevertheless received the disapprobation of pious Catholics of that age, who "cried out 'teremateriam, scandalam, et periculosum,' when they saw the most solemn spectacle in the world's history made the sport of wanton imaginations... the sorrow of the cross made to rest more heavily upon the mother of Christ than upon him" (Hill). The Council of Trent felt itself forced to denounce the impropriety of certain pictures, and it was generally acknowledged that paganized and degenerate influences had overruled spiritual art, that the latter was indeed no more, that "it was dead; it could never be revived without a return to those modes of thought and belief which had at first inspired it" (Mrs. Jameson).

Just at this time "theological art," as Mrs. Jameson calls it, came to the rescue of Mariology. It is true the Reformation at the opening of the 16th century had dealt a severe blow at its root, but the tide of the new mania savoring of idolatry and superstition, but this was only an additional reason why the Church of St. Peter should seek to fortify herself the more strongly in the fortress so severely assailed by the enemy. Mariology had served her purpose, and just now, if ever, needed re-enforcing. Deprived of the aid of "religious art," the poets and artists no longer wrought up to a wild pitch of enthusiasm to inspire the spirit of worship of the Virgin, the infallible guide of the Church himself came to the rescue, and supplied by "theological art" what was needed. In 1571 the battle of Lepanto was fought. In it the combined fleets of Christendom, led by Don Juan of Austria, were arrayed against the Turks, and achieved a memorable victory over the devout adherents of the prophet of Mecca. Pope Pius V quickly availed himself of this opportunity, and "the special interposition of the Blessed Virgin," From a very early period in Mariology we find festivals instituted in honor of the "Blessed Virgin," but now a new festival, that of the Rosary, was added to those already observed, a new Invocation added to her litany, under the title of Our Lady of the Rosary. In all, many sanctuaries were declared to be especially sacred to her worship, and thus a prominence was given to her devotion which found its full expression only in our
own day, on Dec. 8, 1854, when this dogma, conceived in the silence of the cell by the brain of infatuated monks, was canonized by a helpless pontiff, and the doctrine estab-
lished "that not only did the Virgin Mary imma-
culately conceive her son Jesus Christ (as Protestants hold), but was as immaculately conceived herself" (Hill, p. 109, in "Mystics and the Question of Conception," p. 281 sq.).

Well, indeed, may it be said that "the contro-
versy with Rome threatens more and more to resolve it-
self into the question whether the creed of Christendom is to be based upon the life of Jesus or the life of Mary, upon the canonical or the apocryphal Gospels" (Furn-
pape, Christ and the Gospels, p. 181, 1866). [Boyle & H. 1866, p. 34 M.]

Need we wonder, then, that Bishop Bull waxes warm when this abomination presents itself for his comment, and is made to speak in the following severe strain: "We abominate the impious imposture of those who have translated the most humble and holy Virgin into an idol of pride and vanity, and represented her as a vainglorious and aspiring creature; like Lucifer (I trem-
ble at the comparison), thirsting after divine worship and honor, and seeking out superstitious men and women, whom she may oblige to her more special service, and who, like her own mortal sisters, must do what greater or lesser affront than this could they have offered to her hu-
ility and sanctity? How futile, yea, how perfectly loathsome to us are the tales of those that have had the assurance to tell us of the amorous addresses of the Bithynian priests, and of the guileful worship-
ners, choosing them for her husbands, bestowing kisses liberally on them, giving them her breasts to suck, and presenting them with bracelets and rings of her hair as love-tokens! The fables of the Jewish Tal-
mudists, yea, of Mohammed, may seem grave, serious, and other histories, compared to those and other such imprudent fictions. Insomuch that wise men have thought that the authors of these romances in religion were no better than the tools and instruments of Satan, used by him to expose the Christian religion, and ren-
der it ridiculous, and thus introduce atheism. And, in-
deed, we are sure that the Bithynia of Italy, where these abominable deceits have been and are chiefly counte-
nanced, were the first brokers and patrons of infidelity and atheism in Europe, since the time that Christianity obtained in it." "We honor the Virgin Mary," says Mr. Kendall (Worship, p. 891), one of the latest and most critical students of early Church history and Chris-
tian antiquities, "we love her memory, we would, by God's grace, follow her example in faith and humility, meekness and obedience; we bless God for the wonderful work of salvation, in effecting which she was a chosen vessel, a mother of the blessed and holy Virgin; we cannot doubt of her eternal happiness through the merits of him who was 'God of the substance of his Fa-
ther before the world, and man of the substance of his mother born in the world.' But we cannot address re-
ligious phrases to her; we cannot trust in her merits, or intercession, or advocacy, for our acceptance with God; we cannot invoke her for any blessing, temporal or spiri-
tual; we cannot pray to God through her intercession, or for it. This in us would be sin. We pray to God alone; we offer religious praise, our spiritual sacrifices, to Christ in God alone. We trust in God alone. We need no other mediator, we apply to no other mediator, intercessor, or advocate, in the unseen world, but Jesus Christ alone, the Son of God and the Son of man. In this faith we implore God alone, for the sake only of his Son, to keep us steadfast unto death; and, in the full assurance of the belief that this faith is founded on the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-
stone, we will endeavor, by the blessing of the Eternal Shepherd and Bishop of souls, to preserve the same faith, as our Church now professes it, whole and unde-
filed; and to deliver it, both in word and in deed, from all taint of superstition, to our children's children, as their best inher-
itage forever."
connected with that of Abgarus (q. v.), and deserves no credit. The Chaldæan Christians class him with their principal saints as the Apostle of Mesopotamia, and ascribe to him the composition of their liturgy in part. 2. A second Marius, better known in the West, is noted solely because to him is addressed the letter of Ibas, president of the theological school at Edessa, which is preserved in the Codex Ibarrius (c. i., col. 209). Acts of the fifth eunumerical council held at Constantinople in 553, and which the Nestorians afterwards regarded as a kind of confession of faith. 3. Another Marius was sur- named Bur-Tobi. He became patriarch of the Persian Nestorians in 607, and is remarkable as the first patriarch who derived his authority from the caliphs. 4. A fourth of this name, distinguished by the name of Solo- mon's son, lived in the 12th century, and wrote a history in Arabic of the Nestorian patriarchs, of which Asemi- mani (Bibliotheca Orient. iii, 554 sq., 561 sq.) furnishes an epitome. 5. Finally, Theodoret (q. v.) narrates an anecdote of still another Marius, which is noteworthy chiefly because of the light which it throws on the views of that bishop, and of the use which Romanists have made of it. Marius was a hermit, who had long desired to see the mysteries, offered to the sacrificial vessels, and Theodoret joyfully complied with his wish. The sacred vessels were taken to his retreat, the hands of the deacons served as an altar, “and thus,” says the bishop, “I offered the mysterious, divine, and saving sacrifice” in his presence. Roman writers find in these words the support of a father distinguished for his devotion of the 6th century an argument in favor of the Mass. See Theodoret, Religiosa historia, c. 2; Wetzel und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. xii, 769. See also NESTORIUS.

Mar'issa (Maprasi), the Granized form (2 Macc. xii, 85) of Marashah (q. v.).

Marius Aventicus, a Swiss prelate, was born in a noble French family of Autun, near the middle of the 6th century. From childhood he was destined for the Church, and his literary remains furnish evidence that he received a careful training. He was made bishop of Aventicum, now Avenches, in the canton Waadt, in 578, or, as some state, in 580. The times were tumultuous, the population depleted, the country impoverished. In these circumstances he distinguished himself by a praiseworthy frugality, and a devotion to agricultural pur- suits that furnished the means for a lavish liberality. He was bounteous to the poor, and generous to the Church. In honor of Mary Storikos, he rebuilt the town of Payerne (Pateriacum) on its own lands, and dedicated its church to her; he also donated to this church a piece of land. It is not stated, however, that the chapter of Lausanne should derive its tithes from Payerne and two neighboring towns. In the specific work of the episcopal office he was tireless—a model ecclesiastic for the times. Serving his God with reverence and in humility, he was an impartial judge, a protector of the oppressed, and a devoted shepherd to his flock. Towards the close of his life he translated his see to Lausanne, which from that time gave its name to the diocese. The only additional fact connected with his life that has come to our knowledge is that he was present at the Synod of Macon in 585, which was convened by Guntram, a son of Chlotar, to attempt the purification of the Church in his dominions by executing justice on unworthy members of the clergy. Marius is supposed to have died in 586, and was commemorated at first on the 91st of December, but now by the 9th of December. The continu- ation of the work of Prosper Aquit., are the only writings of his that have reached our time which may justly be ascribed to him. They were published at Paris, in the collections of Du Chesne and Dom Bouquet; at Venice, in the Bibliotheca orient. patrum; and, the best manual, by Rickly, in the Mémoires et documents publiés par la société d'histoire de la Suisse Romande, tom. xii. See Zurlauben, Mémoire sur Marius, in the Mém. de l'acad.
from meeting him in his mother's house, for he speaks of "Marcus my son" (1 Pet. v. 13). This term has been taken as implying the natural relation by Bengel, Neander, Credner, Hottinger, Tholuck, Stanley (Serm. on the Apost. Age, p. 36), but this is contrary to the view of the earlier writers (Ursigen, ap. Eusebius, H. E. vi, 25; Eusebius, H. E. ii, 15; Jerome, De Vir. Ill. i. 25). The theory that he was one of the seventy disciples is without any warrant. Another theory, that an event of the night of our Lord's betrayal (A.D. 29), related by Mark alone, is one that beffiled himself (Oehler, Lange), must not be so promptly dismissed. "There followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body, and the young men laid hold on him: and he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked." (Mark xiv, 51, 52). The detail of facts is remarkably minute; the name only is wanting. The most probable view is that Mark suppressed his own name, while telling a story which he had the best means of knowing. Awakened out of sleep, or just preparing for it, in some house in the valley of Kidron, he comes out to see the seizure of the betrayed Teacher, known to him and in some degree beloved himself. He is so deeply interested in his fate that he follows him even in his thin linen robe. His demeanor is such that some of the crowd are about to arrest him; then, "fear overcoming shame" (Bengel), he leaves his garment in their hands and flees. We can only say that if the name of Mark is supplied, the text gives its most probable explanation (John i, 40, xix, 25) introduces himself in this unobtrusive way, and perhaps Luke the same, xxiv, 18. Mary the mother of Mark seems to have been a person of some means and influence, and her house a rallying-place for Christians in those dangerous days (Acts xii, 12). A.D. 44. Her son, already an inquirer, would soon become more anxious to work for Christ, he went with Paul and Barnabas as their "minister" (ἀρσιστός) on their first journey; but at Perga, as we have seen above, turned back (Acts xii, 25; xiii, 18). On the second journey Paul would not accept him again as a companion, but Barnabas his kinsman was more indulgent; and thus he became the cause of the memorable "sharp contention" between them (Acts xx, 36-40). Whatever was the cause of Mark's vacillation, it did not separate him forever from Paul, for we find him by the side of that apostle in his first imprisonment at Rome (Col. iv, 10; Phil. cm. 24). A.D. 56. In the former place a possible journey of Mark to Asia is spoken of. Somewhat later he is with Peter at Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13). Some consider Babylon to be a name here given to Rome in a metaphorical sense. See above. Without a doubt a letter is not the place to look for a figure of speech. Of the causes of this visit to Babylon there is no evidence. It may be conjectured that he made the journey to Asia Minor (Col. iv, 10), and thence went on to join Peter at Babylon. On his return to Asia he seems to have been with Timothy at Ephesus when Paul wrote to him during his second imprisonment, and Paul was anxious for his return to Rome (2 Tim. iv, 11). A.D. 64.

When we desert Scripture we find the facts doubtful, and even inconsistent. If Papias be quoted (as quoted in Eusebius, H. E. iii, 39), Mark never was a disciple of our Lord, which he probably infers from 1 Pet. v. 18. Epiphanius, on the other hand, willing to do honor to the evangelist, adopts the tradition that he was one of the seventy-two disciples who turned back from our Lord at the hard saying in John vi (Comp. Hier. ii, 6, p. 457, Dindorf's recent edition). The same had been said of Luke. Nothing can be decided on this point. The relation of Mark to Peter is of great importance for our view of his Gospel. Ancient writers with one consent make Mark the evangelist the interpreter ("soupèter") of the apostle Peter (Papias in Eusebius, H. E. iii, 39; Ireneaus, Hier. ii, i; iii, 10; Tertullian, c. Marc. iv, 5; Jerome, ad Hedib. vol. ii, etc.). Some explain this word to mean that the office of Mark was to translate into the Greek tongue the Aramaic discourses of the apostle (Eichhorn, Bertholdt, etc.); while others adopt the more probable view that Mark wrote a Gospel which conveyed more exactly than the others to Peter's preaching, and thus "interpreted" it to the Church at large (Valentius, Alford, Lange, Fritzsche, Meyer, etc.). The passage in Eusebius, H. E. ii, 15; Jerome, De Vir. Ill. i, 25, is a quotation from Papias. This also [John] the elder said: Mark, being the interpreter of Peter, wrote down exactly whatever things he remembered, but yet not in the order in which Christ either spoke or did them; for he was neither a hearer nor a follower. "This he said, but he was afterwards, as I [Papias] said, a follower of Peter. The words in italics refer to the word interpreter above, and the passage describes a disciple writing down what his master preached, and not an interpreter orally translating his words. See MArk, Gospel of. The report that Mark was the companion of Peter at Rome is no doubt of great antiquity. Clement of Alexandria is quoted by Eusebius as giving it for a "tradition which he had received of the elders from the first" (ἐν πρώτων εἰς διδάχης παρ' αὐτούς, Eusebius, H. E. iii, 11; Clem. Alex. 1. iv. p. 6). But the force of this is invalidated by the suspicion that it rests on a misunderstanding of 1 Pet. v. 18, Babylon being wrongly taken for a typical name of Rome (Eusebius, H. E. ii, 15; Jerome, De Vir. Ill. i, 8). Sent on a mission to Egypt by Peter (Epiphanius, Hier. ii, 6, p. 457, Dindorf; Eusebius, H. E. ii, 16; Jerome, De Vir. Ill. i, 8) he passed through Jerusalem (Jerome, De Vir. Ill. i, 8), and preached in various places (Niceronius, H. E. ii, 48), then returned to Alexandria, of which Church he was bishop, and suffered martyr's death (Niceronius, ibid., and Jerome, De Vir. Ill. c. 8) in the eighth year of Nero. According to the legend, his remains were obtained from Alexandria by the Venetians through a pious stratagem, and conveyed to their city, A.D. 827. Venice was thenceforward solemnly placed under his protection, and the lion, which mediaval theology had selected from the apocalyptic beasts as his emblem, became the standard of the republic. The place of the deposition of his body having been lost, a miracle was subsequently wrought for its discovery, A.D. 1094, which figures in many famous works of art. Where his remains now lie is, according to the Roman Catholic Eusebius, "acknowledged to be an undivulged secret; or, perhaps, in less cautious language, to be utterly unknown."

MARK, Gospel of, the second of the evangelical narratives in the New Testament. Although the shortest of the four Gospels, its treatment is both with difficulties in some respects and to others see below. See also Mark, Gospel of.

I. Authorship.—The voice of the Church with one consent assigns our second Gospel to Mark, the "evangelist" (1 Pet. v. 17) and "interpreter" (Papias, ap. Eusebius, H. E. ii, 39) of Peter. The existence of this ascription is the best evidence of its truth. Had not Mark been its author, no sufficient reason can be given for its having borne the name of one so undistinguished in the history of the Church. His identity with the "John Mark" of the Acts and Epistles has usually been taken for granted, nor (see last article) is there any sufficient ground for question in that connection. It may be acknowledged that there is no early testimony for the fact—as there is none against it—which appears first in the preface to the Commentary on the evangelist usually attributed to Victor of Antioch, c. A.D. 407 (Cramer, Catena, i, 263), and in a note on the commentary of Chrysostom, xi, where it is mentioned together with some expressions of doubt τίνα σύμποσις εἰς τὸν Μάρκον ἢ διαγεγραμμένος...παρασκευὴν ἡ εἰς τὸν Μάρκον (Westcott, Introd., p. 212). An argument in favor of their identity has been drawn with much acuteness by Tregelles (Journal of Philol. 1855, p. 224; Horne's Introd. to the N. T. p. 453) from the singularity of the title "author" or "interpreter," of which more is said below. See also the words of the Latin prefix found in some MSS. at least nearly coeval with Jerome, "amputata sibi post fidem polit-
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cem dictur ut aedectio repromus habetur;" as if, by his assertion of the apostles (Acts xiii, 13), he had become figuratively a "policis truncus"—a pole-rot.

II. Source of this Gospel.—The tradition of the early Church asserts that Mark wrote his Gospel under the special influence and direction of the apostle Peter. The words of Mark, as quoted by Papias (Eus. Eccl. H. E. iii. 39), are explicit on this point: "This, then, was the statement of the elder: Mark, having become Peter's interpreter (ἱμηνευτής), wrote accurately all that he remembered (ἰμηνομοιότατα); but he did not record the words of Christ (ὡς ἐξ Χριστοῦ τὰ λαβόντα ἧ πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἦν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ρτόν τίνος τῶν εὐαγγελιῶν παῖονίμου λόγων); so Mark committed no error in writing down particulars as he remembered them (ἰσα γράφας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνως)."

For, he made one thing his object—to omit nothing of what he heard. The value of this statement is immense. The apostolic date is, great, though too much stress has been laid upon some of its expressions by Schleiermacher and others, to discount the genuineness of the existing Gospel of Mark. In addition to Peter's teaching having been recorded, the Gospel, we know, recorded it that the facts of the greatest importance for the right comprehension of the origin of the Gospel: "The historic character of the oral Gospel, the special purpose with which it was framed, and the fragmaness of its contents" (Westcott, Ixiv. p. 186). The testimony of later writers is equally definite, though probably to a certain extent derived from that of Papias. Justin quotes from the present Gospel under the title τῶν ἐγκάρδιως ναγίμενων τοῦ Πέτρου. Ireneus (H. E. i. 3) asserts that Mark "delivered in writing the things preached by Peter; and Origen (Adv. v. 25) that he "composed it as Peter directed him" (ὡς Πέτρος ὑγγάγαμεν αὐτῷ παλαμάβοι)." Clement of Alexandria enters more into detail, and, according to Eusebius's report of his words (H. E. vi. 11; ii. 15), contradicts himself. He describes the origin of the Gospel to the importance of Peter's hearers in Rome, who were anxious to retain a lasting record of his preaching from the pen of his ἰμηνευτής, which, when completed, the apostle viewed with approbation, sanctioning it with his authority, and commanding that it should be read in the churches; while elsewhere we have the tradition that when the Spirit of the Lord, whom Peter had been borne as he neither forbade nor encouraged it. Ter- tullian's testimony is to the same effect: "Marcus quod edidit evangelium Petri affirmatur" (Adv. Marci, vi. 5); as is that of Eusebius (H. E. iii. 5) and Jerome (De Vir. Ill. c. 8; ad Hebr. c. 5), who in the last passage writes, "Cajus (Marcii) evangelium Petro narrante et illo scribente composito est." Epiphanius says that, immediately after Matthew, the task of writing a Gospel was laid on Mark, "the follower of Peter at Rome" (Hær. ii. 17).
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It is certainly true that there are a few unimportant passages where Peter is specially mentioned by Mark, and is omitted by one or both of the others (i. 86; v. 37; xi. 20; xiii. 3; vii. 7); but, on the other hand, there are still more numerous and more prominent instances in which we would be uninformed if we were not acquainted with Peter's life than they. He omits his name when given by Matthew (xv. t); comp. Mark vii. 17; passes over his walking on the sea (Matt. xiv. 28-31; comp. Mark vi. 50-51), and the miracle of the tribulation of the devils (Matt. xvi. 24-27; comp. Mark x. 39), as well as the blasphemous pronouncement on himself by the Lord, and his designation as the rock on which the Church should be built (Matt. xvi. 17-19; comp. Mark viii, 29, 30). Although Peter was one of the two disciples sent to make ready the Passover (Luke xxii. 8), his name is not given by Mark (xiv. 19). We do not find in Mark the remarkable words, "I have prayed for thee," etc. (Luke xxii. 31, 82). The notice of his repentance also, ἵνα τῇ ἑλα光荣 (xiv. 72), is tame when contrasted with the ἐξ ὁλῶν ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας (Mark and Luke). Advocates are never at a loss to point out reasons to show that the former is the more ancient, and it has been the habit from very early times (Eusebius, Cry- xostom) to attribute these omissions to the modesty of Peter, who was unwilling to record that which might specially tend to his own honor—an explanation unsatisfactory from the very fact of its bareness. Whatever may be the reasons of the facts, it is true that the case is one of striking evidence of Mark's piety, and it has been the custom of every commentator on the Gospel to draw to notice the name of Peter, especially the name Mark, so much more frequently than any other name, and to explain the fact by the piety and consistency. Indeed, we can hardly have a more striking proof of the readiness with which men see what they wish to see, and make the most stubborn facts bend to their own foregone conclusions, than that a Gospel, in which no unbiased reader would have discovered any special connection with Peter, should have yielded so many fanciful proofs of Petrine origin.

But while we are unable to admit any considerable direct influence of Peter in the composition of the Gospel, it is by no means improbable that his oral communications may have indirectly influenced it, and that it is to him the minuteness of its details and the graphic coloring which specially distinguish it are due. While there is hardly any part of its narrative that is not common to it and some other Gospel, in the manner of the narrative there is often a marked character, which puts aside at once the supposition that we have here a mere epitome of Matthew and Luke. The picture of the same events is far more vivid: touches are introduced such as could only be noted by a vigilant eye-witness, and such as make us almost eye-witnesses of the events described. The most prominent of the characteristics is the account of the denunciation in the country of the Gades. The form of the following words are peculiar to Mark: "And no man could bind him, no, not with chains: because that he had often been bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: neither could any man tame him. And always night and day he was in the mountains crying and cutting himself with stones. But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran," etc. Here we are indebted for the picture of the fierce and hopeless hermit whose work was his life, and whose style is the least perfect. He sometimes adds to the account of the others a notice of our Lord's look (iii. 84; viii. 38; x. 21; x. 23); he dwells on human feelings and the tokens of them; on our Lord's pity for the leper, and his strict charge not to publish the miracle (i. 41, 44); he "loved" the rich young ruler (vi. 21, 22; he "looked round" with anger when another occasion called it out (iii. 5); he groaned in spirit (vii. 34; vii. 12). All these are peculiar to Mark, and they would be explained most readily by the theory that one of the disciples must have been with Jesus and supplied them. To this must be added that while Mark goes over the same ground for the most part as the other evangelists, and especially Matthew, there are many facts thrown in which prove that we are listening to an
independent witness. Thus the humble origin of Peter is made known through him (i, 16-20), and his connection with Cephas or Peter (i, 19); he tells us that Levi was the "son of Alpheus" (ii, 14), that Peter was the name given by our Lord to Simon (iii, 16), and Boanerges a surname added by him to the name of two others (i, 17); he assumes the existence of another body of disciples wider than the twelve (iii, 22; iv, 10, 36; v, 34; xiv, 51, 62); we owe to him the name of Jairus (v, 22), the word "carpenter" applied to our Lord (vi, 8), the nation of the "Synagogue" woman (vii, 36); he substitutes Dalmathus for the "Magdalene" of Matthew (viii, 10); he names Bartimaeus (x, 46); he alone mentions that our Lord would not suffer any man to carry any vessel through the Temple (xi, 16); and that Simon of Cyrene was the father of Alexander and Rufus (xiv, 21). Thus in this Gospel the richness in subtle and picturesque touches, by which the writer sets, as it were, the scene he is describing before us in all its outward features, with the very look and demeanor of the actors, be- token the report of an eye-witness; and with the testi- mony of the Church before us, which can hardly be set aside, we are warranted in the conclusion that this eye-witness was Peter. Not that the narrative, as we have it, was his; but that when Mark, under the Holy Spirit's guidance, after separation from his master, undertook the task of setting forth that cycle of Gospel teaching which his master had never perhaps ever to be satisfactorily explained—the Synoptists chiefly confine themselves, he was enabled to introduce into it many pictorial details which he had derived from his master, and which had been impressed on his memory by frequent repetition. 

III. Relation to Matthew and Luke.—The question of priority of composition among the Synoptic Gospels has long been the subject of vehement controversy, and to judge by the diversity of the views entertained, and the confidence each appears to feel of the correctness of his own, it is far from easy to be being settled. (For monographs under this head, see Volbeding.)

In fact, in composition, says Mr. Wescott, Introd. p. 190 (the two not being necessarily identical, the earlier tradition being perhaps possibly the latest committed to writing), "it is this, that by many of the Gospels contain much of truth in it, that Mark does actually occupy the central position in regard to the first, and the universal Gospel of the third evangelist. Many formidable difficulties beset each of these theo- ries, and their credit severally is impaired by the fact that the very same data which are urged by one as proofs of the priority of Mark, are used by the other as irreducible evidence of its later date. We even find critics, like Baur, bold enough to attribute the vivid de- tails, which are justly viewed as evidences of the inde- pendence and originality of his record, to the fancy of the evangelist; thus importing the art of the modern novelist into ages and works to the spirit of which it is entirely alien.

So much, however, we may safely grant, while maintain- ing the substantial independence of each of the Sy- noptic Gospels—that Mark exhibits the oral tradition of the official life of our Lord in its earliest extant form, and furnishes the most direct representation of the common basis on which they all rest. "In essence, if not in composition," says Mr. Wescott, Introd. p. 190 (the two not being necessarily identical, the earlier tradition being perhaps possibly the latest committed to writing), "it is this, that by many of the Gospels contain much of truth in it, that Mark does actually occupy the central position in regard to the first, and the universal Gospel of the third evangelist. Many formidable difficulties beset each of these theo- ries, and their credit severally is impaired by the fact that the very same data which are urged by one as proofs of the priority of Mark, are used by the other as irreducible evidence of its later date. We even find critics, like Baur, bold enough to attribute the vivid de- tails, which are justly viewed as evidences of the inde- pendence and originality of his record, to the fancy of the evangelist; thus importing the art of the modern novelist into ages and works to the spirit of which it is entirely alien.

If now we proceed to a detailed comparison of the matter contained in the Gospels, we shall find that, while the history of the conception, and birth, and childhood of our Lord and his forerunner have no parallel in Mark, the story of the life and the teachings of the Lord after the coming of the Paraclete (Luke ii, 21-24, 51-88, 14, being of course excepted) is on the whole coincident; and that the difference is mainly due to the absence of the parables and discourses, which were for- eign to his purpose of setting forth the earthly ministry of Christ. Of our Lord's parables he only gives four:
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"the sower," "the mustard seed," and "the wicked husbandman"—common also to Matthew and Luke; and one, "the seed growing secretly," iv, 26-29 (unless, indeed, it be an abbreviated and independent form of the "tares"), peculiar to himself. Of the discourses, he entitles the second and fourth to the common name of O.-T. Illustrations against the Scribes and Pharisees, and almost entirely the instructions to the twelve; while of the other shorter discourses he only gives that on fasting (ii, 19-22), the Sabbath (ii, 23-26), the casting out devils by Beelzebub (iii, 22-29), on eating with unwashed hands, and coral (vi, 5-8, 10-17). That on "the last things" (chap. xiiil) is the only one reported at any length.

On the other hand, his object being to develop our Lord's Messianic character in deeds rather than words, he records the greater part of the miracles given by the Synoptists. Of the twenty-seven narrated by them, eighteen are found in Mark, twelve being common to all three; three—the Syro-Phoenician's daughter, the feeding of the four thousand, and the curing of the fig-tree—common to him and Matthew; one—the demoniac in the synagogue—to him and Luke; and two—the deaf stammerer (vii, 41-47), and the blind man at Bethsaida (viii, 26-26) (supplying remarkable points of correspondence, in the withdrawal of the object of the curse from the crowd, the use of external signs, and the gradual process of restoration)—peculiar to himself. Of the nine omitted by him, only three are found in Matthew, of which two are not given to us, not at all given also by Luke.

The others are found in Luke alone. If we suppose that Mark had the Gospels of Matthew and Luke before him, it is difficult to assign any tolerably satisfactory reason for his omission of these miracles, especially that of the centurion's servant, so kindred to the object of his work. On the contrary hypothesis, that they copied from him, how can we account for their omitting the two remarkable miracles mentioned above?

The arrangement of the narrative, especially of our Lord's earlier Galilean ministry, agrees with Luke in opposition to that of Matthew, which appears rather to have been according to similarity of subject than order of time.

According to Norton (Generosity of Gospels), there are not more than twenty-four verses in Mark to which parallels, more or less exact, do not exist in the other Synoptists. The same painstaking investigator informs us that, while the general coincidences between Mark and one of the other two amount to thirteen fourteenths of the whole Gospel, the verbal coincidences are one sixtieth, and of these four fifths in Mark occur in the recital of the miracle, his only exception being an omissions at the fifth in the narrative portion, which, roughly speaking, forms one half of his Gospel.

Additions peculiar to Mark are, "the Sabbath made for man" (ii, 27); our Lord's friends seeking to lay hold on him (iii, 51); many particulars in the miracles of the Gadarene demoniac (v, 1-20); Jairus's daughter, and the woman with issue of blood (v, 21-43); the stilling of the tempest (iv, 35-41), and the lunatic child (ix, 14-29); the salting with fire (ix, 49); that "the common people heard him gladly" (xii, 37); the command to his mother and his younger brothers to keep "the cloth about his body" (xiv, 51); the want of agreement between the testimony of the false witnesses (xiv, 59); Pilate's investigation of the reality of Christ's death (xv, 44), and the difficulty felt by the women as to the rolling away the stone (xvi, 4, 5). Mark has also preserved several words and phrases of our Lord, which merit close attention (i, 15; iv, 18; vi, 31, 34; vii, 8; viii, 38; ix, 12, 39; x, 21, 24, 30; xi, 17; xiii, 32; xiv, 18-37; xvi, 7 [15-18]).

The hypothesis which best meets all these facts is, that while the matter common to all three evangelists, or to two of them, is derived from the oral teaching of the apostles, which they had purposely reduced to a common form, our evangelist writes as an independent witness to the truth, and not as a compiler; and the tradition that the Gospel was written under the sanction of Peter, and its matter in some degree derived from him, is made probable by the evident traces of an eye-witness in many of the narratives. The omission and abridgment of our Lord's discourses, and the sparing use of O.-T. Illustrations, and the special designation of the Gospel, if we had surer data for ascertaining it; since it was for Gentiles, with whom illustrations from the O. T. would have less weight, and the purpose of the writer was to present a clear and vivid picture of the acts of our Lord's human life, rather than than a full record of his divinity to be descried. We may thankfully own that, with little that is in substance peculiar to himself, the evangelist does occupy for us a distinct position, and supply a definite want, in virtue of these traits.

IV. Characteristics.—Though this Gospel has little historical matter which is not shared with some other, it would be a great error to suppose that the voice of Mark could have been silenced without injury to the divine harmony. The minute painting of the scenes in which the Lord took part, the fresh and lively mode of the narration, the very absence of the precious discourses of Jesus, which, interposed between his deeds, would have delayed the action, all give to this Gospel a character of its own. It is the history of the war of Jesus against sin and evil in the world during the time that he dwelt as a Man among men. Our Lord is presented to us, not as the Son of God, but as the Son of David and Abraham, the theocratic King of the chosen people; nor, as in Luke, as the universal Saviour of our fallen humanity; but as the incarnate and wonder-working Son of God, for whose emblem the early Church justly selected the figure of a lion. His record is emphatically "the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (Mark i, 1), living and working among men, and developing his mission more in acts than by words. The limits of his narrative and its general character can hardly be better stated than in the words of his apostolic teacher. Acts x, 38-42. Commencing with the Baptist preaching in the wilderness, and announcing the " Mightier One" who was at hand, he tells us how, at his baptism, "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power," and declared him to be his "beloved Son." The next scene is the inquiring of the pregnant fact, "He was with the wild beasts," thus setting the Son of God before us as the Lord of nature, in whom the original grant to man of dominion over the lower creation was fulfilled (Malachi, Unity of the N. T. p. 228; Bengel, ad loc.; Wilberforce, Doctrine of Incarna- tion, p. 89). As we advance, we find one act after another giving up every exercise of our Lord's power over man and nature distinctly and minutely—not merely chronicking the incidents, as is Matthew's way, but surrounding them with all the circumstances that made them impressive to the bystander, and making us feel how deep that impression was; how great the awe and wonder with which his mighty works and preaching were regarded, not only by the crowd (i, 22, 27; ii, 12; vii, 2), but by the disciples themselves (iv, 41; vi, 51; x, 24, 28, 82); how the crowds thronged and pressed upon him (v, 1; xii, 21); how he had no place to lay his head (vii, 39), so that there was a scarce room to stand or sit (ii, 2; iii, 32; iv, 1), or leisure even to eat (iii, 20; vi, 81); how his fame spread the more he sought to conceal it (i, 45; iii, 7; v, 20; vii, 36, 57); and how, in consequence, the people crowded about him, bringing their sick (i, 29-34; iii, 10), and "whithersoever he entered into villages or cities, or country, they laid sick in the streets, and besought that they might touch if it were but the border of his garment: and as many as touched were made perfectly whole" (vi, 56); how the unclean spirits, seeing him, at once fell down before him, and cried, "Thou art the Son of God" (i, 23-26; iii, 11); how, again, in Peter's words, "He went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, for God was with him."
But while the element of divine power is that which specially arrests our attention in reading his Gospel, there is none in which the human personality is more conspicuous. The single word ὄρεισκών (v, 8) throws a flood of light on our Lord's early life as man in his native village. The version of his knowledge is expressly stated (xiii, 82, οἷος ὄριοι) and we continually meet with mention of human emotions—anger (iii, 5; viii, 12, 38; x, 14), wonder (vi, 5), pity (vi, 34), love (v, 21), grief (vii, 34; viii, 12); and human infirmities—sleep (iv, 38), desire for repose (vi, 31), hunger (x, 17).

In Mark we have no attempt to draw up a continuous narrative. His Gospel is a rapid succession of vivid pictures loosely strung together (usually by soi, καὶ παλιν, or ὥσπερ), without much attempt to bind them into a whole, or give the events in their natural sequence. This pictorial power is that which specially characterizes this evangelist; so that, as has been well said, "if any one desires to know an evangelical fact, not only in its main features and grand results, but also in its most minute and, so to speak, more graphic delineation, he must betake himself to Mark." (De Coeris, Ταυρά, p. 86.) This power is especially apparent in all that concerns our Lord himself. Nowhere else are we permitted so clearly to behold his very gesture and look; see his very position; to read his feelings and thoughts. In Mark the Lord deals to us the comprehensive gaze of Christ (τοιαύτα ἄμφως, iii, 5, 34; vi, 22, x, 23; xi, 11), his loving embrace of the children brought to him (ιγνάκεισάς μνέα, ix, 36; x, 16); his preceding his disciples, while they follow in awe and amazement (x, 52). We see him take his seat to address his disciples (εἰλος, ix, 84), and turning round in holy anger to rebuke Peter (πταστροφῆς, viii, 33); we hear the sighs which burst from his bosom (vii, 34; viii, 12), and listen to his very accents ("Ταλίθα, κυμη," vi, 41; "Εὐρυφάθα," vii, 34; "Αβάς," xvi, 59). We have an eye on every event. And the freshness and pictorial power which places the whole scene before us with its minute accessories—the paralytic (ii, 1—12), the storm (iv, 38—41), the demoniac (v, 1—20), Herod's feast (vi, 21—29), the feeding of the 5000 (vi, 30—40), the lunatic child (ix, 14—29), the young ruler (x, 17—22), Bartimeus (x, 46—53), etc. At another place details are brought out by the addition of a single word (κίψας, i, 7; σχιζομακράς, i, 10; σπαλασσώμεις, i, 41; τοις ἔως, iv, 11; πρωσῳμνίζομαι, vi, 58; ἵππων, viii, 21, 23; κρεάς, σπαραγματίζει, ix, 26; στυγγαλίας καλεῖται, xiv, 67), or by the substitution of a more precise and graphic word for one less distinctive (ἰειδάλλω, ii, 12: ἴειςτασιν, ii, 12: γεμνοίσιν, iv, 37; ἴεράρχαι, v, 29: ἀρνοῦτας, v, 46; ἀντίφητες, vii, 9; ἰμαρμίζοιται, xiv, 38).

It is to Mark also that we are indebted for the record of the minute particulars of persons, places, times, and numbers, which stamp on his narrative an impress of authenticity.

(1.) People.—i, 20; ii, 14; iii, 5, 17, 82, 84; iv, 11; v, 32, 37; vi, 40, 48; vii, 1, 25, 26; viii, 10, 27; ix, 13; x, 15; x, 29; x, 31, 32; x, 34; x, 37, 65; xv, 7, 21, 40, 47; xvi, 7.

(2.) Places.—i, 28; iv, 1, 38; v, 11, 20, 21; vi, 55; vii, 17, 31; viii, 10, 27; ix, 30; x, 4; xi, 41; xiv, 66; xvi, 13, 16, 59; xv.

(3.) Times.—i, 32, 35; ii, 26; iv, 35; v, 2, 18, 21; vi, 2; xi, 11; xii, 20; xiv, 1, 12, 17, 33, 65, 72; xvi, 25, 38, 84, 42; xvi, 1, 2.

(4.) Number.—v, 13, 42; vi, 7; vii, 34; xiv, 30, 72.

Other smaller variations are continually occurring. Here a single word, there a short parenthesis, sometimes a shift of the point of view, and finally that striking air of life to the record; e.g., Zedeba left with the hired servants (i, 20); our Lord praying (i, 85); the paralytic borne of four (iii, 5); the command that a ship should wait on him (iii, 9): "thy sisters" (iii, 32); our Lord taken "even as he was in the ship" (iv, 35)."
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8. Words not found at all, or found less frequently in Mark, are—γενομένος, only twice, in the same context (x, 17, 18); Matthew sixteen, Luke fifteen times; νεός, παῖς, σύμβας, σύμφωνον, ἀνρήτω, ἄνωθεν, ἄγιος, κόσμος, ἔργα, μακάριος, ὄρθιος, καλῶς, only three times, to Matthew twenty-six, Luke forty-two; "νομίζω, only once; Χριστός, seven, Matthew sixteen, Luke three; these are mentioned twice, Samarna and its inhabitants not once.

VI. Persons for whom the Gospel was written.—A dispassionate review of the Gospel confirms the traditional statement that it was intended primarily for Gentiles, and among these the use of Latinisms, and the concise abrupt character "suitable for the vigilance of a Roman audience" (Westcott, Introduction, p. 348), seem to point out those for whom it was specially meant. In consistency with this view, words which would not be understood by Gentile readers are interpreted: Bonner, (iii, 17); Talihia cumi (iv, 40); Corban (vii, 11); Bartimeus (x, 46); Abb (xxiv, 36); Eli or lamba zachbathani (xxv, 34); two mites "make a farthing" (xii, 42); Gehenna is "unchangeable fire" (4x, 19); Jewish usages, and other matters with which none but Jews could be expected to be familiar, are explained, e.g. the washing before meals (v, 5, 8); in the days of uninterred bread the Passover was killed (xiv, 13); at the Passover the season of figs had not come (xii, 13); the preparation is "the day before the Sabbath" (xv, 42); the Mount of Olives is "over against the Temple" (xxiii, 33); Jordan is a "river" (Mark i, 5; Matt. iii, 6); the Pharisees, etc., "used to fast" (Mark i, 18; Matt. ix, 14); the Sadducees' worst tenet is mentioned (Mark xii, 18); and explanations are given which Jews would not need (Mark xv, 6, 16). All reference to the law of Moses is omitted, and even the word νομός does not occur; the Sabbath was appointed for the good of man (ii, 27); and in the quotation from Isaiah (lvi, 7) he added "all nations." The genealogy of our Lord is likewise omitted. Other matters interesting chiefly to the Jews are similarly passed over, such as the reflections on the request of the Scribes and Pharisees for a sign (Matt. xii, 38-45); the parable of the king's son (Matt. xxii, 1-14); and the awful denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees (Matt. xxiii). Matter that might offend is omitted, as Matt. x, 6; vi, 7, 8. Passages, not always peculiar to Mark, abound in his Gospel, in which the antagonism between the pharisaic legal spirit and the Gospel come out strongly (Mark i, 19, 22; x, 5, 11); which hold out hopes to the heathen of admission to the kingdom of heaven even without the Jews (xii, 9), and which put ritual forms below the worship of the heart (ii, 18; iii, 1-5; v, 23). Whilst he omits the invective against the Pharisees (Mark i, 18; Matt. ix, 14), our Lord may in some way have Jesus condemned them "with anger" (iii, 5). Mark alone makes the Scribe admit that love is better than sacrifices (xii, 33). In conclusion, the absence of all quotations from the O.T. made on his own authority, with the exception of those in the opening verses from Mal. iii, 1; Isa. xi, 3 (xxv, 29 being rejected as interpolated), points the same way. The only citations he introduces are those made by our Lord, or by those addressed to him.

VII. Citations from Scripture.—The following are the only direct citations:

Mal. iii, 1. 1, 2.
Isa. xi, 2.
Isa. xii, 12.
Isa. xiv, 13.
Ezek. x, 16.
Ezek. xiv, 7.
Ezek. xxi, 19.
Ezek. xxviii, 12; 25, 13, 17.
Gen. i, 7, 8.
Gen. ii, 4, 5.
Ps. xxviii, 26, 29, 31.

(b) Isa. ix, 17; Jer. vii, 17.
Ps. cxviii, 23, 25, xil, 10, 11.
Dent xvi, 8.
Ps. liii, 18.
Ps. liii, 20.
Ps. cx, 1.
Dan. xii, 7, xil, 11, xil, 14.
Zech. xxii, 1.
Isa. lx, 1.
Ps. xlii, 17, xiv, 34.

Of these, (a) only one peculiar to Mark. In (b) we have the addition of a few words to the Syntactical quotation. We have also references to the O.T. in the following passages:

Lev. xvi, 9, 10, 11.
Isa. xii, 11, xii, 9, 14.
Dan. vii, 18, xil, 18, xil, 24.
Deut. xiv, 21.

VIII. Time and Place of Composition.—On these points the Gospel itself affords no information, except that we may certainly affirm, against Baur, Hilgenfeld, Weisse, etc., that it was composed before the fall of Jerusalem, since otherwise so remarkable a fulfilment of our Lord's prophecies could not but have been noticed. Ecclesiastical tradition is, as usual, vacillatory and untrustworthy. Clement, as quoted by Eusebius (ut sup.), places the composition of the Gospel in the lifetime of Peter; while Irenaeus, with much greater probability, asserts that it was not written till after the decease (ὑπὸ δοθεωρ, not "departure from Rome," Mill, Grabe, Ehrard) of Peter and Paul. Later authorities are, as ever, much more definite. Theophylact and Euthym. Zigab., with the Chron. Pasch., Georg. Synell., and Hesychius, place it ten years after the Ascension, i.e. A.D. 40; Eusebius, in his Chronicon, A.D. 43. Then Peter, Paul, and John were together in Rome. It is not likely that it dates before the reference to Mark in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv, 10), where he is only introduced as a relative of Barnabas, as if this were his greatest distinction; and this Epistle was written about A.D. 65. If, after coming to Rome, Paul's sending out was on, and joined Peter at Babylon, he may have then acquired, or rather completed that knowledge of Peter's preaching, which tradition teaches us to look for in the Gospel, and of which there is so much internal evidence; and soon after this the Gospel may have been committed to writing. We may probably date it between Peter's martyrdom, c. A.D. 65, and the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70.

As to the place, the uniform testimony of early writers (Clement, Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, etc.) is that the Gospel was written and published in Rome. In this view many modern writers of weight agree. Chrysostom asserts that it was published in Alexandria, but his statement is not confirmed—as, if true, it must certainly have been—by any Alexandrian writer. Some (Eichhorn, R. Simon) maintain a combination of the Roman and Alexandria view under the theory of a dual publication, first in one city and then in the other. Storr is alone in his view that it was first made public at Antioch.

IX. Language.—There can be no room for questioning that the Gospel was composed in Greek. To suppose that it was written in Latin—as is stated in the subscription of the Muratorian fragment and some early MSS. (ἀργυροφυλάκια ἐν Πορείᾳ) because it was intended for the use of Roman Christians, implies complete ignorance of the Roman Church of that age, which in language, organization, and ritual was entirely Greek, maintaining its character in common with most of the churches of the West as a "Greek religious colony" (Milman, Latin Christ, i, 27). The attempt made by Baronius, Bellarmine, etc., to strengthen the authority of the Vulgate by this means was therefore, as one of their own Church, R. Simon, has shown, entirely futile; and the pretended Latin authentic, said to be preserved in the library of St. Mark's at Venice, turned out to be part of an ancient Latin code of the four Gospels, now known as Codex Forculenensis.

X. Contents.—The Gospel of Mark may be divided into three parts:

(1.) The references previous to the commencement of the public ministry of our Lord, including the preaching and baptism of John, our Lord's baptism and temptation (i, 1-18).

(2.) Our Lord's ministry in Galilee, including that in Eastern Galilee (i, 14-27); that in Northern Galilee (vii, 24-ix, 27); that in Perea, and the journeys towards Jerusalem (ix, 38—x, 52).

(3.) His triumphant entry, passion, death, resurrection, and ascension (xi, 1-xvi, 8 [20]).
XI. Genuineness and Integrity.—The genuineness of Mark's Gospel was never doubted before Schleiermacher, who, struck by an apparent discrepancy between the orderly narrative we now possess and the description of Papias (at loc.), broached the view followed by Credner, Ewald, and others, that the Gospel in its present form was the work of Mark the Apostle, not of Peter. This led to the notion, which has met with much ac-
ceptance among German critics (Haur, Hilgenfeld, Kist-
lin, etc.), of an original, pre-canonical Mark, "the Gospel of Peter," probably written in Aramaic, which, with other oral and documentary sources, formed the basis upon which some unknown later writers formed the existing Gospel. But even if, on other grounds, this view were probable, all historical testimony is against it; and we should have to account for the entire disappearance of an original document of so much importance without leaving a trace of its existence, and the silent substitu-
tion of a later work for it, and its acceptance by the whole Church. If ordinary historical testimony is to have any weight, we can have no doubt that the Gospel we now have, and which has always borne his name, was that originally composed by Mark. We can have no reason to think that either John the prebyster or Pa-
piax were inadmissible; and if the ordinary interpretation of οὐ τὰ ταύτα was correct, and the description of the Gos-
pel given by Papias was really at variance with its pres-
cent form, it would be at least equally probable that the words of the plagiarist were excised and the evidence mistaken. There can, however, be little doubt that the meaning of οὐ τὰ ταύτα has been strained and distorted, and that the words do really describe not Mark's alone, but all three Synoptic Gos-
spels as we have them; not, that is, "Lives of Christ" chronologically arranged, but "a sum-
mary of representative facts" given according to a moral and not a historic sequence, following a higher order than that of mere time.

As regards the integrity of the Gospel, Ewald, Reuss, and others have called in question the genuineness of the opening verses (l, 1-13). But the external evidence for them is as great as that for the authenticity of any part of the Gospels. Internal evidence is too subtle a thing, and varies too much with the subjectivity of the writer, for us to rely on it exclusively.

The case is different with the closing portion (xxvi, 9-20), where the evidence, both external and internal, is somewhat strong against its having formed a part of Mark's original Gospel, which is thought to have broken off abruptly with the words φεοδωτόν γὰρ (for various theories to account for this, the death of Peter, that of Mark, the flight of Judas, the last leaf, etc., see Hug, Meyer, Schott). No less than twenty-one words and expressions occur in it, some of them repeatedly, which are never elsewhere used by Mark. This alone, when we remember the peculiarities of diction in the pastoral epistles, as compared with Paul's later writ-
ings, would not be sufficient to prove that it was not written by the same author; though when taken in con-
nection with the external evidence, it would seem to show that it was not composed at the same time.

On this ground, therefore, we must conclude that if not the whole, at least the latter part, was written in a later period than the rest of the Gospel. The external evidence, though somewhat inconsistent, points, though less de-
cidedly, the same way. While it is found in all codices of weight, including A, C, D, and all versions, and is re-
peatedly quoted, without question, by early writers from the second century onward, elsewhere found in the N. (?) in that codex), while in several MSS. that contain it, it is noted that it is wanting in others, and those the most accurate copies. Jerome (ad Hebr. iv, 172) speaks of it as being found in but few copies of the Gospels, and de-

ficient in almost all the Greek MSS. Eusebius (ad Mar-
thin, quest. I) states that it is wanting "in nearly all the more accurate copies," while the canons that bear his name and the Ammonian sections do not go beyond v, 8. Of later critics, Olshausen and De Wette pronounce for its genuineness. The note of the latter may be con-
sidered, as well as those of Weiss and Meyer, who take the other side, for a full statement of the evidence for and against. See also Burgon, The last twelve Verses of Mark vindicated (Lond. 1871).

XII. Canonicity.—The citation of v. 19 as Scripture by Irenaeus, and the fact that it is canonical, commences with words which evidently refer to it. It is mentioned by Papias. Justin Martyr refers to it for the name Boanerges (Tryph. 169), as "the Memoirs of Peter." Irenaeus, as we have seen above, quotes from it, and in the 1st Clementine Homily (ed. Dusseldorf, 1858) a peculiar phrase of Mark iv, 54 is repeated ver-

bally. The text is also recorded by Irenaeus (Her. iii, 11, 7), that the Docetists, heretics preferred the Gospel of Mark to others, affords an early proof of its accep-
tance in the Church.

XIII. Commentaries.—The following are the special exegetical helps on the entire Gospel of Mark: to a few sections of the book, the diligent extracts were made by Antioch, In Marcus (Gr. ed. Mattioli; also in the Bibl.
Max. Patr. iv, 870); Jerome, Expositio (in Opp. [Sep-

don.], xi, 788); also Commentarius (ibid. xi, 783); Pos-

cinus, Catena Gr. Patrum (Lond. 1673, fol.); Bede, Expos-

icio in Opp. v, 92; Works, x, 1); Aquinas, Catena (in

Opp. iv, 167, ii in Engl. transl.); Albertus Magnus,

Commentarius (in Opp. ix); Gerson, Lectiones (in

Opp. iv, 208); Zwingle, Annotationes (in Opp. iv, 141);

Brentius, Homilia (in Opp. v); Myconius, Commentarius (Basil. 1588, 8vo); Hengediarchus, Achatocrates (Hap.

1526, 1526, 8vo); Sarcer, Scholast (Basil. 1590, 1540, 8vo); Bullinger, Commentarius (Tifur. 1545, fol.); Hofmeister,

Commentarius [incl. Matt. and Luke] (Loran. 1563,

fol.; Par. 1563; Colon. 1572, 8vo); Dunshe, Questiones

(Genev. 1594, 8vo.); Guathier, Homiliae (Heidelberg. 1608, 8vo.); Winkelmann, Commentarius (Francof. 1613, 8vo.); Del Prete, Commentarius (Rom. 1626, 8vo.); Novius, En-

eposio (Lugd. 1642, fol.); Petter, Commentarius (Londen. 1662, 2 vols. fol.); Hartsoeker, Aetenederung (Amster.

1671, 4to); De Veel, Expositio [incl. Matt.] (Lond.

1688, 8vo.); Dorsch, Commentarius (Kilon. 1688, 4to.);

Heupel, Nota (Augsburg. 1716, 8vo); Tuchau (Tubing. 1728, 4to); *Elias, Commentarius (Traj. 1773, 4to); Cunningham, Thoughts (Lond. 1825, 2mo); Hinds, Manual (Lond. 1829, 8vo); Bland, Annotations (Lond. 1850, 8vo); *Fritzsche, Commentarius (Lipa. 1850, 8vo); Ford, Illustrations (Lond. 1845, 1846, 8vo); Hilgenfeld, D. Marcus - evangelium (Halle, 1858, 8vo); Cumming, Readings (Lond. 1858, 8vo); *Alexander, Explanation (N.Y. 1858, 12mo); Klostermann, D. Marits-evangelies (Götting. 1867, 8vo); Goodwin, Notes (Lond. 1869, 8vo).

See Gospels.
MARKET

the University of Kiel; in 1766 he was honored with the degree of doctor of divinity. He was a hospitable, kind man. Gifted with a quick perception and a good memory, Mark acquired great learning, particularly in theology and philosophy. By his indefatigable diligence as an author he kept the press almost constantly busy. Of his works the following have special interest for us: *Modesta testificationes in vita sancti Augustini,* Kiel, 1769, 4to); — *Prædicta juris divini evangelici* (ibid. 1768, 4to); — *Diss. de divina vocacione hominum miserorum ad fidem et salutem* (ibid. 1767, 4to); — *Causa Dei et sub ipso imperantia contra theologiam JesuChristi* (ibid. 1766, 4to).—Düring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, a. v.

Market (µαρκατος), a mercantile term, found only in Ezek. xxvii (rendered "merchants," except in ver. 15, 17, 19, 25), in several senses: (a) properly bar-
ter, and to trade; traffic (ver. 9, 27); (b) place of bar-
ter (ver. 12, 13, 17, 19); (c) gain, wealth, acquired by
traffic (ver. 27, 34; plur. ver. 58, perf. precious wares), like "µεταρχη," "merchandize," and "μηταιρια." In the N. T., the word agora (δυσαπαρεις), thus rendered ("market-place") in Matt. xx, 3; Mark xii, 38; Luke vii, 36; Acts xix, 11, 40, denotes generally any public
place in towns and cities where the people came
together, and more specially it signifies a (a) public
place, a broad street, etc. (Matt. xi, 16; xx, 3; xxi, 7; Mark vi, 56; xii, 38; Luke vii, 32; xi, 43; xx, 46); (b) a forum or market-places, where goods were exposed for
sale, and where public trials were held (Acts xvi, 19; xvii, 17). In Mark vii, 4 it is doubtful whether
dyópetai denotes the market itself, or is put for that
which is brought from the market; but the known customs of
the Jews suggest a preference of the former significance.
From this is derived the term agordous (ἀγορωδος), properly signifying the thing belonging to, or persons
frequenting the agora; improperly rendered "in
law" in Acts xix, 38, where it is applied to the days on
which public trials were held in the forum; and in ch.
xxvii, 5 (where it is rendered "basar sort") it denotes
dilege, or persons lounging about in the place of
business and other places of public resort.

There is a peculiar force in this application of the word, when we recollect that the market-places or bazaars of the East were, and are at this day, the constant resort of unoccupied people, the idler, and the newsmonger.

In very early periods markets were held at or near the gates of cities, sometimes within and sometimes without the walls. Here commodities were exposed for sale, either in the open air or in tents (2 Kings vii, 18). It is still not unusual in the East for the wholesale mar-
ters to come to the marketplace and carry with them (short
time in the early part of the morning) at the gates of
towns; but manufactured goods and various sorts of
fruits are retailed in the bazaars within the towns.

In the time of our Saviour, as we learn from Josephus, the markets were inclosed in the same manner as the modern
Eastern bazaars, which are shut at night, and con-
tain traders' shops disposed in rows or streets; and in
large towns the dealers in particular commodities are
confined to certain streets. That this was also the case
in the time of the prophet Jeremiah, we may infer from his

The close connection existed between those of the same
craft, we learn incidentally from Neh. iii, 82. In
rebuilding Jerusalem after the exile, the "goldsmiths and
the merchants" acted together in repairing the walls.
Josephus calls the valley between Mounts Zion and Mo-
riah the Tyrean (τυρειανον), i.e. the valley of the
cheesemakers. In like manner there is mentioned the
valley of Charashim, or "the craftsmen" (1 Chron. iv,
14; Neh. xi, 35). Josephus also mentions a street of
the meat-dealers. The streets of Eastern cities are
generally distinguished from each other, not by the sepa-
rate names which they bear, but by the sort of traffic or
business carried on in them. Thus at Cairo and other
large Oriental cities we hear of the market of the butcher-
for the fruit-dealers, the copper-ware sellers, the jew-
ellers, and each, according to a row of shops on each
side of the street devoted to that particular branch of
trade (Hackett, *Illustra. of Scripture*, p. 61). See Bar-
gain; Bazaar; Commerce; Merchant.

Marklin, Johann Friedrich, a German theolo-
gian, was born at Reichenbach, in Wurttemberg, Feb. 6, 1732; was educated at the University of Tubingen: in 1755 became a professor of theology at Wurzburg and, in 1769, tutor at his alma mater; in 1767, archdeacon; and in 1786 was raised to the dignity of professor of divinity, the
department of exegesis of the Old Test. and Oriental
literature falling to him. In 1779 he was made general
superintendent of the churches of Wurttemberg, and died
May 18, 1795, so as to distinguish him from the
O.T. Scripture. Of his productions we only men-
tion *Diss. inaug. de Sermones Dei ad Joh. 28, 29 ejusque*
(Scopo (Tubinge, 1784, 4to); — *Diss. de religione, imprima
Christiana, magno in officia, etc. (ibid. 1786, 4to).—Dür-
ing, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, a. v.

Marks, Richard T., a Presbyterian minister, was
born in Louisville, Ga., Sept. 24, 1899. He was edu-
cated a printer. In 1827 he moved to Columbus, Ga.,
and united with Mr. Larmar in establishing the Colum-
bus Inquirer, the first paper started in the western
portion of Georgia. Soon after, feeling called to the
ministry, he commenced the study of theology under
Thomas Goulding, D.D.; was licensed in 1837, and ordained in 1839. He labored as a minister mostly in missionary
fields, or where the destitution was so great that un-
requited labor had to be given. He preached in the
following places in Georgia: Muscogee, East Point, West Point, Hamilton, Columbus, Emmaus, Americus,
Mount Tabor, Ephesus, and White Sulphur Springs. He
died Dec. 6, 1867. Mr. Marks was a ready writer, an
excellent preacher, and an editor of great power and

Mark's, St., Day, the 26th of April, observed at
least since the 6th century, in commemoration of St.
Mark, the evangelist. It is celebrated in most parishes
of the Roman Church by a solemn, supplicatory pro-
cession, mentioned as early as pope Gregory the Great.
Walafrid Strabo states (De reh. ecc. c. 8) that it was
inaugurated by that pope as the commencement of his
pontificate, with a view to supplicate God for deliver-
ance from a pestilence which was devastating Rome; and
it is certain that Gregory held a procession in A.D.
590, in order to avert the pestilence. But the two cere-
monies are clearly not identical. The latter was held in
August, and was continued during three or four days; and
taken in the procession of St. Mark, the faithful issued
from seven separate churches, in this they all proceeded from
a single sanctuary. In churches of which St. Mark is the
patron, a mass is celebrated in connection with the
procession, in which the color used is blue, indicative of
the penitential feeling which predominates in the cere-
mony. An occasional removal of the festival to another
day does not set aside the procession, which is always held
on the 26th of April, unless Easter Sunday falls on
that day.—Wetzer and Weitzel, *Kirchen-Lex*. vi, 952.

Mark's, St., Liturgy. See LITURGY.

Marlatt, the Rev. E.D., a noted Methodist bishop
and minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born
in Warren County, N.J., in 1829, and educated at Dickin-
son College (class of 1850); was junior preacher on
Carlisle Circuit in 1851; was the following year ap-
pointed to Lock Haven Circuit, where a bronchial affec-
tion developed itself, which compelled him to locate in
1854. In this same year he was appointed professor of a
high literary institution in Washington City, where
he remained until 1856, when he accepted the presi-
dency of the newly-founded Irving Female College, and
to this institution he devoted his energies until Jan. 2, 1865, when he "fell asleep in Jesus." "The
personal character of our brother may be included in
the comprehensive title 'a Christian gentleman,' the
highest style and type of manhood. As a gentleman, a scholar, and a minister of truth, he was a noble candor. . . . In everything that bore upon truth or purity he was a decided man. Of his mental power and literary culture it may be safely said that he possessed a clear intellectual perception; rapid insight, coupled with careful analysis, and broad powers of generalizing; a vivid sensibility of nature, a keen discrimination of character, a large acquaintance with ancient and modern belles-lettres; and from the college under his presidency have been sent forth those that shall shine brightly in the literary world."—Conf. Minutes, 1865, p. 12.

Marlay, Michael, D.D., a noted Methodist minister, was born, of Roman Catholic parents, in Berkeley County, Va., June 21, 1797. In the year 1818 he migrated to the State of Ohio, and settled near Dayton. In 1821 he united with the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was soon after appointed a class-leader. The Church, recognizing his gifts and graces, speedily licensed him as an exhorter, and afterwards as a local preacher. In the fall of 1851 he was received on trial as a travelling preacher by the Ohio Conference. He quieted the disquiet of the minds of the ministers and was widely known as a sound theologian, an able preacher, and a skilful administrator of discipline. So great was his reputation as an executive officer, that more than half of his ministry of thirty-five years was spent in this capacity. Twice its leaders were twice active and influential member of the General Conference, by which body he was appointed, in 1855, one of the commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church to manage the suit in the then pending trial for the property of the Western Book Concern. In 1856 he received the degree of D.D. from the Indiana State University. He died of cholera, while in attendance upon the session of the Cincinnati Conference, at Ripley, Ohio, Sept. 2, 1866. The late bishop Thomson thus spoke of Dr. Marlay shortly after his decease (Christian Advocate, N. Y., vol. xii, No. 49): "His strong frame of medium size, fine proportion, and high health, admirably fitted him for itinerant labor; his benignant countenance, amiable spirit, and gentle manners rendered him a welcome guest wherever he went. His fine head indicated great intellectual power; his habits of study seemed to render certain his constant improvement, while his clear call to the ministry insured his unwavering devotion to its duties. . . . In Biblical science, as well as in theoretical, practical, and experimental divinity, he was a master. . . . He was a great man in private as well as in public life; and one of the strongest proofs that his estimate of the goodness of a large family which he leaves behind him, every one is an ornament to society. . . . He expired in the arms of his brethren, and they buried him, feeling that they could lay in the tomb no man to whom the Methodist Church in Ohio has been more indebted." See also Leaders Repository, 1866, Jan.; Conf. Minutes, 1866, p. 292. (J. F. M.)

Marlorton, Augustine, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Bar-le-Duc in 1566. At an early age he went out in an Augustinian convent, and took the vows in 1524. He soon acquired a knowledge of Hebrew and was appointed an exorcist in the convent. Having been appointed prior of a convent of his order at Bourges, he commenced to entertain Protestant views, as is evinced in the sermons he delivered after 1535 at Bourges, Poitiers, and Angers. He was designated to preach during the Lenten season at Rouen, when he openly separated from the Church. Pursued as a heretic, he sought refuge at Geneva, where he lived for a time by correcting proofs for the printers. He then went to Lausanne, to perfect his knowledge of theology. In 1549 he was appointed pastor at Crissier, and served at that place till 1564. The dissensions of Geneva sent him in 1565 to Paris, and in the beginning of the year following he was called to take charge of the Reformed Church at Rouen. His talents and his personal qualities now had a fair opportunity for display, and soon gained him great influence in that city, and brought many converts to the Church. In 1561 he went to the Colloqy of Poissy, where, next to Theodore de Beza, he stood at the head of the Protestants, and on the 15th of May he presided over the provincial synod assembled at Dieppe. The union of all the Confessio fidei with the common expression of religious opinion adverse to Roman Catholicism, and more particularly the bloody deeds of Vassy on March 1, 1562, had greatly exasperated the Protestants [see Huguenots] and, the latter, feeling that there was only one alternative for them, either to adopt the compromise and embrace their worst convictions, took arms on each side. The opening scene had been made at Paris. At Rouen the Protestants were in the majority (if we may follow Beza, according to Flocquet [Rom. Cath.], however, they only assumed the majority, and, anxious to secure the city for the armies of Condé, made themselves masters of the place by stealth in the night of April 15 to 16. An independent government was established, and unbounded religious toleration exercised towards non-Protestants. The masses, however, in the hour of their triumph, fell victims to their own enthusiasm. The public safety of the country, in short, was placed in danger. The commune, after the people and the mayor, the civil and armed forces, the townsmen, the clergy, the nobles, the notables, all rose against the Huguenots. The commune at first appeared to be the champion of the oppressed, but it was the instrument of the local revolution. In the first place, the commune declared its peace with the State, and, in the second, it recognized the authority of the State over the commune. The commune also refused to act in favor of the Huguenots, and thus rendered them incapable of taking any part in the war. The Huguenots, under the leadership of the Duke of Anjou, were defeated at the battle of Jemmapes, and the city of Paris was taken by the State. The Peace of Saint-Germain was concluded between the State and the Huguenots, and the Huguenots were allowed to retain their possessions in France. For this and other outrages the Protestant leaders, of whom Marlorton was one, were not responsible either directly or indirectly. Yet, when the Huguenots were succeeded in power, Marlorton was one of the first accused, and, though he had done so much more than simply bear the blame for the grant of religious freedom, he was arrested Oct. 28, 1562, brought before the bar of the Parliament, which had re-entered Rouen with the Roman Catholic forces, and condemned, as a traitor and heretic, to be drawn on a hurdle through the streets of the town, and then hung in front of his own church. After the execution, which took place Nov. 1, 1563, his head was severed from the trunk, and exposed on the bridge of the town. The Huguenots revered this outrage as the execution of two leading Romanists in their hands. The widow and five children of Marlorton fled to England, where they were for a long time maintained by the French Protestants.

As a writer Marlorton figures very prominently by himself. His exegetical works are numerous and valued, because of the accuracy and scholarship which they evince in the author. "They may be best described as painstaking and not injudicious selections of the interpretations of other writings" (Kitto). His earliest production is Remarques sur la representation de l'Esprit et du Verbe Divin dans le Psaume (Paris, 1563, fol.; ed. 1561, 8vo); but one of his most important productions is his Novi Testamenti catholicae expositio, etc. (Geneva, 1561, fol.; 2d ed. 1605, fol.). This is a valuable work, containing Erasmus's Latin version of the N.T., with the expositions of the fathers of the Church, and of Orcus, Calvin, Erasmus, Musculus, Melancthon, Servetus, Bunsen, Bullinger, Zwinglius, Vitus Theodorus, etc. His object seems to have been to prove to Romanists the identity of the Protestant and the Apostolic Church, and the essential oneness of the two Protestant parties. He himself left no distinct confession. Part of it was translated into English, and published under the following titles: A Catholick and Ecclesiastical Explication of the holy Gospel after St. Matthew. Translated out of Latin into English by Thomas Tyman, Mynystor (Lond. 1579, fol.); A Catholick and Ecclesiastical Explication of the Apocalypse of St. John the Apostle. Translated (black letter, Lond. 1574, 4to). Translations have also been published of his Exposition of St. Mark (1583, 4to); St. John (1574, 4to); St. Luke (1584, 4to, etc.). He also wrote Genesis, cum catholicae Expositione, etc. (Geneva, 1562, fol.; often reprinted under the title of The Prophecies of the Prophets of S. S. Prophecatum Expositio ecclesiastica, etc., Item Cataca sacra ep divina Bibliorum locns cum similis expositions (Geneva, 1562, fol.; often reprinted; and in English un-
MARMONTEL

MARNIX, PHILIPPE VAN DE STE. ALDEGOOREN, occupies a distinguished place in the history of the Netherlands during the Reformation period. He was born at Brussels in 1588, of parents thoroughly identified with the interests of their country, and was carefully educated at home, and later at Geneva under Calvin and Beza. After returning to his native city in 1606, he spent six years in retirement, but became known, notwithstanding his seclusion, as a careful observer of events, and respected as a patriot and a man of honor. His devotion to the cause of the Reformation, whose influence he steadfastly endeavored to extend, could not be concealed; nor could his learning, his keen understanding, and his power as a writer escape recognition. He was soon in intimate relations with the leaders of the nation, and the rapid progress of events forced him into prominence. He is universally held to be the author of the so-called compromise (about 1565-66) by which the nobles and others pledged themselves to resist, by all lawful means, the introduction of the Inquisition. The league soon attained such proportions that it dared to present (April 5, 1566) a petition to the regent for the suppression of the Inquisition. On the Protestant field-praying was introduced, he placed himself at the head of the movement, and insisted that the Protestants should be permitted to worship in Antwerp itself. On the 19th of August an iconoclastic mob destroyed the many works of art that adorned the churches, expelled the Protestants, and committed Protestant worship in specified places; and under this sanction the first synod of the Walloon churches assembled in Antwerp Oct. 26, 1566. Marnix presided, and by his influence contributed to the adoption of the reformed confession, by which event the Calvinists acquired a pre-eminence that still continues. The government now adopted more energetic measures to restrain the Protestants, by placing garrisons in important towns, and even besieging such as refused to admit them. This was the case at Valenciennes; and Marnix, while seeking to aid the beleaguered city, was defeated, his brother killed, himself banished, and his property confiscated. During his exile he was influential in converting William of Orange and Nassau to the Protestant faith, and formed a connection with him that was only dissolved by death. In the mean time, however, Marnix had entered the service of the Palatinate, where he continued his labors. He died of consumption at Heidelberg, where he was largely engaged in theological investigations; but, with the consent of the elector, he was often employed in the affairs of his own country, under the direction of the prince of Orange. He left a treatise on the regency of Louis of Nassau at Jemmingen in July, 1568, etc. He attended the synod of the exiled clergy at Wesel in November, 1568, and his influence is seen in the constitution of the Church then adopted. A second important synod was held at Emden, Oct. 4 to 14, 1571, at which Marnix was also present, and which selected him to write a history of recent events in the Netherlands; but the needs of his country prevented the execution of this task. In July, 1572, he was sent by the prince of Orange to confer with the delegates of Holland, who were assembled at Utrecht, and succeeded in securing them to pledge their readiness to make every sacrifice to throw off the Spanish yoke. Thenceforward his activity was incessant. He was taken prisoner by the Spaniards in November, 1573, but his life was spared, as the prince of Orange had threatened to retaliate, and Requesens, successor to the duke of Alba, empowered him to negotiate a peace, which was defeated by the sagacity of Orange. A similar office, undertaken after his exchange on the order of the prince of Orange, likewise failed, as did his mission to induce Queen Elizabeth of England to accept the sovereignty of the Netherlands. He assisted in the negotiations that resulted in the "Pacification of Ghent" in November, 1576, and in the formation of the second union between the provinces at Brussels in December, 1577. In May, 1578, he repre-
sent the Netherlands at the Diet of Worms, and prevailed on the German states to remain neutral in the contest with Spain. In the mean time religious intolerance had led to great outrages among his countrymen, and the bitter feeling between the parties threatened more ruin, if it had not been secured by so much exertion. An attempt to reconcile these differences, in which he was engaged on his return, failed, and several of the Roman Catholic provinces withdrew, and placed themselves and their religion under Spanish protection. An alliance with France was now thought of, and Mar

ix carried his intentions successfully to the states-general to offer the crown to Francis, duke of Anjou-Alençon. This prince reached Antwerp on Feb. 19, 1572; but an attempt to seize Antwerp and other impor.

tant towns led to his expulsion from the land before he had reigned a year, and both Orange and Marnix were suspected of complicity with the French. In consequence, Marnix retired from public life; but the progress of the Spaniards, under the duke of Parma, induced William of Orange to recall him, and he was appointed to the office of first burgomaster of Antwerp, in order that he might direct its defence. He entered on its duties Nov. 15, 1568, and a few days later the siege began. It was continued until Aug. 17, 1585, when the city honorably capitulated. With this event his political career was ended, and he retired to his estates, devoting himself to the study of theology and science. He was appointed by the states-general to translate the Bible into Dutch, he removed to Leyden, in order to avail himself of its library, and of the assistance of his friends Scaliger, Lipsius, Janius, and others. He only lived, however, to complete the book of Genesis. He died Dec. 15, 1586. "He was," says Motley, "a man of most rare and versatile genius—scholar, theologian, diplomat, statist, scribe, orator, pamphleteer; he had genius for all things, and was eminent in all." The theological works of Van Marnix were chiefly of a political character. They are The Betrayal, written after the manner of Von Hutten, and written in the style of Rabelais. It was probably intended to promote a reconciliation between the Roman and the Protestant provinces of his country. Another able contribution is his Tableau des différences de la religion (1669, and often). A complete edition of his works, in 8 vols., was published at Brussels, 1857-60, under the title Oeuvres de Phil. de Marnix de Ste. Aldegondie; vol. iv contains a brief memoir, and a notice bibliographique. His life has been frequently written; among others, Th. Juste has treated of his connection with his countrymen (1858). Motley's Rise of the Dutch Republic, and Hist. of the United Netherlands, vol. i, chap. iii, are valuable aids to the study of this career. See also Prins, Leben van P. v. Marnix (1782); Dreschhals, F. v. Marnix (1892); Boese, F. v. Marnix (1898-90, 2 vols. 8vo); Herst, Recueil Exùb., xx, 96 sq.; Edgar Quinet, in the Revue des deux Mondes, 1854.

MATON, JOANNEs, a noted Eastern patriarch, supposed to be the founder of the Maronites, was born at Sirum, near Antioch, in Syria, about the middle of the 7th century. He became a Christian, and became monk and priest in the convent of St. Matthias, and was elected bishopric of Boeotys in 676, according to some, by the papal legate, he brought, if we may follow Romish authority, all the Christians of Lebanon within the communion of the Church of Rome; was then made patriarch of Antioch, and confirmed by pope Honorius; and died in 707. See, however, MARONITES.

Maronites, a community or sect of Christians, numbering some 150,000, in Syria, particularly in the northern part of Mount Lebanon, and said to be of very ancient origin.

1. History.—Considerable controversy has arisen as to the real origin of this most peculiar Christian people; the most probable account represents them as descendants of a remnant of the Monophysites (q. v.), who, fleeing from the repressive measures of the emperor Anas-Taurus II., in the early part of the 8th century, settled on the slopes of the Lebanon, and gradually yielded their distinctive Monothelite views. According to Mosheim (Eccles. Hist. i, 457; iii, 127), many Monophysites, after the Council of Constantinople, found a refuge among the Marons. In 836, Mardam, the Maron chief, obtained possession of Lebanon A.D. 676, and made it the asylum of vagabonds, slaves, and all sorts of rabble; and about the conclusion of the 7th century these Monophysites of Lebanon were called Maronites, after Maro, their first bishop. None, he says, of the ancient writers give any certainty in Syria really first person who converted these mountainites to Monothelism; it is probable, however, from several circumstances, that it was John Maro, whose name they have adopted; and that this ecclesiastic received the name of Maro from his living, in the character of a monk, in the famous convent of St. Maro, upon the borders of the Oreons, before his settlement among the Mardaites of Mount Libanus. Gieseler (Eccles. Hist. ii, 419), however, takes exception to this identification of the Maronites with the Mardaites, and, by authority derived from the writings of Anesotil Duparon (Rit che I' eglise eignation des Mardes, in the Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscript., i, 1), holds that the Mardaites or Mards, a warlike nation of Armenia, were placed as a garrison on Mount Libanus by Constantine Pogonatus, A.D. 676 (Theophanes, p. 159); and were with them having been called Mardaites II. (Thaer, p. 592). Madden (Turkish Empire, i, 154), upon the authority of the learned Benedictine St. Maur (Histoire Monastique de l'Orient, p. 348), holds that the Maronites were founded by St. Maro, a patriarch of Syrian Christians in the 5th century, and that they existed under that name in the 7th century, when the Saracens ravaged the country, and were afterwards persecuted as Mardaites (comp. here Churchill, Mount Libanus, iii, 58). There is certainly much in favor of this argument, not the least of which is the fact that, "at the time of the conquest of the7th century, the entire range of mountains from Antioch to Jerusalem was in the hands of the Syrian Christians, who formed a political power under chiefs or emirs, excercising a hereditary govern-

ment" (Churchill). But, however great may be the darkness surrounding their earliest history, one thing is certain, from the testimony of William of Tyre and other unexceptionable witnesses, as also from the most authentic records, namely, that the Maronites retained the opinions of the Monothelites until the 12th century, when, abandoning and renouncing the doctrine of one will in Christ, they were re-admitted into the communion of the Roman Church. Jacques Hors, in his Church of Acre in the 12th century, thus speaks of the Maronites in his Historia Hierosolimitana, drawn up at the request of pope Honorius III: "Men armed with bows and arrows, and skilful in battle, inhabit the mountains in considerable numbers, in the province of Phoenicia, not far from the town of Biblos. They are called Maronites, from the name of a certain man, their master, Maron, a heretic, who affirmed that there was in Jesus but one will or operation. The Christians of the Lebanon, dopes of this diabolical error of Maron, remained sep-
brought back to the communion of Rome by the influence of the Crusaders. Even in our day the Maronites, "warranted, indeed, both by historical and traditional records, allure in terms of pride and satisfaction to the service done by their ancestors to the armies of the Crusaders, and estimate in round numbers 50,000 of their people as living under the dominion of the Cross" (Churchill). During the early part of the 12th century the communications between the Maronite patriarch and the papal see were of frequent recurrence, and thus the way was easily paved for reunion. But though the Maronites joined the communion of Rome in this very year, as if it were an energetic act of conversion, and it was some time before the insurrection was quelled, the Druses being the last to submit. They had asked the Maronites to join them, and the latter, who had held back when there was some chance of success, now rose under the most favorable pretext. In the mean time, in 1840, the allied fleet of England, Austria, and Turkey were employed to secure the restoration of Syria to Turkey. Turkish agents were busy among the Maronites, fanning the flame of rebellion; most of these wretches were Englishmen. Finally, France not withholding her consent to the Treaty of Trianon, and Austria and Prussia being satisfied by the position of the Christians now became worse than ever, and their merchants were obliged to invoke the protection of the European consuls against the spoliation of the Turks. Lord Stratford of Redcliffe interfered in their behalf, and his influence was sufficient to restore. The Turkish government wished to appoint a Turkish governor over Lebanon, but the English finally succeeded in obtaining the appointment of emir Bashir Kassim Shehab, a Christian. The Druses, however, took exception to this arrangement, and when subsequently the Maronite patriarch attempted to confiscate all civil authority for the benefit of the Maronites, they became exasperated. Colonel Rose, the English consul-general, wrote on that occasion, "The Maronite clergy show a determination to uphold their supremacy in the mountains at the risk of a civil war. And a civil war was the result of this obstinacy. The patriarch (for his functions among the Maronites, see below, under III. Religious Status—1. Clergy) at the same time, by his mismanagement, excited the jealousies of the Turks, and displeased the English, whom the Druses hailed as their friends. On Sept. 14, 1841, a first affray took place between the Druses and the Christians at Deir el-Kamar; it was repressed by the efforts of colonel Rose. The Druses rose again, however, on Oct. 18, 14, and 15, and the entire destruction of the town was only prevented by the arrival of the colonial forces, numbering up, however, their connection with Rome. In the 17th century they placed themselves under the direct protection of France, Louis XIV and Louis XV granting them "Letters of Protection;" and for some time the French consul at Beirut exercised almost royal sway over them, the Maronites regarding themselves as "the French of the East." In the early part of the 18th century the Druses called the Mohammedan family of the Shehabe to govern Lebanon, and in 1713 the Turks made the first attempt to bring the inhabitants under the direct rule of the Porte; but after a long and bloody contest, the Turks in the battle of Aïdaleh; but in 1756 several emirs became Maronites, and, invited by the Maronite clergy, showed great favor to their new brethren, thereby displease the Druses, and provoking a feeling of ill-will between the Druses and the Maronites, which has not yet subsided. The pachas of Acre, since Jezzar, carefully promoted this misunderstanding, for they felt that the tribes of Lebanon, fully united under an enterprising chief, would become dangerous to the Porte. Yet there was no feeling of religious animosity between the two nations at this early date, and, whenever political troubles broke out, Druse and Maronite sided indiscriminately with both parties. Emir Bashir Shehab (1783-1840), although in secret a Maronite, was always surrounded by the most important among the Druses, and, whenever he needed help, asked it of them rather than of the Maronites. Thus the Druses and the Christians were living peaceably side by side until 1831, when Syria passed under the rule of Mohammed Ali, and he commissioned his son, Ibrahim Pacha, to govern the provinces. Bringing his enlightened views, Ibrahim Pacha applied himself to the improvement of the condition of his Christian subjects, and, in spite of the opposition of the Mohammedans, they were raised to civil and military offices. The Syrians, however, accustomed to the indolent Turkish rule, revolted against this energetic and active Egyptian management, and it was some time before the insurrection was quelled, the Druses being the last to submit. They had asked the Maronites to join them, and the latter, who had held back when there was some chance of success, now rose under the most favorable pretext. In the mean time, in 1840, the allied fleet of England, Austria, and Turkey were employed to secure the restoration of Syria to Turkey. Turkish agents were busy among the Maronites, fanning the flame of rebellion; most of these wretches were Englishmen. Finally, France not withholding her consent to the Treaty of Trianon, and Austria and Prussia being satisfied by the position of the Christians now became worse than ever, and their merchants were obliged to invoke the protection of the European consuls against the spoliation of the Turks. Lord Stratford of Redcliffe interfered in their behalf, and his influence was sufficient to restore. The Turkish government wished to appoint a Turkish governor over Lebanon, but the English finally succeeded in obtaining the appointment of emir Bashir Kassim Shehab, a Christian. The Druses, however, took exception to this arrangement, and when subsequently the Maronite patriarch attempted to confiscate all civil authority for the benefit of the Maronites, they became exasperated. Colonel Rose, the English consul-general, wrote on that occasion, "The Maronite clergy show a determination to uphold their supremacy in the mountains at the risk of a civil war. And a civil war was the result of this obstinacy. The patriarch (for his functions among the Maronites, see below, under III. Religious Status—1. Clergy) at the same time, by his mismanagement, excited the jealousies of the Turks, and displeased the English, whom the Druses hailed as their friends. On Sept. 14, 1841, a first affray took place between the Druses and the Christians at Deir el-Kamar; it was repressed by the efforts of colonel Rose. The Druses rose again, however, on Oct. 18, 14, and 15, and the entire destruction of the town was only prevented by the arrival of the colonial forces, numbering up, however, their connection with Rome. In the 17th century they placed themselves under the direct protection of France, Louis XIV and Louis XV granting them "Letters of Protection;" and for some time the French consul at Beirut exercised almost royal sway over them, the Maronites regarding themselves as "the French of the East." In the early part of the 18th century the Druses called the Mohammedan family of the Shehabe to govern Lebanon, and in 1713 the Turks made the first attempt to bring the inhabitants under the direct rule of the Porte; but after a long and bloody contest, the Turks in the battle of Aïdaleh; but in 1756 several emirs became Maronites, and, invited by the Maronite clergy, showed great favor to their new brethren, thereby displease the Druses, and provoking a feeling of ill-will between the Druses and the Maronites, which has not yet subsided. The pachas of Acre, since Jezzar, carefully promoted this misunderstanding, for they felt that the tribes of Lebanon, fully united under an enterprising chief, would become dangerous to the Porte. Yet there was no feeling of religious animosity between the two nations at this early date, and, whenever political troubles broke out, Druse and Maronite sided indiscriminately with both parties. Emir Bashir Shehab (1783-1840), although in secret a Maronite, was always
Zaḥlil and Deir el-Kamar. On May 4 some Druses broke into the convent of Amlk, near Deir el-Kamar, and murdered the superior in his bed. The Maronites still sought to obtain peace, but found that they would be compelled to meet force with force. Three thousand men from Zaḥlil attacked the Druse village of Amdara, but were beaten by a much smaller force, their arrangements, and especially their discipline, being much inferior to that of the Druses. Kurčchid Pacha had a Turk- ish camp in the immediate vicinity of Beirūt, and commanded the plain, but he did not move here now as he had done on the former occasion. On the contrary, after encouraging the Maronites by promising them his protection against the Druses, he gave the signal of their massacre on May 8. One hundred Turkish sol- diers and the irregular Turkish cavalry joined the Druses in cutting down the Maronites. The Druses would have pushed on to Beirūt had they not been prevent- ed by the Turks. The European consuls now attempted to interfere; they were met with fine protestations by the Turkish authorities, and nothing was done to re- press the outrages. On May 10, Deir el-Kamar was blockaded Deir el-Kamar, and on June 1 it was attacked by 4000 of them. The city surrendered the next day. The pacha, after entering the city, upbraided the Maronites as traitors, rebels, etc., because they had thought it wise to defend themselves against the Druses. At the same time, Deir el-Kamar was bombarded, and Seleb Bey, Jumblatt, took Jeant, and murdered the inhabitants. Roman Catholic convents shared the same fate as those of the Maronites, being sacked, plundered, and burned: in that of Meshmāl alone thirty monks had their throats cut; the plunder was enormous. Ali Said Bey's district was given up to fire and the sword. Sidon was only saved by the timely arrival of captain Manuell, with his English ship the Firefly, on June 8. In the Anti-Lebanon, Said Bey's sister followed her brother's example and instructions, causing the Christians of his district to be inveigled into the service of the emir, and two of them escaped death by being taken over the border; others were killed. In the plain, where there were no European consuls, brooked out in which the whole mass of the inhabitants were massacred, but it was repressed with the aid of general Kmety (Ismail Pacha). The purely Maronite districts of Lebanon now became greatly alarmed, the more as Turkish soldiers were quartered there under the pretence of protecting them. The Eu- ropean consuls advised together, and drew up a remon- strance to the Druse chiefs, which a Mr. Graham was sent to deliver to them. Said Bey Jumblatt, however, when appealed to, declared only his respect for Eng- land and his willingness to see this struggle end, but added that he had no power over it, and that the Druses would not obey him. Most of the Druse sheiks con- trived to avoid Mr. Graham, and those who did meet gave him but evasive answers. Finally, on July 10, the Mohammedans of Damascus rose against the Christians, of whom there were some 25,000 in the city. The Christian quarter was soon a heap of smouldering ruins, beneath which numberless corpses were buried. Wom- en, married and unmarried, were wandering through the streets, and were seen to cry for assistance, with heads uncovered and feet naked, appealing to the mur- ders for mercy. Many were sold as slaves for a few piastres, or taken away to the desert, and their persons crowded with fanatics, who shouted continually, "Death to the Christians! Let us slaughter the Christians! Not let one remain!" Every church and convent was plundered and afterwards burned. The silver plate, jewelry, and gold coin taken from these sanctuaries were not allowed to be plundered by the rabble, but were removed by soldiers. These are the words of the British consul, Mr. Brunt. The consulates of France, Russia, Austria, Belgium, Holland, and the United States of America were vigorous in their protestations to the Turkish government, and the latter was at first so超過, as they were not situated in the Christian quarter, and they became an asylum for as many as were able to reach them. Others were saved in great numbers in the house of Abd-el-Kader, and in the cita- del; but the governor, Ahmed Pacha, was an unmoved witness of the horrid scenes that took place. The con- fiscated and lawless deeds of the plundering rabble (Lond. Rev. 1860, Oct., p. 160). As has already been stated in the article Druzes (q.v.), the French and English governments were obliged to come to the rescue of the Syrian Chris- tians, and the Porte was forced to inflict punishment upon those whom the Turkish officers had made pliant tools for the destruction of the Maronites. On Aug. 3 a conference of the great powers—Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, and Turkey as well—met, but the meet- ing was closed without accomplishing any real good. All that was secured was the promise that the Sublime Porte had endeavored and would continue to do its duty: but what this duty consisted in, it has been hard to de- termine to this day. Only a few weeks previously the Christian emissary had been compelled by the Turkish pa- cha to leave his country during the course of his pros- ecutables, when the emirs felt constrained afterwards to acknowledge their extorted perjury. In October, finally, the international conference of the plenipotentiaries of European powers convened at Beirūt, and crowned their labors successfully, June 9, 1861, by a spe- cial treaty concerning the administration of the Leba- non. See DRUZES, vol. ii, p. 900, col. 2.

II. Social Position.—The nation may be considered as divided into two classes, the common people and the sheiks, by whom must be understood the most eminent Christians, whether of the lebanes, of the serail, or the ordinary class. They all live dispersed in the mountains, in villages, hamlets, and even detached houses, which is never the case in the plains. The whole nation consists of cultivators. Every man im- proves the little domain he possesses, whether with his own hands. Even the sheiks live in the same manner, and are only distinguished from the rest by a bad pe- lasse, a horse, and a few slight advantages in food and lodging; they all live frugally, without many enjoy- ments, and are acquainted with the inventions of luxury. In general, the nation is poor, but no one wants necessarily; and if beggars are sometimes seen, they come rather from the sea-coast than the country itself. Property is as sacred among them as in Europe; nor do we hear of robberies and extortions so frequently committed by the Turks. Travellers may journey there, either by night or by day, with a security unknown in any other part of the empire, and the stranger is received with hospitality, as among the Arabs: it must be owned, however, that the Maronites are generous and reality of parsimony. Conformably to the doctrines of Christianity, they have only one wife, whom they fre- quently espouse without having seen, and always with- out having been much in her company. Contrary to the precepts of that same religion, however, they have admitted, or retained, the Arab street dance, and the nearest relation of a murdered person is bound to avenge him. From a habit founded on distrust, and the political state of the country, every one, whether sheik or peasant, walks continuously armed with a musk- et and poniards. This is, perhaps, an inconvenience; but this advantage results from it, that they have no novices in the use of arms among them when it is neces- sary to employ them against the Turks. As the coun- try maintains no regular troops, every man is obliged to join the army in time of war; and if this militia were
well conducted, it would be superior to many European armies. From accounts taken in late years, the number of men fit to bear arms amounts to 85,000.

Maronite Sheik and his Wife.

III. Religious Status. — Although the Maronites are united with Rome, and though they are perhaps the most ultramontane people in the world, they nevertheless retain their distinctive national rites and usages.

1. Clergy. — The most peculiar of all their institutions is undoubtedly the clerical. As we have seen above, it is supposed that the founder of the Maronites constituted himself a patriarch, and this position remains the highest dignity among them. It is true they admit the supremacy of Rome, but for the home government of the Church the patriarch is the highest authority, and in his election, as well as in the selection of all the clergy, the Maronite exercises his own private judgment, independent of the papal power at Rome. Here it may not be improper to state that the patriarch is at present expected to furnish every tenth year a report of the state of his patriarchate. Associated with the patriarch in the ecclesiastical government of the Maronites are twelve bishops, but of the latter four are titular, or in partibus. The patriarch himself is chosen by the bishops in secret conclave, and by ballot. "The debates usually last for many days, and even weeks; at last, when the choice is made, the bishops present kneel down and kiss the new patriarch's hands; the patriarch immediately writes letters to all the chief nobles of the mountain informing them of his nomination. The latter lose no time in assembling to pay him their respects and make their obeisance. A procession of honor shortly afterwards arrives for the patriarch from the governor of Lebanon. Fines, and rejoicing, and illumination extend throughout the whole range of the Maronite districts; a petition is now drawn up to be sent to the pope, praying him to confirm the choice which has just been made, and signed by the principal chiefs. It is open, however, to the clergy, or any party, to protest against the nomination. . . . The pope, however, never fails at once to confirm a selection which has the support of the feudal aristocracy and principal clergy of Lebanon." (Churchill, ii., 78.) In true puerile affection and presumptuous inference, the patriarch of the Maronites, who is styled the Patriarch of Antioch, usually takes the name of Peter, intended to denote an official descent from the apostle Peter. "His power," says Churchill, "is despotic, and from his decision there is no appeal, either in temporal or spiritual affairs; every Maronite, constantly in Lebanon, and is supposed to superintend all the ecclesiastical proceedings of the Maronite Church, has no influence over the patriarch beyond what may be obtained by personal superiority of character. . . . The income of the patriarch may amount to about £5000 a year, derived principally from lands set apart exclusively for the office. He obtains likewise a sixth of the revenue of the bishops." "The patriarch of the Maronites," says Marden ("Turkish Empire," ii., 160), "formerly exercised very extensive power not only of a religious, but of a civil kind, for the protection of his people, who in those times possessed many important immunities and franchises, which, since 1842, have been either abrogated or assimilated to the privileges enjoyed by the Roman Catholic subjects of the Porte. But the Maronites still, in case of emergency and danger, have at the hands of their old and constant enemies the Druses, are wont to look for counsel and guidance to their patriarch rather than to the emir, their nominal civil protector. The patriarch, in the winter, resides ordinarily at Kesrer, and in the summer at the monastery of Canobin, in the valley of Tippo, supposed to be, on very insufficient grounds, where the venerable Maron had fixed his abode." The eight regular bishops of the Maronite Church are Aleppo, Tripoli, Ijebel, Hasbalk, Damascus, Cyprus, Beirut, Tyre, and Sidon. The incumbents of this, the second office, are, like the patriarch, possessed of stated revenues, that enable them to live in comparative affluence. Their election takes place as follows: "When a bishop dies, the patriarch writes to the principal people of the village under the jurisdiction of the deceased prelate, requesting them to assemble together and elect a priest, and to the vacant chair elect one to whom there be a unanimity of voices, the patriarch confirms their selection; if, on the contrary, they cannot agree, he desires them to send him the names of three priests, and from this list he selects one for the bishopric." The inferior clergy of the Maronites, who are the middling sorts of income, subsist on the produce of their masses, the bounty of their congregations, and, above all, on the labor of their hands, i.e. they exercise trades, or cultivate small plots of ground, and are thus industriously employed for the maintenance of their families: it is one of the peculiar characteristics of the Eastern clergy that they are not strangers to the married state. The Maronite priests marry as in the first ages of the Church, but their wives must be maidens, and not widows; nor can they marry a second time.

The poverty to which the Maronite clergy is doomed is, however, compensated to them by the great respect the people award them. "Their vanity is incessantly flattered; whoever approaches them, whether rich or poor, great or small, is anxious to kiss their hands, which they fall not to present. . . . It is perhaps to the potent influence of the clergy that we owe the numerous religious and simple manners generally prevailing among the Maronites, for violent crimes are extremely rare among them. Retribution immediately follows every offence, however slight, and the clergy are rigorous in preventing every appearance of disorder or scandal among the members of their flocks. Before a young man can marry he must obtain the consent of his pastor and of his bishop. If they disapprove of the marriage they prohibit it, and the Maronite has no remedy. If an unmarried girl become a mother, her seducer is compelled to marry her, whatever be the inequality of their conditions; if he refuses he is reduced to obedience by measures of severity, fasting, imprisonment, and even bastinadoing. This influence of the clergy extends to every detail of civil and domestic life. The Maronite who should appeal from the decision of the clergy to the civil authority of the emir would not be listened to by him, and the act would be regarded by the appellant's bishop as a transgression to be visited with condign punishment" (Kelly). The number of Maronite priests is said to be 1200, and the number of their churches 4000.

2. Monastics. — Of the more than 200 convents scattered through Lebanon, nearly one half belong to the Maronites, and contain from 20,000 to 25,000 inmates,
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who all wear a distinctive costume, and follow the rule of St. Anthony. They are divided into three different congregations: those of St. Isaiah, those of the Alpines, and those of the Libanese or Baladites; besides which there are also a number of nunneries. Their dress, like that of all Greek monks, consists of a black frock-coat, reaching to the knees, confined around the waist by a leather girdle, and surmounted by a hood, which can be drawn over the head. This attire is called a "cacoily." The temporal affairs of the convents are directed by a superior monk, called Heis el-Aam, a sort of accountant-general, who regulates all the disbursements of his fraternity. "Lest the monks should form any particular local attachments, they are removed from convent to convent every six months, in a kind of rotation. They are, in general, exceedingly ignorant, but skilful in such trades as are necessary for their own wants and necessities." "The monks, by the rules of their order, are not allowed to smoke or eat meat. The latter, however, is permitted in case of sickness, by the order of the physician and the consent of the superior. In making long journeys the bishop may give the same permission. The monks are employed in their prayers, and in various occupations of industry; the lay-brothers tilling the lands of the convents, making shoes, weaving, begging, etc.; and the priests applying themselves to study, copying books, and other machinations in the dignity of their place. The nuns are taught to read and sew. Both the monks and nuns vow the three conditions of a monastic life—namely, chastity, poverty, and obedience; and, taken as a whole, both are extremely ignorant and bigoted."

IV. Peculiar Religious Usages.—Like the Bohemians and the Greek Christians, the Maronites administer the sacraments in both kinds, dipping the bread in wine before its distribution. "The host is a small round loaf, unleavened, of the thickness of a finger, and about the size of a crown-piece. On the top is the impresson of a seal, which is eaten by the priest, who cuts the remainder into small pieces and putting it into the wine in the cup, administers to each person with a spoon, which serves the whole congregation" (Kelly, Syria and the Holy Land, as compiled from Burckhardt, etc., p. 92). They also keep up public nightly prayers, which the women as well as the men: have a peculiar commemoration of the dead in the three weeks preceding Lent, and their whole office during Lent is of immense length and peculiar to themselves. Indeed their ritual and liturgy differ in many respects from those of the Latin Church. The mass is recited in the Syriac language, with the exception of the Epistle and Gospel, and some prayers, which are recited in Arabic, the only language understood by the people, the Syriac being simply used in the services of the Church and the offices of the priests.

V. —The Maronite clergy had formerly lands at Rome, the revenues of which were appropriated to keeping up a seminary for the education of young Christians from the Lebanon; and from this high school came forth some illustrious Romanists, e.g. Gabriel Sionita, Abr. Echelhaina, the Assseni, etc. The resources of this appropriation were partly administered by the French during the first revolutionary war. Since then the court of Rome has granted them a hospitium at Rome, to which they may send several of their youth to receive a gratuitous education. It would seem that this institution might be introduced again then the ideas and arts of Europe; but the pupils of this school, limited to an education purely monastic, bring home nothing but the Italian language, which is of no use, and a stock of theological learning from which all advantage can be derived; they accordingly soon assimilate with the rest. Nor has a greater change been operated by the three or four missionaries maintained by the French Capuchins at Gazir, Tripoli, and Beirut. Their labors consist in preaching in their church, in instructing children in the Catechism, Thomas & Kempis, and the Psalms, and in teaching the monks to read and write. In one of its had two missionaries at their house at Antura, but the Lazarites have now succeeded them in their mission. The most valuable advantage that has resulted from these labors is that the art of writing has become so general among the Maronites, and rendered them, in that country, within the Copts are in Egypt, that is, they are in possession of all the poets of writers, intendants, and kuryas among the Turks, and especially of those among their neighbors, the Druses. "But, though the ability to read and write be thus general among the Maronites, it must not be inferred that they are a literary people. Far from it; the book-learning of all classes, both clergy and laity, can hardly be rated too low. There are native printing-presses at work in some of the monasteries, but the sheets they issue are all of an ecclesiastical character—chiefly portions of the Scripture or mass-books in Syriac, which few even of the clergy understand, though they repeat them by rote" (Kelly, p. 97).

The American Protestant churches, so ably represented by the Rev. W. M. Thomson and others, have been doing work of an entirely different character. Their theology, course, has not been forgotten, and his educational disadvantages it has been sought to ameliorate by bringing the influence of American schools to his very door. Tristram (Land of Israel [Lond. 1865], p. 22), who cites the opinion of the noted pasha Daud Gholly, writes the following as from the mouth of the illustrious Muslim ruler of Mount Lebanon: "He spoke with much warmth and interest of the American mission-schools; and it was gratifying to hear his independent testimony to the importance and solid nature of the work they are carrying on, especially among the Maronites, with whom he considered they have met with greater success than with any other sect."

See Churchill, Mount Lebanon (Lond. 1853, 3 vol. 8vo); id. Druse and Maronite (Lond. 1864, 8vo); Kelly, Syria and the Holy Land (compiled from Burckhardt and others), chap. viii; Guy, Beyrut et le Liban (Par. 1860); Madonna, Turkish Empire, ii, ch. vii; Ritter, Erdkunde, xvi, 744; Robinson, Palestine, i, 572; Comte de Paris, Dumas et le Liban, p. 75-78; Neale, Hist. Holy East. Ch. (Introil.), i, 158 sq.; Cowper, Ssets in Syria; Taylor, the Syrian Towns (1801-1811); Silbemagel, Verfassung u. gegenwartiger Bestand sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients (Landshut, 1865); Foulkes, Christiendoms' Divisionen, ii, ch. ix; New-Englander, 1861, p. 92; Westminster Review, 1862 (July).

MAYOT, CLEMENT, a French poet, known in the theological world for his translation of the Psalms into French verse, was born at Chalon in 1495. At an early age he commenced writing poetry, and at the recommendation of Francis I became a member of the household of his duchess of Alençon. He accompanied Francis I to Italy, and was wounded and taken prisoner at the battle of Pavia. On his return to France he wrote poetry for Diana of Poiriers, the king's mistress, who showed him favor; but, having presumed too much upon his familiarity with her, she discarded him, and he was soon detected by persons of his own age and rank as some person of importance in that ring. In 1525, Margaret procured his release; and it appears likely that Mayot's intercourse with that princess caused him to incline towards the Reformation, although he is not known to have openly embraced it. When, in 1538, Gérard Houssel preached in Paris, after the dismissal of the fanatical Sorbonnian Beda, satirical verses against the Protestants were posted on the walls; Mayot answered in the same tone; and when the persecution broke out, in
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the spring of 1584, prohibited books being found in his
dwelling, Marot was compelled to flee to Beauvais, whence
he was captured by a Frenchman, the executioner of the
duchess Renata of Este. In 1556 Francis I returned him
unto his court. It is said that he had recanted, but this is
not proved. In 1558 he commenced, with the aid of
the learned Vatablus, the translation of the Psalms,
which was very warmly received; it became the fashion
to carry to sing them, and Charles V himself gave Marot
a reward of two hundred doubles. The Sorbonne,
however, condemned the book, while the pope caused it
to be reprinted at Rome in 1542. Marot, in the mean-
time, was, on account of the condemnation of the Sor-
bonne, obliged, in 1543, to flee to Geneva, where he was
well received by Calvin, and invited to continue his
translation of the Psalms, which was first used in public
worship at Gruson, Switzerland, Dec. 1, 1540. Gene-
va, however, did not long please Marot, accustomed to
the gayety of the French court; and, after remaining a
while at Chambéry, he went to Turin, where he died in
1544. The first known edition of Marot's translation
appeared towards the end of the year 1541; it contained
thirty psalms, a poetical translation of the Lord's Prayer,
etc. A second edition, containing thirty psalms, with the
music, and the liturgy of Geneva, was published by Cal-
vin in 1546. The Psalms were adopted by the church,
containing twenty more psalms, dedicated "to the ladies
of France," and accompanied by the well-known preface
of Calvin; this, as well as the subsequent editions, con-
tains the liturgy; the catechism, the reformed confession
of faith, and thecatechumenal sermons added to others.
The remainder of the Psalms was translated by Beza
(1550-52), and in 1552 appeared the first complete
Psalter, with Beza's eloquent appeal "to the Church of
our Lord." The popularity of these Psalms was so great
that, after the Colloquy of Poissy, on Oct. 19, 1561,
Charles IX gave the Lyons printer, Anton Vincent, the
privilege of printing them. In the 17th century the
translation was revised by Conrat, first secretary of the
French Academy, and the learned Anton Labastide.
This revision, approved by the Synod of Charenton in
1672, was admitted in the churches of Geneva, Neufchâ-
tel, and Hesse, while the ancient text remained in use
in the French villages. In 1701 Beaussobre and Leant-
ft, at Berlin, undertook a revision, which was much
opposed, especially by country congregations. See Lex-
fant.
The modern revision was accepted without dif-
ficulty, except in Protestant France. The English trans-
lation, from popular tunes; but when they were to be used in the
Church it was found necessary to adapt a more solemn
music to them. William Frank, however, who is consid-
ered the original composer of the tunes, wrote only a few
of them and died in 1561; Jean Bourgeois; those of 1562 and 1563 have some by Claude
Goudemil, the teacher of Palestrina, in four voices.
See Anguis, Vie de Marot, prefixed to his (Eyresas (1823, 5
vols. 8vo); Jan Suef, Lesen en Bedrijf van C Marot
(1866); Sainte-Beuve, Tableau de la Poésie Française
au sixième siècle (1864, 3e éd., vol. ix); Palmaro,
Life and Times, ii, 92 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, li,
115; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Général, xxxiii, 924. (J. N. P.)

Ma'roth (Heb. Maroth, rūn'îr, bitter fountains; Sept. ἀθωσία, Vulg. amaritudines), a place apparently
not far from Jerusalem, on the route of the
invading Assyrian army from Lachish (Mic, i, 12; see Henderson,
Comment. ad loc.). Schwarz (Pulsel, p. 107) conjectures
it was identical with Maccaroth (Josh, xv, 50); but
this name is very different in the Hebrew.

Marouf. See Ma'ôrôf.

Marozia, a Roman lady of noble birth, but of infam-
ous reputation in the scandalous chronicles of her age,
descendant of the daughter equal in nobility Theodora (q.v.),
was born near the close of the 9th century. On the dissolu-
tion of the hermitage of St. Symeon, which had long
been in the hands of the nuns, at the close of the
war of factions occasioned in Rome in the 10th cen-
tury, Marozia, by her beauty and her intrigues, con-
trived to exercise great influence. She was married
three times, and, according to Luitprand, had skill and
address enough to make her husband despise the
name of the pope, John X, and the elevation of heaven, the
fruit, it is alleged, of adulterous intercourse with pope Sergius
III, to the pontificate, under the name of John XI.
This testimony of Luitprand, who wrote some time after
the period, is considered doubtful by Muratort and by
Dr. Pertz. See, however, our articles John X and John XI.
In her latter years Marozia suffered the punish-
ment of her early crimes. She was imprisoned by her
own son Alberic, and died in prison at Rome in 938.

Marquesas Isles, frequently applied to the whole
Mendaña Archipelago, refers strictly only to the southern
group of the Mendaña Archipelago, in Polynesia,
the northern group bearing the name of the Washing-
ton Islands. They are situated in lat. 7° 30'—10° 30'
S., long. 188°—214° 20' W., have an area of 500 English
square miles, and a population of 6011, and were dis-
covered by Mouta de Neyra, a Spanish navigator, in
1596 (the Washington Isles were discovered in 1791 by
Ingram, an American). The isles were named after
the viceroy of Peru, Marquesas de Mendoza. They are
of volcanic origin, and are in general covered with
mountains, rising in some cases to about 3000 feet above the
sea-level; the climate is rich and feverish, but
healthy. The coasts are difficult of access, on ac-
count of the surrounding reefs and the sudden changes
of the wind. Cocoa-nut, bread-fruit, and papaw trees
are grown, and bananas, plantains, and sugar-cane are
cultivated.

The inhabitants are of the same race as those of the
Society and Sandwich islands. They are well propor-
tioned and handsome, but degraded in their religion and
in many of their customs. They exhibit some confused
notion of a divine being, whom they call Esooa; but
they give the same name to the spirit of a priest, of a
king, or any of his relations, and generally to all Euro-
peans, as superior beings. The principal appearance of
a religious feeling is found in their reverence for any-
thing pronounced to be " taboo" or sacred, which a priest
only can extend to any general object, but which every
person may effect upon his own property by merely de-
claring that the spirit of his father, or of some king,
or of any other person, reposes in the spot or article
which he wishes to preserve. They have a universal belief
in charms (which they name " kahu") which kill, by im-
pregnating and obliterating the subtle things which they are
directed, and which the priests chiefly are un-
derstood to be able to render effectual. Some reference
to a future life appears in their funeral rites. The
corpse is washed, and laid upon a platform under a piece
of new cloth; to obtain it from the gods, the grave is
increased through the lower regions, a great feast is given
by the family to the priests and the relations.
The body continues to be rubbed for several months with
cocoa-nut oil, till it becomes quite hard and incorrupt-
able; and a second feast, exactly twelve months after the
first, is then given of the gods, to which the deceased is
decreed a safe arrival to the other world. The
corpse is then broken in pieces, packed in a box, and
deposited in the morai or burying-place, which no wom-
nan is permitted to approach upon the pain of death.

On some of the islands there are missionary stations;
but, although cannibalism has been abolished, the efforts
of the missionaries have not otherwise met with much
success. The Gospel was introduced in the Marquesas
Isles by the "London Missionary Society" in 1797. The
first missionary was William Crook, a man of great zeal
and untiring industry. Though much depressed by the
ignorance and rudeness of the natives, he pushed the
good work, and accomplished much, notwithstanding his
failure to secure converts. In 1825, when three teach-
ers came to his aid, it was found that the natives had
introduced into their island numerous superstitions
in morals. In 1828 the mission was abandoned; but in 1831
Mr. Darling, then a missionary to Tahiti, visited the isles,
and gave the home society such glowing accounts of the improvements that had been wrought by their earlier efforts, that the mission was re-established in 1833 by Mr. Darling, assisted by Messrs. Rodgerman and Stallworthy, and four natives from Tahiti; but in 1841 the work was again abandoned. The Romanists gained a foothold, and in 1845 they were placed under French protection, the Roman Catholics secured most favorable terms for their missionaries. Their work, however, remains thus far without fruit. See Aikman, Cyclop. of Christian Missions, p. 68.

Marquette, Jacques, a celebrated French Roman Catholic missionary and discoverer, was born at Laon, in France, July 26, 1637; entered the Order of the Jesuits; became a missionary, and travelled and labored several years in Canada and other regions. He was a member of the first exploring party to the Mississippi River, and wrote a narrative of the expedition (Paris, 1681). "He writes," says professor Sparks, "as a scholar, and as a man of careful observation and practical sense. In every point of view, this tract is one of the most interesting among those that illustrate the early history of America." On his return from the Mississippi he resumed his missionary labors among the Miami on Lake Michigan, 1673.——Charlesvits, Histoire de la Nouvelle France, s. v.; Moreri, Dictionnaire Historique, s. v.; Baccquelin de la Potherie, Hist. de l' Amerique Septentrionale (Paris, 1874, 4 vols. 12mo); Sparks, Amer. Biog. vol. x, 1st series, s. v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, xxiii, 1842.

Marques, Juan, a Spanish theologian, was born at Madrid in 1654; studied at the University of Salamanca; joined the Augustines of Madrid, and attained to the first dignities of his order. He died at Salamanca Feb. 17, 1621. He has written El gobernador Christiano, de dueño de los vicios de Mayos y Juevos, principio del pueblo, de la institucion del mismo, 1611, 1619, 1620; Los dos Estados de la espiritual Gerusalem sobre los Pueblos crey y creyeri (Medina, 1630, and Salamanca, 1810, 4to)——Origen de los Pueblos Erraticos de su Agutin, y su verdadera institucion antes del gran concilio Lateranense (Salamanca, 1618, fol.); y——Vida de s. fr. Alonso de Horcasio (Madrid, 1648, 8vo). He left in manuscript some comedies and several theological treatises.—Nicholas Antonio, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Hispanum, iii, 738; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, xxi, xxxvii, s. v.

Marquis, James E., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Cross Creek, Pa., Nov. 20, 1815; was educated in Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa.; studied divinity in the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany, Pa.; was licensed by Washington Presbytery in 1844, and ordained by Sidney Presbytery in 1848. During the first ten years of his ministry he labored successively in the churches of Canton, Mansfield, Shelby, and Ontario, Ohio. In 1868 he removed to Bloomington, Ill., and commenced to labor as Presbyterian missionary for the presbyteries of Peoria and Bloomington. In 1859 he accepted the united charge of the churches of Salem, Brunswick, and Elwood, which he retained until his death, Feb. 22, 1853. Mr. Marquis was noted for his faithfulness, devotion, and purity of life. He was eminently successful as a pastor; earnest and sincere as a preacher. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 171.

Marquis, Thomas, a Presbyterian minister, was born near Winchester, Va., in 1758. His early life was subjected to many deprivations. He received an ordinary common-school education, prosecuted his classical studies, amid painful vicissitudes, at Buffalo and Canonsburg, and in April, 1788, was licensed to preach; labored one year as a licentiate, and in 1794 was ordained as an installed pastor of the church at Cross Creek, Pa. In 1796 he became an active missionary to the Indians, travelling down the Alleghany, and the lower waters of the Muskingum and Scioto rivers. In 1802 he became a member of the executive committee of the Missionary Board west of the Allegheny Mountains. The remaining twenty years of his ministry were filled up with multiplied labors and varied but unusual success. He died Sept. 27, 1829. Mr. Marquis was a laborious and faithful pastor, eminently wise in counsel, and apt in introducing and enforcing religious duty. As a preacher he was noted for his purity of style, and entirely persuasive in the expression of thought. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 171; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, iv, 83-89.

Marracci, an Italian priest, eminent as an Oriental scholar, was born at Lucca in 1612, and for years held the professorship of Arabic in the College della Sapienza in Rome. He died in 1700. His principal work is an excellent edition of the Koran in a Latin version (1698). "This," says Hallam, in his Introduction to the Literature of Europe, "is still esteemed the best."

Marriage. This relation is in a general way represented by several Hebrew words, the most distinctive of which are several forms of כַּשָּׁת, chasah, to give in marriage; גַּרְוָה, garoa, a wedding. It is very remarkable, however, as well as significant, that there is no single word in the whole Hebrew Scriptures for the state of marriage. It is to express the abstract idea of marriage, as the German Ehe does. It is only in the post-exilic period, when the laws of marriage had gradually developed themselves, that we meet with the abstract נישואין and נישואים (under niswah, vi, 5; Kid-dushin, i, 2); the former denoting the legal, and the latter the natural side of marriage. But even then no such definition of marriage is to be found in the Hebrew writings as we find in the Roman law, "Nuptiae sunt conjunctio maris et feminae et consortium omnis vitae, divini et humani juris communicatio" (Dig. lib. xxxii, tit. 2, "De nupt.""). In the present article, which treatises of marriage are collected, we have to speak of marriage in the abstract sense; or, as far as it may be perceived, the relation of the male and female, as outside of the field of matrimonial relations and ceremonies, both ancient and modern. See WEDLOCK.

I. Origin, Primitive Relations, and General View of the Married State.—1. The institution of marriage is founded on the requirements of man's nature, and dates from the time of his original creation. It may be said to have been ordained by God, in so far as man's nature was ordained by him; but its formal appointment was the work of man, and it has ever been in its essence a natural and civil institution, though admitting of the infusion of a religious element. All that is exhibited in the historical account of its origin in the book of Genesis; the peculiar formation of man's nature is assigned to the Creator, who, setting it "not good for man to be alone," determined to form an "help meet for him" (vi, 18), and accordingly completed the work by the addition of the female to the male (i, 27). The necessity for this step appears from the words used in the declaration of the divine counsel. Man, as an intellectual and spiritual being, would not have been a worthy representative of the Deity on earth, so long as he lived in solitude, or in communion only with beings either higher above him in the scale of creation, as angels, or far beneath him, as the beasts of the field. It was absolutely necessary, not only for his comfort and happiness, but still more for the perfection of the divine work, that he should have a "help meet for him," or, as the word is employed, "the other half of himself" (םֵשֶׁת אֵשֶׁת, Septuag., δύο ουράνιοι γίνουσθαι; Vulg. adjutorium simile soli, a help meet for him)—a being capable of receiving and reflecting his thoughts and affections. No sooner was the formation of woman effected, than Adam recognised in that act the will of the Creator as to man's social condition, and immediately acknowledged the importance, in which his posterity might refer as the charter of marriage in all succeeding ages, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and
they shall be one flesh" (ii, 24). From these words, coupled with the circumstances attendant on the formation of the first woman, we may evolve the following principles: (1) The unity of man and wife, as implied in her being formed out of man, and as expressed in the words "one flesh;" (2) the indissolubility of the marriage bond, except on the strongest grounds (compare Matt. xix, 6; Mark x, 7; Rev. xii, 14); (3) the law of marriage, resulting from there having been but one original couple, as is forcibly expressed in the subsequent reference to this passage by our Lord ("they two be one flesh," Matt. xix, 5 and St. Paul ("two shall be one flesh," 1 Cor. vi, 16); (4) the social equality of man and woman is implied in the terms used, that the one being the exact correlative of the other, as well as in the words "help meet for him;" (5) the subordination of the wife to the husband, consequent upon her subsequent formation (1 Cor. xii, 8, 9; 1 Tim. ii, 18); and (6) the respective duties of man and wife, as implied in the words "help meet for him." 

2. The introduction of sin into the world modified to a certain extent the mutual relations of man and wife. As the blame of seduction to sin lay on the latter, the condition of subordination was turned into subjection, and it was said, "Thou art nigh unto the fall" or "Thou art under the fall rule over thee" (Gen. iii, 16)—a sentence which, regarded as a prediction, has been strikingly fulfilled in the position assigned to women in Oriental countries; but which, regarded as a rule of life, is fully sustained by the voice of nature and by the teaching of Christianity (1 Cor. xi, 3; Eph. v, 22, 23; 1 Tim. ii, 15). The evil effects of the fall were soon apparent in the corrupt usages of marriage: the unity of the bond was impaired by polygamy, which appears to have originated among the Canaïtes (Gen. iv, 19); and its purity was deteriorated by the promiscuous intercourse of the "sons of God" with the "daughters of men," i.e., of the Sethites with the Canaïtes, in the days preceding the flood (Gen. vi, 2).

3. For the history of marriage in the later ages, see below. One question may properly be considered here, i.e., elopement. Shortly before the Christian era an important change took place in the views entertained on the question of marriage as affecting the spiritual and intellectual parts of man's nature. Throughout the Old Testament period marriage was regarded as the indispensable duty of every man, nor was it surmised that there has been in it an important back to the attainment of the highest degree of holiness. In the interval that elapsed between the Old and New Testament periods, a spirit of asceticism had been evolved, probably in antagonism to the foreign notions with which the Jews were brought into close and painful contact. The Essenes and the Apocalyptic Church of the "sons of God" regard the propiety of marriage; some of them avoided it altogether, others availed themselves of it under restrictions (Josephus, War, ii, 8, § 2, 13). Similar views were adopted by the Therapeutae, and at a later period by the Gosport's "Book of the Law," i. 214; hence they passed into the Christian Church, forming one of the distinctive tenets of the Encratites (Burton, ii, 161), and finally developing into the system of Monachism. The philosophical tenets on which the prohibition of marriage was based are generally condemned in Col. ii, 16-23, and specifically in 1 Tim. iv, 5. The general propriety of marriage is enforced on various occasions, and abstention from it is commanded only in cases where it was rendered expedient by the calls of duty (Matt. xix, 12; 1 Cor. vii, 8, 25). With regard to remarriage after the death of one of the parties, the Jewish community with other nations, regarded abstinence from it, particularly in the case of a widow, laudable, and a sign of holiness (Luke ii, 36, 7; Josephus, Ant. xvii, 18, 14; xviii, 6, 6); but it is clear, from the example of Josephus (Vit. 76), that there was no prohibition even in the case of a woman who was again married. As far as is regarded as occasionally undesirable (1 Cor. vii, 40), and as an absolute disqualification for holy functions, whether in a man or a woman (1 Tim. iii, 2, 12; v, 9); at the same time it is recommended in the case of young widows (1 Tim. v, 14).

II. Mode of selecting a Bride, Retrospect, and Marriage-Price. 1. Imitating the example of the Fathers of the Universe, who provided the man he made with a wife, fathers from the beginning considered it both their duty and prerogative to find or select wives for their sons (Gen. xxiv, 5; xxxvii, 6). In the absence of the father, the son would devolve upon the mother (Gen. xxii, 21). Even in cases where the wishes of the son were consulted, the proposals were made by the father (Gen. xxxiv, 4, 5); and the violation of this parental prerogative on the part of the son was "a grief of mind" to the father (Gen. xxxvi, 8). The proposals were generally made by the parents of the young man, except when there was a difference of rank; in such a case the negotiations proceeded from the father of the maiden (Exod. ii, 21), and when accepted by the parents on both sides, sometimes also consulting the opinion of the adult brothers of the maiden (Gen. xxv, 4; xxxiv, 11), the matter was considered as settled without requiring the consent of the bride. The case of Rebekah (Gen. xxiv, 58) forms no exception to this general practice, inasmuch as the alliance had already been concluded between Eleazar and Laban before the question put to Rebekah was to consult her opinion, not about it, but about the time of her departure. Before, however, the marriage contract was finally concluded, a price (Hid) was stipulated for, which the young man had to pay to the father of the maiden (Gen. xxv, 15; xxxiv, 12), besides giving presents (Hid) to her relations (Gen. xxiv, 50; xxxiv, 12). This marriage-price was regarded as a compensation due to the parents for the loss of service which their daughter would undergo by the marriage; the matter, as well as for the trouble and expense which they incurred in her education. Hence, if the proffered young man had not the requisite compensation, he was obliged to make it up in service (Gen. xxix, 20; Exod. ii, 21; iii, 1). Some, indeed, deny that a price had to be paid down to the father for marrying his daughter, and appeal for support to Gen. xxxv, 15, where, according to them, "the daughters of Laban make it a matter of complaint, that their father bargained for the services of Jacob in exchange for their hands, just as if they were strangers." Thus showing that the sale of daughters was regarded as an unjust act and a matter of complaint (Sealshutz, Das Mosesische Recht, p. 783). But, on a closer inspection of the passage in question, it will be seen that Rachel and Leah do not at all complain of any indignity heaped on them by being sold just as if they were strangers; they were sold, so to say, for their price, hence the sale to corroborate their statement that they are no longer their father's property, have no more any portion in his possession, and are now regarded by him as strangers, since, according to the usual custom, they have been duly sold to their husband, and hence agree with the latter that it is time for them to depart. Besides, the marriage-price is distinctly mentioned in other passages of Scripture (Exod. xxii, 15, 16; 1 Sam. xviii, 23, 26; Ruth iv, 10; Hos. iii, 2), and was commonly demanded by the nations of antiquity; as the Babylonians (Hered, i, 198); the Assyrians (Elian, V. H. iv, 1; Strabo, xvi, 745); the ancient Greeks (Odyss. viii, 818 sq.; Arist. Politi. ii, 8; Pausan. iii, 12, 2); the Germans (Tacitus, Germ. xviii), and still obtains in the East to the present day. In fact, it could not be otherwise where polygamy was practised. At the number of maidens was under such circumstances less than that of wooers, it called forth competition, and it was but natural that he who offered the highest marriage-price obtained the damsel. There was therefore no fixed marriage-price; it varied according to circumstances. We meet with no dowry in a Greek woman, even when given with the consent of the father; and it was regarded as occasionally undesirable (1 Cor. vii, 40), and as an absolute disqualification for holy functions, whether...
2. The Mosaic enactments introduced no changes into these usages. The father's power over the child in matters of marriage continued paramount, and he could give his children to any one he pleased without asking their consent. Thus Caleb offers his daughter Achsa (Josh. xv, 16, 17) as wife to any one who will conquer Kirjath-shepher (Judg. i, 5). Saul promised his daughter Michal to the Philistine who shall kill the Philistine, and bar ters his daughter Michal for the preprices of a hundred slain Philistines (1 Sam. xvii, 26, 27; xviii, 25-27); and Lo zan takes thirty wives for his thirty sons (Judg. xiii, 5). The imaginary case of women soliciting husbands (Isa. iv, 1, 2) is to be accounted for by reference to the ravages of war, by which the greater part of the males had fallen. A judicial marriage-price (סיוו כיוו ושנש) was now introduced, which was fixed at fifty silver shekels (Exod. xxi, 16, with Deut. xxii, 29), being the highest rate of a servant (Lev. xxviii, 8), so that one had to pay as much for a wife as for a bondwoman. When the father of the maiden was rich and did not want the marriage-price (סיוו כיוו ושנש), he expected some service by way of compensation for giving away his daughter (1 Sam. xviii, 29). As soon as the bargain was concluded, and the marriage-price paid, or the required service rendered, the maiden was regarded as betrothed to her wooer, and as sacredly belonging to him. In fact, she was legally treated as a married woman (סיוו כיוו ושנש); she could not be divorced from her betrothed husband without a null of divorces, and the same law was applicable to her as to married people. If she was persuaded to criminal conduct between the espousals and the bringing her home to her husband's house, both she and her seducer were publicly stoned to death; and if she was violated, the culprit suffered capital punishment (Deut. xxii, 22, 23, with Lev. xxvi, 14; Lev. xv, 10). With such sacredness was betrothal regarded, that even if a bondmaid who was bought with the intention of ultimately becoming a secondary wife (Exod. xxii, 7-11), was guilty of unchastity prior to her entering into that state, both she and her seducer were scourged, while the latter was also obliged to bring a sin-offering, and the priest had to pray for the forgiveness of his sin (Lev. xix, 20-22). Every betrothed man was by the Mosaic law exempt from military service (Deut. xxv, 7).

3. In the post-exilic period, as long as the children were minors—which in the case of a son was up to thirteen, and a daughter to twelve years of age—the parents could betroth them to any one they chose; but when they became of age their consent was required (Maimonides, Hilchot Ishut, iii, 11, 12). Occasionally the law was suspended, when the will was left in the hands of a friend, and hence the case might arise which is supposed by the Talmudists (Yebamot, 2, § 6, 7), that a man might not be aware of which of two sisters he was betrothed. So in Egypt at the present day the choice of a wife is sometimes intrusted to a professional woman styled a khdthbkh; and it is seldom that the bridegroom sees the features of his bride before the marriage has taken place (Lamb, i, 209-211). It has not infrequently happened, however, that the selection of partners for life was made by the young people themselves. For this, the communities connected with the celebration of the festivals in the Temple afforded an excellent opportunity, as may be gathered from the following remark in the Mishna: "R. Simeon ben-Gamaitel says. There were never more joyous festivals in Israel than the 15th of Ab and the Day of Atonement. On the day of the maidens of Jerusalem used to come drest in white garments, which they borrowed, in order not to shame those who had none of their own, and which they had improved [for fear of being polluted]. Thus arrayed, these maidens of Jerusalem went out and danced in the synagogues, singing the song of a young man, and with bright eyes, and see whom thou art about to choose; fix not thine eye upon beauty, but look rather to a pious family; for gracefulness is deceit, and beauty is vanity, but the woman that fears the Lord, she is worthy of praise." (Megilla, iv, 8). Having made his choice, the young man or his father informed the maiden's father of it, whereupon the young people were legally betrothed. The betrothals was celebrated by a feast made in the groom's house (Judg. xvii, 13), and the lists of - sachein, 49 a; Kiddushin, 45 b), and is called סיוו ינשס, made sacred, for by it the bride was made sacred to her bridegroom, and was not to be touched by any one else. It is also called סיוו ינשס, which may be from סיוו ינשס, to betroth. For a betrothal to be legal, it has to be effected in one of the following three modes: 1. By money, or money's worth, which, according to the school of Shammai, must be a denar (טנשף) = 90 grains of pure gold, or, according to the school of Hillel, a perusha ( hứngף) = half a grain of pure silver, and which is to be given to the maiden, or, if she is a minor, to her father, as betrothal price (סיוו ינשס פועש); 2. By letter or contract (טנשף פועש), which the young man, either in person or through a proxy, has to give to the maiden, or to her father when she is a minor; or, 3. By cohabitation (עבב לשון, usu), when the young man and maiden, having pronounced the betrothal formula in the presence of two witnesses, retire into a separate room. This, however, is considered immodest, and the man is scourged (Kiddushin, 12 b). The legal formula to be pronounced is, "Behold, thou art betrothed or sanctified to me (לדנשף ליגאל), according to the law of Moses and Israel" (Kiddushin, 1, 1; iv, 9; Tanhaja Kama, 1; iv; Kethuboth, iv, 8; Maimonides, Hilchot Ishut, iii; Eben Ha-Ezer, xxx, 23). Though betrothals, as we have seen before, was the beginning of marriage itself, and, like it, could only be broken off by a regular bill of divorce (בנשף), yet twelve months were generally allowed to intervene between it and actual marriage (נשף) in the case of a maiden, to prepare her outfit, and thirty days in the case of a widow (Kethuboth, 57 a). The intercourse of the betrothed during this period was regulated by the customs of the different towns (Mishna, Kethuboth, v, 2). When this more solemn betrothment (סיוו ינשס) was afterwards united with the marriage ceremony (נשף), engagements (סיוו ינשס פועש) more in the sense of the word took its place. Its nature and obligation will best be understood by perusing the contents of the contract (בנשף) which is made and signed by the parties, and which is as follows: 'May he who declares the end from the beginning give stability to the words of this contract, and to the covenant made between these two parties! namely, between A, bachelor, with the consent of his father B, and C, who is proxy for his daughter D, spinster. The said A, bachelor, engages, under happy auspices, to take the afore-mentioned D, spinster, by marriage and betrothal (סיוו ינשס פועש), according to the law of Moses and Israel. These henceforth are not to conceal anything from each other appertaining to money or goods, but to have equal power over their property. Moreover, B, the said father of the bridegroom, is to dress his son in goodly apparel before the marriage, and to give the sum of . . . in cash to the father of the bride, to give his daughter before the marriage a dowry in cash to the amount of . . . as well as jewellery to the amount of . . . to dress her in goodly apparel corresponding to the bridegroom the Talith (תלית), i.e. the fringed wrap used at prayer [see Fringe], and Kitel (קטל), i.e. the white burial garment, in harmony with his position and in proportion to the dowry. The marriage is to be (D. V.) on the . . . with the bride (John, a minor), or with the bride's father, and, if agreed to by both parties, may take place within the specified period. Now the two
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parties have pledged themselves to all this, and have
taken upon themselves by an oath to abide by it, on the
penalty of the greatest anathema, and at the peril of forfeit-
ing half the dowry; but the forfeit is not to absolve
from the anathema, nor is the anathema to absolve from
the forfeit. The said father of the bride also under-
takes to board at his table the newly-married couple for
the space of . . . and furnish them with lodgings for the
space of . . . The surety on the part of the bridegroom
is E, son of F; and on the part of the bride, G, son of H.
The two bridal parties, however, guarantee that these
sureties shall not suffer thereby. Further, C, the said
father of the bride, is to give his daughter an assurance
letter, that, in the event of his death, she is to get half
the inheritance of a son (ני aloud, that the
bridegroom pledges himself to get his brothers, in the
event of his dying without issue, to give her a Chalilah
documen [for which see below], without any compensa-
tion. But if there should be dispute or delay on the
subject, which God forbid, the decision is to be left to the
Jewish congregation. We have taken all this in
possession from the party and sureties, for the benefit of
the other parties, so that everything aforementioned
may be observed, with the usual witness which qualified
us to take care of it. Done this day . . . Every-
thing must be observed and kept. (Signed) . . . (Comp.
Nachshon. B. Sh. 6). This contract, which is written
in Rabbinic Hebrew, is used by all orthodox Jews to the
to present day.

III. Marriage Ceremonies.—I. In the pre-Mosaic pe-
tiod, when the proposals were accepted, and the mar-
riage-price (טַנַח), as well as the sundry other gifts
(מְנֹחָה), were duly distributed, the bridegroom (עֵינָי)
could at once remove the bride (טַנַח) from her father's house
to his own house, and this removal of the maiden,
under the beneficence of her family, but without any
definite religious ceremony with whatever consecrations
consummated and expressed marriage (כִּיסֹא יִנֶּס). We thus are told that Isaac, when meeting Eleazar and
Rebekah in the field, as soon as he was informed by the
former of what had transpired, took Rebekah to the tent
of his departed mother, and this without further cere-
mony constituted the marriage, and she thereby became
his wife (גֶּרֶשֶׁת ל יַעֲרָב, Gen. xxvi, 63-67). Under
more ordinary circumstances, however, when the bride
had been taken, it was necessary not to quit her paternal
home, for the protection of a friend, as in the case just mentioned,
but where the marriage took place in the house of the bride's
parents, it was celebrated by a feast, to which all the
friends and neighbors were invited, and which lasted
seven days (כִּיסֹא יִנֶּס). On the first day of the mar-
riage, the bride was conducted to her future husband
veiled, or, more properly, in an outdoor wrapper or shawl
(כִּיסֹא יִנֶּס), which nearly enveloped her whole form, so that
it was impossible to recognize the person, thus account-
ing for the deception practiced on Jacob (Gen. xxiv, 65;
xxxi, 29) and on Judah (Gen. xxxviii, 14).

2. With regard to age, no restriction is pronounced in
the Bible. Every marriage is spoken of with approval
in several passages (Prov. ii, 17; v, 18; Isa. lxxi, 5), and
in reducing this general statement to the more definite
one of years, we must take into account the very early
age at which persons arrive at puberty in Oriental coun-
tries. In modern Egypt marriage takes place in gen-
eral before the bride has attained the age of sixteen,
frequently when she is twelve or thirteen, and occasion-
ally when she is only ten (Lane, l, 208). The Mosaic
law prescribes no civil or religious forms for the cele-
buration of marriage. The contract or promise made at
the payment of the marriage-price, or when the service
which was required in its stead was rendered, constitu-
ted the solemn bond which henceforth united the es-
poused parties, as is evident from the fact pointed out in
the preceding sections, that a betrothed maiden was
both called a married woman, and was legally treated
as such. There can, however, be no doubt that the anc-
ient custom of celebrating the consummation of the
marriage by a feast, which lasted seven days (Num. xvi,
22, 27), must have become pretty general by this time.
Thus we are told that when Samson went to Timnath
to take his wife, he made there a feast, which continued
for seven days, according to the usage of young men
on such occasions (גֶּרֶשֶׁת ל יַעֲרָב), that the parents
of the bride invited thirty young men (ויִאָשׁ ל יִנֶּס),
and that to honor his nuptials, and that to prop-
voces (Gen. xiv, 10). We afterwards find that
the bridal pair were adorned with nuptial crowns (Can. iii, 11; Isa. lxx, 10) made of various materi-
als—gold, silver, myrrh, olive—varying in costliness
according to the circumstances of the parties (Mish-
na, Sota, ix, 14; Gemara, 49 a and b; Selden, Us. Ebr.
ii, 15), and that the bride especially wore gorgeous apar-
el, and a peculiar girdle (Psa. xlv, 13, 14; Isa. xlix, 18; Jer. ii, 12), whence in fact she derived her name
Kedla (קֶדֶל), which signifies the ornamented, the
adorned. And at the end of the bridegroom and bride
were led in joyous procession through the streets, accompa-
nied by bands of singers and musicians (Jer. vii, 34;
xxix, 10; xxxiii, 11), and saluted by the greetings of
the maidens of the place, who manifested the liveliest
interest in the nuptial train (Can. iii, 11), to the house of
the bridegroom, or that of his father's house, where the
feast was prepared, to which all the friends and the
neighbors were invited, and at which most probably
that sacred covenant was concluded which came into
d均由 the post-Mosaic period (Prov. ii, 17; Ezek.
xxvi, 20, Mal. ii, 16). The bride, thickly veiled, was then
conducted to the (כִּיסֹא יִנֶּס) bridal chamber (Gen. xxiii, 23;
Judg. xv, 11; Joel ii, 6), where a nuptial couch (כִּיסֹא יִנֶּס)
was prepared (Psa. xlix, 5; Joel ii, 16) in such a manner
as to afford facility for ascertaining the following morn-
ing whether she had preserved her maiden purity; for
in the absence of the siga virginalis she was stoned
to death before her father's house (Deut. xxii, 10-21).

3. In the period after the exile the proper age for
marriage is fixed in the Mishna at eighteen (Aboth, v,
81), and though, for the sake of preserving morality,
purity was regarded as the desirable age, yet men gen-
erally married when they were seventeen (Jebromoth, 62;
Kidushin, 29). The Talmudistas forbade marriage in
the case of a man under thirteen years and a day, and
in the case of a woman under twelve years and a day
(Buxtorf, Symposiog. cap. 7, p. 149). The day originally
fixed for marriage was Wednesday for maidens and Fri-
day for widows (Mishna, Kethuboth, i, 1). But the Tal-
mud already partially discarded this arrangement (Ge-
mana, ed, 3 a), and in the Middle Ages it became quite
obsolete (Eben Ha-Exar, lxxv). The primitive practice
of the sages, however, has been resumed among the
orthodox Jews in Russia, Poland, etc. The wedding-feast
was celebrated in the house of the bridegroom (Kethu-
both, 8 a, 10 a), and in the evening, for the bridal pair
fasted all day, since on it, as on the day of atonement,
they confessed their sins, and their transgressions were
forgiven. On the day of the wedding, the bride, with
her hair flowing, and a myrtle wreath on her head (if
she was a maiden, Mishu, Kethuboth, ii, 1), was con-
ducted, with music, singing, and dance, by the bride's
relations and friends, who were adorned with chapes of myrtle, and carried palm
branches in their hands (Kethuboth, 16, 17; Sabbath, 110
a; Sota, 49 b). The streets through which the nuptial
procession passed were lined with the daughters of Is-
rael, who greeted the joyous train, and scattered before
them cakes and roasted ears of wheat, while fountains
freely poured forth wine (Kethuboth, 15 b; Berachoth,
50 b). Having reached the house, the bridegroom, ac-
companied by the groomsmen, met the bride, took her
by the hand, and led her to the threshold. The Kethu-
the marriage-feast was enlivened by the guests, who sang various songs and asked each other amusing riddles (Berachot, 51a; Nedahim, 51a), parched corn was distributed among the guests if the bride was a virgin (Kethuboth, 7b), and when the meal was concluded with customary prayer of thanksgiving, the bridegroom supplementation in the presence of at least ten persons (Kethuboth, 7b), which gave the last religious consecration to the marriage-covenant, and which are as follows: 1. "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast created everything for thy glory." 2. "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast created man in thine image, in the image of the likeness of thy own form, and hast prepared for him, in himself, a building for the perpetuity of the races. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the creator of man." iv. "The barren woman shall rejoice exceedingly, and about joy for when her children are gathered around her in delight. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who rejoiced Zion in her children." v. "Make this loving pair to rejoice exceedingly, as thou hast made thy creature rejoice in the beauty of Eden." vi. "Blessed art thou, O Lord, who rejoiced the bridegroom and the bride." vii. "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast ordained joy and gladness, bride and bridegroom, delight and song, pleasure and intimacy, love and friendship, peace and concord; speedily, O Lord, let thy word be heard in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem the voice of joy and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the voice of jubilant bridegrooms under their canopies, and of the young men at the nuptial feast, singing and playing music. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who maketh the bridegroom and bride rejoice in his own. viii. "Remove all suffering and anger; there will the dumb be heard in song; lead us in the paths of righteousness, listen to the benedictions of the children of Jeshurun! With the permission of our seniors and rabbis, and my masters, let us bless our God in whose dwelling is joy, and of whose bounties we have partaken; to which the guests respond, 'Blessed be our God, in whose dwelling is joy, of whose bounties we have partaken, and by whose goodness we live; and he then raises us to bless our God, in whose dwelling is joy, of whose bounties we have partaken, and by whose goodness we live' (Kethuboth, 7b, 8). The married couple were then conducted to an elaborately ornamented nuptial chamber (maidan, where the bridal couch (talatam) was carefully prepared; and at the performance of the linurum virginitatis the following morning (Deut. xxv, 11-21), which was anxiously awaited, the following benediction was pronounced by the bridegroom: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast placed a nut in paradise, the rose of the valleys—a stranger must not rule over this sealed fountain; this is why the kind of love has preserved the holy seed in purity, and has not broken the compact. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast chosen Abraham and his seed after him!" (see Halakhot Gedoloth, ed. Vienna, 51 [comp. Pliny, Hist. Nat. xtv, 24], where an explanation will be found of the use of ma'at, nut, in this connection). Festivities continued for seven days (Kethuboth, 7a). As important religious questions had to be decided by the bridal party, it was decided that a learned man be called in (Gen. xxi, 6; Kidushin, 6, 18), it was afterwards resolved that the marriage-ceremony should be performed by a rabbi, and it is celebrated in the following manner: A beautifully-embroidered silk or velvet canopy, about three or four yards square, supported by four long poles, is held by four men outstretched on the day of the wedding. Under this canop (ma'at), which represents the ancient bridal chamber, the bridegroom is led by his male...
friends, preceded by a band of music, and welcomed by the joyous spectators with the exclamation, *Blessed is he* 

(נֶבֶט), the bride, with her face veiled (*nupshes*), is then brought to him by her female friends and led three times round the bridegroom, in accordance, as they say, with the remark of Jeremiah, *"The woman shall compass the man"* (xxxii. 22), when he takes her round once amid the congratulations of the bystanders, and then places her at his right hand (*Psar. xii. 10*), both standing with their faces to the north and their backs to the north. The rabbi then covers the bridal pair with the *Talit*, or fringed wrapper, which the bridegroom has on (comp. Ruth iii. 19; Ezek. xvi. 8), joins their hands together, and pronounces over a cup of wine the benediction of alliance (יִבְנֶה לְאָלֶף), which is as follows: *"Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast created the fruit of the vine. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast forbidden to us consanguinity, and hast prohibited us the betrothed, but hast permitted us those whom we take by marriage and betrothal. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy betrothal and marriage (קֹתֶב בַּתִּיץ, 7 a). Whereupon the bridegroom and bride take the taste of the cup of blessing, and the former produces a plain gold ring, and, in the presence of all the party, puts it on the bride's finger, saying, *"This ring is consecrated with this ring according to the rites of Moses and Israel."* The rabbi then reads aloud, in the presence of appointed witnesses, the *Ketubah*, or the marriage-settlement, which is written in Syro-Chaldaic, and concludes by pronouncing over another cup of wine the seven benedictions (יִבְנֶה לְאָלֶף), which the bridegroom in ancient times, before the ceremony of marriage became a public act and was delegated to the spiritual head, used to pronounce himself at the end of the meal. The bridegroom and bride taste again of this cup of blessing, and when the glass is emptied it is put on the ground, and the bridegroom breaks it with his foot, as a symbol to remind them in the midst of their joys that just as this glass is destroyed, so Jerusalem is destroyed and trodden down under the foot of the Gentiles. With this the ceremony is concluded, amid the shouts, *May you be happy!* (יִבְנֶה לְאָלֶף). See WEDDING.

IV. Polygamy and Concubinage.—1. Though the history of the protoplasts,—in which we are told that God in his providence created a single partner for each sexseems to exhibit a standard for monogamy, yet the Scriptures record that from the remotest periods men had simultaneously several wives, occupying either coordinate or subordinate positions. Against the opinion that Lamech, sixth in descent from Adam through Cain, introduced polygamy—based on the circumstance that he is the first who is recorded as having married two wives (Gen. iv. 19)—is to be urged that (1.) Lamech is the first whose marriage or taking of a wife is recorded, and consequently it is impossible to say how many wives his five progenitors had; (2.) The mention of Lamech's two wives is incidental, and is entirely owing to the fact that the sacred historian had to notice the useful inventions made by their respective sons Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal-Cain, as well as to give the oldest piece of rhythmical composition which was addressed to the deities, celebrating one of these inventions; and (3.) If polygamy had been for the first time introduced by Lamech, the sacred writer would have had distinctly mentioned it as he mentions the things which were first introduced by Lamech's sons. The manner in which Sarah urges Abraham to take his servant Hagar into his harem (Gen. xvi. 4), the fact that Sarah herself gives her maiden to her own husband (לַעֲבֹר בַּתִּיזָה לְאָלֶף) to be his wife, the readiness with which the patriarch accepts the proposal (Gen. xvi. 1-4), unquestionably show that it was a common custom to have one or more secondary wives. In fact, it is distinctly mentioned that Nahor, Abraham's own brother, who had eight sons by Milcah, his principal wife, and consequently did not require another wife for the purpose of securing progeny, had nevertheless a secondary wife (לַעֲבֹר בַּתִּיזָה לְאָלֶף), by whom he had four sons (Gen. xxii. 21-24).

Besides, it is now pretty generally admitted that Gen. xxxv, 1 describes Abraham himself to have taken another or secondary wife in the lifetime of Sarah, in addition to Hagar, who was given to him by his principal wife, as is evident from Gen. xxxv. 6; 1 Chron. i. 32, and that he could not have taken her for the sake of obtaining an heir. If any more proof be wanted for the prevalence of polygamy in the patriarchal age, we refer to Esau, who, to please his father, married his cousin Ma-halalth, in preference to the several wives of his uncle Simon (Gen. xxxvii. 8, 9); and to Jacob, who had not the slightest scruple to marry two sisters, and take two half-wives at the same time (Gen. xxix. 28-30; xxx. 4, 9), which would be unaccountable on the supposition that polygamy was something strange. Though sacred history is silent about the number of wives of the twelve patriarchs, yet there can be little doubt that the large number of children and grandchildren which Benjamin had at so early an age (Gen. xlix. 21; Num. xxxvi. 36-41; 1 Chron. vii. 6-12; viii. 1), must have been the result of polygamy. Moreover, that Simon, at all events, had more than one wife (Exod. vi. 15). The extraordinary rate at which the Jews increased in Egypt implies that they practiced polygamy during their bondage. This is, moreover, corroborated by the incidental notice that Asher, Judah, and Naphtali, of the two wives (Gen. xli. 18, with ii. 34); that Caleb, Judah's great-grandson, had three principal and two subordinate wives (1 Chron. ii. 9, 18, 42, 46, 48); that Abrahahaim, probably Benjamin's great-grandson, had three wives (1 Chron. viii. 8-11); and that Moses had two wives (Exod. ii. 21; Num. xii. 1), as well as by the fact that the Moses legislation assumes the existence of polygamy (Lev. xix. 14; Deut. xxxv. 47). Still, the theory of monogamy seems to have been exhibited in the case of Noah and his three sons (Gen. vi. 18; vii. 7, 18; viii. 10), of Aaron, and of Eleazar.

In judging of this period we must take into regard the following considerations: (1.) The principle of monogamy was retained, even in the practice of polygamy, by the distinction made between the chief or original wife and the secondary wives, or, as the A. V. terms them, "concubines"—a term which is objectionable, inasmuch as it is applied to us in the Old Testament to an unhonored and unrecognized position, whereas the secondary wife was regarded by the Hebrews as a wife, and her rights were secured by law. The position of the Hebrew concubine may be compared with that of the concubine of the early Christian Church, the sole distinction between her and the wife consisting in this, that the marriage was not in accordance with the civil law: in the eye of the Church the marriage was perfectly valid (Bingham, Ant. xi, 5, § 11). It is worthy of notice that the term *pillegorah* (לַעֲבֹר בַּתִּיזָה) — "concubine" nowhere occurs in the Mosaisic law. The terms used are either "wife" (Deut. xxii. 15) or "maid-servant" (Exod. xxii. 7); the latter applying to a person who becomes the wife of another by purchase. (2.) The motive which led to polygamy was that absorbing desire of progeny which is prevalent throughout Eastern countries, and was especially powerful among the Hebrews. (3.) The power of a father over his child, and of a master over his slave (the *postestas patria* and dominicus of the Romans), was paramount even in matters of marriage, and may pass to any cases to phases of polygamy that are otherwise quite unintelligible, as, for instance, to the cases where it was adopted by the husband at the request of his wife, under the idea that children born to a slave were in the eye of the law the children of the master, and therefore only: (xxx. 4, 9); or, again, to cases where it was adopted at the instance of the father (Gen. xxix. 28, 29; Exod. xxi. 9, 10). It must be allowed that polygamy, thus legalized and systematized, justified to a certain extent by
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the motive, and entered into, not only without offence to, but actually at the suggestion of those who, according to our notions, would feel most deeply injured by it, is a very different thing from what polygamy would be in our own state of society.

As to polygamy, as in that of other national customs, the Mosaic law adheres to the established usage. Hence there is not only no express statute to prohibit polygamy, which was previously held lawful, but the Mosaic law presupposes its existence and practice, bases its legislation thereupon, and thus authorizes it, as evidenced from the following enactment is clear:

1. It is ordained that a king "shall not multiply wives unto himself" (Deut. xvii, 17), which, as bishop Patrick rightly remarks, "is not a prohibition to take more wives than one, but not to have an excessive number, after the manner of Eastern kings, whom Solomon seems to have irritated;" thus, in fact, legalizing a moderate number.

The Mishna (Sanhedrin, ii, 4), the Talmud (Babylon Sanhedrin, 21 a), Rashi (on Deut. xvii, 17), etc., in harmony with ancient tradition, regard eighteen wives, including half wives, as a moderate number, and as not violating the injunction contained in the expression "multiply." 2. The law enacts that a man is not to marry his wife's sister to vex her while she lives (Lev. xvi, 18), which, as the same prelate justly urges, manifestly means "that though two wives at a time, or more, may be united in those days, a father should take two sisters (as Jacob had formerly done) begotten of the same father or born of the same mother;" or, in other words, a man is at liberty to take another wife besides the first, and during her lifetime, provided only they are not sisters. 3. The law of primogeniture (Deut. xxii, 13-17) actually presupposes the case of a man having two wives, one beloved and the other not, as it was with Jacob and his two wives, and ordains that if the one less beloved is the mother of his first-born, the husband is not to transfer the right of primogeniture to the son of another wife; but is to acknowledge him as first-born who is actually so. 4. Exod. xxvi, 9, 10, permits a father who has given his son a bondwoman for a wife, to give him a second wife of freer birth, and prescribes how the first is then to be treated — that she is to have allowance, clothes, and the conjugal duty; and 5. Deut. xxxi, 15 expressly enjoins that a man, though having a wife already, is to marry his deceased brother's widow.

Having existed before the Mosaic law, and being acknowledged and made the basis of legislation by it, polygamy continued in full force during the whole of this period. Thus, during the government of the judges, we find two cases of polygamy on record. 1. Judges ii, 19, 21, and 22, and 1 Sam. i, 2. During the monarchy, we find Saul, the first king of Israel, had many wives, and three score and ten sons (Judg. viii, 30), 2. Jair the Gileadite, also a judge of Israel, had thirty grown-up sons (Judg. x, 4) and a proportionate number of daughters. 3. Ben, another judge of Israel, had thirty full-grown sons and thirty full-grown daughters (Judg. xii, 9), and Abdon, also a judge of Israel, had forty adult sons and thirty adult daughters — which was utterly impossible without polygamy; the pious Elekhanan, father of Samuel the illustrious judge and prophet, had two wives and 35 sons (1 Sam. i, 5). 4. During the monarchy, we find Saul, the first king of Israel, had one wife and six concubines (1 Sam. i, 15). 5. During the same period, Jehoshaphat, the son of Rehoboam, was the first king of Judah to multiply wives and concubines, having 33 wives and 60 concubines (2 Chron. xii, 1), 6. Zedekiah, the last king of Judah, married 14 wives and concubines (2 Kings xi, 3), and 7. The last king of Judah, Jehoiakim, was the last king of Judah to marry 12 wives and concubines (2 Kings xxiv, 18). 8. In the time of the captivity, the first king of the captivity, Nebuchadnezzar, was the first king of the captivity to multiply wives, having 10 wives and concubines (2 Chron. xii, 1); Abijah, his son and successor to the throne of Judah, married fourteen wives (2 Chron. xiv, 1); and Josiah, the tenth king, including David, who reigned from B.C. 878 to 838, had two wives given to him by the godly high-priest Jehoiada, who restored both the throne of David and the worship of the true God according to the law of Moses (2 Chron. xxiv, 3). A very remarkable illustration of the prevalence of polygamy in private life is given in 1 Chron. vii, 4, where we are told that not only did the five fathers, all of them great chieftains of the house of Jashar, live in polygamy; but that their descendants, numbering 36,000 men, "had many wives." De Wette, indeed, affirms that "the Hebrew moral teachers speak decidedly for monogamy, as is evident from their always speaking of one wife, and from the high notion which they have of a good and faithful wife." A silly notion, this, in the case of a husband, but a bad wife is like rottenness in the bones (Prov. iii, 4); "Whoose findeth a wife findeth happiness" (xviii, 22); "A house and wealth are an inheritance from parents, but a discreet wife is from the Lord" (Prov. xix, 14); and it describes an innocent and managing wife in such a manner as one only could be it" (Christl. Sittenlehre, vol. iii, sec. 472). Similarly Ewald: "Wherever a prophet alludeth to matrimonial matters, he always assumes faithful and sacred monogamy contracted for the whole life as the legal one" (Jud. Alterthumser Israels, p. 177 sq.). But we have exactly analogous passages where parental fidelity is described: "A wise son is happiness to the father, but a foolish son is the grief of his mother" (Prov. x, 1; xv, 20); "A wise son heareth his father's instruction" (xxii, 1); and "If a man die, having no children to inherit the property, the theory of having only one son is assumed by the sacred moralist, because, when speaking of happiness or misery, which parents derive from their offspring, only one son is alluded to. Besides, the facts which we have enumerated cannot be set aside by arguments.

As nothing is said in the post-exilian portions of the Bible to discourage polygamy, this ancient practice also continued among the Jews during this period. During the second Temple, we find that Herod the Great had nine wives (Josephus, Ant. xvi, 1, 3); his two sons, Archelaus the Ethnarch, and Antipas the Tetrarch (Josephus, Ant. xvi, 12, 2; xviii, 5, 1); and John the Baptist and other Jews, who censured the one for violating the Mosaic law by the marriage of his deceased brother's wife who had children (Josephus, Ant. xvi, 12, 2), and the other for marrying Herod's half-sister, the wife of his half-brother Herod-Philip (Matt. xiv, 8, 4; Mark vi, 17, 18; Luke iii, 19), raised no cry against their practicing polygamy; because, as Josephus tells us, "the Jews of those days adhered to their ancient practice to have many wives at the same time" (Josephus, Ant. xvi, 1, 2). In harmony with the theory of their polity in Israel, the law of the empire enacted various statutes to regulate polygamy and protect the rights and settlement of each wife (Mishna, Yebamoth, iv, 11; Ketuboth, x, 1, 6; Kiddushin, ii, 7), and the Mosaic law in the marriage of his deceased brother's wife who had children (Josephus, Ant. xvi, 12, 2), and the other for marrying Herod's half-sister, the wife of his half-brother Herod-Philip (Matt. xiv, 8, 4; Mark vi, 17, 18; Luke iii, 19), raised no cry against their practicing polygamy; because, as Josephus tells us, "the Jews of those days adhered to their ancient practice to have many wives at the same time" (Josephus, Ant. xvi, 1, 2). In harmony with the theory of their polity in Israel, the law of the empire enacted various statutes to regulate polygamy and protect the rights and settlement of each wife (Mishna, Yebamoth, iv, 11; Ketuboth, x, 1, 6; Kiddushin, ii, 7). As a striking illustration of the prevalence and legality of polygamy during this period may be mentioned the following circumstance which is recorded in the Talmud: Twelve widows appealed to their brother-in-law to perform the duty of Levir, which he refused to do, because he saw no prospect how to maintain such an additional number of wives and possibly a large family, hence the case was handed over to Jehu the Holy, who promised that if the man would do the duty enjoined on him by the Mosaic law, he himself would maintain the family and their children. In case such there should be any, every sabbatical year, when no produce was to be got from the land, which was at rest. The offer was accepted by the Levir, and he accordingly married his twelve sisters-in-law; and after three years these twelve wives appeared with thirty-six children before Jehudah the Holy to demand the promised allowance, as it was then that the half-wisdom of the law was at rest. The offer was accepted by the Levir, and he accordingly married his twelve sisters-in-law; and after three years these twelve wives appeared with thirty-six children before Jehudah the Holy to demand the promised allowance, as it was then that the half-wisdom of the law was at rest. The offer was accepted by the Levir, and he accordingly married his twelve sisters-in-law; and after three years these twelve wives appeared with thirty-six children before Jehudah the Holy to demand the promised allowance, as it was then that the half-wisdom of the law was at rest. The offer was accepted by the Levir, and he accordingly married his twelve sisters-in-law; and after three years these twelve wives appeared with thirty-six children before Jehudah the Holy to demand the promised allowance, as it was then that the half-wisdom of the law was at rest. The offer was accepted by the Levir, and he accordingly married his twelve sisters-in-law; and after three years these twelve wives appeared with thirty-six children before Jehudah the Holy to demand the promised allowance, as it was then that the half-wisdom of the law was at rest. The offer was accepted by the Levir, and he accordingly married his twelve sisters-in-law; and after three years these twelve wives appeared with thirty-six children before Jehudah the Holy to demand the promised allowance, as it was then that the half-wisdom of the law was at rest. The offer was accepted by the Levir, and he accordingly married his twelve sisters-in-law; and after three years these twelve wives appeared with thirty-six children before Jehudah the Holy to demand the promised allowance, as it was then that the half-wisdom of the law was at rest. The offer was accepted by the Levir, and he accordingly married his twelve sisters-in-law; and after three years these twelve wives appeared with thirty-six children before Jehudah the Holy to demand the promised allowance, as it was then that the half-wisdom of the law was at rest.
remark in the Mishna, that a Levir may marry his deceased brother's four widows (Jebamoth, iv, 11), the Babylonian Gemara concluded that it recommends a man to have no more than this number (Babyl. Jebamoth, 44 a); and from this most probably Mohammed's injunction is derived (Koran, iv, 8). It was Rabban Gershom ben-Jehudah of France (born cir. 960, died 1028), who, in the 11th century, prohibited polygamy under pains of excommunication, saving in exceptional cases (Gritz, Geschichte der Juden, v, 405-507). His motive for doing so is a matter of dispute; the older Occidental rabbins say that the prohibition originated in a desire to preserve the peace of the family, while the Oriental rabbins will have it that it was dictated by the governments of Christian countries. His interdict, however, made but slow progress, even in Germany and France, for which it was chiefly designed. Thus Simon ben-Abraham of Sens, one of the most celebrated French Talmudists, tells us (cir. 1200): "The institution of R. Gershom has made no progress either in our neighborhood or in the provinces of France. On the contrary, it happens that pious and learned men and many other people marry a second wife in the lifetime of the first" (B-Joseph, Eben Het-Exar, 1). The practice of marrying a second wife in the event of the first having no issue within ten years also obtained in Italy till about the 15th century—the pope giving a special dispensation for it. The Spanish Jews never recognized R. Gershom's interdict; bigamy was practiced in Castile till the 14th century, while the Christian government of Navarre declared polygamy among the Jews legal, and the law of king Theobald allowed them to marry as many wives as they could maintain and govern, but they were not permitted to divorce any one of them without sending all away (Kayserling, Geschichte der Juden in Spanien, 1, 71). Nor was the said interdict acknowledged by the Jews in the East; and monogamy is there practiced simply because the bride makes a special agreement, and has a clause inserted in the Ketubah (סכום קנה), or marriage-settlement, that her husband is not to marry another as long as she lives. An exception, however, is made in case there is no issue. As to the opinion of the Karaites on monogamy and polygamy, the celebrated Jehudah ben-Ella Hadassi (Bourheil 1149) remarks, in his famous work against rabbinic Judaism, "The Pentateuch prohibits one to marry two wives with a view to vex one of them (/ofa ויבכ רץ, Lev. xviii, 18); but he may take them provided he loves them and does not grieve either of them, and treats them both affectionately. If he does not diminish their food, raiment, and conjugal rights (Exod. xxi, 11), he is allowed to take two wives or more, just as Elkanah married Hannah and Peninnah, and as David, peace be upon him, and other kings and judges did" (Zekhol Hacopher, ed. Equatoria, 1866, p. 129). From this it is evident that polygamy was not prohibited by the Jewish law, nor was it regarded as a sin, and that the monogamy of the Jews in the present day is simply in obedience to the laws of the countries in which they live. There were, however, always some rabbins who discouraged polygamy (Abot, ii, 7; Jebamoth, 65 a, al.); and the elevated notion which they had of monogamy is seen in the statutes which they enacted that the high-priest is to be the husband of one wife and to keep to her (Jebamoth, 58 a; Maimonides, Hilchoth Isure Bia, xviii, 13; Josephus, Ant. iii, 12, 2); and which the apostle Paul also urges on Christian bishops (1 Tim. iii, 2; Titus i, 16).

V. Prescribed Degrees and Laws of Intermarriage.—
1. There were no prescribed degrees within which a man was forbidden to marry in the pre-Mosaic period. On
It will be seen from the foregoing table that, while some kinds are proscribed, others are allowed, e. g. a father's sister is forbidden while a brother's daughter is not. This has occasioned great difficulty in tracing the principle which underlies these prohibitions. Philipp- per's solution is of the assertion that it is possible to deduce the remarks which accompany the respective vetoes. The stepmother is proscribed because "it is thy father's nakedness" (Lev. xviii, 9); the son's or daughter's daughter because it "is thine own nakedness" (ver. 10); the father's or mother's daughter because she is the "father's or mother's death" (ver. 12, 29); and the brother's or sister's daughter because it "is the nakedness of thy brother" (ver. 16).

"From this it is evident," this erudite rabbi submits, "that, on the one side, son, daughter, and grandchild are identified with the father, while, on the other side, brethren and sisters are identified with each other, because they have one and the same source of life. Accordingly, we obtain the following data. All members proceeding from a common father or mother constitute one issue, because they possess together the same source of life; while the ascendants and the descendants in a straight line form one line, because they have one after the other and from each other the same source of life; and hence the law—1. Two members of the same issue, or two members of the same line, are not to intermarry, because they have the same source of life. But inasmuch as the ascendants enter the issue, and the descending the derived to every ascending, an ascending issue may press forward out of the straight line, or step down into the following, i. e. the primary into the one derived from it; while the succeeding cannot go backwards into the foregoing, i. e. the derived into the primary. Now, as the man is the moving cause in carnal intercourse, hence the law—2. A male member of the succeeding issue must not marry a female member of the preceding issue, while, on the contrary, a male member of the preceding may marry a female of the succeeding issue, provided they are not both of a direct line. Half-blood and step-relations make no difference in this respect, since they are identified, both in the issue and in the line, because husband and wife become identified. It is for this reason, also, that the relationship, which the wife always assumes in marriage with regard to her husband, is such a blood relation bears to her; hence it is, for instance, that a brother's wife is proscribed, while the wife's sister is allowed. Thus the principle of the Mosaic proscriptions is a profound one, and is fully borne out by nature. Carnal intercourse has for its object only a third by the combination of two opposites; but that which proceeds from the same source of life is merely of the same kind. Hence, when two, originally of the same kind, unite, it is contrary to the true design of copulation, and can only proceed from an overpowering and excess of rude and animal passions. It is a desecration of the nature and morality of man, and the highest defilement" (Jewish Ethics, i, 588 sq.; 8d. ed. Lipsia, 1863).

Different penalties are attached to the infringement of these prohibitions. The punishment of death is to be inflicted in the case of a Levite marrying a wife from the same tribe (Lev. xx, 11), or a daughter-in-law (Lev. xviii, 15; xx, 12); of death by fire for marrying a woman and her daughter at the same time (xviii, 17; xx, 14); of being cut off or excommunicated for marrying a sister on the father's side or on the mother's side (xviii, 9; xx, 17); of not being pardoned for marrying a father's sister (xviii, 12; xx, 19); of not being pardoned and childlessness for marrying a father's brother's wife (xviii, 14; xx, 20); and of childlessness alone for marrying a brother's wife (xviii, 16; xx, 21), the case of a Levite marrying (Deut. xii, 15). Pardonnability is mentioned for marrying one's mother (xviii, 7), grand-daughter (xviii, 10), or both sisters together (xviii, 18). From this enumeration it will be seen that it only specifies three instances in which capital punishment is to be inflicted.
The grounds on which these prohibitions were enacted are reducible to the following three heads: (1) moral propriety; (2) the expenses of maintaining the household; and (3) social convenience. The first of these grounds common to all is prominently forward in the expressions by which the various offenses are characterized, as well as in the general prohibition against approaching "the flesh of his flesh." The use of such expressions undoubtedly contains an appeal to the honor naturalis, or that repugnance with which man instinctively shrinks from matrimonial union with one with whom he is connected by the closest ties both of blood and of family affection. On this subject we need say no more than that there is a distinction between the affections which bind the members of a family together, and that which lies at the bottom of the matrimonial bond, and that the amalgamation of these affections cannot take place without a serious shock to one or the other of the two; hence the desirability of drawing a distinct line between the provinces of each, by stating definitely where the matrimonial affection may legitimately take root. The second motive to laying down these prohibitions was that the Hebrews might be preserved as a peculiar people, with institutions distinct from those of the Egyptians and other nations with which they came in contact. The Egyptians were more nearly related to the Hebrews than nations with whom they might come in contact.

Marriages with the proscribed degrees prevailed in many civilized countries in historical times, and were not unusual among the Hebrews themselves in the pre-Mosaic age. For instance, marriages with half-sisters by Moses (Gen. xxv, 15), by Moabites (Cim. 4; Thenestocl. 32), with half-sisters by the same mother at Sparta (Philo, De spec. leg. p. 779), and with full sisters in Egypt (Diod. i, 27) and Persia, as illustrated in the well-known instances of Pelemy Philadelphus in the former (Paus. i, 7, 1), and Cambyses in the latter country (Herod. iii, 81). It was even believed that in some nations marriages between a son and his mother were not unusual (Ovid, Met. x, 381; Eurip. Androm. 174). Among the Hebrews we have instances of marriage with a half-sister in the case of Abraham (Gen. xxv, 21), with an aunt in the case of Amram (Exod. vi, 20), and with two sisters at the same time in the case of Jacob (Gen. xxix, 26). Such cases were justifiable previous to the enactments of Moses: subsequently to them we have no case in the O.T. of actual marriage within the degrees, though the language of Tamar towards her half-brother Amnon (2 Sam. xiii, 13) implies the possibility of their union with the consent of their father. The Herods committed some violent breaches of the marriage law. Herod the Great married his half-sister (Matt. xvi, 5); Archelaus his brother's widow, who was still in the chancery of her father (Matt. ii, 21); Herod Antipas' brother's wife (xviii, 5; Matt. xvii, 4). In the Christian Church we have an instance of marriage with a father's wife (1 Cor. vi, 1), which St. Paul characterizes as "fornication" (απροσώπιον), and visita with the severest condemnation.

The third ground of the prohibitions, social convenience, comes forward solemly in the case of marriage with two sisters simultaneously, the effect of which would be to "vex" or irritate the first wife, and produce domestic jars. Besides the proscribed degrees, the Mosaic law also forbids the following intermarriages: i. No Israelite is to marry the progeny of incestuous and unlawful copulations, or a maimer (יַעֲשֶׂה, Deut. xxiii, 2). In the absence of any Biblical definition of this much-disputed expression, we must accept the ancient traditional explanation contained in the Mishna, which is as follows: "When their head is betrothed without transgression of the law about forbidden marriage, e. g. when the daughters of Levites, Levites, or Israelites are married to priests, Levites, or Israelites—the child goes after the father; where there is betrothal, and this law has been transgressed—e. g. if a widow is married to a high-priest, a divorced woman, or one who performed the ceremony of chullin to an ordinary priest, or a bastard or a fe-

male nehilim to an Israelite; or, vice versa, if a Jewess is married to a bastard or nehilim—the child goes after the inferior party; where the woman cannot be betrothed to the man, he might legally be betrothed to another person—e. g., if a man married within any one of the degrees proscribed by the law—the child is a bastard or maimer" (Kid. hil. iii, 12). ii. Any person who is יַעֲשֶׂה, cujus testiculi vulnerati sunt, or ceci eunctus eorum, or בֶּלֶם, cujus membrum virile praeconium est, as the Mishna (Jeb. viii, 2) explains it, is not allowed to marry (Deut. xxiii, 1). iii. A man is not to remarry a woman whom he had divorced, and who, after marrying another husband, has become a widow, or been divorced again (Deut. xxiv, 2-4). iv. Hebrews are not allowed to intermarry with persons of another tribe (Numb. xxvi, 5-9). v. A high-priest is forbidden to marry a widow, a divorced woman, a profane woman, or a harlot, and restricted to a pure Jewish maiden (Lev. xv, 13, 14). vi. Ordinary priests are prohibited from marrying prostitutes and divorced women (Lev. xx, 7).

b. The proscription of epigamy with non-Israelites is absolute with regard to some nations, and conditional with regard to others. The Canaanites are forbidden to intermarry with the seven Canaanitish nations, on the ground that it would lead the Israelites into idolatry (Exod. xxxiv, 15, 16; Deut. vii, 13, 24); and with the Ammonites and Moabites, on account of national antipathy (Deut. xxiii, 3-4); while the prohibition against marriage with Egypt and Ethiopia tends to the third generation (Deut. xxiii, 7, 8). The Talmud, which rightly expounds the prohibition to enter into the congregation of the Lord as necessarily extending to epigamy (comp. 1 Kings xi, 2; Kid. iv, 3, 3), takes the same interpretation to mean the intermarriage of the Israelites with those of the cease proieltes, i.e. the grandchildren of an Ammonite or Moabit who professes Judaism (Mishna, Jeb., viii, 3; Maonimode, Yad Ha-Chazak, Iserue Rish, xii, 19, 20). This view is confirmed by the fact that the Bible only mentions three intermarriages with Egyptians, and records at least two out of the three to show the evil effect of them. One occurred in the wilderness, and in the wilderness, and we are told that the son of this intermarriage, while quarrelling with a brother Jew, blasphemed the name of God, and suffered capital punishment. (Lev. xxiv, 10-14): the second occurred towards the end of the history of the Jewish people, when Judah endeavours to show that Ishmael, the munificer of Gedaliah (Jer. xii, 1, 2), was a descendant of Jarcha, the Egyptian son-in-law of Sheshan (1 Chron. ii, 54, 55; and Rashi, ad loc.); and the third is the intermarriage of Solomon, which, however, is excepted from the censure of the law, in the book of Kings (i, ii, 1, 13, 30, 31). Of intermarriages with Edomites not a single instance is recorded in the O.T.; the Jewish antipathy against them was transmitted down to a very late period, as we find in the declaration of Jesus, son of Sirach, that his soul hates the inhabitants of Seir (Eccles. iv, 25, 26), and in the fact that Judas Maccabaeus carried on a deadly war with them (1 Macc. v, 3; 2 Macc. xx, 15-23).

An exception is made in the case of female captives of war (Deut. xx., 10-14), which is evidently designed to obviate as far as possible the outrages committed after the evil passions have been stirred up in the conflict. The law, however, most humbly ordains that the capter, before making her his wife, should first allow her to induce herself for a full month in mourning for her parents, from whom she is snatched away, and to practice the following customary rites expressive of grief: 1. Cut off the hair of her head, which was the usual sign of mourning both among the Jews and other nations of antiquity (Ezra ix, 3; Job i, 20; Isa. xxv, 2; Jer. vii, 29; xxi, 6; Ezek. xii, 18; xxvii, 31; Amos viii, 10; Micah i, 10); 2. Cut off her nails, which were stained to form a part of personal adornment; and, 3. Put off the raiment in which she was taken captive, since the
MARRIAGE

women who followed their fathers and husbands to the war put on their finest dresses and ornaments previous to an engagement, in the hope of finding favor in the eyes of their captors in case of a defeat (Ovid, Remed. Amor, 543; Rosenmüller, Das alte u. neue Morgenland, ii, 3).

The first complaint of epigamy with aliens is, strange to say, made against Moses, the lawyer himself (Numb. xii, 1). In the days of the Judges the law against intermarriage was commonly transgressed (Judges iii, 6), and from the earlier portions of the book of Proverbs, which ring with repeated denunciations of foreign women (Prov. ii, 16-17; v, 8-11; xvi, 17), as well as from the warnings of Isaiah (ii, 6), it is evident that intermarriages with foreign women were generally practiced in private life in after times. Of the twenty kings of Israel who reigned from the division of the kingdom to the Babylonian captivity, Ahab is the only one mentioned who married a foreign wife (1 Kings xvi, 31); while of the nineteen kings of Judah after the division none intermarried with aliens. Marriages between Israelitish women and proselyted foreigners were at all times of rare occurrence, and are noticed in the Bible as if they were of an exceptional nature, such as that of an Egyptian and an Israelitish woman (Lev. xxiv, 10); of Abigail and Bathus, the Ishmaelite, contracted probably when Jesse's family was sojourning in Moab (1 Chron. ii, 15), to the daughter and the wife of his mother, who was staying in his house (1 Chron. ii, 35); and of a Naphthalite woman and a Tyrian, living in adjacent districts (1 Kings vii, 14). In the reverse case, viz. the marriage of Israelites with foreign women, it is of course, highly probable that the wives became proselytes after their marriage, as instance in the case of Ruth (i, 16), and probably in that of Solomon's Egyptian wife (Psa. xxi, 10); but this was by no means invariably the case. On the contrary, we find that the Canaanitish wives of Solomon (1 Kings xi, 4), and the Phoenician wife of Ahab (1 Kings xxi, 2), cast off their idolatrous problems, and intro-duced them into their adopted countries. Proselytism does not, therefore, appear to have been a sine qua non in the case of a wife, though it was so in the case of a husband: the total silence of the law as to any such condition in regard to a captive, whom an Israelite might wish to marry, must be regarded as evidence of the reverse (Deut. xxii, 14-10), nor have the refinements of rabbinical writers on that passage succeeded in establishing the necessity of proselytism. The opposition of Samson's parents to his marriage with a Philistine woman (Judges xvi, 3) leads to the same conclusion.

3. In the post-exilian period, besides the fifteen proscribed degrees enumerated in Lev. xvii, 7-17; xx, 11, etc., the Sopherim, or scribes (B.C. 822-221), prohibited marriage with other relations (Mishna, Jebamoth, li, 4), and the rabbins afterwards extended still further by R. Chijai ben-Abba the Babylonian (A.D. 163-198), and friend of Jehudah i the Holy (Jebamoth, 22 a). The prohibited degrees of the scribes are denominated פָּרָשִׁים, פָּרָשִׁים ר', וּוּרְשֵׁים, the second or subordinate in rank with respect to those forbidden in the Bible, and may be seen in the following list given by Mainmides: "i. The mother's mother's mother, and so upwards, are proscribed. ii. The mother of his father's mother, and so further. iii. His father's mother, and this is infinite, for even the father's mother's mother, and so upwards, are proscribed. iv. The mother of his father's father's mother, and this is infinite, for even if she were the wife of our father Jacob, she is forbidden to one of us. vi. The wife of his mother's father only. vii. The wife of his father's brother by the mother. viii. The wife of his father's mother's brother, whether by the mother or by the father. ix. His son's daughter-in-law, i.e. his son's son's wife, and this is infinite, for even if she were the son's son's son's wife, descending to the end of the world, she is forbidden, so that, as long as the wife of one of us lives, she is secondary or forbidden to our father Jacob. x. His daughter's daughter-in-law, i.e. his son's wife only. xi. The daughter of his son's daughter only. xii. The daughter of his son's son only. xiii. The daughter of his daughter's daughter only. xiv. The daughter of his daughter's daughter only. xv. The daughter of his wife's daughter's wife only. xvi. The daughter of his wife's daughter's daughter only. xvii. The mother of his wife's father's mother only. xviii. The mother of his wife's mother's father only. xix. The mother of his wife's mother's mother only. xx. The mother of his wife's father's father only. Thus, of these secondary intermarriages, there are four which are infinite: α, the mother's mother and all upwards; β, the father's mother and all upwards; γ, the grandfather's wife and all upwards; and, δ, the son's son's wife and all downwards" (Hilchoth Ishuth, i, 6).

The principle by which the Scribes were guided in extending the prohibition to the whole line wherever the Mosaic law refers to lineal ascendants or descendants, as well as to those who might easily be mistaken by having a common appellation. Thus mother's mother's mother, and in general, is forbidden, because the Mosaic law prescribes for the mother, and she, because the stepgrandfather, because the law is forbidden in the Mosaic law; while the mother of the father is proscribed, because the appellation grandmother is used without distinction for both the mother's and father's mothers. Thus Moses' mother, i.e. the mother of the brother of his mother, who has been seen that he, like Alfaas, restricts prohibition to ii to the mother of the grandfather, and prohibitions xii-xvi, xx, to the son's grandchildren, great-grandmother, and grandmother, but does not extend it to any further ascendants or descendants. The whole subject is extensively discussed in the Talmud (Jebamoth, 21. 7, Jerusalem Jebamoth, ii, 4), and by Mainmides (Iod Ha-Chazaka, Hilchoth Ishuth, i, 6, etc.), to which we must refer. It must, however, be remarked that Philo's list of proscribed degrees is much shorter. After explaining why Moses prohibited marriage with one's own mother or sister, he says, "For this reason he has thus forbidden other matrimonial connections, inasmuch as he ordained that a man shall not marry his granddaughter (μη δύναμαι δύναμαι, μη βιον), nor his aunt on the father's or mother's side, nor the wife of an uncle, son, or brother; nor a step-daughter while the lifetime of her mother, or after her death, because a stepfather takes the place of a father, and a step-daughter is to be looked upon as his own daughter. Neither does he allow the same man to marry two sisters, either at the same time or at different times, even in case one of them is married, and is brought to another and another, and for he did not consider it pious that one sister should succeed to the place of her unfortunate sister, whether the latter is still cohabiting with him, or is divorced and has no husband, or is married to another husband" (De special. legis 6, 780). Still shorter is the list of Josephus, who says, "The law prohibits it as a heavy sin and an abomination to have carnal intercourse with one's mother, step-mother, father's or mother's sister, one's own sister, or a son's wife" (A. W. iii, 12, 1). Marriage with a wife's step-sister is allowed by the Babylonian and the Jew, and is considered by the Spanish Jews follow the former, while the GermanoFrench communities adopt the latter. Intermarriages between cousins, uncle and niece, entire step-brother and step-sister, are quite legitimate. Indeed, for an uncle to marry a niece, which the English law forbids, has been approved by the Jews as a convenience, and is something specially meritorious. The Talmud says that the promise given in Isaiah, "Then shalt thou call and the Lord shall answer" (viii, 9), refers to that man especially who "loves his neighbors, befriends his relations; from his wealth, or from his substance, to the poor in the hour of need" (Jebamoth, 62 b, 63 a).

As to the ethical cause of the proscribed marriages, or the cases specified, including parallels by affinity, the ancient Jews, to whom the oracles of God were communi-
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and who had to explain and administer the law in practical life, knew nothing about it. The Palestinian doctors regarded the proscribed degrees as a positive law, the cause of which cannot be divined by human reason (Sifra, Raddush, ix, 12; Talmud, Sabbath, 190 a; Joma, 7a). The only attempt to rationalize on the subject of the proscriptions, made in the Mosaic law in prohibiting marriage with the wife of the father's brother, in case she is divorced or left a widow, and not forbidding the wife of the mother's brother. Upon this the Talmud remarks that a man visits his father's relations more than his mother's (Jebamoth, 21 a; see above on this passage); and it is assumed, we believe with perfect reason, and based on Numb, ii, 2, that it is the father's relations who constitute the family, and not the mother's. We thus see that up to the time of the Talmudists, when the Greek loose barriers of consanguinity threatened to fall among the Jewish families, the ancient Hebrews were bound only by the specific proscriptions in the Mosaic law, and that even after the prohibitions were extended by the scribes, the proscription of a male relative by blood did not imply the wife's relatives of the like degree, because of the strong distortion of this custom in the absence of the ancients and affinity by marriage; the former being permanent and sacred, and the latter uncertain and vague, as a man might any moment divorce his wife, or take as many as he pleased, and because the husband's family were regarded as his relations, while the wife's were not esteemed beyond those who are especially mentioned.

The proscribed degrees were scrupulously avoided by the Jews during this period, and no dispensation could be obtained by any one, no matter how high his position, as Judaism never invested any spiritual function with power to absolve, even in extraordinary cases, from the obligations of the law. Hence the outcry against Herod the Great, who married his half-sister (Josephus, Ant. xvii, i, 3); against Archelaus, who took his deceased brother's widow when she was the mother of children (Jebamoth, xiii, 9, 1); and against Hadrian Antipas, for which John the Baptist had to atone with his life (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 5, 1; Matt. xiv, 8). So long as foreign epigamy was of merely occasional occurrence no veto was placed upon it by public authority; but when, after the return from the Babylonian captivity, the Jews contracted marriages with the heathen inhabitants of Palestine in so wholesale a manner as to endanger their national existence, the practice was severely condemned (Exra ix, 2; x, 2), and the law of positive prohibition, originally pronounced only against the Canaanites and the Moabites, was extended to the Philistines (Neh. xiii, 23-25). Public feeling was henceforth strongly opposed to foreign marriages, and the union of a Manassite with a Cuthaan led to such animosity as to produce the great national schism, which had its focus in the temple on Mount Gerizim (Josephus, Ant. xi, 6, 2). A less signal instance of the same feeling is exhibited in the cases of Joseph (Ant. xii, 4, 6) and Anieleus (Ant. xviii, 9, 5), and is noticed by Tacitus (Hist. vi, 5) as one of the characteristics of the Jewish nation in his day. In the N. T. no special directions are given, but the necessity of separation between believers and unbelievers (2 Cor. vi, 14, 17) would apply with special force to the case of marriage; and the permission to dissolve mixed marriages, contracted previously to the conversion of one party, at the instance of the unconverted one, cannot but be regarded as implying the propriety of such unions subsequently to conversion (1 Cor. vii, 12).

Besides the proscribed degrees, the rabbinic law also enacted—1. A man must not marry a divorced woman with whom he has committed adultery prior to her divorce, even if he is only suspected of it (Jebamoth, 24; Maimonides, Sechs, ii, 12). 2. A man who attested the death of the husband is not allowed to marry the widow, nor is the bearer of a divorce permitted to marry the divorced woman, to avoid suspicion.
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seducer, but not the wife of the criminal. 3. If the wife vowed anything to the Lord, or imposed upon herself voluntary obligations to the Deity, her husband could nullify it (Numb. xxx, 6-8). 4. He could send her away or divorce her when she displeased him (Deut. xxiv, 1-4). The woman, again, is protected by the following laws: 1. If she is under her husband's control, she is to be with him, save when he ill-treats her and removes her, in which case he is obliged to send her maintenance (Jebamoth, 64 b). ii. If the husband goes on a three-months' journey without making provision for his wife, the legal authorities of the place are ordered to propitiate him (Michah, 48 a, 107). i. He is obliged to perform the duties of a husband within a stated period (Mishna, Kethaboth, v, 6). iv. If her husband dies, she is to be maintained from his property, or by the children, in the same manner as she was in his lifetime, till she is betrothed to another man, and her rights must be attended to before the claims of any one else (Kethaboth, 48, 51, 62, 68, 106; Jer. 31:14). iii. If a woman marries a man who is more than five years younger than herself; to a man, with the understanding that she is to be his half-wife (בַּתָּהוֹ תַּעֲשֵׂה, Exod. xxvi, 7; Judg. ix, 18 with Judg. viii, 31), the law enacts that, in case her master and intended husband is displeased with her, and she refuses to redeem his promise,—i. he is not to keep till the sabbatical year, and then give her her liberty like her brother; ii. he is not to sell her to any other as a wife; iii. he may give her to his son as a wife, and in that case must treat her as a daughter-in-law; iv. if he gives his son an additional wife, she is to obtain—her food, 5, raiment, and, conjugal rights as heretofore; and, v. if these three last conditions are refused to her, she is forthwith to set as free (Exod. xxvi, 7-11). 2. If he maliciously impuges her chastity, he is to be scourged, and loses his right over her to divorce her (Deut. xxiii, 18-19). 3. If she has children, they must render equal obedience to her as to the father (Exod. xxiii, 12). 4. The husband must not vex her by marrying two sisters simultaneously (Lev. xviii, 18). 5. He is not allowed to annoy her belovend wife by transferring the primogeniture from her son to the child of his favorite wife (Deut. xxi, 15-17). 6. If her husband dislikes her, he is not to dismiss her, but gives her a "bill of divorce" (Deut. xxiv, 1), which requires the interposition of legal advisers. 7. When a woman is divorced, or her husband dies, she is free, and at liberty to marry any one she likes, as is evident from the enactments in Lev. xx, 11; Deut. xxiv, 2-4; xxv, 5, which are based on this fact. 3. The notions about sanctity of marriage were lofty during the post-exilic period than in the preceding epochs, as may be judged from the fact that unfaithfulness to a wife is denounced by the prophet Malachi as violating a sacred covenant, to the transaction of which God himself was a witness (i, 14). And though it may be questioned whether the prophet's appeal to God as having witnessed to the marriage-contract refers to the above-named seven benedictions (בְּרוּךְ יִבְרֵא בְּרֵא בְּרֵא בְּרֵא בְּרֵא בְּרֵא בְּרֵא בְּרֵא בְּרֵא בְּרֵa בְּרֵa בְּרֵa בְּרֵa בְּרֵa בְּרֵa בְּרֵa בְּרֵa בְּרֵa בְּרֵa בְּרֵa בְּr بְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr בְּr b
and acted upon by those who were charged with the administration of the law from time immemorial. The only blunder which heathen nations made was when a man divorced his wife because of an evil report which he maliciously circulated about her; then he was not allowed to remarry her (Mishna,Gitin, iv, 7). ii. If the divorced woman marries again, and the second husband either kills her or she is not remarried to her first husband: this was to preclude the possibility of procuring the death of, or a divorce from, the second husband, in case the parties wished to be reunited. 3. If a man seduces a maiden, and on this account is legally obliged to marry her, he may not marry her away all his property (Deut. xxii, 29, 30). ii. If he impugns her chastity, he also loses the power of ever divorcing her (Deut. xxii, 13-19). This, as well as the preceding benign law, was evidently designed to make men care for those women whom they had either virtually or actually deserted of their moral character, and who, if these men were allowed to desert them, might never be able to get husbands. Thus these laws, while checking seduction, inasmuch as the man knew that he would have all his lifetime to be wedded to and care for the injured woman, also prevented those women who had left their husbands being left as an unprovided for life, and compelled to give themselves up to prostitution. 4. Though the Mosaic law has no express statute that the wife, under certain circumstances, may demand a divorce from her husband, yet it is undeniably implied in the Ten Commandments (Ex. xx. 14). For if a slave-bondwoman who became the wife of her master could quit him if he did not fulfill the conditions of a husband, it is but natural to conclude that a free wife would, under similar circumstances, be able to claim the protection of the same law. A few instances of the violation of the divorce law, between the period of its enactment and the Babylonian captivity, are incidentally recorded without any censure whatever. Thus we are told that Saul took away Michal, his daughter, David's wife, without David's formally divorcing her, and gave her to Phalti (1 Sam. xxv, 44), and that David took back again Michal, who had been united to another husband (2 Sam. iii, 14-16). Still the laws of divorce and of prohibiting reunion after the divorced woman had been married to another husband are alluded to by Jeremiah as well known and commonly observed (iii, 1, 8). ii. Another uncertain ground upon which the Mosaic law permits divorce (Deut. xxiv, 1-4) were minutely defined during the period after the exile. Though the school of Shammai restricts the phrase עשה א יבּ הָיִיתָ לְעוֹשֵׁהְךָ, and the Sadducees too insisted that divorce is not to be tolerated except when the woman is guilty of adultery (according to Sol Ha-Cogeh, Abipha, and the Midrash Chalda- sheh, iv, 576), yet the Jews as a nation, as well as most Christian expositors, agree with the school of Hillel. (Mishna, Gitin, ix, 10) that it denotes faults or deformities, as the context plainly shows. Now, in stating the grounds on which the Jewish expositors of the law in the time of Christ and after, regarded dissolution of marriage as justifiable, we must distinguish the cases in which the legal authorities themselves took up the matter, from those in which the married parties asked for divorce.

a. Dissolution of marriage occasioned by the lawful authorities took place—i. When the woman is guilty of adultery. ii. When the woman carries on secret intercourse with a man after her husband has warned her against it (Sota, 27; Jebamoth, 24). iii. Where, though betrothal had taken place, yet a matrimonial law (swatimutum injustum) is violated, and her referring to the proscribed degrees or to other matters enacted by the rabbins. iv. When the husband is infected with leprosy (Kethuboth, 77).

b. It was granted on the demand of the married parties, and was regarded as the sacred duty of the officiating priest of his dissolution of marriage.—i. When his wife, by violating the Mosaic law, caused him, without knowing it, to be guilty of transgression (Mishna, Kethuboth, vii, 6). ii. If the wife violates the bounds of modesty—e.g. by going into the street with uncovered hair, mixing with young males, etc. (ibid.). iii. If the wife is suspected of adultery. iv. If the woman curses her father-in-law in the presence of her husband (Kethuboth, 72). v. If the wife will not follow her husband to another place (Kethuboth, 110). vi. If the husband leaves his husband the conjugal rights for twelve months.

The wife can demand a divorce.—i. If after marriage the husband contracts a loathsome disease (Mishna, Kethuboth, vii, 9, 10). ii. If after marriage he betakes himself to a dishonorable business (ibid. the Gemara elsewhere, 76). iii. If he is unfaithful to her (Eben Ha-Ezra, 55). iv. If her husband changes his religion (ibid.). v. If the husband commits an offence which makes him flee from his country (Eben Ha-Ezra, 9). vi. If he leads a dissolute and immoral life (Eben Ha-Ezra, Gloss on Sekt, 11). vii. If he wastes his property and neglects to maintain her (Mishna, Kethuboth, vii, 1). viii. If he refuses her comunal rights (Mishna, Kethuboth, v, 6).

There are other grounds on which divorce can be obtained, but for these we must refer to the Mishna, Gittin, as they are very numerous. The bill of divorce must be handed over, either by the husband or a messenger, to the wife or one deputed by her, with the words, "This is thy divorce; thou art henceforth divorced from me, and canst marry whomsoever thou likest." (Mishna, Gitin, ix, 10). It must, however, be remarked that in the case of a divorce the Talmudists, and it is declared that "he who divorces his wife is hated of God. The altar sheds tears over him who divorces his wife and companionship of his youth" (Gitin, 90 a).

During the post-exilian period the abuse of divorce continued unabated (Josephus, Life, 76); and under the Amonasian dynasty the right was assumed by the wife as against her husband, an innovation which is attributed to Salome by Josephus (Ant. xv, 7, 10), but which appears to have been prevalent in the apostolic age, if we may judge from passages where the language implies that the act emanated from the wife (Mark x, 12; 1 Cor. vii, 11), as well as from some of the comments of the early writers on 1 Tim. v, 9. Our Lord and his apostles re-established the integrity and sanctity of the marriage-bond by the following measures: (1) by the confirmation of the original charter of marriage as the basis on which all regulations are to be framed (Matt. xix, 4, 5); (2) by the restriction of divorce to the case of fornication, and the prohibition of remarriage in all persons divorced on improper grounds (Matt. v, 32; 12, xix.; Rom. vii, 1; 1 Cor. vii, 10, 11); and (3) in the enforcement of moral purity generally (Heb. xii, 4, etc.), and especially by the formal condemnation of fornication, which appears to have been classed among acts morally indifferent (ἀδιάφορα) by a certain party in the Church (Acts xv, 20).

VIII. Levirate Law.—1. The only power which a woman had over the man during the pre-Mosaic period, in matrimonial matters, was when her husband died without issue. The widow could then claim his next brother to marry her; if the second also died without progeny, she could ask the third, and so on. The object of this Levirate marriage, as it is called, from the Latin, levir, brother-in-law (Hebrew, לְוִיר; Greek, ἱερὸςβιοῦ), is "to raise up seed to the departed brother," which should preserve his name upon his inheritance, and prevent it from being erased from among his brethren, and from the gate of his town (Gen. xxxviii, 8; Deut. xxv, 3-6; Lev. xxi, 10); or if he had reared his offspring to the proscribed degrees or to other matters enacted by the rabbins. iv. When the husband is infected with leprosy (Kethuboth, 77).
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considered as the representative and heir of the deceased. Thus we are told that when Er, Judah's eldest son, who was married to Tamar, died without issue, the second son was called upon to marry his deceased brother's widow, and that when he again died, leaving no children, Tamar, the widow, had still a claim upon the only surviving son, for whom she had to wait, as he was not yet marriageable (Gen. xxxviii, 6-12, 14, 26). Ultimately Judah himself had to marry his daughter-in-law, for she inveigled him into it as a punishment for neglecting to give her his third son (Gen. xxxviii, 28-30); and Pharez, the son of this Levirate marriage, not only became the founder of a numerous and illustrious family, but was the direct line from which the royal family of David descended, and the channel through which the Messiah was born (Gen. xxxviii, 29, with Matt. i, 3). This Levirate marriage was not peculiar to the Hebrews. It also obtained among the Moabites (Ruth i, 11-13), Persians (Kleuker, Zendwörter, iii, 220), Indians (Asiatic Researches, iii, 85), and still exists in Arabia (Burckhardt, Notes, i, 112; Niebuhr, Voyages, p. 61), among the tribes of the Caucasus (Hant-Hausen, Transcaucasia, p. 468), and other nations (comp. Leyer, in Herzog, Real-Encyclop. viii, 586, a. v. Levi-Ratache). 2. This law, which, as we have seen, existed from time immemorial both among the patriarchs and other nations of antiquity, was at length formally enacted as part of the Jewish marriage law. In general, this law, however, as in the case of other primitive practices incorporated in the Mosaic code, the sacred legislator both prescribes for it definite limits, and most humbly deprives it of the irksome and odious features which it possessed in ancient times. It is evident from the enactment itself, which is as follows: "Brothers dwell together, and one of them die and have no child, the wife of the deceased shall not marry out of the family a stranger; her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her as his wife, and perform the duty of a brother-in-law. Her first-born shall then succeed in the name of the deceased brother, so that his name be not blotted out of Israel" (Deut. xxx, 5, 6). Accordingly—i. This law is restricted to brothers who dwell together, i.e. in contiguous properties, as the rabbinical law explains it according to the meaning of the word נַעֲרָא, in Gen. xlii, 6; xxxvi, 7, and elsewhere. If the brothers lived far away, or if the deceased had no brothers at all, it was an understood thing that it devolved upon the nearest of kin to marry the widow, or care for her if she was too old, when, of course, it passed over from the domain of Levirat into that of God or redeemer (Ruth ii, 20; iii, 9; iv, 15, 16). ii. To cases where no issue whatever is left, as גַּם is here used in its general sense of offspring and not specifically for son. This is not only confirmed by the Sept. (αὐγόν), Matthew (μὴ γὰρ αὐγόν), Mark (xii, 6), Luke (diēci̊ν, xx, 29), Josephus (Ant. iv, 8, 26), and the Talmud (Jebamoth, 22 b), but is evident from the law of inheritance (Numb. xxvii, 8-11), in which it is declared that if a man dies without leaving a son, his daughter shall inherit his property; the widow could therefore claim the surviving brother to marry her in order to raise up a son to the deceased, the daughter who legally came to the inheritance to either have to lose her possessions, or the son born of the Levirate marriage would have to be without patrimony. In fulfilling the duty of the Levir in the patriarchal age the surviving brother had to make great sacrifices. He had not to renounce the perpetuating of his own name through the first-born son (Gen. xxxviii, 9), and mar his own inheritance (Ruth iv, 6), but, what was most galling, he was obliged to take the widow whether he liked it or not, any such objection as he might have, or not, as the Levir in the patriarchal age had no alternative. Now the Mosaic law removed this hardship by opening to the man a door of escape: "But if the man like not to take his brother's wife, then let his brother's wife go up to the gate of the elders and say, My husband's brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel; he will not perform the Levirate duty. And the elders of the city shall call him, and speak unto him. But if he say, I will not, then shall his brother's wife go in to the house of the man, and he shall lie before the eyes of his brothers-in-law, and in the face of the elders, and shave his head, and spit in his face and say, So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house; and his house shall be called in Israel the house of the barefoot" (Deut. xxv, 7-10). This Levirate marriage does not impose it as an inexorable law, but simply enjoins it as a duty of love, which the Levir might escape by submitting to censure and reproach. Of this he could not complain, for he not only neglected to perform towards his deceased brother the most sacred offices of love, but, by refusing to do so, he openly declared his disregard to the widow, and thus publicly insulted her. The symbolic manner in which she took away in the public court his right to her and his deceased brother's possession, has its origin in the fact that the possession of property was claimed by planting the foot on it. Hence, when the transfer of property was effected by an amicable transaction, the original owner signified the renunciation of his rights by taking off his shoe and giving it to the new possessor (Ruth iv, 7, 8). A similar custom obtains among the Indians (Benary, Deutsches künstlerisches und germanisches, Berol., 1835, 14) and among the Germans (Grimm, Deutsche Rechtsvölkerthümer, p. 156). In the case before us, however, where the privilege of possession was not renounced by a mutual understanding, but involved insult both to the deceased brother and the surviving widow, the outrageous sister-in-law snatched the right from him by pulling off his shoe. 3. That this patriarchal law—which, as we have seen, was incorporated in the Mosaic gamology—continued in its full force after the Captivity, is evident from Matthew (xxiii, 25-27), Mark (xii, 19-23), and Luke (xx, 28-38). From the question put to our Saviour in these passages, it will be seen that it was incumbent upon each surviving brother in succession to perform the duty of the Levir. There were, however, cases where this duty could not be performed, about which the Mosaic law gives no directions whatever; e.g. when the deceased brother's widow was a near relation of the Levir and came within the proscribed degrees of which the Mishna (Jebamoth, 1, 1) gives fifteen cases; or when the latter was a child when his brother died and left a widow without issue (ii, 9); and if he were on this or any other account exempt from the obligation (Deut. xxv, 5). When one of the widows, he was also from the obligation to marry any of them (i, 1); it is also implied that it was only necessary for one brother to marry one of the widows in cases where there were several widows left. The marriage was not to take place within three months of the husband's death (iv, 10). The eldest brother ought to perform the duty of marriage; but, on his declining it, a younger brother might do it (ii, 8; iv, 5). The chalilah was regarded as involving future relationship, so that a man who had received it could not marry the widow's daughter, for he was the wife's brother. Special rules are laid down for cases where a woman married under a false impression as to her husband's death (s, 1), or where a mistake took place as to whether her son or her husband died first (s, 8), for in the latter case the Levirate law would not apply, as to the evidence of the husband's death to be produced in certain cases (cap. 15, 16). There can, therefore, be no question that the administrators of the law in the time of the prophets and at the advent of our Saviour had to adapt and supplement the Levirate law. As the space of this article does not permit us to enumerate these important definitions and enactments, we must refer to the Mishna, Tract Jebamoth, which derives its name (เจבמה) from the fact that it embodies these laws. These descend into trivial distinctions—e. g. that
the shoe was to be of leather, or a sandal furnished with a heel-strap; a felt shoe, or a sandal without a strap, would not do (Yeham. xiii, 1, 2). The *chailetak was not valid when the person performing it was dead and dumb (xii, 4), as he could not learn the precise formula which accompanied the act. The custom is retained by the modern Arabs, and occasionally described by Picart (*Ceremonies Religieuses, i, 243). It receives illustration from the expression used by the modern Arabs in speaking of a repudiated wife: "She was my slipper. I have cast her off" (Burckhardt, Notes, i, 118). It only remains to be remarked that the fear lest the performance of the duty, and the hazard of a collision with the law of consanguinity, made the ancient rabbins declare that ([עִבְרִית: רְאוּבֵן] the ceremony of taking off the shoe is preferable to marrying the widow, and thus virtually set aside Levirate marriages. As this ceremony, which is called *chailetak ([ירושית: רְאוּבֵן] to draw out, to pull off), supersedes the ancient law, the rabbins gave very minute orders about the manner in which it is to be performed. The ceremony is performed in the synagogue after morning prayer, in the seclusion of the rabbins and two witnesses, attended by others of the congregation as auditors and spectators. The Levir and widow are called forward, and after being questioned by the principal rabbi, and avowing his determination not to marry her, he man puts on a shoe of a peculiar form and made for this purpose, and the woman repeats, "My husband's brother refused to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel; he will not perform the duty of my husband's brother." To which the Levir replies, "I like not to take her." Upon this declaration the widow unites the shoe with her right hand, takes it off, throws it on the ground, and spits before him, saying in Hebrew, "So shall it be done unto that man who will not build up his brother's house; and his name shall be called in Israel, The house of him that hath his shoe loosed;" when the person present exclaim three times, "His shoe is loosed." This concludes the ceremony, and the rabbi tells the widow that she is now at liberty to marry whom she pleases.

IX. In considering the social and domestic conditions of married life among the Hebrews, we must, in the first place, take into account the position assigned to women generally in their social scale. They were called *artem and the habits consequent upon it, were utterly unknown in early times, and the condition of the Oriental woman, as pictured to us in the Bible, contrasts most favorably with that of her modern representative. There is ample evidence of the relative condition of men and women, whether married or unmarried, went about with their faces unveiled (Gen. xii, 14; xxiv, 16, 65; xxix, 11; 1 Sam. i, 18). An unmarried woman might meet and converse with men, even strangers, in a public place (Gen. xxiv, 45, 57; xxix, 12; 1 Sam. ix, 11); she might be found alone in the country without any reflection on her character (Deut. xxii, 25-27); or she might appear in court of a state (Numb. xxiv, 2). Women not infrequently held important offices: some were prophetesses, as Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, Noadiah, and Anna; of others, of Miriam, Deborah, Noadiah, and Anna; of others, an account of the marriage of the daughter of Pharaoh (Exod. xvi, 20; 1 Sam. xviii, 6, 7); in short, they enjoyed as much freedom as ordinary life as the women of our own country.

If such was her general position, it is certain that the wife must have exercised an important influence in her own home. She appears to have taken her part in family affairs, and even to have enjoyed a considerable amount of independence. For instance, she entertains guests at her own desire (2 Kings iv, 8) in the absence of her husband (Judg. iv, 18) and presides in the defence of his wishes (1 Sam. xxiv, 14, 14); she disposes of her child by a vow without any reference to her husband (1 Sam. i, 24); she consults with him as to the marriage of her children (Gen. xxvii, 46); her sug-
which is countermarried before manhood is reached by the greater risks incurred by that sex. The conditions 
which secure the interests of morality are thus pointed 
out by the laws of our physical nature.

The conception of marriage which appears in the 
writing of Paul has sometimes been said to be a low 
one, as having real prominence in the chur 
ch, more than in the life of the religious women. 
Yet it was not originally of this character, for the 
spiritual life of the early Church was not more 
spiritual than the life of Paul himself. It was not 
the result of the conversion of the church, but of the 
call of the Holy Spirit, which was revealed in the 
conception of the church itself.

Tatian went even so far as to rail against marriage; as 
Simon Magnus is said, on the other hand, to have taught 
in his day a plurality of wives, and the Quo Vadis and 
Manicheans rejected marriage altogether. But what 
was really the view of the early Church is best seen 
in the canons of the Gynaster Synod, held about A.D. 387, 
where it is stated that marriage is the sin of one 
sin, in accordance with the idea that the marriage 
was the sin of one sin. This is a general principle of 
the moral law. The moral law itself is based on the 
principle that the sinner is to be punished with 
the same degree of severity as that which he 
has committed. The marriage of the sinner is 
therefore the punishment of the sin of the sinner.
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and the like, the State was content to lend the Church the secular arm for the enforcement of the decisions of the ecclesiastical courts. The principles of the law concerning marriage thus became a part of canon law as in the Romish Church, and received final settlement by the Council of Trent, which not only established marriage as a part of the natural law, but also excommunicated, scourged, or exiled such as held to the contrary. 

Cod. 24. Mat. can. 1: "Si quis dixerit, matrimonium non esse vere et proprie unum ex septem legibus evangelici sacramentis a Christo instituto, sed ab hominibus in ecclesia inventum neque gratiam confecerit: sanat. sit:"

see also I, can. 7, canon 2. 2, 4, 5, 29, sqq.; Con. art. 260, p. 183), but referred the question of its validity exclusively to the Church. The remains of these and similar laws have almost disappeared in Protestant England in our own times; the act of 1667 (cited as 20 and 21 Vict. cap. 85), with its amendments, destroys all jurisdiction of courts ecclesiastical in matters pertaining to marriage, except so far as marriage licenses are concerned, and constitutes a new court, which is called the court for divorce and matrimonial causes. See Woolsey, Divorce and Divorce Legislation (New York, 1869), p. 174-178.

The Continental Reformers from the first denied the sacramental character of marriage. They acknowledged, indeed, marriage as holy and instituted of God, yet considered it as partaking more of a civil than of an ecclesiastical character with an institution which received only a higher consecration by the blessing of the Church. They even required the Protestant civil authorities to legislate on the subject, and thus it passed entirely into the hands of the latter. The new laws were promulgated in the 16th and 17th centuries, yet all still referred to Scripture, the symbolic books, and canon law as their basis; and, being generally drawn up with the assistance of the clergy, the Church still retained the higher authority over all questions pertaining to matrimony. In all Protestant countries at present, as far as we are informed, marriage is essentially controlled by the law of the state, although the solemnization of it may be put into the hands of clerical persons. In Catholic countries there is a tendency to establish two kinds of marriage ceremonies—one a civil, the other an ecclesiastical one; but all the civil consequences of marriage, in relation to property, legitimation of children, hignamy, etc., grow out of the civil marriage, and the other (or ecclesiastical) is left to the option of the parties. The Catholic Church endures this with great willingness; and in this feeling the Concordat between Austria and the Church, which restored the civil right, which was abolished in 1869 (comp. Richter, Kirchenrecht, § 263, 5th ed.). We thus are brought to the question of the relations of the state in right reason to the marriage-contracts of its citizens. Here, before touching the particulars that are within the province of state-law, we wish to make two points in regard to the office of the state: 1. Marriage is a contract, because it is an agreement between two persons to live together in the condition of life called marriage. But, while in most other cases the contract creates or specifies the rights of the parties, in the contract of marriage the character of the contract is presupposed, and the contract has nothing to do except to introduce two persons into a definite specific state. Out of this grows the peculiar state of patrige. This, it seems to us, is one of the greatest points in hand against the institution of "Free-love." The result of the marital relation is a character that does not admit of the dissolution of the contract when once it has been entered into. The offspring requires the care of both the parties, as is clearly seen in the case of second marriages with children from the one before. Thus there can be no contract to enter into a marriage state which is terminable by the consent of the parties, or dependent on the pleasure of either. There may be partners; of this kind, as contracts of service or of agency, for the performance of specific acts for a specific time, but there are no such contracts of marriage. This institution is unlike the passing business relations of life, and resembles the Church and State unions more closely, although not entirely. The reason for all this is the moral nature of the institution, and its immense importance as the foundation of the family as well as the origin of the state. Just as the civil law of property requires marriage at first considered a "vir et mulieris conjunctio individuorum vitas consequtudinem continens" (to which canon law adds, "i.e. talen se in omnibus exhibere virum, quals ipsas sibi est, et se et conuerso"), or a "conspersionis omnis vitae, divini et humani juris", 1667, p. 41, re Quite a different tendency, however, is found in the attempts of some modern philosophers to establish free-marriage, as e.g. the St. Simonistes (q. v.), who would overthrow all these laws, and make marriage a mere human convention subject to all the rules of the contracting parties and who have failed hitherto from this very case, as has also the pretended emancipation of woman which has gone hand in hand with it. The higher nature of marriage over any other human institution at once dismisses itself not only in the fact that it has at all times been connected with religion, both as to its contracting and dissolving, but that this view has been in no wise confined to Christendom, but in a great degree has taken a like hold upon heathen communities also.

2. Our other point is that on account of the moral and religious influence of any state, which receives a new concurrent power over it; that is, they both may act and lay down principles in regard to matrimonial questions. How are their provinces to be distinguished? In this way, as it seems to us: The State can require nothing which the Word of God forbids in a Christian country, although it may forbid what the Word of God does not forbid. The Church can allow nothing permitted by the law, which the Word of God forbids. For illustration, we may suppose the State to have very loose divorce laws, or to have no penalty for concubinage during regular marriage; the Church must keep its members pure in such respects, until its protest, loud or silent, shall change the current of legislation.

2. II. These things being premised, we proceed to a brief discussion of some of those points relating to marriage which may be reasonably made the subjects of legislation without violating the feelings of Christians or opposing the authority of the Scriptures.

1. The State may decide who shall be capable of contracting marriage. Thus (a) the age at which, or the state of the parties to, the marriage, may be legally made, is as much within the control of the law as the similar conditions necessary for making business contracts or for exercising political rights. If minors are allowed to enter into this condition, the law ought to provide that their free consent is ascertained beforehand. Thus, too, incapacity to give consent, by reason of immaturity, force on the will, insanity, idiocy, and the like, may be obstacles. But (b) far more important is the control of state-law over the degree of relationship and affinity which shall incapacitate persons to marry. Here we find that, although the children of the first pair must have united in wedlock, it became the very decided feeling of a large part of the human race that such a union is unlawful for with brothers or sisters, or for a parent and a child. H. W. J. Thiersch (Das Verstande der Ehe [Nüdlingen, 1869] (p. 4)) remarks that wild heathen tribes in Asia and Africa consider incest a crime. Exceptions to this occurred in Persia and Egypt, where incest was practiced within the reigning families—in the latter country after the example of Sires and Osiria. At one time the law in India required that the mother of a new born child should be a bride who had not been married to another man, and adoption was no obstacle to the union of an adopted brother and sister. The Romans were more strict, but allowed this relation to commence between an adopted brother and his adopted sister, after the adoption was dissolved by emancipation. By Ro-
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man law a man could not marry his sister's daughter, but when the emperor Claudius took Agrippina, his brother's daughter, to wife, that relation became permissible (see Gal. Inst., i, § 61, 62). By Levitical law the prohibited degrees embraced the direct relatives in the ascending and descending line, whether of full or of half blood. The marriage of a brother to his sister, of brothers or sisters of fathers or mothers, brothers' wives, daughters-in-law, a woman and her daughter, or other descendant in the third generation, and the sister of a wife during her lifetime. It would seem that in Lev. xviii, where these rules are given, the analogy derived from relations there mentioned may be applied to others equally close, of which nothing is said (comp. Salschütz, Mos. Rech., cap. 105, §§ 6). In the Christian Church a stricter system of prohibited degrees was a part of canonical law, and a sign of the new feeling was that the emperor Theodosius I forbade by law the marriage of first cousins, which was formerly by Roman law permitted. The Roman Catholic and the Greek churches went far beyond this. The Latin Church carried the prohibition of marriage to the seventh degree, that is, to the sixth cousins—counting brothers and sisters of the first, and first cousins of the second—until Innocent III, in 1216, gave a new rule that the "prohibito copulare conjugalibus quattuor consanguinatis et affinitatis gradum non excedat"—that is, third cousins might marry; but a little while after Gregory IX so modified this rule that a marriage between a third and a fourth cousin was allowable. Where pressing reasons demanded, these rules might be suspended. More severe and worthless were the rules prohibiting marriage, on the ground of affinity, which reached to the seventh degree, to the rules affecting blood-relatives, and were altered together with them. Other restrictions touching spiritual affinities, betrothal, etc., were mitigated by the Council of Trent. According to the canons of the Greek Church, a man may not marry:

- His second cousin's daughter.
- His deceased wife's first cousin's daughter.
- His deceased wife's second cousin.

Two brothers may not marry—

- Two sisters.
- An aunt and a niece.
- Two first cousins.

A man may not marry—

- His wife's brother's wife's sister, i.e. his brother-in-law's sister-in-law.
- His brother-in-law's wife: nor can his own brother marry her.

Godparentage and Adoption constitute impediments to marriage up to the seventh degree. See Affinity. What was the feeling lying at the bottom of all these prohibitions? It must have been that which led the Roman lawyer Gaius (c. § 69) to say that if such persons were parents and children marry another nefarias nuptias contraeuxisse dicentur. Incest is the greatest unchastity, from which its Latin name comes, and men early felt this. If the children of the first parent did not partake of this sentiment, there is a parallel in the treatment of the insane, whose modesty is developed just at the time of life when it is needed for a moral protection. Besides this moral principle, it might be urged that to marry out of one's near relationship binds families together, and diverts the feeling of brotherhood through neighborhoods and tribes. This is urged by Cicero (De Leg., xv, cap. 16). Another consideration is, that the marriage of near relations promotes neither the health nor the multitude of offspring. In a letter imputed to Gregory the Great (A.D. 601), written to his missionary in England, Augustine, he is made to say, while urging the marriage of distant cousins, "We have learned from experience that from such a marriage offspring cannot grow" (Gratian's Dec. caus. xxv, quaest. 5, c. 2). This is in conformity with a physical law which governs the issue of animals. Hay, plants themselves, it is now known, are benefited by the pollen of one flower being conveyed to another, and it is the office of insects, such as bees and flies, to mediate in this keeping up the "breeds" of the vegetable kingdom. (c) Besides enacting laws against the marriage of blood-relations, states have sometimes prohibited men from marrying that they themselves or their ancestors sustained to them the closest degrees of affinity. Some Protestant countries make it unlawful to marry a wife's sister. There are no valid arguments against such unions from Scripture, but rather, when it is said (Lev. xviii, 19) that a man shall not have two sisters together as wives, the text's inference is that Jewish law allowed marriage to one of them after the death of the other and preceding wife. Marriage to a brother's widow or deceased husband's brother is more doubtful. Yet in the canonical law, where such unions are forbidden, the pope can probably give a dispensation from the rule. Such was the case of Henry VIII of England, and a canon of the Council of Trent (see. xxiv, De sac. matrim. can. iii) ordains that if any one shall say that the Church cannot give a dispensation in the case of some of the prohibitions in Leviticus, xiv., "anathema sit"—evidently referring to that very case which blew up such a flame in England.

On the whole, there are no certe fines within which the moral feeling and the law—which in this case is more or less controlled by such feeling—can be confined. We have seen that, according to the time of the consanguinity rights, where the law has to make the positive and actual metes and bounds. Thus there is a time in the life of a child when he ought to acquire a jural capacity, and so become legally independent of his father; but whether this shall be reached at the age of eighteen or twenty-one, or shall be reached by degrees or all at once, the reason of a state must determine. So the moral feeling of a state must determine within what limits of consanguinity or of affinity parties may contract marriage; and if the Church has another prevailing sentiment, it must have its own rules prohibiting for its members what the state does not prohibit.

We will just mention, with little or no remark, several other hindrances which either State or Church law have put in the way of wedlock. Such are fraudulent representations of either party, which were leading causes of the contract of marriage; mistakes affecting the identity of the person; and previous crime of one party unknown to the other, especially previous adultery; to which is to be added difference of religious confessions, especially when so great as that between a Jew and a Christian, or between a Protestant and a Catholic. Indeed, in the case of mixed marriages (see below), there is still much conflict between the legislation of Church and State. Civil law in countries where slavery was allowed made all marriage unions between freemen and slaves unlawful. In some countries marriage between a noble and an ordinary citizen or peasant has been either forbidden or attended with civil disabilities, such as degradation of rank to the offspring. Here it may not be out of place to allude also to the regulations of the Romish Church in the case of persons who may marry, and the vow of celibacy of those who may not marry, who have not yet entered the convent, pope Boniface VIII decided that marriage may be contracted; after having once entered the convent, the contract becomes illegal. Among Protestants, however, the taking of the vow of celibacy remains a question of conscience only. Another obstacle to marriage in the Roman Catholic Church is spiritual relationship, cognotio spiritualis, which prevents marriage between persons who have held one another at the baptismal font. In the 18th century this was made to include both the infant baptized and the children of the sponsors, as well as the sponsors themselves; but it has since been restricted. The Continental Reformers as early as the Smalcald articles declared against this impediment of the sponsors. In the Greek Church, as we have seen above, Godparen-
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age and adoption constitute impediments up to the seventh degree.

In order to preserve the purity and peace of married life, the State has often passed rules making all sexual union of either the husband or the wife with a third party penal, and the Church will of course view such acts as violations of its members with severity and discipline. Some states in their laws have punished the concubinage or illicit intercourse of a husband with an unmarried woman less severely than similar offenses of a wife, or, it may be, has let them go unpunished. According to Roman law, adultery was a crime committed only with a married woman; but a wife, displeased with her husband's morals, could without difficulty obtain a divorce. Under English law adultery has not been treated as a public crime, the dealing with it being left to the ecclesiastical law, and "the temporal courts take no cognizance of it otherwise than as a private injury." (Blackstone's Comment, bk. iv, chap. 4).

In our country it is visited with punishment according to law in almost all the states—New York, which has followed English law, and one or two other states, being exceptions; but it is safe to say that prosecutions for the crime of adultery are very rare indeed. The protection afforded by such laws is very small, except so far as they testify that society regards crimes against marriage as deserving of civil penalties.

Both the man and the guardian of the family, as the protector of the wife's and the children's rights even against the husband and father, is bound, and has in no civilized country refused, to make laws touching the posterity patris postestas—the husband's rights over and obligations towards the wife; his obligations especially to support his wife and children, and the amount of freedom he ought to have in transmitting his property. We do not intend to enter into this large subject, except so far as to say that there lies a feeling of the unity of family life at the foundation of all righteous law on these subjects, whatever may be the specific rules of this or that code. The family being one, the wife ought to be deprived of no more than the children of a portion of a deceased husband's effects; so that the right of testament in his case, even if he acquired all his property himself, ought not to be absolutely free.

4. The moral feeling of the importance and sanctity of marriage lies also, in a measure, at the foundation of laws and usages regulating its commencement. Such are betrothal, the formal declaration before a registrar or other officer of an intention of marriage, the publication of the intention or the publication before the witnesses and with appropriate formalities. Marriage having a religious side, it has been natural that the ministers of religion should have a part in its initial solemnities. But it is a great grievance that they are obliged—as the law of Prussia, we believe, requires of them—to unite in wedlock any persons who may by law be lawfully united, whether the minister's own views touching the lawfulness of marriage after divorce agree with those of the government or not; and it is another grievance when only the ministers of an establishment can solemnize marriages. Civil marriage, on the other hand, as it exists in some Catholic countries, and marriage before a magistrate or justice of the peace, which is lawful to a great extent throughout the United States, have this great evil attending on them: that they look on the civil side of marriage exclusively. Surely that institution which is the foundation of the state, the guardian of children against evil influences until they can act their part in the state; in which, and in which alone love presides over the formation of character; from which, through the sympathies of kindred, chords are in all directions binding and uniting society together, where the seeds of religion are sown in the impressible heart—such an institution surely, which parents feel to have a sacred quality, and place under the protection of their gods, ought to have a solemn beginning, so that the parties to be united in "holy matrimony," and the witnesses, may feel that it is a deeply serious transaction—a relation not to be lightly assumed without forethought and preparation, and solemn consecration to one another, and earnest prayer to God who has said that "they twain shall be one flesh."" HILL.

In this marriage, if the husband is dead, and the wife is different from that taken by the State, it cannot sanction the remarriage of a person whom it regards as bound by Christ's law to a former wife or husband. See Divorce.

1. Some of these obstacles to marriage are of such a nature that a marriage actually commenced in disregard of or in ignorance of the law is either voidable or a nullity. There is, however, a need of some formal proceeding by which the nullity is made manifest. There are others in which the innocent party may continue the marriage, and condone or consent to live with the offender; nor can such consent be afterwards withdrawn in order to make good a claim which has been once waived. Near relationship or affinity, the existence of a previous wife or husband, are instances of the first kind; impotence, mistake, previous misconduct, even fraudulent statements procuring marriage, are instances of the second. In the first case the marriage is void, in the second it is voidable. We are apt to call separations for either reason divorces, and our statutes in many state-codes group them with divorces properly so called; but there is a wide difference between separations on the ground of conduct and those on the ground of divorce proper on the ground of some event occurring after actual marriage. In the first case there was a form without the reality of marriage, and the court—civil or ecclesiastical—pronounced a decree of nullity, which did not affect the children nor the parties up to the time of the sentence. Being decided to have never been united in wedlock, they were free to enter into this union with third parties. See Woolsey, On Divorce, etc., p. 128, 129, and especially Richter's Kirchenr. § 286—284, 6th ed.; Göschel, in Herzog's Recht-Encyklopädie, vol. iii.

2. In regard to the lawfulness of remarriage in general, we must refer to the article on Divorce (Christian Law of) in this Cyclopædia. On the particular point of marrying again after a first wife's or husband's decease, we have room for a few remarks. That this is lawful in itself, and must not be left to the conscience and the circumstances of individuals, there can be no question, after what the apostle Paul has said in Rom. vii., 1—4, and in 1 Tim. v., 14, in which latter passage "the younger women" evidently refers to the young widows just brought up to marriage. The Second Epistle to Timothy, p. 172, edit. Otto) is both unscriptural and weak where he says that a second marriage is "decorous adultery," and applies the words of Christ (Matt. xix, 9) to such remarriages, adding that he who depriives himself of (or separates himself from) a former wife, even if she be dead, is a covetous adulterer who transgresses the direction of God, since in the beginning God made one man and one woman. Similar views are entertained by Tertullian in his treatise De monogamia, which was written after he became a Montanist (comp. esp. cap. x); and in the treatise De Adulter. While he left the Catholic Church, he does not condemn remarriage, although he praises widowhood. Most of the fathers, while, from the times of Hermas and of Clement of Alexandria, they regard remarriage as no sin, look on widowhood and the state of a widower as capable of higher virtue. Augustine thus expresses his opinions in his little work De bono vita, written at the request of a widow named Juliana, whose daughter had chosen a virgin's life. "As the good thing of virginity which your daughter has chosen does not condemn you, your own remarriage, so your country together with the Church does not condemn the second marriage of some one else."... Do not so extol your good thing as to accuse that which is not evil belonging to another, as if it were evil, but so much the more rejoice in your good, the more you perceive that not only evils are prevented by it, but that
it surpasses some good things in excellence. The evil things are adultery and fornication. Now from these ill things arises the “divorced who by a free will has bound herself, and thus has brought to pass not by the power of law, but by the purpose of love, that for her not even lawful things should be lawful.” See Digambras; Celibacy.

But if the Apostle Paul could even advise young widows to marry again, must not this be understood as if he thought this the less of evils, and only necessary to save the persons in question from crime? How otherwise can we explain his directions that a bishop, and also a deacon, must be the husband of one woman only? (1 Tim. iii. 12; Titus i. 6)? We have already explained these directions as forbidding polygamy—

that is, simultaneous polygamy, to speak technically—which would seem to imply that among the private members of the Church at Ephesus and in Crete such plurality of wives was allowed. But the words in 1 Tim. v. 9, where the qualification occurs that the aged widow in question must have been the wife of one man, forbid such an interpretation, for otherwise we should have to suppose that polyandry was practiced. The phrases are exactly of the same form in all the four cases, and it is the dispensing of the lowest possible condition of marriage by the law of yggavisse to be joined to “sixty years” (comp. Luke ii. 42). The sense, then, must be that the bishop, or deacon, or widow had not been married but once. Now this was a special precept suited to the state of life of the times, for in marrying more than once they might have broken their heathen condition or have married divorced persons contrary to the law of Christ. Of these irregularities, if they had married but once, there would be less probability.

IV. Many one-sided and erroneous opinions must arise when marriage is so tied up in one of its aspects or relations. Thus it may be said to exist leborum guerrdororum causae; but if that is the only side on which we view it, we shall have to say that no marriages ought to be contracted when the woman is past the age of child-bearing. It may be put on the foundation of restraining and moderating those sexual desires which might otherwise imbrute men. But if this were the only reason for marriage, it would be at the best but a necessary evil. It may be said to be instituted for the happiness of the partners in the union; but if this were all, every disappointed man or woman would have the opportunity to place his or her affections on a new object. It may be said to be in the interest of the highest religious union, but a Christian wife has never felt it to be right for this reason to leave a husband merely because he is unconverting. We must, then, look at marriage from its social and religious aspects; on its relations to sexual differences; to the birth and education of children; to its use in cementing the State together through the ties of kindred; to the love that will almost of course subsist between the married couple; to the field which it affords for the highest social and spiritual life of husband, wife, and family. It ought to be added also, as a point of no small importance, that the jural relations of marriage are determined by the moral convictions of men, and that thus Christianity, by purifying the moral sense, and by giving forth a nobler idea of marriage, has ennobled and strengthened civil law. Those nations have had the best moral habits where the sentiments regarding matrimony and the family were the purest. Witness the Romans of the earlier ages, to whom divorce was unknown, and among whom the matron was adored. The corruption of Roman morals first appeared, according to Horace, in the defilement of married life and the family:

"Facunda cupisse secula nuptias

Primum inquinasve et genus et domos."

And so, our Christian Church is now so weakened in so many ways, the laws of marriage are thus already in many places impaired, yet there is no need to fear, for marriage is also doing great evil in this country. In fact, a state of things now exists which our fathers hardly dreamed of, and which makes reflecting men tremble for the future. Rash and ill-sorted marriages have always been, but where there are no laws, so loose as to be opposed to the very idea of marriage, to be an easy door to get out of an uncomfortable relation, the tendency is that parties will marry with divorce before their eyes, and that, instead of forbearance and patience, they will magnify their present evils, and give to one another only another one. In the old times there were few who did not look upon large families as a blessing; at present it is established beyond doubt that a multitude of women, in one part of the country, regard children as an evil to be prevented or avoided, and do actually use the means for such flagitious ends. See Sinfarthritis. Some of these are communicants in Christian churches, as physicians assert who profess to know. This shows that the very notion of marriage in many minds is a degraded and a corrupting one—that this union is entered into as an honest way of gratifying the low instincts of the lowest possible condition of human procreation, without any moral purpose. Nor are there wanting representatives of these base views, who practice upon them in their communities and defend them before the world. Who will question that the extreme of ancient asceticism, which gave to the word chastity the sense of rigid abstinence, as we give to the word temperance; the same perverted meaning, was infinitely nearer to the Christian standard, in fact to any respectable pagan standard of morals, than feelings which can tolerate such practices? That they can exist and even be common is an alarming sign for the future of the country. The duty of the Church and every woman needs to be enlightened on a point of morals which can hardly be referred to from the pulpit. We ought not to hear Catholics twit the Protestantism of the country with winking at methods of preventing the increase of families. We ought to strike at that extravagance of living and showiness of dress which tempt the less wealthy to such things. We ought to hear from every quarter where the subject can be mentioned that "they who do such things cannot inherit the kingdom of God." (T. D. W.)
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See also Herzog, Real-Eyclopaed. xix, 458; iii, 666, art.
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Ehe; and for early literature, Walch, Bib.d., and for English writers, especially on this subject, Malcolm, Theol. Index, s. v. For modern half or left-hand matrimony in Christendom, see MORGANATIC MARRIAGE. For marriage as a sacrament, see MATRIMONY.

V. Marriage with Betroters.—The importance of regularity and uprightness in religious principles was, according to the record of the Old Testament, practically recognised at a very early period. Indeed, the corruption of manners which rendered the Flood necessary is directly traced to such mixed marriages (Gen. vi, 1-4).

The intermixture, by marriage, of the professed servants and worshippers of God, with those by whom civil authority was disowned, was first branded, and afterwards positively forbidden by divine authority; being denounced as an evil, the results of which were most injurious to the interests of religion, and which exposed those who fell into it to the consign and awful displeasure of the Most High (Exod. xxxiv, 16). Now, although there were some circumstances attending the marriages in this manner denounced which do not directly apply to the state of society in our own country (especially the circumstance that the people with whom such marriages are forbidden were not always described as such), it is much, as must be evident to every pious observer, that illustrates the sin and danger of forming so intimate and permanent a union in life with the ungodly. The general fact is hence clearly deducible that there is an inordinate attachment in marriage strongly affecting the character, which descends not only from those without the influence of moral rectitude and improvement much of caution as to the manner in which their affections are fixed; and that unequal alliance—-alliances where the parties are actuated by different spiritual habits and desires, and where good is made to meet and combine with bad, encountering most imminently the danger of seduction and pollution—-are guilty, unnatural, and monstrous. The expression of the divine authority, in application to the Jews, is to be regarded as comprehending the principle of his people in all ages, that here they ought not to walk in the counsel of the ungodly, nor to stand in the way of sinners.

What we thus are enabled to conclude from the Old Testament, will be still more distinctly exemplified from the New. The evangelical writings do not, indeed, frequently offer directions expressly on the subject of marriage, the point appearing rather to be assumed than argued, that in Christian marriage the husband and wife ought both, in the emphatic terms of the apostle Peter, to be and walk as being "heirs together of the grace of life." In the first Epistle to the Corinthians, the apostle deals at length with a question under these words:

That time to have been agitated—whether Christians who, previous to their conversion, had contracted marriages with unbelievers, ought not to be actually divorced from the wives or husbands remaining in unbelief, because of the evil and peril attendant the continuance of the alliance. Such an extreme, advocated by some, he considers as uncalled for (1 Cor. vii, 10-17).

But, respecting the formation of a new matrimonial connection by a believer (the case taken being that of a believing widow, though the rule, of course, extends to all), this is the direction: "She is at liberty to be married to whom she will, only in the Lord" (1 Cor. vii, 39).

Here is a simple proclamation, the force of which is permanent, and in submission to which Christians in every period should act. They are to marry "only in the Lord." They, being themselves "in the Lord"—united to the Lord Jesus by the divine Spirit, and possessing an interest in the redeeming blessings he has purchased—
amy to marry only on Christian principles, and, of course, only such as are thus also "in the Lord"—believer with believer, and with none else. This is the obvious meaning of the passage, which no sophism can evade or fritter away.

It would be easy to employ the attention further, on the general statements contained in the Word of God, respecting the character of separation from the world which ought to be sustained by his Church, the ends for which it is called, and the objects it is bound to perform; statements which all bear on the principle as to marriage, operating to enforce and to confirm it (see especially 2 Cor. vi, 14-18; vii, 1). But, without amplifying here, and satisfying ourselves that this principle, the marriage, according to the record already quoted, a convincing and solemn establishment, the reader is requested to ponder a truth, which is as indubitable as it ought to be impressive, namely, that marriages formed by Christians in violation of the religious design of the institute, and of the express principles of their religion, are with evils many and calamitous, most earnestly to be deprecated, and most cautiously to be avoided. Is it, indeed, to be expected, on the ground of religion, that an act can be committed against the expressed will of the Most High God without expiring the transgression of those of his chastisement? Is it to be expected, on the ground of reason, that an alliance can be formed between individuals whose moral attributes and desires are essentially incompatible without creating the elements of unfruitfulness, discord, and disappointment? Excited imaginations, the passion of the moment; innocence and hope of escape, but religion and reason speak the language of unchangeable veracity, and are ever justified in the fulfilments of experience and of fact.

The operation of the evil results whose origin is thus deduced, is of course susceptible of several illustrations in domestic and social life; and, for many reasons, the degrees of public exhibition and of personal pressure may vary. 1. Yet it may be remarked uniformly, respecting these results—they are such as deeply affect the character. A reference has already been made to the moral influence of marriage, and as marriages stigmatised under the patriarchal, and forbidden and punished under the Jewish dispensation, were obnoxious on account of the contamination into which they led the professed people of God, so are the marriages of Christians with worldlings in this age, a worldly spirit being still the essence of idolatry to them, 1 Cor. vii, 4; Col. iii, 5; 1 John ii, 15-17; Matt. vi, 24), the objects of censure and depreciation, because of the benevolent effect they exert on those who are numbered among the redeemed of the Lord. Such marriages as these present constant and insatiable temptations to seduce Christians to worldly dispositions and pursuits; they enfeeble their spiritual energies; interfere with their communion with God; hinder their growth in the attainments of divine life; check and oppose their performance of duty and their pursuit of usefulness, in the family, in the Church, and in the world. Be it further remembered, that under the law known as marriage, which, if its original character were continued, did not pollute and injure. Some instances have been most palpable and painful; nor can it be considered otherwise than a truth, unquestionable and notorious, that whoever will transgress invades a very brightening of the soul. 2. It may be remarked respecting these results, again, they are such as deeply affect happiness. Christian character and Christian happiness are closely connected: if the one be hurt, the other will not remain untouched. And who sees not in the unhallowed alliance a gathering of the elements of sorrow? Are there not ample materials for secret and pungent accusations of conscience, that agitate the heart with the untold pangs of self-condemnation and remorse? Is there not reason for the bitterness of disappointment, and the sadness of forsaking?—the best is counted the least?—the truest affection is impossible—the noblest union is wanting—and the being on whom the spirit would repose is, to all that is the sweetest and most sublime in human sympathies, human joys, and human prospects, an alien and a stranger? And who is not filled with the horror of the situation which sets forth the event of a final separation at the bar of God, when, while the hope of personal salvation may be preserved, the partner of the bosom is seen
as one to be condemned by the Judge, and banished whither ever they might Elasticsearch from his presence, and the

and the glory of his power! Oh the affutuance of the folly
which leads to unites, where evils like these are created,
rather than where God will sanction, and where time
and eternity will both combine to bless! 8. Its effects
upon what may be regarded as the supreme end of the
marriage transaction, and the author of the Church
interests, is another most disturbing consideration.

What must it be! What has it ever been! That much injury, there-
fore, has arisen to the public interests of the Church of
Christ from this transgression cannot be doubted. In-
jury done to individual character is injury done to the
community of which that individual is a part. It has
been always a fact, that whoever sins in the household
of faith, sins not only against himself, but against oth-
ers; and that this transgression is one particularly
extended in its influence, operating more than, perhaps,
any one else which can be named to bring religion from
its vantage ground, to clog its progress, and to retard its
triump. See Conq. Mag. May, 1831; Malcolm on the
Christian Rule of Marriage; H. More's Comic in Search of
A Wife.

VI. Marriage Ceremonies.—In the early Christian
Church marriages were to be notified to the bishop or
society, and in the first centuries were solemnized by
the clergy, but with very many exceptions. Much
was borrowed from the customs of the Roman Law.
Banns were required about the 12th century. See Banns.
New laws sometimes moving this marriage ceremony
seems to have existed in early times. Witnesses were
required, and the dowry was settled in writing. The
espousal or betrothal preceded, and tokens or pledges
were given or exchanged. The ceremonies were to all
appearances not regarded as essential by the early Chris-
tians, but were more of a conspicious and becoming
and becoming, and when celebrated were observed as follows:
"The use of the ring, in the rites both of espousal and
of marriage, is very ancient. It is mentioned both by
Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, the latter of
whom says, It was given her, not as an ornament; but
as a seal, to signify the woman's duty in preserving the
goods of her husband, because the care of the house
belongs to her." The crowning of the married pair with
garlands was a marriage-rite peculiar to many nations
professing different forms of religion. Tertullian in-
volves a used it with the same ceremony, and he
terminated it with cypress and vernal. The crown, ap-
propriately so called, was made of olive, myrtle, and
rosemary, variegated with flowers, and sometimes with
gold and silver, pearls, precious stones, etc. These
crowns were constructed in the form of a pyramid or
tower. Both the bride and the bridegroom were crown-
ed in this manner, together with the groomman and
the bridesmaid. The bride frequently appeared in
church thus attired on the day when proclamation of
the banns was made. Chaplets were not worn by the
parties in case of second marriage, nor by those who
had been guilty of impropriety before marriage.
In the Greek Church the chaplets were imposed by the
officiating minister at the altar. In the Western Church
it was customary for the parties to present themselves
thus attired. The wearing of a veil by the bride was
brought from the Romans. It was also conformation to
the example of Rebecca (Gen. xxiv). From this mar-
riage-rite arose the custom of taking the veil in the
Church of Rome. By this act the nun devotes herself
to perpetual virginity as the spouse of Christ, the brid-
gegroon of the Church. It appears to have been customs-
ary among the ecclesiastics to be called vita matrisfolis, pallium jugale, etc., and made of a
mixture of white and red colors. Torches and lamps
were in use on such occasions, as among the Jews
and pagan nations. The festivities were celebrated by nun-
ial processes going out to meet the bridal party under
conducting him home, by nuptial songs and music, and
marriage feasts. These festivities were frequently the
subject of bitter animadversion by the fathers, especial-
ly by Chrysostom, and often called for the interposition
of the author of the Church orders, is another most disturbing consideration.

For a considerable time the observance of a marriage-
ceremony fell into desuetude among the Christians, to
remedy which certain laws enforcing it were enacted in
the 8th century. The ceremony now differs in different
places. In Scotland, like all other religious services of
that country, it is extremely simple, and is performed in
the session-house, the residence of the minister, or
private house of some friend of one of the parties. In
Lutheran countries it is generally celebrated in private
houses. In England, by the ancient customs prevailing,
the customary prevailed as in Scotland until 1757, when,
by lord Hardwicke's Act, a ceremony in a church of the
state establishment was made necessary, and this con-
tinued till 1886, when the Dissenters succeeded in re-
ceiving permission to have a marriage ceremony. Con-
tinuation of two forms of contracting marriage: it may be
with or without a religious ceremony; and, if with a re-
ligious ceremony, it may be either in the established
church or in a dissenting chapel. If the marriage is to
take place in an established church, then there must
be either a license of the bishop or permission for three
successive Sundays, or a license or certificate ob-
tained, which dispense with such publication; and, in
either case, seven or fifteen days' previous residence
in the parish by one of the parties is necessary, accord-
ing as it is a certificate or license respectively which is
applied for. The marriage must take place in the church,
the marriage-service of the Church of England being read
over, and this must be done in canonical hours, i.e.
between 8 and 12 A.M., in presence of two witnesses at
the altar, before which, in the body of the church, the
parties are placed after having been joined hands, and
pledged their mutual troth, according to a set form of
words, which they say after the minister; the man
shall a ring to the woman, then lays it on the book,
with the accustomed duty to the priest and clerk. The
priest then, in the name of the bridegroom, in the
person of the marriage, whom he instructs to put it on the
fourth finger of the woman's left hand, and holding it there, to repeat
the words, "With this ring I thee wed, with my body I thee
worship, and with all my worldly goods I thee endow.
In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the
Holy Ghost. Amen." The minister next joins their
right hands together, and, after prayers and blessings,
during certain parts of which the man and woman kneel
before the altar, they are dismissed with the reading of
a part of the Prayer-book, which points out the duties
of the marriage state. If the marriage is celebrated in
a dissenting chapel (as for that purpose it is allowed to
must be duly licensed and registered, there must be
present the superintendent-registrar of the district as
one of the witnesses, but the dissenting clergyman may
use his own or any kind of form of service. If the mar-
rriage is not to be with any religious ceremony, then it
must take place in the office of the superintendent-reg-
istrar, and in presence of witnesses, the essential thing
being that both parties should in the presence of wit-
nesses there exchange a declaration that they take each
other for man and wife. The canonical hours must be
attended to in all cases, and the blessing of the marriage
residence by one of the parties in the district; but the
condition of residence is often evaded. In all cases the
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fact of the marriage must be entered in a register, which register is kept by a public officer, and ultimately filed and kept in Somerset House, London, where a copy of the certificate of registration of every marriage in England can at all times be had for a small sum.

In the United States of America the customs of the Church of England are followed by the Presbyterian and Congregational churches, and measurably also by the Baptists. The Protestant Episcopal Church adheres closely to the practices of the Church of England, and from the latter the Methodist also, in a somewhat modified form, have copied it in this particular. Minor bodies of the Christian Church follow the practices of one or the other of the churches mentioned.

The laws of the several states differ somewhat as to the matter of marriage ceremonies, but they are adapted to the usages of all acknowledged Christian denominations, and recognize the validity of the most solemn performances, by a clergyman or magistrate, or by a simple contract before witnesses.

Peculiar usages are found in some of the Eastern churches of to-day. In Russia the bride and bridegroom hold a lighted taper in their hands in front of a sacred picture in the centre of the church. Rings are placed on their fingers, and, their hands being joined, they are led by the priest three times round the altar. Two highly-ornamented gild crowns are placed on their heads, and held over them by the groomsmen during the ceremony. They drink from thimbles three times, and, kissing one another, the ceremony is finished. The married couple then make the tour of the church, crossing themselves at and saluting each saintly image on their way. Weddings generally take place towards evening, so that immediately after the ceremony dinner commences at the house of the bride's father. At a marriage-feast lighted candles are placed in every position and corner possible. No other wine but champagne is drunk, and the quantity of this beverage consumed is remarkable. The dinner is followed by a ball, and the feasting is usually kept up for twenty-four hours. The custom of a honeymoon does not exist in Russia. The married couple spend the first few days of their married life with the bride's father. Shortly after the marriage the bride and bridegroom must call upon every one of their relations, friends, and acquaintances, and after this ceremony is finished they sink back into their ordinary life (Jesus at Home). For the Roman Catholic view of marriage, see MATRIMONY.

MARRIAGE, HEATHEN. Under this head, as being most akin to the ancient Hebrew, and perhaps best representing the general type of Oriental matrimonial law, we begin with.

I. Mohammedan.—The following description of this (condensed from Lane's Modern Egyptians) applies especially to Cairo, but will serve for a general illustration in most Moslem countries. To abstain from marrying when a man has attained a sufficient age, and when there is no just impediment, is esteemed by the Egyptians improper, and even deplorable. Oriental females arrive at puberty much earlier than the natives of colder climates. Many marry at the age of twelve or thirteen years; few remain unmarried after sixteen years of age. And when the age of thirty is attained at Cairo, or even earlier, a woman may be a mother. It is very common among the Arabs of Egypt and of other countries, but less so in Cairo than in other parts of Egypt, for a man to marry his first cousin. In this case the husband and wife continue to call each other "cousin," because the tie of blood is indissoluble, but that of marriage is very precarious, and may be broken. Most commonly the mother, or some other near female relation of the youth or man who is desirous of obtaining a wife, describes to him the personal and other qualifications of the young women with whom she is acquainted, directs his choice, and employs a woman whose regular business it is to assist men in such cases. The parents may betroth their daughter to whom they please, and marry her to him without her consent if she be not arrived at the age of puberty, but after she has attained that age she may choose a husband for herself, and appoint any man to arrange and effect her marriage. In the former case, however, the relations of a girl sought in marriage usually endeavor to obtain her consent to the proposed union. The bridegroom is generally expected to obtain the consent of the Bishath, and to show sufficient assets to meet the expenses of the marriage, and the features of his bride until he finds her in his absolute possession, unless she belongs to the lower classes of society; in which case it is easy enough for him to see her face. When a female is about to marry, she should have a betrothal contract drawn up in duplicate. This contract for her with her proposed husband. If she be under the age of puberty this is absolutely necessary; and in this case her father, if living, or (if he be dead) her nearest adult male relative, or a guardian appointed by will or by the magistrate, performs the office of deputy; but if she be of age she appoints her own deputy, or may even make the contract herself, though this is seldom done. After a youth or man has made choice of a female to demand in marriage, on the report of his female relations, and, by proxy, made the preliminary arrangements before described with her and her relations, a betrothal contract is drawn up, and is signed by the deputy. Having obtained consent to the union, if the intended bride be under age, he asks what is the amount of the required dowry. The giving of a dowry is indispensable. It is generally stipulated that two thirds of the dowry be paid in money, a cup three months, and, kissing one another, the ceremony is finished. The married couple spend the first few days of their wedding life with the bride's father. Shortly after the marriage the bride and bridegroom must call upon every one of their relations, friends, and acquaintances, and after this ceremony is finished they sink back into their ordinary life (Jesus at Home). For the Roman Catholic view of marriage, see MATRIMONY.
ures; amen," after which all present repeat the same chapter. It is not always the same form that is recited on these occasions: any form may be used, and it may be repeated by any person; it is not even necessary, and is often altogether omitted. The contract concluded, the bridegroom sometimes (but seldom unless he be a person of the lower orders) kisses the hands of his friends and others there present; and they are presented with sherbet, and generally remain to dinner. Each of them receives an embroidered handkerchief, provided by the family of the bride. Before the persons assembled on this occasion disperse, they settle upon the night when the bride is to be brought to the house of the bridegroom, and the latter, for the first time, is to visit her.

In general, the bridegroom waits for his bride about eight or ten days after the conclusion of the contract. Meanwhile he sends to her, two or three or more times, some fruit, sweetmeats, etc.; and perhaps makes her a present of a shawl, or some other article of value. The bride's family are at the same time occupied in preparing for her a stock of household furniture and dress. The portion of the dowry which has been paid by the bridegroom, and generally a much larger sum (the additional money, which is often more than the dowry itself, being supplied by the bride's family), is expended in purchasing the articles of furniture, dress, and ornaments for the bride. These articles are the property of the bride, and, if she be divorced, she takes them away with her. She cannot, therefore, with truth be said to be purchased. The furniture is sent, commonly borne by a train of camels, to the bridegroom's house. Often among the articles is a chair for the turban or headdress. There are sometimes sent two of these chairs, one for the husband and the other for the wife. The bridegroom should receive his bride on the eve of Friday, or that of Monday; but the former is generally esteemed the more fortunate period. During two or three or more preceding nights the street or quarter in which the bridegroom lives is illuminated with chandeliers and lanterns (q. v.). An entertainment is also given on each of these nights, particularly on the last night before that on which the wedding is concluded, at the bridegroom's house. On these occasions it is customary for the persons invited, and for all intimate friends, to send presents to his house a day or two before the feast which they purpose or expect to attend; they generally send sugar, coffee, rice, wax candles, or a lamb; the former articles are usually placed upon a tray of copper or wood, and covered with a silk or embroidered kerschief. The guests are entertained on these occasions by musicians and male or female singers, by dancing girls, or by some other performance.

On the preceding Wednesday (or on the Saturday if the wedding is to conclude on the eve of Monday), at about the hour of noon, or a little later, the bride goes in state to the bath. In general the first persons among the bride's party are several of her married female relations and friends, walking in pairs, and next a number of young virgins. The former are dressed in the usual manner, covered with the black silk shawl; the latter have white silk shawls. Then follows the bride, walking under a canopy of silk, of some gay color, as pink, rose-color, or yellow, or of two colors composing wide stripes, often rose-color and yellow. It is carried by four men, by means of a pole at each corner, and is open only in front; and at the top of each of the four poles is attached an embroidered handkerchief. The dress of the bride during this procession entirely conceals her person. She is generally covered from head to foot with a red shawl, or with a white or yellow shawl, though rarely. Upon her head is placed a small paste-board cap or crown. The shawl is placed over this, and conceals from the view of the public the richer articles of her dress, her face, and her jewels, etc., excepting one or two ornaments, generally of diamonds and emeralds, attached to that part of the shawl which covers her forehead. She is accompanied by two or three of her female relations within the canopy; and often, when in hot weather, a woman, walking backwards before her, is constantly employed in fanning her with a large fan of black ostrich feathers, the lower part of the front of which is usually ornamented with a piece of looking-glass. Sometimes one procession, with a single canopy, serves for two brides, who walk side by side. The procession moves very slowly, and generally pursues a circuitous route, for the sake of greater display. On leaving the house it turns to the right. It is closed by a second party of musicians, similar to the first, or by two or three drummers. The whole bath is sometimes hired for the bride and her party exclusively. They pass several hours, seldom less than two, occupied in washing, sporting, and feasting; and frequently female singers are hired to amuse them in the bath: they then return in the same order in which they came. Having returned from the bath to the house of her family, the bride and her companions sup together. If singers have
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contributed to the festivity in the bath, they also return with the bride to renew their concert. Their songs are always on the subject of love, and of the joyous event which occasions their presence. It is on this night, and sometimes also during the latter half of the preceding day, that the bridegroom gives his chief entertainment. Love is the preceptor on the occasion before the bride, or, if it be large enough, in the court. The other and more common performances by which the guests are amused have been before mentioned.

On the following day the bride goes in procession to the house of the bridegroom. The ceremony usually occupies three or four hours. She arrives at the house of the bridegroom about an hour before the wedding, accompanied by her ladies (women of the third, or half the amount of that of a virgin. Among persons not of the lowest order, though in very humble life, the marriage ceremonies are conducted in the same manner as among the middle orders. But when the expenses cannot by any means be paid, the bride is paraded in a very simple manner, covered with a shawl, her hair (often greased), and surrounded by a group of her female relations and friends, dressed in their best, or in borrowed clothes, and enlivened by no other sounds of joy than their shrill cry, which they repeat at frequent intervals. The general mood of processions of the villages is different from those above described. The bride, usually covered with a shawl, is seated on a camel, and so conveyed to the bridegroom's dwelling. Sometimes four or five women or girls sit with her on the same camel, one on either side of her, and two or three behind her. The camel is usually covered with carpets or other drapery. She is followed by a group of women singing. In the evening of the wedding, and often during several previous evenings, in a village, the male and female friends of the bridegroom and bride are usually the only persons present in the mosque. The vigil is then broken, the bridegroom and his bride retiring to their separate apartments. A second group of musicians, with the same instruments, or with drums only, closes the procession. The prayers are commonly performed merely as a matter of ceremony; and it is frequently the case that the bridegroom does not pray at all. The procession returns from the mosque with more order and display, and very slowly; perhaps because it would be considered unbecoming in the bridegroom to hasten home to take possession of his bride. Soon after his return from the mosque, the bridegroom leaves his friends in a lower apartment, enjoying their pipes, and coffee, and sherbet. The bride and her mother and sister, or whatever other female relations were left with her, are above, and the bride herself and her companion in a separate apartment. If the bridegroom be a youth or young man, it is considered proper that he, as well as the bride, should exhibit some degree of bashfulness: one of his friends therefore carries him a part of the way up to the room. On entering the bride's apartment he gives a present to her companion, who then retires. The bride has a shawl thrown over her head, and the bridegroom must give her a present of money, which is called the gift. The bride, and her neighbors, are entertained in the apartment before she has opportunity to attempt to remove this, which she does not allow him to do without some apparent reluctance, if not violent resistance, in order to show her maiden modesty. The bridegroom now sees the face of his bride for the first time, and generally finds her nearly what he has been led to expect. He remains with her but a few minutes: having satisfied his curiosity respecting her personal charms, he calls to the women (who generally collect at the door, where they wait in anxious suspense) to raise the veil, they raise the veil, and the shrill sounds acquaint the persons before asked, as well as neighboring, neighborhood, residents, and invited by other women, spread still further the news that he has acknowledged himself satisfied with his bride; he soon after descends to rejoin his friends, and remains with them an hour or more before he returns to his wife. It very seldom happens that the husband, if dissatisfied in his bride, immediately disgraces and deserts her; in general he retains her a week or more, even if dissatisfied with her.

Marriages are sometimes conducted without any pomp or ceremony, even in the case of virgins, by mutual consent of the bride and groom, and the bride's family, or the bride herself; and widows or divorced women are never honored with a procession on marrying again. The mere sentence, "I give myself up to thee," uttered by a female to a man who promises to become her husband (even without the presence of witnesses, if none can easily be procured), renders her his legal wife, if arrived at puberty; and marriages with widows and divorced women, among the Moslems of Egypt, and other Arabs, are sometimes concluded in this simple manner. The dowry is very small, not more than a burning candle, or half the amount of that of a virgin. Among persons not of the lowest order, though in very humble life, the marriage ceremonies are conducted in the same manner as among the middle orders. But when the expenses cannot by any means be paid, the bride is paraded in a very simple manner, covered with a shawl, her hair (often greased), and surrounded by a group of her female relations and friends, dressed in their best, or in borrowed clothes, and enlivened by no other sounds of joy than their shrill cry, which they repeat at frequent intervals. The general mood of processions of the villages is different from those above described. The bride, usually covered with a shawl, is seated on a camel, and so conveyed to the bridegroom's dwelling. Sometimes four or five women or girls sit with her on the same camel, one on either side of her, and two or three behind her. The camel is usually covered with carpets or other drapery. She is followed by a group of women singing. In the evening of the wedding, and often during several previous evenings, in a village, the male and female friends of the bridegroom and bride are usually the only persons present in the mosque. The vigil is then broken, the bridegroom and his bride retiring to their separate apartments. A second group of musicians, with the same instruments, or with drums only, closes the procession. The prayers are commonly performed merely as a matter of ceremony; and it is frequently the case that the bridegroom does not pray at all. The procession returns from the mosque with more order and display, and very slowly; perhaps because it would be considered unbecoming in the bridegroom to hasten home to take possession of his bride. Soon after his return from the mosque, the bridegroom leaves his friends in a lower apartment, enjoying their pipes, and coffee, and sherbet. The bride and her mother and sister, or whatever other female relations were left with her, are above, and the bride herself and her companion in a separate apartment. If the bridegroom be a youth or young man, it is considered proper that he, as well as the bride, should exhibit some degree of bashfulness: one of his friends therefore carries him a part of the way up to the room. On entering the bride's apartment he gives a present to her companion, who then retires. The bride has a shawl thrown over her head, and the bridegroom must give her a present of money, which is called the gift. The bride, and her neighbors, are entertained in the apartment before she has opportunity to attempt to remove this, which she does not allow him to do without some apparent reluctance, if not violent resistance, in order to show her maiden modesty. The bridegroom now sees the face of his bride for the first time, and generally finds her nearly what he has been led to expect. He remains with her but a few minutes: having satisfied his curiosity respecting her personal charms, he calls to the women (who generally collect at the door, where they wait in anxious suspense) to raise the veil, they raise the veil, and the shrill sounds acquaint the persons before asked, as well as neighboring, neighborhood, residents, and invited by other women, spread still further the news that he has acknowledged himself satisfied with his bride; he soon after descends to rejoin his friends, and remains with them an hour or more before he returns to his wife. It very seldom happens that the husband, if dissatisfied in his bride, immediately disgraces and deserts her; in general he retains her a week or more, even if dissatisfied with her.

Marriages are sometimes conducted without any pomp or ceremony, even in the case of virgins, by mutual consent of the bride and groom, and the bride's family, or the bride herself; and widows or divorced women are never honored with a procession on marrying again. The mere sentence, "I give myself up to thee," uttered by a
ter these preliminaries, the bride was generally conducted from her father's house to the house of her bridegroom at nightfall, in a chariot (ฎิภุ่) drawn by a pair of mules or oxen, and furnished with a kind of couch (ελαβε) as a seat. On either side of her sat the bridegroom and one of his most intimate friends or relations, who from his office was called the paramymph (παραμυψήνων), as he held his head, as the bridegroom's marriage (γυμνα) with the bride and bridegroom, he was sometimes called the μαριγος. The nuptial procession was probably accompanied, according to circumstances, by a number of persons, some of whom carried the nuptial torches. Both bride and bridegroom (the former veiled) were received by the bride's relations and friends at their heads, and the doors of their houses were hung with festoons of ivy and bay. As the bridal procession moved along, the hymeneal song was sung to the accompaniment of Lydian flutes, even in olden times, as beautifully described by Homer, and the married pair received the greetings and congratulations of those who met them. After entering the bridegroom's house, into which the bride was probably conducted by his mother, bearing a lighted torch, it was customary to shower sweetmeats upon them (ἐπάνωσεσωρετα), as emblems of peace and friendship, which were now eaten at the marriage feast, to which the name γαμος was particularly applied; it was generally given in the house of the bridegroom or his parents, and, besides being a festive meeting, served other and more important purposes. There was no preliminary ceremony which took place in the civil or religious ceremony. There were no preliminaries with the celebration of marriage among the ancient Greeks, and therefore no public record of its solemnization. This deficiency was then supplied by the marriage-feast, for the guests were of course competent to prove the fact of a marriage having taken place. To this feast, contrary to the usual practice among the Greeks, women were invited as well as men; but they seem to have sat at a separate table, with the bride, still veiled, among them. At the conclusion of this feast she was conducted by her husband into the bridal chamber; and a law of Solon required that, on entering it, they should eat a kiss together, as if to indicate that their conversation ought to be sweet and agreeable. The song called the Επίθηλομελες was then sung before the doors of the bridal chamber. The day after the marriage, the first of the bride's residence in her new abode, was curtailed, so that the only ceremony of which their friends sent the customary presents to the newly married couple. On another day, the apalula (απαλλα), perhaps the second after marriage, the bridegroom left his house to lodge apart from his wife at his father's in-law. Some of the presents made to the bride by her husband were called the omphalos (ομφαλος) or λαυρίγα, as being given on the occasion of the bride first appearing unveiled; they were probably given on the apalula, or day after the marriage. Another ceremony observed after marriage was the sacrifice which the husband offered up on the occasion of his bride being registered among his own phratries.

The above account refers to Athenian customs. At Sparta the betrothal of the bride by her father or guardian (ερηπος) was requisite as a preliminary of marriage, as well as at Athens. Another custom peculiar to the Spartans, and a relic of ancient times, was the seizure of the bride by her intended husband, but of course with the sanction of her parents or guardians. She was not, however, immediately domiciled in her husband's house, but cohabited with him for some time clandestinely, till he brought her, and frequently her mother also, to his house.

The Greeks, generally speaking, entertained little regard for the female character. They considered women, in fact, as decidedly inferior to men, qualified to discharge only the subordinate functions in life, and rather necessary to complete that form of matrimony which was considered the only degree of rank. To these notions female education for the most part corresponded, and, in fact, it confirmed them; it did not support the elegant accomplishment and refinement of manners which permit occasionally to engage the affections when other attractions have passed away. Aristotle is that the relation of man to woman is that of the governor to the subject; and Plato, that a woman's virtue may be summed up in a few words, for she has only to manage the house well, keeping what there is in it, and obeying her husband. Among the Bithynians, however, and, especially at Sparta, women enjoyed much more estimation than in the rest of Greece.

2. Roman.—A legal Roman marriage was called justus nuptiae, justum matrimonium, as being conformable to justus (circile) or to law. A legal marriage was either cum benedicta civis (a italic) or without any ceremony at all. But both forms of marriage agreed in this: there must be connubium between the parties, and consent. The legal consequences as to the power of the father over his children were the same in both.

Connubium is merely a term which comprehends all the conditions of a legal marriage. Generally it may be stated that there was only connubium between Roman citizens; the cases in which it at any time existed between parties not both Roman citizens, were exceptions to the general rule. Originally, or at least at one period of the Roman Republic, there was no legal marriage between the patricians and the plebeians; but this was altered by the Lex Canuleia (B.C. 445), which allowed connubium between persons of those two classes. There were various degrees of consanguinity and affinity within the limits of which it was legal to contract marriage. An illegal union of a male and female, though affecting to be, was not a marriage: the man had no legal wife, and the children had no legal father; consequently they were not in the power of their reputed father. The marriage cum conventione differed from that sine conventione in the relation which it established between husband and wife; the marriage cum conventione was a necessary condition to make a woman a matres familiares. By the marriage cum conventione the wife passed into the family of her husband, and was to him in the character of a daughter, or, as it was expressed, in manum convenit. In the marriage sine conventione the wife's relation to her own family remained as before, and she was merely uxor. "Uxor," says Cicero, "is a genus of which there are two species: one is matres familiares, quae in manum convenit; the other is uxor only." Accordingly a materfamilias is a wife who is long, and in the family of her husband. A wife not in manu was not a member of her husband's familia, and therefore the term could not apply to her. Matrona was properly a wife not in manu, and equivalent to uxor: and she was called matrona before she had any children. But these words are not always used in those their original and proper meanings. It does not appear that any forms were requisite in the marriage sine conventione; and apparently the evidence of such marriage was cohabitation matrimonii causa. The matrimonii causa might be proved by various kinds of evidence. In the case of a marriage cum conventione, there were three forms: (1) Usus, (2) Forreum, and (3) Coemptio.

(1.) Marriage was effected by usus if a woman lived with a man for a whole year as his wife; and this was by analogy to usus as marriage by coemption is to marriage by ceremony. In such cases the law of the Twelve Tables provided that if a woman did not wish to come into the manus of her husband in this manner, she should absent herself from him annually for three nights (trinomium), and so break the usus of the year.

(2.) Forreum was a form of marriage in which certain words were used in the presence of ten witnesses, and were accompanied by a certain religious ceremony, in which panis farreus was employed; and hence this necessity of form is called auscultation, and the ceremony is a form of marriage by auscultation. It was the ceremony that certain priestly offices, such as that of Flamen Diaios, could only be held by those who were born of
parents who had been married by this ceremony (civitates parentes).

(3.) Coemptio was effected by mancipation, and consequently the wife was in mancipio. A woman who was cohabiting with a man as uxor, might come into his mancibio; that is, into mancipation, in which case the coemption was said to be matrimonio causa, and she who was formerly uxor became opul maritum filio loco.

Sponsalia were not an unusual preliminary of marriage, but they were not necessary. The sponsalia were an agreement to marry, made in such form as to give each party a right of action in case of non-performance, or the party might not, and the offending party was condemned in such damages as to the judge seemed just. The woman who was promised in marriage was accordingly called sponsa, which is equivalent to promissa; the man who was engaged to marry was called sponsus. The sponsalia were of course not binding if the parties consented to waive the contract. Sometimes a present was made by the future husband to the future wife by way of earnest (arvha, arvha sponsalia), or, as it was called, proper magistus donatio.

The consequences of marriage were: 1. The power of the father over the children of the marriage, which was a completely new relation—an effect indeed of marriage, but one which had no influence over the relation of the husband and wife. 2. The liabilities of either of the parties to the contract was affected by the violation of the marriage union. 3. The relation of husband and wife with respect to property.

When marriage was dissolved, the parties to it might marry again; but opinion considered it more decent for a woman not to marry again. A woman was required by usage (usu) to wait a year before she contracted a second marriage, on the pain of infamia.

It remains to describe the customs and rites which were observed by the Romans at marriages. After the parties had agreed to marry, and the persons in whose presence the contract was to be concluded, a Vestal virgin was sometimes held at the house of the maiden for the purpose of settling the marriage-contract, which was written on tablets, and signed by both parties. The woman, after she had promised to become the wife of a man, was called sponsa, posta, dieta, or sperata. It appears that—at least during the imperial period—the man put a ring on the finger of his betrothed as a pledge of his fidelity. This ring was probably, like all rings at this time, worn on the left hand, and on the finger nearest to the smallest. The last point to be fixed was the date of the marriage to be taken place. The Romans believed that certain days were unlucky, and that the performance of the marriage rites, either on account of the religious character of those days themselves, or on account of the days by which they were followed, as the woman had to perform certain religious rites on the day after her wedding, which could not take place on a dies ater. Days not suitable for entering upon matrimony were the calends, nones, and ides of every month, all dies atrae, the whole months of May and February, and a great number of festivals. On the wedding-day, which in the early times was never fixed upon without consulting the auspices, the bride was dressed in a long white robe with a purple fringe, or adorned with ribbons. This dress was called tunica recta, and was bound round the waist with a girdle (corona, cingulum, or sones), which the husband had to untie in the evening. The bride’s veil, called flamamur, was of a bright yellow color, and her shoes likewise. Her hair was divided on this occasion with the point of a spear. The bride was conducted to the house of her husband in the evening. She was taken with apparent violence from the arms of her father or of the person who had to give her away. On her way she was accompanied by three boys dressed in the praetexta, and whose fathers and mothers were still alive (patrini et matrini). One of them carried before her a torch of white thorn (spina), or, according to others, of pine wood; the two others walked by her side, supporting her by the arm. The bride herself carried a distaff and a spindle, with wool. A boy called cuscilla carried in a covered vase (curnera, curnum, or cuscillum) the so-called utensils of the bride and playthings for children (sponsia). Besides those persons who were engaged in the ceremony, it was extended by a numerous train of friends, both of the bride and the bridegroom. When the procession arrived at the house of the bridegroom, the door of which was adorned with garlands and flowers, the bride was carried across the threshold by promaves, i.e. men who had been married on the occasion, who might not knock against it with her foot, which would have been an evil omen. Before she entered the house, she wound wool around the door-posts of her new residence, and anointed them with lard (adipsa suillsa) or wolf’s fat (adipsa lupanae). The husband received her with fire and water, which the woman had to touch. This was either a symbolic purification, or a symbolic expression of welcome, as the interdices aqua et igni was the formula for banishment. The bride saluted her husband with the words, Ubis tu Civis, ego Civis. After she had entered the house with distaff and spindle, she was placed upon a sheep-skin, and here the keys of the house were delivered into her hands. A repast (cosa nuptialis), given by the husband to the whole train of relatives and friends who accompanied the bride, proceeded. Ancient writers mention a very popular song, Talassae or Talassis, which was sung at weddings; but whether it was sung during the repast or during the procession is not quite clear, though we may infer from the story respecting the origin of the song that it was sung while the procession was advancing towards the house of the husband. It may be easily imagined that a solemnity like that of marriage did not take place among the merry and humorous Italians without a variety of jests and railleries; and Ovid mentions obscene songs which were sung by a man while he was laying on a bed, and which he gave after the company had left. These songs were probably the old Foscennia, and are frequently called Epikolo-meia. At the end of the repast, the bride was conducted by matrons who had not had more than one husband (promaves) to the Lectus genialis in the atrium, which was on this occasion magnificently adorned with flowers. On the following day the husband sometimes gave another entertainment to his friends, which was called repotides, and the woman, who on this day undertook the management of the house of her husband, had to perform certain religious rites; on which occasions a sacrifice of a white hart was made in the morning, and the woman was to select a day for the marriage which was not followed by a dies ater. These rites probably consisted of sacrifices to the Dii Penates.

The position of a Roman woman after marriage was very different from that of a Greek woman. The Roman presided over the whole household; she educated her children, watched over and preserved the honor of the house, and, as the materfamilias, she shared the honors and respect shown to her husband. Far from being confined, like the Greek women, in a cramped apartment (a matronoom, at least during the better centuries of the republic) occupied the most important part of the house, the atrium.—Smith, Dict. of Class. Ant., s. v.

III. Among the Hindoos. There are writers, perhaps we had better call them "fact gatherers" (comp. Müller, Ciba, ii, 262), who, not contenting themselves with the accomplishment of the task for which they are fitted, frequently go out of their way to cast a slur upon the Christian's belief, and to ridicule him for entertaining the thought that the Bible is the education of the human race. Yet the deeper the researches into the "primitive" condition of man, and the more intimate our relation with those nations who can claim a civilization outside of the pale of Christian teachings, the more stubborn appears the fact that Christianity alone assigns to woman
a position of equality with man. The N. T. teaches "there is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." The Hindu's sacred writings, however, not only fail to make woman the equal of man, but thin and male, as being upon the plain, which still longeth for grass." "They exhaust," says Manly (Controversial India, ii, 158), "the catalogue of vice to affix its epithets to woman's nature—indul- lence, violence, deceit, envy, extreme avariciousness, an entirely want of good qualities, with impurity they aff- irm, are the innate faults of womankind." "Why," says Butler (Land of the Vedas, p. 470), "if my native friend had six children, three boys and as many girls, and I happened to inquire, 'Lalla, how many children have you?' the probability is he would reply, 'Sir, I have three children. I never would not think it worth while to count in the daughters.' Indeed, the Brahmin is taught that perfection is to be attained only, freed from the contamination of woman, in a pure ascetic state (Wuttke, Christian Ethics, i, 51). But let us not be misunderstood as conveying the impression that the law and custom in India is to look upon the brahman and the laity celibacy is a reproach in either sex. As among the Chinese (see below), "girls are not desired, not welcome;" and, when they come, they are either quickly done away with, where the English law does not interfer- ence); if they are not claimed by the parents, they are ig- nored, not despised. Arrived at the age of only seven, the age at which the Shastri pronounce the girl marriage-able, the unhappy parents begin to look about for an early opportunity to free themselves from the burden that is upon them by betrothal of the child. As all thought of this is usually left to the women and their relatives, the latter being the parents of the children. The poor girl has no choice or voice in her own destiny—all is arranged that her parents or any way whatever. "Courtship, in our Christian sense," says Butler, "the maiden in India cannot trust her to see or choose with whom she to whose control she will ever be long be handed over. She cannot write to him, for she can neither read nor write; all she is able to do is to follow the instructions to 'worship the gods for a good husband.' She is taught to commence at about eight years old, and her teachers and nurses are ad- dressed chiefly to Kama-deva (v.), the Hindu Cupi- did. . . . The maiden prays, and father and mother manage the business of selection. Each caste [see In- dian Caste] has its professional match-makers, whose aid is indispensable. When the negotiations have been a certain decision, the Pandits are consulted to avoid mistakes of consanguinity, and then the astrolo- gers, who pronounce upon the carefully-preserved horo- scopes of the boy and girl, whether they can be united with safety. These preliminaries all found satisfactory, the wedding ceremony is sought for by the family gods favor the union. The stars, the gods, and men being a unit, negotiations are opened between the parents and relatives as to the amount of gift and dow- ry, and, when conclusions are reached here to their mutual satisfaction, the astrologer is again called in to as- sure that the individual elements of the marriage are be registered, and a bond for the dowry executed. This is done with due solemnity, and then the astrologer has again to ascertain and name a lucky day for the cere- mony, which is accepted by the parents under their bond to see that the consummation of the engagement takes place. This is the usual method, slightly varied in different locali- ties" (p. 479, 480). No female child is expected to have gone beyond the age of twelve without the consumma- tion of an engagement. Woe be unto that family wherein a girl is past the age of twelve and yet unbe- trothed (Butler, p. 497). And yet what is the fate of the poor girl after she has actually found her mate? Marriage to the Hindu female means slavery in its most abject form. "The Hindu," says Manly (i, 154), "does not marry to secure a companion who will aid him in enduring the toils of life, or who will be trained to use- ful employment, he seeks only a slave who shall nourish (he thinks not of training) children, and abide in al- subject to his rule.

Betrothal with the Hindu being as binding as mar- riage (indeed, the word "marriage" is used to include both betrothal and our conception of the matrimonial alliance), the female child enters into a new state of existence im- mediately after the ceremony of betrothal. "Henceforth she is no more free to roam the fields and enjoy the lovely face of nature. Reserved for her husband, she can no longer be seen with propriety by any man save her father and brothers. She is from that day 'a purdah-nasini'—one who sits behind the curtains within the enclosure which surrounds her mother's home; and now com- mences her education, which, lasting for five or six years, may be epitomized in its entire curriculum under these four heads: cooking, domestic service, religion, and their peculiar female literature, to enter at last a state of dependence more strict, contemptuous, and humiliating, ordained for the weaker sex among the Hindus, than which there cannot easily be conceived another. Look into the life of the Hindu woman, where she has lived along and always announces to her lord that his meal is ready. He en- ters and sits down, and finds all duly prepared by her care. Why does she still stand? Why not sit down too, and share with her husband the good things which she has made ready. She dares not. He would not al- low her to sit, no how low it is. Her rank is held by the parents in their own hands. The poor girl has no choice or voice in her own destiny—all is arranged without consulting her views or affections in any way whatever. "Courtship, in our Christian sense," says Butler, "the maiden in India cannot never know. She is not allowed to see or converse with him to whose com-
the woman who has had the good fortune to be the first 
wife takes precedence in rank; she remaining the mist-
tress of the zenana—the Hindu harem.

Polyandry, strangely enough, has also established it-
selves here. "This singular and amazing relation existed 
in Samskrit, and represented by the officiating Brahmin with 
the utmost rapidity, no one understands what is said. 
The principal rites among the Brahmins are walking 
three times round a fire, and tying the garments of 
the parties together. The bride has also to make seven 
steps, at the last of which the marriage is complete.

The marriage is usually solemnized in the house 
of the bride's father. Thither the bridegroom proceeds, 
attended by his friends, and from thence conducts the 
bride to his home in a grand procession, usually by 
night, with torches and great rejoicings. On both occa-
sions considerable expenditure is incurred in Feast 
the friends and relatives, and in providing ornaments, 
sec, processes, and illuminations. The wealthy 
spend freely on these objects, and the poorer classes of 
ten incur debts which burden them for many years. 
These make the scene so splendid that what is cele-
brating a marriage, form a heavy item of Hindu ex-
penditure, and one of the motives to female infanticide 
is doubtless laid in the desire to avoid this charge (Tre-

The marriage procession is thus described by Butler 
(p. 360). "Often when travelling at night in my pa-
laquin, I have been roused from my sleep by my bear-
ers catching sight of an approaching marriage proces-
sion, with its torches, music, and shouting; falling in 
with the enthusiasm of each event, they would cry out 
that my palanquin was naturally fit to be transformed 
into a bridegroom would make his appearance, mounted on a fine horse 
splendidly caparisoned—his own or borrowed for the oc-
casion—and wearing a grand coat, decked out in tinsel 
and gold thread, with the matrimonial crown on his head, 
and his richly-embroidered slippers, all very fine, 
his friends shouting and dancing alongside of him, 
and, of course, as he passes, we make our salaam and wish 
him joy. Right behind the bridegroom's horse comes 
the palanquin of the bride, but she is veiled, and the 
veil so closely shut, and on the little lady is borne 
the groom whom she never saw before, to surrender her-
self into the hands of one who has never seen her nor 
own her; a bride without a choice, with no voice in her 
only destiny; married without preference; handed over, 
by those assumed to do all the thinking for her, to a fate 
where the feelings of her heart were never consulted in 
the most important transaction of her existence; begin-
ning her married life under circumstances which pre-
clude the possibility of her being sustained by the 
affection which is founded upon esteem. When the proces-
sion has come within halting distance of his home, the 
watching friends go forth to meet the bridegroom, the 
bride enter her apartments, the door is shut, and the 
guests are entertained in other parts of the establish-
mant."

IV. Among the Chinese and Japanese.—The Chinese 
are divided into a number of clans, each distinguished by 
a clan name. Of these clans there are from a hundred 
to a thousand, according to different authors. The law 
is that no man shall marry a woman of his own clan 
name. Thus relationship by the male line, however 
distant, prevents marriage. This rule is very ancient, 
its origin being referred by the Chinese to the mythic 
times of the emperors. The legendary emperor Fu-Hi, 
who reigned before the Hea dynasty, which, according 
to the Chinese annals, began in B.C. 2027, is said to 
have divided the people into clans, and established 
this rule regarding marriage (Tyler, Researches, p. 278).

We give the Chinese marriage customs at considerable 
length, as they are highly illustrative of Oriental usages 
in general.

As in all Eastern countries, the girl to be given 
in wedlock is not consulted in the choice of her future 
husband. The prohibitions against marriage are 
stronger among the Chinese than among other Na-
inese are firm believers in the sentiment to which the 
Western mind has given expression in the proverb that 
"Matches are made in heaven." To secure an alliance, 
a person is employed as a go-between or match-maker. 
The negotiation is generally opened by the family of 
the bridegroom sending a deputation with a offer of 
—"a relic of the patriarchal custom. Occasionally, 
when a female child is born to persons in humble cir-
cumstances, it is given away to a family having a male 
child only; is reared by the latter, and, when the girl 
and boy have reached marriageable age, they are mar-
inmary. Not unfrequently it occurs among wealthy 

families having a daughter that the custom of purchase 
is reversed, and a husband secured for a pecuniary con-
sideration. The wealthy look with special favor upon 
the literary class, and not unfrequently great sacrifices 
are made to secure a scholarly husband. "It is not un-

frequently occurs," says Doolittle (Chinese, i, 99), 
that a rich family, having only one daughter and no boys, de-
sires to obtain a son-in-law who shall be willing to 
marry the girl and live in the family as a son. Some-
times the notice is seen in a newspaper by the parent 
of a certain man to find a son-in-law and heir who will come 
and live with him, perhaps stating the age and qualifi-
cations of an acceptable person. In such a case, the 
parents of those who have a son whose qualifications 
might warrant such an application, and whom they 
would be willing to allow to marry on such terms, are 
expected to make application by a go-between, when 
the matter would be considered by the rich man. 
Sometimes the rich man makes application by a go-between to 
the parents of a young man whose reputation he is 
pleased with, and who perhaps may be a recent great 
name, but who is standing near the head of the list of suc-
seful competitors of the first or second literary de-
gree.

Betrothal.—This among the Chinese is considered as 
binding as marriage, if the rites and observances have 
been carefully looked after. The final act in betroth-
ment is the exchange of cards (for description, see Doo-
little, i, 67). The time intervening between betrothal 
and marriage varies from a month or two to eighteen 
or twenty years, depending much on the age of the parties. 
"From one to three months before the marriage a forts-
nate is given to the bride, and the deputation for celebrat-

ing the marriage is usually a member of the family of the bridegroom, or a trusty 
friend, takes the eight oratory characters which denote 
the birth-time for each of the affianced parties, and for 
each of their parents, if living, to a fortune-teller, who 
selects lucky days and times for the marriage, for the 
cutting of the wedding garments, for the placing of the 
bridal bed in position, for the finishing of the curtains 
of the bridal bed, for the embroidering of the bridal pil-
lovs, and for the entering of the sedan, on the part of 
the bride, on the day of her marriage. These items are 
written on a white sheet of paper by the fortune-teller, 
the family of the girl by the hands of the go-between. 
If accepted, the periods specified become the fixed times 
for the performance of the particular indicated, and 
both parties proceed to make the necessary arrange-
ments for the appropriating wedded garments, the wedding-cakes and material for the bridal dress to the 
family of the bride by the other party is next in order. 
The relative time usually adopted for the performance 
of this custom is about one month before the day fixed 
for the marriage. The number of these 'cakes of cer-
memony,' or wedding-cakes, varies from several score 
to several hundreds. They are round, and about an inch 
high, weighing generally about one pound and ten or 
twelve ounces each, and measure nearly a foot in diam-
er. They are made out of wheat flour, and contain in
the middle some sugar, lard, and small pieces of fat pork, mixed together in a kind of batter, and then cooked: the mixture is subsequently divided into small portions of different sizes and is also sent a sum of money, of greater or less amount, according to previous agreement; a quantity of red cloth or silk, usually not less than five kinds, for the use of the bride; five kinds of dried fruits, several kinds of small cakes, a cock and a hen, and a gander and a goose. The family of the girl, on receiving these wedding-cakes, proceeds to distribute them among their relatives and intimate friends. The small cakes are also distributed in a similar manner. The money sent is generally spent in outfitting the bride.

The day before the day fixed for the wedding, the family of the bridegroom again makes a present of various articles of food and other things to the family of the bride, as a cock and a hen, a leg and foot of a pig and of a goat, eight small cakes of bread, eight torches, three pairs of large red candles, a quantity of vermicelli, and several bunches of fire-crackers. There are also sent a girdle, a head-dress, a silken covering for the head and face, and several articles of ready-made clothing, which are usually borrowed or rented for the occasion. These are to be worn by the bride on her entering the bridal chamber, and to be returned to the family of the husband on the morning of her marriage. The food, or a part of it, including the cock, is to be eaten by her on that morning. The fire-crackers are for explosion on the road, and the torches are for burning during the time occupied on route to her new home. On each of the eight bread-cakes is made a large red inscription in an ancient form of writing, of an auspicious meaning, as 'longevity', 'happiness', 'official emolument', and 'joy'; or certain four of them have four characters, meaning 'the phonixes are singing in concert', or 'the ducks are swimming together'. Four of these bread-cakes are accepted; the remaining four and the hen, according to strict custom, are returned to the party which proffers them. The bread-cakes and the vermicelli are omens significant of good, owing to a play on the local sound of the characters which denote them, or in consequence of the shape of the article. The vermicelli is significant of 'longevity', because of its length; and the four bread-cakes reserved by the family of the bride are kept for a singular use on the morning of the girl's entering her bridal chair. Placing the bridal bedstead in the presence of her seat, to stand in an important ceremony. When the bridegroom is selected, and a few days before the wedding, the bedstead is arranged in some convenient place in the bride's chamber, and then for a considerable time it must not be moved, for fear of ill luck. This placing of the bedstead in position is a marriage ceremony, in which one of the principal ceremonies is that of the bridegroom and his parents to perform the ceremony indicated to the Chinese apprehension by the quilt and the cakes being retained in the house—the local sound of the common word for 'bread', and a certain word meaning 'to warrant', 'to secure', being identical.

Worship of Ancestors by the Bridal Party...—Usually the day before the wedding, the bride has her hair done up in the style of married women of her class in society, and tries on the clothes she is to wear in the sedan, and for a time after she arrives at her future home on the morrow. This is an occasion of great interest to her family. Her parents invite their female relatives and friends to a feast at their house. The professed object of trying on the clothing is to see how the articles provided will fit, and to ascertain that everything is ready, so that there may be no delay or confusion on the arrival of the hour when she is to take her seat in her sedan. While thus dressed (the thick veil designed to conceal her features on arrival at her husband's residence not now being worn), she proceeds to light incense before the ancestral tablets belonging to her father's family, and to worship them in the last time before her marriage. She also kneels down before her parents, her grandparents (if living), her uncles and aunts (if present), and worships them in much the same manner as she and her husband will on the morrow worship the ancestral tablets in the morning, for the purpose of the annual processions of the ancestral tablets belonging to his family. On the occasion of the girl's trying on these clothes and worshipping the tablet and her parents, it is considered unpropitious that those of her female relatives and friends who are in mourning should be present.

The bridal chair is selected by the family of the bridegroom, and sent to the residence of the bride generally on the afternoon preceding the wedding-day, attended by a band of music, some men carrying lighted torches, two carrying a pair of large red lanterns, containing candles also lighted, and one having a large red umbrella, and one or two friends or other attendants. The bridal chair is always red, and is generally covered with broadcloth, or some rich, expensive material. It is borne by four men, who wear caps having red tassels. The musicians employed in the procession have similar caps. Very early on the morning of her marriage the bride or the 'new woman' arises, bathes, and dresses. While she is bathing the musicians are required to play. Her breakfast consists theoretically of the fowl, the vermicelli, etc., sent by the family of her affianced husband. In fact, however, she eats and drinks very little of anything on the morning or during the day of her wedding. When the precise time approaches for taking her seat in her sedan, usually between five and eight o'clock in the morning, previously fixed by the fortune-teller, her toilet is completely finished, so that parents take her in their sedan and placing it over her head, completely covering her features from view. She is now led out of her room by one of her female assistants, and takes her seat in the sedan, which has been brought into the reception-room of the house. The floor of the sedan is covered for the occasion with a kind of red carpeting, so that her feet may not touch the ground. She takes her place in the sedan amid the sound of fire-crackers and music by the band. The bride, her mother, and the various members of her family, are required to custom to indulge during this morning in hearty and protracted crying...times, no doubt, sincere and unaffected. While seated in the sedan, but before she starts for her future home, her parents, or some members of her family, take a bed-quilt by its four corners, and, while holding it thus before the bridal chair, one of the bride's assistants tosses it into the air, one by one, four bread-cakes, in such a manner that they will fall into the bed-quilt. These bread-cakes were received from the family of her husband at the same time as the cock and vermicelli were received. The woman during this ceremony is constantly repeating, emitting only sighs, not intended to by some others of the company. The quilt containing these cakes is gathered up and carried immediately to an adjoining room. The object of this ceremony is explained to be to profit the family of the bride's parents with one of the main blessings of the bridegroom, to the manner indicated to the Chinese apprehension by the quilt and the cakes being retained in the house—the local sound of the common word for 'bread', and a certain word meaning 'to warrant', 'to secure', being identical.

Bridal Procession...—After these performances the bridal procession starts en route for the residence of the other party, amid explosions of fire-crackers and the music of the band. In the front of the procession go two men carrying two large lighted lanterns, having the ancestral or family name of the groom put in a large form out of red paper pasted upon them. Then come two men carrying similar lanterns, having the family name of the bride in a similar manner pasted on them. These belong to her family, and accompany her only a part of the way. Then comes a large red umbrella, followed by the lighted torches, by the band of music. Near the bridal chair are several brothers of the bride or friends of her family, and several friends or brothers of the groom. These latter are dispatched from the house of the groom early in the morning, for the purpose of accompanying the bridal procession and escorting the bride to her home. This deputation sometimes arrives at the house of the bride
before she sets out on her journey, and, if so, it accompanies the procession all the way. About midway between the homes of the bride and the groom the procession stops in the street, while the important ceremony of receiving the bride is formally transacted. The friends of the bride stand near each other, and at a little distance from them, the friends of the groom. The former produce a large red card, having the ancestral name of the bride's family written on it; the latter produce a similar card bearing the ancestral name of the groom. They exchange, and each, seizing his own hands à la Chinoise, bows towards the members of the other party. The two men in the front of the procession who carry the lanterns having the ancestral name of the groom now turn about, and, going between the sedan chair and the two men who carry the lanterns having the ancestral name of the bride, come back to their former position in the procession, having gone around the party which has the lanterns with the bride's ancestral name attached. This latter party, while the other is thus encircling it, turns round in an opposite direction, and starts for the residence of the family of the bride, accompanied by that part of the escort which consisted of her brothers or the friends of her family. The rest of the procession now proceeds on its way to the residence of the bridegroom, the band playing a lively air. At intervals along the street fire-crackers are exploded. It is said that, from the precise time when the two parties have left the residence of the families, the names of the two families attached separate from each other in the street, the name of the bride is changed into the name of her betrothed; the lanterns having his name attached remaining in the procession, while those which have her (former) name are taken back to the residence of her father's family. From this time during the day she generally is in the midst of entire personal strangers, excepting her female assistants, who accompany the procession and keep with her wherever she goes. On arriving at the door of the bridegroom's house fire-crackers are let off in large quantities, and the band plays very vigorously. The torch-bearers, lantern-bearers, and the musicians stop near the door. The sedan is carried into the reception-room. The floor, from the place where the sedan stops to the door of the bride's room, is covered with red carpeting, lest her feet should touch the floor. A woman who has borne both male and female children, or at least male children, and who lives in harmonious subjection to her husband, approaches the door of the sedan and utters various felicitous sentences. If she is in good pecuniary circumstances, and if her parents have a learned family, she has so much the more to say. A boy six or eight years old, holding in his hands a brass mirror, with the reflecting surface turned from him and towards the chair, also comes near, and invites the bride to alight. At the same time the married woman who has uttered propitious words arrives as if to open the door of the sedan, when one of the female assistants of the bride, who accompanied the procession, steps forward and opens it. The married woman referred to and the boy are employed by the family of the groom, and receive a small present from the family of the bridegroom. This is considered proper and auspicious. The mirror held by the lad is expected to ward off all deadly or pernicious influences which may emanate from the sedan. The bride is now aided by her female assistants to alight. While being led towards the door of her room, the sieve which had been seated beside the door of the bridegroom on the arrival is sometimes held over her head, and sometimes it is placed directly in front of the door of the sedan, so that, on stepping out, she will step into it. The groom, on the approach of the bridal procession, by the agency of a servant or other person, conveys the groom's house, to the front of the residence of the bride, having his face turned towards the bed. When the bride enters the room, guided by her assistants, he turns around, and remains standing with his face turned from the bed. As soon as she has reached his side, both bridegroom and bride simultaneously seat themselves side by side on the edge of the bedstead. Occasionally the groom manages to have a portion of the skirt of her dress come under him as he sits down by minor tricks. This is no doubt a greater compliment to the bride than that she will be submissive. Sometimes the bride is very careful, by a proper adjustment of her clothing at the moment of sitting down, not only to prevent the accomplishment of such an intention on his part, but also to sit down, if possible, in a manner that some of his dress will come under her, thus manifesting her determination to preserve a proper independence, if not to bring him actually to yield obedience to her will. After sitting thus in profound silence together for a few moments, the groom arises and leaves the room. He waits in the reception-room for the reappearance of his bride, to perform the ceremony called 'worshipping the temple' (q. v.). Until this time the bride has worn the heavy embroidered outside garment, head-dress, etc., which she had on when she entered her sedan. These are now removed. She has her hair carefully combed in the style of her class in society, and she is arrayed in her own wedding garments. Sometimes her hair is gorgeously decked out with pearls and gems, true or false, according to the ability of the family to purchase, rent, or borrow. When her toilet has been completed, the bridegroom is expected to find her seated in the residence of the bridegroom, and the bridegroom sits down in their wedding dinner. He now, oftentimes for the first time in his life, and always for the first time on his marriage day, beholds the features of his wife. He may eat to his fill of the good things left over from the occasion, but she, according to established custom, may not take a particle. She must sit in silence, dignified and composed.

"The wedding festivities generally last at least two days. The first day the male friends and relatives of the groom are invited to 'shed their light' on the occasion. On the second day the female friends and relatives of the family of the groom are invited to the wedding feast: this is often called the 'women's day.' Not long after the family and guests have breakfasted on the morning of the second day, the newly-married couple, amid the noise of fire-crackers, come out of their room together for the purpose of worshipping the ancestral tablets belonging to the household, the grandparents, and parents of the groom. This custom is known by the name of 'coming out of the room.' In the case of those families who devote only one day to the marriage festivities and who have no female relations, so much the more to say on the first day. Not long subsequent to the ceremony of 'coming out of the room,' the couple proceed to the kitchen for the purpose of worshipping the god and goddess of the kitchen. This is performed with great decorum, and is regarded as an important and essential part of marriage solemnities. Incense and candles are lighted, and arranged on a table placed before the picture or the writing which represents these deities, plastered upon the wall of the kitchen. Before this table the bridegroom and his bride kneel down side by side, the bridegroom on the right, and the bride on the left. It is believed that they will thus propitiate their good-will, and especially that the bride, in attempting culinary operations, will succeed better in consequence of paying early and respectful attentions to these deities. On the third day the bride and her new husband go to visit the bride's mother-in-law and her husband and wife, and to visit their friends. With this invitation they send sedan for them. The card is usually brought by her brothers, if she has any of the proper age, or by relatives having her own ancestral name. Until this ceremony has been completed, the bride has been none of her own family, and generally none of her own relatives or acquaintances. She and her husband now receive the congratulations and compliments of her brothers or other relatives, and prepare
to visit her parents. The bride enters her sedan first, and proceeds a short distance in front of her husband. These two then return together, and it is the custom that they should arrive at the house of her parents at the same time. The chair provided for the bride on this occasion is a common black sedan in all respects, except that its screen in front has a certain charm painted upon the outside. This charm is the picture of a grim-looking man, sitting on a tiger, with one of his hands raised up holding a sword, as if in the act of striking, representing a certain ruler of elves, hobgoblins, etc. The object of its use on the occasion of a bride's returning to her parents' house, on the third day after her marriage, is to keep evil and unpropitiously disposed spirits from her. On the way home at the maternal house, the bride's sedan is carried into the reception-room, and she alights amid the noise of fire-crackers. The sedan which contains the son-in-law stops a few rods from his father-in-law's residence, where he is met by one of his brothers-in-law, or some relative or friend deputed to meet and conduct him into the house. The two parties, standing in the street, respectfully shake their own hands towards each other on meeting, according to the approved fashion. The newly-arrived is now invited to enter the house. He is seated in the reception-room, where he is treated successively to coffee and tobacco, and then to coffee and tobacco again. Afterwards he is invited to go and see his mother-in-law in her room, where he finds his wife. There he sits awhile, and visits after a stereotyped manner, being careful to use only good or propitious words, avoiding any such which while they may be not good for those persons, are unlucky. He is soon invited into the reception-room, where he is joined by his wife. Everything being arranged, the husband and wife proceed to worship the ancestral tablets of her family. At the conclusion of this ceremony the bride retires to her mother's apartments, or to some back room, where she and the female relatives present are feasted. Her husband is invited to partake of some refreshments in the reception-room, in doing which he is joined by his bride's brothers, or some others of her family relatives. According to the rules of etiquette, he must eat but very little, however hungry he may be. The usual phrase employed in speaking of it is that he eats part of "three bowls of vegetables," after which he declines to receive anything more, under the plea that he has eaten enough. He soon takes his departure in his sedan, leaving his bride behind, and the saying that,"It is usual only by a servant or female friend. Husbands are never seen with their wives in public."

The marriage customs of the Japanese are so very like those of the Chinese that we have grouped them together. The custom of purchasing the wife is still more prominent amongst the Japanese than amongst the Asiatic nations. Polygamy is strictly forbidden. Though the harem is tolerated, only one lawful wife is recognized. "It appears, however," says MacFarlane (Japon, p. 268), "to be very easy for a man to put away his wife and take another—at least so far as any law exists to the contrary." The condition of woman is far better than in any other Asiatic country.

V. Among Savages.—Perhaps in no other way can the great advantages of Christian civilization be more conclusively shown than by the improvement which it has effected in the relations between the two sexes. The best students of the primitive condition of man have come to the conclusion that where divine revelation does not extend the institution of marriage, if it exists at all, it is by no means the outgrowth of affection and a desire for companionship, but is an institution into the male savages "as a mere animal and convenient connection" as the "meats of getting their dinner cooked." There is "no idea of tenderness nor of chivalrous devotion" (Hill, Traits of Chittagong, p. 116; comp. Pallas, Voyages, iv. 94). Indeed, according to Lapp, "among the Japanese, and perhaps the Papuans (or Tiones) the lowest races have no such institution as the marriage rite, because "true love is almost unknown among them" (p. 56). Kolben (Hist. Cape of Good Hope, p. 132), says: "The Hottentots are so cold and indifferent to one another that you would think there was no such thing as love between them." There are even some savages, as the North American Indian tribe, the Timnes, who have no word for "dear" or "beloved," and it is said of the Algonquins that when the Bible was translated into their language a word had to be coined to give expression to our verb "to love." There are other uncivilized races of men that lack greatly in words to express social relations, as, e. g., the Sandwich Islanders, who, according to Lacocke (Diction. Hopkins, and Van Houten, 2nd ed.), have no words answering to "son," "daughter," "wife," or "husband," that is, to the poverty of language, but to the fact that "the idea of marriage does not enter into the Hawaiian system of relationship."

Among savages, the peculiar idea attached to the bond of marriage makes the marriage ceremony rather an institution peculiar to them. As we have seen above, there are many rude people who do not recognise the symbol of marriage, and, naturally enough, no ceremony is known to them; and then there are many cases in which the marriage bond is recognised, but no ceremony of marriage performed. "But," says MacFarlane (Japon, p. 263), "we must not assume that marriage is necessarily and always lightly regarded where it is unaccompanied by ceremonial." In Tahiti, says Cook (Voyage around the World), "marriage, as appeared to us, is nothing more than an act of consent brought to the knowledge of the church, with which the priest has no concern. Where it is contracted it appears to be pretty well kept, though sometimes the parties separate by mutual consent" (comp. Klemm, Cultur der Menschen, iv. 299).

I. Ceremonies.—There cannot be said to exist any marriage ceremonies among the Badagas (Hindoozam); the Kurumbas, a tribe of the Neelgherry Hills (Transact. Ethnol. Soc. vii, 276); the Indians of California (Smithsonian Rep. 1868, p. 968); the Kutchin Indians, further north (Smith, Rep. 1866, p. 826); the Arawaks of South America (Brett, Guiana, p. 101), and the Brazilian tribes generally (Marquius, Reise zu Brasilien und seinen Umkreisern in Brasilien, p. 51); and the same is the case with the Australian tribes (Eyre's Discoveries, ii, 819). Speke (Journ, p. 361) says "there are no such things as marriages in Uganda," and of the Mandingoes (Wagstaff, 2nd ed.), Callot de la Fresnaye (1804) says that husband and wife are not united by any ceremony; and Hutton (in Klemm, Cultur, iii, 280) makes the same statement as regards the Ashantees. In Congo and Angola (Astley, Coll. of Voyages, iii, 221, 227) "they use no peculiar ceremonies in marriage, nor scarce troubles for ceremonies of any sort," and neither do we find that the Hottentots know anything about marriage ceremonies, if we may follow La Vaillant (Voy. ii, 58); nor do the Bushmen, according to Mr. Wood (Nat. Hist. Man, i, 269), have in their language any means of distinguishing an unmarried from a married girl. According to Dalton (Trans. Ethn. Soc. vi, 25), the Keriahs of Central India have no word for marriage in their own language, and the only ceremony used appears to be little more than a sort of public recognition of the fact. "The marital rite among our tribes" (i.e. the Redkinks of the United States), says Schoolcraft (JInd. Tribes, p. 182, 248), "is nothing more than the personal consent of the parties, without requiring any concurrent act of a priesthood, magistracy, or witnesses; the act is assumed by the parties without the necessity of any law or ceremony." Says Bruce (Trotrele, iv, 487), "no such thing as marriage in Abyssinia, unless that which is contrived by mutual consent, without other form, subsisting only till dissolved by dissent of one or the other, and to be renewed or repeated as often as it is agreeable to both parties, without any formal ceremony or celebration as man and wife, after having been divorced, had children..."
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by others, or whether they have been married or had children with others or not." Among the Bedouin Arabs there is a marriage ceremony in the case of a girl, but the remarriage of a widow is not thought sufficiently important to deserve one.

2. Communal Marriage.—Bachofen and McLennan, two of the most devoted students of marriage among the savages, will have it that the primitive condition of man was one of Pureteitum, or, as it might perhaps be conveniently Englished, "communal marriage," where every man and woman in a small community were regarded as equally married to one another. Of course none of these arrangements will be set aside by the use of the word "primitive." It is not our province here to enter into a discussion on primeval man [see PREDADAMITE]; we use the word with reference to the lowest condition of unchristianized man, satisfied, as we stated at the beginning of our subject, that the marriage relation, as exists among civilized men, is due solely to the influence of divine revelation—man's noblest educator. The most extravagant form of communification we find related of the Techer of Oude. "They live together almost indiscriminately in large communions, and the property of the people is considered as matrimonial; the tie is but nominal" (Watson and Kaye, People of India, ii, 85). In the Andaman Islands, we are told by Sir Edward Belcher (Trans. Ethn. Soc. v, 45), it is the custom for man and woman to remain together until a child is born, when they separate as a matter of course, and each seeks a new partner. Among the Southals, one of the aboriginal tribes of India, marriages take place once a year, mostly in January. "For six days all the candidates for matrimony live together in promiscuous conchability, the introductory rite to the marital relation; for only after this are the separate couples regarded as having established their right to marry" (Watson and Kaye, i, 2). Among the Todas, of the Hawaiian race, when a man marries a girl, she becomes the wife of all his brothers as they successively reach manhood; and they also become the husbands of all her sisters, as they become old enough to marry. (Comp. here Ethn. Journ, 1867, p. 286, on a practice among the Sioux and other North American Indians.) Among the Greenland Eskimoes it is related that "those are reputed the best and noblest tempered who, without any pain or reluctance, will lend their friends their wives" (Egede, Hist. Greenland, p. 142). This custom of wife-lending is, however, by no means confined to the inhabitants of Greenland, but prevails among North and South American Indians, Polynesienses, Eastern and Western negroes, Arabs, Abyssinians, Kaffirs, Mongols, Tutsis, etc. (see Lubbock, p. 282), and is practiced especially as an act of hospitality. Plutarch will have it that the custom of lending wives existed also among the Romans. Nor must it be forgotten that it was held one of the essentials of the model Platonic republic that "among the guardians, at least, the sexual arrangements should be under public regulation, and the monopoly of one woman by one man forbidden" (Bain, Mental and Moral Science; comp. Kames, Hist. of Man, ii, 60). See also PROSTITUTIO. A very peculiar custom is found among the Nasca Indians (Amer. Anthro. p. 71). They practice what might be appropriately termed three-quarter marriage; i.e., the woman is legally married for three days out of four, remaining perfectly free for the fourth (Lubbock, p. 54). In Ceylon, according to Davy (Ceylon, p. 286), marriages are provisional for the first fortnight, at the expiration of which they are either annulled or confirmed. Among the Reddies of Southern India a still more singular custom prevails. "A young woman of sixteen or twenty years of age may be married to a boy of five or six years. She, however, lives with some other adult male—perhaps a maternal uncle or cousin—but is not allowed to form a connection with the father's relatives; occasionally it may be the boy-husband's father himself—that is, the woman's father-in-law. Should there be children from these liaisons, they are fathered on the boy-husband. When the boy grows up the wife is either either or past child-bearing, when he, in his turn, takes up with some other boy's wife in a manner precisely similar to his own, and procreates children for the boy-husband" (Shortt, Trans. Ethnol. Soc., New Series, vi, 194).

3. Marriage by Purchase.—Those who believe, like Tyler, McLennan, Bachofen, and Lubbock, that the communal system of the marital relation existed in the primeval state, hold that out of it arose the system of individual marriage. We who depend upon the guidance of a written revelation are rather of the opinion that it is the influence of Christian savage-life that has led some of them to prefer individual to communal marriage. It is true that the marriage by capture has done much to bring about individual marriage, but it is by no means clear to us that even then the practice was not borrowed by the heathen from the people directly or indirectly. We certainly do not believe, with Lessing, that nations develop without external influences, that civilization is the possession of every people, and that it is constantly progressive. The condition of the American savage, and the remnants of an early and almost civilized humanity are far from contrary. Yet we believe, with Brinton (Myths of the New World, p. 5), that "religious rites are living commentaries on religious beliefs;" and that, while the idea of God does not and cannot proceed from the external world, it nevertheless is the product of our own mind. The American savage's struggle for life, in the satisfaction of the animal wants and passions, in those vulgar aims and motives which possessed the mind of the primitive man to the exclusion of everything else. It is pretty clear that with all pre-Christian nations the modes of getting a wife were the same with those of acquiring any other species of property—capture, gift, sale. The contract of sale may be said to be at the foundation of the marriage relation in every system of ancient law. When daughters belonged to parents as goods, they were parted with only on the principles of fair exchange. Usually the intended bride and bridegroom not being consulted. As to the marriage ceremonies, they were those and no other which were necessary to complete and evidence a sale—delivery, on the price being paid, and "the taking home." It was never thought of that the children should be consulted, and allowed to act on their likings. Just so the savage has been in a measure addicted to the purchase of his wife, with only this difference, however, that the property is secured by the buyer for himself. In Sumatra, e. g., there were formerly three perfectly distinct modes of marriage: the "Ambel-akan," in which the man purchased the woman; the "Ambel-akan," in which the woman purchased the man (see below, Polyandry); and the "Sendamo," in which they joined on terms of equality (comp. Marxen, Hist. of Sumatra, p. 282 sq.). "Among low races," says Lubbock (p. 60), "the wife is indeed literally the property of the husband, as Petruchio says of Catharine:"

"I will be master of what is mine own.
She is my goods, my chattels; she is my house,
My bed, my board, my field, my farm.
My horse, my ox, my sea, my anything."
Wallachians, for the most part—are dressed in their best goat-skins, and make what show of horsemanship they can. After both parties have taken up their respective quarters opposite each other, the fathers step forward and begin to negotiate marriages for their children. The questions asked on these occasions are, we fear, of a somewhat sordid character. "How many bullocks?" "How many sheep?" "Your daughter is this year twelve: we look for a rather old; that chest of drawers does not shut properly. I must find something better than that for my son." Such would doubtless be a correct report of the conversations held in this primitive, if not poetical Arcadia, previous to clinical inquiries, which they are altogether more serious. The business is, however, carried out with a promptitude equal to its frankness. As soon as the parents are agreed, a priest, who is always ready at hand, is summoned. He chants a hymn and gives his benediction. The bride then kisses her parents, mounts the chariot, and starts for some unknown village with a husband whom she has never seen before, the furniture and cattle which her parents have allowed her as a marriage portion following in the rear.

5. Marriage by Capture.—Marriage by purchase, however, is not the only kind of marriage which we saw usual in Wallachia to secure a helpmeet for himself. Perhaps the general mode by which rude nations enter into the marital relation is that of capture. In the opinion of Lubbock, the first state of individual marriage was brought about by capture, and, if he chose to treat of this practice as confined to savage races, his judgment is still more pronounced with him that man came to claim for his sole personal benefit the female he secured from the conquered. Indeed, such a practice finds a counterpart not only among the pagan nations, but is related of even in the O-T. Scriptures (e. g., Deut. xx. 15—16). In reality, however, to be led to believe that among savage races marriage by capture means the procuring of a wife by hostility. Many marriages, indeed, never secure their female companions except by capture, though they be of the same tribe to which they themselves belong. Indeed, while there are many rude nations that do not tolerate anything else but endogamy, i. e., intertribal marriage, many others, perhaps the majority, permit only exogamy, i. e., marriage without the tribe. (See this head below.) Nor does it at all follow that all exogamous marriages do away with communism. It is significant, however, that in these primitive instances there has perhaps been instrumental in bringing about individual marriage relations. There is certainly no symbol more widespread, nor more varied in its forms, than that of capture in marriage ceremonies. In many cases it is a State right to marry to the captured marriage. For the Hindū such a marriage form is prescribed in the Sutras (Lassen, Indische Studien, p. 825), and in the Institutes of Manu marriage by capture is enumerated among the eight forms of the nuptial ceremony used by the four castes (chap. iii, 88, Jones v. Houghton). "In the description of this marriage, called Raschasa, we have the exact prototype of the Roman and Spartan forms, in a code of laws a thousand years older than our era" (Nat. Qu. Rev. June, 1872, p. 89).

The practice of capture is found in great perfection among the American Indians, existing everywhere throughout the savage races of South America, but more particularly in the regions of the Orinoco and the Amazon. The Fuegians have the practice as well as the fiction of capture. The Horse Indians of Patagonia are commonly at war with each other, or with the Canoe Indians, victory on either side resulting in the capture of women and slaughter of men. The Oesas, or Coin men, are more systematic, for every year, at the time of red leaf, they are said to make excursions from the mountains in the north to plunder from the Fuegians their cattle and maidens (Merriam, Travels, p. 61). The tribes of the Amazon and the Orinoco are in a state of constant warfare, and alternately rich and poor in women. Mr. Bates found the Manasas on the Rio Negro to resemble the Oesas in habits. The Caribbees were found by Humboldt to form family groups, often numbering only forty or fifty, which were at constant enmity with each other. Capture prevailed among them to such an extent that the women of any tribe belonged so much to distinct tribes that in no group were the men and women found to speak the same language. They made war against the Hottentots of the Orange river, always carrying off the prize; a weak man, unless he be a good hunter and well-beloved, is seldom permitted to keep a wife that a stronger man thinks worth his notice. . . . This custom prevails throughout all their tribes, and causes a great spirit of emulation among their youth, who, upon all occasions, from their childhood, trying their strength and skill in wrestling" (Voyage to the Northern Ocean, p. 104). Franklin also says that the Copper Indians held women in the same low estimation as the Chippeways, who, "looking upon them as the dregs of society, which is coarsest grain may take from the weaver" (Journeys to the Shores of the Arctic Ocean, ch. 48), and Richardson (Boat Journey, ii, 24) "more than once saw a stronger man assert his right to take the wife of a weaker countryman. Any one may challenge another to wrestle, and if he overcomes, may carry off the wife and see no difficulty in disagreeing with him, and protesting against this, which, indeed, seems to them perfectly natural." The capture of women for wives prevails also among the aborigines of the Deccan, and in Afghanistan (La- thani, Descriptive, ii, 215). It formerly prevailed, according to Olaus Magnus, in Muscovy, Lithuania, and Livonia (Historia de gentibus Septentrionalibus, bk. xiv, ch. x, p. 48). There is ample reason to believe that the practice was general among the nations in the north of Europe and Asia. Olaus Magnus, indeed, represents the tribes of the north as having been continually at war with one another, either on account of stolen women, or with the object of stealing women, "properaptas virgines aut arripiendas" (ut sup., p. 328). In numerous cases the plunderers were of the royal houses of Sweden and Denmark. Among the Scandinavians, before they became Christians, the bridegroom had in various cases to capture his bride and wedded at the sword-point. Among the Kalmcucks, Kirghis, Nogais, and Circassiains, where the power cannot be agreed upon, nothing is more common than to carry off the lady by force. This capture constitutes a marriage, and the ceremony takes place even before the capture has been made. The Australians, while having a general system of betrothals, yet employ the practice of capturing wives to a great extent. According to Turnbull, when a man sees a woman whom he likes, he tells her to follow him. If she refuses, he forces her to accompany him by blows, ending by knocking her down and carrying her off (Voyage round the World, i, 81 sq.). Sir George Grey says that many plots are laid to carry off the women, and in the encounters which result they receive usually very harsh treatment. Many other less barbarous nations keep up the show of force only. The following are among the most marked examples. Among the Khonds the marriage-ceremony begins with a feast at the dwelling of the bride. This is followed by dancing and song. When the night is far spent in these amusements, the principals are lifted by an under of slaves and carried through the dance. Suddenly they exchange burdens, and the uncle of the youth disappears with the bride. The friends of the bride now seek to arrest his flight, those of the groom to cover it, the mock contest that ensues being considered a great sport (Anson, Report upon Khonds, p. 55). Among the noble class of the Kalmucks a similar form appears. The price to be paid being fixed, the bridegroom and his no-
of marriage. The bridegroom comes to the bride's house and, carrying a lance, a bow, and arrows, and accompanied by his friends, goes to her father's house, where the marriage ceremony takes place. The bridegroom places a silver plate in the presence of the bride and her family, and the couple is declared married by the priest. The bride and groom then return to their own homes, where the wedding feast is held. The marriage is regarded as permanent and unbreakable. The newlyweds are expected to live together for the rest of their lives, and any subsequent marriages are considered adultery.

### Exogamy and Endogamy

Marriage by capture is a type of marriage practice known as exogamy, which means that individuals marry someone from outside their own social group. In some societies, marriage by capture was a common practice, particularly among nomadic tribes. The rationale behind this practice was that individuals would not only seek new consorts and fathers for their own offspring but also ensure the survival of their community by facilitating inter-marriage between these groups. In this way, the practice served to integrate different ethnic and geographical groups. The text emphasizes that individuals in such societies were not only concerned with marrying but also with securing the safety of their families through inter-marriage. This practice influenced the development of different systems of law and governance, as well as cultural practices. The practice of marriage by capture served to foster social cohesion and maintain the integrity of the community. It was a way to ensure the survival of different cultural traditions and practices. The practice was considered a testament to the strength and resilience of different communities. The practice was also a way to establish stronger ties between different societies and promote cultural exchange. The practice was a testament to the strength and resilience of different communities, and it was a way to ensure the survival of different cultural traditions and practices. The practice was also a way to establish stronger ties between different societies and promote cultural exchange.
exogamy is strictly enforced among the Australian tribes. These savages are divided into small tribes, named after the districts which they inhabit. The tribe inhabiting a particular district considers itself the owner thereof, and vigorously resists any intrusion. Yet there are many tribes often found inhabiting the same area quite differently disposed. The improvement in the latter is occasioned by the inhabitants of tribes with forbidden intermarriage of clansmen, and others which forbid marriage outside of the tribe limits. In some districts, as in the hills on the north-eastern frontier of India, in the Caucasus, and the hill-ranges of Syria, are found a variety of tribes which might be called similar, yet in this particular utterly differing—some forbidding marriage within the tribe, and some proscribing marriage without it (McLennan, p. 147).

7. Polyandry and Polygyny.—The peculiarity of women not only reveals to us the reason why exogamy became so generally established among rude nations, but also easily explains the practice of polyandry, which we are told by best authorities exists to a moderate extent among savage races. Lubbock, however, will have it that “polyandry, or the marriage of one woman to several, is commonly supposed, though much less so than polygyny” (p. 53; compare p. 100). It prevails in its most striking form throughout Tibet and in the Himalayan regions. It is also met with in Ceylon, among tribes of the north of Asia, and in parts of Africa and America.

8. Family Relations among Savages.—That the marriage system in such imperfect stages of development as we find it to be among savage races cannot furnish any of the advantages suggested by the Biblical marriage system, will appear to all a matter hardly necessary to be dwelt upon. Yet there are some faint ideas of the family relation, as we conceive it, prevailing among rude nations also. That polyandry, polygyny, and communism cannot establish the relationship of father and mother, is clearly apparent. Exogamy, however, will do this measurably, especially where it approaches the monogamous system. In communal marriage no man can identify his father; the child is raised by the mother as a sort of tribal property, and naturally enough bears her name, and only considers parenthood as existing in the female line. This gave rise to the wide-spread system of kinship through the mother only, continuing to exist in many cases, though the case which provoked it has disappeared. There is good reason to believe that this system formerly was prevalent among the Celts, and Max Muller (Chips from a German Workshop) has traced it to the ancient Brahmins. It also appears to have been in existence in the Semitic races, and is traceable in the Grecian systems. Its effect is visible in the habits of many modern tribes, and shows the propriety of the words in the Vulgate used by Latin writers among the North American Indians, who, he says, adopted their wives, as it were, by stealth: “Il n’est point dans les cabanes particulières ou habitent leurs épouses, que durent l’obscurité de la nuit... ce serait un acte extracanunul de s’y présenter le jour” (I, 570). Herodotus says that the Lydians named the children from the mother. On the Etruscan tombs descent is traced in the female line. Many modern instances exist besides those we have already mentioned. We may instance the Nairs, and other peoples of India; the Saporogian Tatars, and other tribes of the same name, the Herberts of Sahara, and various other African tribes. Among the Bunter—the highest rank of Sudras in Tulava—a man’s children are not his heirs. During his lifetime he may give them money, but all of which he dies possessed goes to his sister and to their children. When a rich man dies, his man died, his son has to work for his uncle's son. Battel says the town of Loango was governed by four chiefs, the sons of the king’s sister; for king’s sons never became kings. Quadrarmmmmee notes that, “Chez les Nubiens, dit Abon Selah, lorsqu’un roi vient à mourir et qu'il laisse un fils et un veuf du côté de sa femme, celui-ci monte sur le trône de preference a l’héritier naturel” (Geographie sur l’Egypte, etc.). McLennan (Primâ, Marriage, p. 247) thus traces the development of the family relation to our present status; and, though the statement is made from the outset that we cannot sanction the position taken by him and others of his class, we will not refuse them an introduction to our readers: “The polyandry, in which all the husbands were brothers, would establish the certainty of the children being of their own blood. In time the eldest brother became considered, by a species of fiction, the father of all the children. The next to him was considered the headship of the family, and kinship became established in the paternal line. The elder brother became a sort of paterfamilias; the right of succession being in the younger brothers in their order, and, after them, in the eldest son. The idea of a headship through the Thibetan system of polyandry. In most races, though, as the sexes became more evenly balanced, through progrena towards civilisation, the system of monogamy or of polygamy would arise. Paternity thus becoming certain, the practice of sons succeeding as heirs direct to their father’s estates would ensue, and, as this idea of paternal kinship arose, that of maternal relationship would die away.” “Our family system, in which the child is equally related to both its parents,” says Lubbock (p. 110), “appears at first sight the only natural one, but it is merely so in connection with our marriage system, there being sufficient reason to conclude, as we have seen, that the child is first related to the family group only; then to the mother, and not to the father; afterwards to the father, and not to the mother; and, only as a final result of civilisation, becomes related to both.” Maine (Ancient Law) and other writers of his class, however, hold to a theory that considers man’s history, in the light of divine revelation, to open with perfect recognition of such kinship. In their view the family, under the father’s government, was considered the prime unit of the state and of royalty. The family gathers other families about it, becoming the centre of a group; and these groups, tracing back their descent to a common
origin, aggregate into tribes and nations. Tribes are numerous which make this claim to common descent. But, upon inquiry, the ancestor of the race is always a legendary hero or god—a being invented to explain the origin of the tribe. In some cases the time of the invention is known, as with the Greek tribes which traced their descent back to the sons of Helios.

There are several other peculiar customs widely in vogue relating to marriage, some of which are so curious that it will be well to give a brief description of them also. The strangest of these is the general avoidance of incestuous marriage among the children of father-in-law and mother-in-law, in which the one is often forbidden to look at or mention the name of the other. The reason or the origin of these customs, or of the many strange forms which theseassume, is not clear to us, and we can only give some instances of their general character. Under the peculiar Fijian system known as the tabu, the husband and wife are forbidden to eat from the same dish. (Compare the above custom among the Hinduts.) In other places the father is not permitted to speak to the son after the latter is fifteen years old (Williams, Fiji, i, 1836). Among many races the woman is absolutely forbidden to speak to her son-in-law. This system prevails generally among the American Indians (Origins of Civilization, p. 7). Among the Osmahaws neither the father nor mother-in-law will hold direct communication with their son-in-law (James, Exp. to Rocky Mountains, p. 33). In the social system of the Mangools and Kalmucks a similar restriction appears, the wife being forbidden to speak to her father-in-law, or to sit in his presence. With the Ostiaks of Siberia a similar rule holds ("Un fille mariée évoit autant qu'elle est possibl la présence du père de son mari ou de son mari m'a pas droit; et le mari, pendant ce temps, n'ose pas parler devant la mère de sa femme. "Sils se rencontrent par hasard, le mari lui tourne le dos, et la femme se couvre le visage" [Pallas, iv, 71].) In China customs of a like nature exist, and also in some of the Pacific islands. In some cases this peculiar system assumes the strangest and most decided form. In Central Africa the lover carefully avoids seeing either the father or mother of his future bride, taking great precautions to avoid an encounter. If he is of a different camp, this prohibition extends to all the members of the lady's camp, except a few special friends with whom he is permitted to have intercourse. He avoids passing through the camp, and, if obliged to do so, carefully covers his face (Caillle, Travels to Timbuctoo, i, 94). This appears to be a relic of the old system of capture, in which the captor would apparently marry the captive, and thus steal his wealth. He carefully avoids being observed by the inmates of the opposite camp, as in the case of the Australians above described.

Another custom widely prevalent, and of a yet stranger character, is that known in Bearn as La Couvenci. It consists in putting the husband to bed on the birth of a child, and nursing him with the greatest care, while the mother goes to her usual duties. In some cases the poor fellow is put on such a strict regimen that he really becomes sick. There are, in fact, cases in which his peculiar sufferings are continued for several days, and he is so hardly hit that a real sickness would be far more endurable. Cases of this description occur in various parts of America, and in many regions of Europe and Asia, taking often the strangest forms. The idea thus symbolized is that the child is affected by anything happening to its nearest parent, and that any internal or external drinking or otherwise, seriously affects the health of the child. Under the idea of male kinship, the father was considered the nearest parent; hence, was obliged to perform this peculiar penance. Max Muller says that the poor husband was first tyrannized over by his female relatives, and afterwards frightened into superstitiously making a martyr of himself, until he became really ill, or took to his bed in self-defence (Chips from a German Workshop, ii, 281). Laftau regards it as arising from a dim recollection of original sin, rejecting the Carib explanation that if the father engaged in rough labor, or was careless in his diet, "cela ferait mal à l'enfant, et que cet enfant participerait à tous les défauts naturels des animaux dont le père aurait mange" (i, 259).

For additional illustrations, see W. H. S. Fox (J. H. W., iii, 80).
Marrow Controversy. The Marrow of Modern Divinity was a work published in 1646 by Edward Fisher (q. v.), of the University of Oxford. It is in the form of a dialogue, to explain the freeness of the law—to expose, on the one hand, Antinomian error, and also, on the other, to refute Neonomian heresy, or the idea that Christ has, by his atonement, so lowered the requirements of the law that mere endeavor is accepted in room of perfect obedience. In the course of the book, which had been brought into Scotland by an English Puritan soldier, was accidentally found by Boston, then minister of Simpkin, and was republished in 1718, under the editorship of Mr. Hogg, minister of Carnock. It had been recommended long before by several divines of the Westminster Assembly. The treatise, consisting of quaint and stirring dialogues, throws into bold relief the peculiar doctrines of grace, occasionally puts them into the form of a startling proposition, and is studded with quotations from eminent Protestant divines. The position of the Marrow is that “true communion, and by many of them it was violently censured. But not a few of the evangelical pastors gave it a cordial welcome, and among multitudes of the people it became a favorite book, next in veneration to the Bible and the Shorter Catechism. In 1719 its editor, Mr. Hogg, wrote an explanation of some of its passages, but in the same year principal Haddow, of St. Andrew’s, opened the Synod of Fife with a sermon directed against it. The synod requested the publication of the discourse, and this step was the signal for a warfare of years’ duration. The Assembly of that year, acting in the same spirit with the Synod of Fife, instructed its commission to look after books and pamphlets promoting such opinions as are found in the Marrow, though they do not name the book, and to summon before them the authors and recommenders of such publications. The commission, so instructed and sworn, appointed a committee, of which principal Haddow was the soul; and before this committee, named the “Committee for Purity of Doctrine,” four ministers were immediately summoned. The committee gave in a report at the next Assembly of 1720 and in the Assembly of 1722, exalting the doctrines of the Marrow, and solemnly condemning them. It selected several passages which were paradoxiocally expressed, while it severed others from the context, and held them up as contrary to Scripture and to the Confession of Faith. The passages marked for condemnation were so far changed under the heads of 7 such as the nature of faith, the atonement, holiness, obedience and its motive, and the position of a believer in reference to the law. The committee named them as errors, thus—universal atonement and pardon, assurance of the very essence of faith, holiness not necessary to salvation, and the law not under the law as a rule of life. Had the Marrow inculcated such tenets it would have been objectionable indeed. The report was discussed, and the result was a stern condemnation of the Marrow; and the General Assembly do hereby strictly prohibit and discharge all the ministers of this Church, either by preaching, writing, or printing, to recommend the said book, or in discourse to say anything in favor of it; but, on the contrary, they are hereby enjoined and required to warn and exhort those people in whose hands the said book is or may come not to read or use the same. That book, which had been so highly lauded by many of the southern divines—such as Caryl and Burroughs—by the men who had framed the very creed of the Scottish Church, and who were universally acknowledged to be as able as most men to know and judge of which through its terror and blood he was himself the instigator that he was invoked as the protector of the Qui- rites (citizens)—in other words, of the state. The
principal animals sacred to him were the wolf and the horse. He had many temples at Rome, which were most celebrated of which was that outside the Porta Capena, on the Appian Road. The Campus Martius, where the Romans practiced athletic and military exercises, was named after him; so was the month of March (Martius), the first month of the Roman year. The Ludi Martiai (games in honor of Mars) were celebrated every year in the circus on the 1st of August.

(2) Ares, the Greek god of war, was the son of Zeus and Hera, and the favorite of Aphrodite, who bore him several children. He is represented in Greek poetry as a most sanguinary divinity, delighting in war for its own sake, and in the destruction of men. Before him into battle goes his sister Eris (Strife), along with her are his sons and companions, Deimos (Horror), and Phobos (Fear). He does not always adhere to the same side, like the great Athena, but inspires now the one, now the other. He is not always victorious. Dionysus wounded him, and in his fall, says Homer, “he roared like nine or ten thousand warriors together.” Such a representation would have been deemed blasphemous by the ancient Roman mind, imbued as it was with a solemn, Hebrew-like reverence for its gods. The worship of Ares was never very canvassed in Greece; it is believed to have been imported from Thrace. There and in Scythia were its greatest shrines, and there Ares was believed to have his chief home. He had, however, temples or shrines at Athens, Sparta, Olympia, and other places. On statues and reliefs he is represented as a person of great muscular power, and either naked or clothed with the chlamys. — Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.; Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. vol. ii. s. v.; Vollmer, Mythol. Wörterbuch, s. v.

Mars, St. a French hermit, was born at Baia, near La Guerche, about 510. He was a priest of Vitre, and acquired a great reputation for piety. When old, he constructed a hermitage for himself in some waste land in the neighborhood of the village of Mars, and there ended his days. His tomb became celebrated for the numerous miracles which it was claimed were performed there. The faithful came thither on pilgrimages from all parts of Brittany. In 1427 the inhabitants of Baia, fearing an incursion of the English, carried the body of their saint to Saint-Madeleine du Lude. The danger passed, the Baisiens demanded the body of their saint, but the canons of Vitre refused to restore it. From law-suits they proceeded to blows, and many times during the processions the Baisiens attempted to recover their precious relic; but the inhabitants of Vitre always proved the stronger, and retained the body of Saint Mars until 1570, when a decree of the Parliament of Rennes reconciled the parties by dividing the body of the saint. Vitre kept the head, the right thigh, and two sides; Baia had the remainder. The festival of Saint Mars occurs on the 12th of January and 21st of June. At these periods the shrine is carried through the surrounding country. — Dom Lobineau, Histoire de Bretegaine; Godescard, Vie des plus célèbres Saints, vol. i; A. Hugo, La France pittoresque; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, vol. xxxii., s. v.

Marchy, Charles, Hector de St. Georges, Marchy, a French mystic, was born in 1688 at Paris, whether his parents, pious members of the Reformed Church, had fled to avoid the persecution raging against the Protestants in the provinces. While yet a youth the whole family removed to Germany, and there Charles took part in the Spanish War of Succession in the Netherlands. He now became a convert to the views of Bourgignon (q. v.), and with his friend Cordier retired, in 1711, to Schwarzenau, in the province of Wittgenstein. Cordier, however, leaving him, he married, in 1712, Clara Elizabeth of Callerberg, whose views were similar to his own. During the years 1718–16 he made several journeys to Italy and Spain, where he became associated with the works of Madame Guyon (q. v.). He then returned to Schwarzenau, learned the watch-making trade, became president of the Philosophical Society, and resided there until 1724. In 1746 he became a priest, and continued in the neighborhood of Ansbach until 1753, a truly evangelical Christian, a disciple of Christ, clinging faithfully to the truth as it is in Jesus. Marchy had great influence in propagating throughout Germany the mystic views of Bourgignon and Guyon. He wrote Freimüthige u. christliche Discurse (1754); Augenzeugen eines Kindes u. d. Richtigfertig d. Wege u. Grünes (1758), 2 parts; Selbstbiographie, in the 2d vol. of Valenti, System d. höheren Heilkunde (Elberfeld, 1826). — Gobel, Gesch. der wahren Inspirations-gemeinden (in Nieder's Zeit. d. hist. Theol. 1835, iii, § 21, 4); the same, Gesch. d. christl. Kirche (1802), ii, bk. ix; also see an excellent article in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. ix, 116 sq.

Marsden, Samuel, one of the noblest missionary workers the Church of England ever sent out to battle for Christ, the noted Australian chaplain and friend of the Maori, was born of humble parentage in 1754, and was trained first in the free grammar school at York, and then, by the celebrated English divine Dr. Joseph Milner. Samuel began life as a trader at Leeds. He had been converted under Wesleyan preaching, had joined the Methodist, and belonged to their society for some time, but, being higher aspirations than that mercantile profession, he entered the English Church to secure a collegiate training. He was placed at St. Joseph's College, Cambridge, and there educated by the Elland Society, whose object it was to aid poor young men having the ministry in view. Before Marsden had even taken his degree, he was offered the chaplainship in New South Wales. At first he was very adverse to accepting it, but, finding that there was no one who could so well fill this difficult post, he consented, and in the spring of 1788 was ordained. Soon after he married Elizabeth Tristram, a very worthy lady, who did much to aid him in his missionary labors. In 1794 he arrived at Parramatta, his new home. Early in the 17th century England had adopted postal transportation. The newly-acquired territories in America were then used for this purpose, and, as we know, oftentimes aided in the propagation of the gospel and slavery. The Revolution of 1789 led to the consequent establishment of independence in the colonies, obliged England to discontinue this practice of disposing of criminals. But the great fear entertained in England that the country would be overrun with crime, led the government of George III to establish penal colonies in Australia. About seven years previous to Marsden's arrival there the first convict ship had been sent out with its living freight, and yet up to this time religious training was unknown. It little mattered to England what became of the convict, so long as he was well out of her way. A powerful military force was required to keep this mass of corrupt humanity in subjection, and, instead of being benefited, they were rather hardened in their sins. For teaching the Gospel the Church furnished only two ministers—for soldiers, convicts, settlers, and all. Marsden was at one of these, and, as a poor preacher failing in health, he was soon left to struggle on alone. Although severely tried by domestic affliction, he was not found wanting. At that time the custom prevailed there and in England for the parish priest to administer justice as well as give spiritual advice. The son of a Yorkshire man, educated to be very conversant with law, but good sense and a clear perception of justice came to the rescue. His farming education, however, served him well, for, receiving a
grant of land, and thirteen convicts to till it, as part payment for his services, he made it the model farm in New South Wales, and from the proceeds was enabled to establish schools and missions. A rebellious spirit manifesting itself among the convicts, Marsden sailed for England, after an absence of fourteen years, to appeal to the home government. His main object was to secure a grant permitting the convicts' friction with the penal colony. This was denied him, but his representation that the convicts ought to be instructed in trades was well received.

During his visit to England Mr. Marsden also laid the foundation of the missions to New Zealand, and prepared to go out there. But the health of his own country was exigent, and after visiting Australia he had had some intercourse with these tribes, which he found to be of a much higher type of humanity than the Australian native. Indeed, they possessed such a spirit of enterprise and curiosity that they would often visit the island of Australia, and Marsden is said to have entertained thirty at one time. He vainly endeavored to obtain help from the Church Missionary Society. No clergyman could be found to undertake the mission to New Zealand, but two laymen, William Hall and John King, consented to act as pioneers. This they accomplished before Marsden himself returned to Australia in August, 1809. They were soon followed by Thomas Kendall. To transfer these lay missionaries to their intended field of labor, Marsden conceived the plan of fitting out a missionary ship, but, failing to interest outside parties, he finally purchased a small one at his own expense. This was the Acheron, the first of the mission ships that now carry the Gospel to every part of the globe. Marsden accompanied this expedition, and was kindly welcomed by the natives. His method in founding missions to propagate Christianity was unlike that of Eliot, to begin with faith, and then to look for civilization. He rather thought that civilization prepared the way for the acceptance of faith, and, as his teachers were laymen, he employed them only in laying the foundations of a Christian civilization. Marsden frequently repeated his visits, and in many ways aided the enterprise. On his fourth visit, he took out with him the Rev. Henry Williams, who afterwards became bishop of a Maori district. It was now nine years since he had first landed here, and, in spite of so many disappointments and so much opposition, he found the condition of the natives greatly improved. A Wesleyan mission had been established at Wingarara, under Mr. Leigh. During his two months' stay he endeavored to persuade the natives to adopt a fixed form of government, and advised the missionaries to collect a vocabulary, and arrange a grammar that might aid in future translations. In 1826 he made his seventh and last visit. He was now seventy-two years of age. Wherever he went he was greeted as the friend of the Maories. He had always hoped that this intelligent people might be Christianized, and it gladdened his heart to see the improvements they had made. Sunday was generally observed among the natives, and polygamy and cannibalism were fast diminishing, and there was every token that the apostle of New Zealand had conquered a country and people for the Church of God. Marsden was possessed of a will and force of character that enabled him to accomplish whatever he undertook. He died May 12, 1838.

See Miss Charlotte M. Yonge, Pioneers and Founders, p. 216-240. See New Zealand; Selwyn.

Mar'sena (Heb. Mar'ásen, מַרְסֵנָא or מִרְסֵנָא, according to Benfey, the Samaritan marha, noble, with the Zend ending ma, man; Sept. Maporás, but most copies omit; Vulg. Marzena), one of the seven Medo-Persian satraps or viziers (Esth. 1, 14). R.C. 983. Josephus understands that they had the office of interpreters of the laws (Ant. xi. 6, 1).

Mar's Hill (Ἀργυρώνας, collis Martius, Acta xxv, 22, the Areopagus, as in ver. 19; so called, according to Pausan. I. 28, 5, from the fact that Mars was first judged there), a limestone hill in Athens, north-west of the Acropolis (Herod. viii, 230) ... (Pococke, Eust. iii, tab. 65), where (even down to the time of the Roman emperors, Gell. xii, 7) the most ancien ... judicial authority, it fell under some restrictions in the times of the New Test.; but the date of its extinction is unknown. (See Paley, Real-Encyklop., i, 700 sq.; Döderlein, in the Hall. Encyklop., i, 188 sq.; also Meurill Areopagus, Ludg. Bat. 1624; Bockh, De Areopago, Berol. 1826.) From some part of that hill, but not before the judges (for there is no trace of a regular judicial procedure in the entire narrative), Paul delivered his fa ... to his hearers upon the steps and in the valley (comp. Robinson, Researches, i, 10 sq.). See Areopagus.

Marsh (מְרָשָׁה, ge'be', a collection of waters, Ezek. xlvii, 11; elsewhere a cistern or reservoir, rendered "pit," Isa. xxx, 14; Jer. xiv, 3), a swamp or wet piece of land. The passage in Ezekiel speaks of the future blessings of the Jews after their restoration under the figure of the drainage of the lands, and by its dampness, "the marshes thereof, and the marshes thereof, shall not be healed: they shall be given to salt" (xlvii, 11); that is, the part in question shall be reserved for the production of salt by the evaporation of the waters (see Henderson, Comment. ad loc.). It is supposed that the "outlet of salt" in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea is here referred to, for there the Kedron, the course of which the prophet describes the holy waters as following, empties this plain or valley has been traversed and described by captains Irby and Mangles in terms appropriate to the prophecy. Lieut. Lynch, in coasting around the southern extremity of the Dead Sea, found not only the Ghor to be an immense marshy flat, but the bottom of the lake itself a muddy shoal, scarcely allowing the boat to be rowed through it. The salt hills around presented a scene of uninterrupted desolation (Expedition, p. 810).

Marsh, Francis, a noted Irish prelate, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was made bishop of Limerick in 1667; was transferred to Kilmore and Ardagh in 1673; in 1682 became archbishop of Dublin, and died in 1688. But little is accessible to gather a detailed account of his life and work. Lawrence B. Phillips (Dict. Bio. Refs) refers to Cotton, Poeti Ecclesi- sic Hibermiae (Dubl. 1649, 5 vols. 8vo), and to D'Alton, Lives of the Archbishops of Dublin (Dublin, 1888, 8vo).

Marsh, Herbert, an English theologian and preacher, "one of the acutest and most truly learned divines of his day," was born in London in 1575, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; graduated with great distinction; was made fellow, and became M.A. in 1572. He then went to the Continent, and studied at the University of Göttingen, and later at Leipzig. He returned to England in 1680, and in 1687 became professor of divinity at Cambridge. In 1616 he was appointed bishop of Llandaff, and bishop of Peterborough in 1619. He died May 1, 1639. He published several religious and controversial treatises, and furnished an excellent English translation of Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament, with notes. "A dissertation on the genuineness of 1 John v, 7, included in Michaelis's Introduction, from Dr. Travers, 'Letters to Edward Gibbon, Esq.,' in defence of the genuineness of the passage, which bishop Marsh
answered, in vindication of Michaelis and himself, in his celebrated ‘Letters to Archdeacon Travers’—an able and critical production, but which did not, as some eminent scholars have supposed, settle the question. He has also published several parts of a Course of Divinity Lectures on the Messiah, and an Office of the Church, of theological learning, and notices of authors. This work, entitled Lectures on Divinity, with an Account of the principal Authors who have excelled in Theological Learning (7 parts, Camb., 1809–23; Lond., 1838), includes ‘Lectures on Sacred Criticism and Interpretation,’ which have been published separately, and are, as is well known, a subscription to Biblical scholars, of the highest value” (Horne, in Bibl. Bib., 1839, p. 160 sq.). His other works are Essay on the Usefulness and Necessity of Theological Learning to those designed for Holy Orders (1792) —Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome (Lond., 1841, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. ii, 1225; Blackwood’s Magazine, xxix, 69 sq.

Marsh, James, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born July 19, 1794, at Hartford, Vt. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1817; spent some years in An- dover Theological Seminary; was ordained Oct. 12, 1824, and afterwards, for a short time, the incumbent of a professorship in Hampden Sydney College, Va. In 1826 he was elected president of the University of Ver- mont, which position he resigned in 1833, but continued as professor of moral and intellectual philosophy until 1849. He died at Colchester, Vt., July 5, 1842. Dr. Marsh was among the first to render the text of the German on the Geography of the Scriptures (1822). He published a Preliminary Essay to Coleridge’s Aids to Reflection (1829): — Selections from the Old English Writers on Practical Theology: — His Inaugural Address at Bar- linpton (1826) — A Treatise on Eloquence: — Translation of Herder’s Work on Hebrew Poetry: and Translation of Hegel’s Works on Christian Philosophy. A memoir of his life, with selections from his writings, was published by professor Torrey (1843, 8vo; 2d ed, 1845). See North Am. Rev. xxiv, 470; Dayeckine, Cyclop. Am. Lit. ii, 130; Sprague, Annals, ii, 692; Drake, Dict. Am. Biog. s.v.

Marsh, John (1), D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Nov. 2, 1742 (O. S.), at Haverhill, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1761; entered the ministry in 1765; was appointed tutor at Harvard in 1771; remained there two years, and was ordained January 1774, pastor of the First Church, Wethersfield, Conn., where he served until 1811. He preached a few occasional Sermons.—Sprague, Annals, i, 619.

Marsh, John (2), D.D., son of the preceding, an eminent American divine, who enjoyed a national reputation from his connection, almost from its origin, with the great temperance reform of the last half century, was born in Wethersfield, Conn., April 2, 1769; graduated at Yale College, and in 1786 settled as a Congregational pastor in Haddam, Conn. He at once identified himself with the cause to which he so ably served for half a generation, and attracted public attention by the address which he delivered before the Windham County Temperance Society in Pomfret, Conn., in 1828. That year a state society had been formed, of which Jeremiai Day, of Yale College, was the president, and Mr. Marsh the secretary and general agent, and, to do efficient service for the society, the latter offered his services to the county associations as far as he could in connection with his pastoral labor. His address in Pomfret, styled “Putnam and his Wolf,” ran a parallel between general Putnam’s well-known pursuit of the wolf in his den in that town and the temperance crusade against a more terrible monster. The address was afterwards printed, and in a short period a subscription of $10,000 was obtained for the American Tract Society finally placed upon its list. See Temperance Reform. In 1833 Dr. Marsh was invited to leave his charge and become an agent of the society in Philadelphia; and by the advice of his friends he yielded himself to what was at that time a most laborious and self-denying mission. Three years later he removed to New York as secretary of the American Temperance Union, and editor of its organ and of its publications, and remained until 1865, when the society was reorganized, and a change was made in its officers. He did not rest from his labors, preaching constantly, lecturing upon his life theme, and offering himself to every good word and work. His last efforts were put forth in behalf of an endowment of the Yale Theological Seminary. He had already raised $10,000, and was full of encouragement in reference to the success of his endeavors. His labors ended only with his life. He died Aug. 4, 1868. “Few men have been more respected or more widely known throughout the country than Dr. Marsh. Enthusiastic in his mission, catholic in spirit, welcoming every new laborer in the great field, and readily seizing upon each new phase of the temperance reformation, his name will remain inseparably connected with the history of the cause in all future time. He was a good man, shedding a benignant influence by his devoted life wherever he moved” (N. Y. Christian Advocate, August, 1868). Besides editing The Temperance Journal, Dr. Marsh was the author of several popular works; among others, of a well-known Epitome of Ecclesiastical History (N. Y., A. S. Barnes and Co.); of a valuable hand-book entitled Temperance Recollections: — Labora, Debe-, Tanta, Troca, Tanta: A Pugilist’s Autobiography (N. Y., 1844) — “a rich text-book for every man who would plead the cause of temperance,” etc. See (the N. Y.) Christian Advocate, August, 1868; the Eclectic Magazine, 1866 (June), p. 773. (J. H. W.)

Marsh, Narcissus, D.D., a learned Irish prelate, was born at Bannington, near Highworth, in Wiltshire, in 1658; was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, and in 1658 became fellow of Exeter College. The degree of D.D. he received in 1671; some time previous he was made chaplain to the bishop of Exeter, and later to chancellor Hyde, earl of Clarendon. In 1673 he was appointed principal of St. Alban’s Hall, Oxford, and in 1678 provost of Dublin College. In 1683 he became bishop of Leighlin and Fern; archbishop of Cashel in 1690, of Dublin in 1694, and of Armagh in 1706. He died Nov. 2, 1713. Dr. Marsh was a pious and noble soul. He founded an almshouse at Drogheda for poor widows of clergymen, and provided for their support. He likewise built on his own estate decayed churches within his diocese, and bought in several improvements, which he restored to the Church. He also gave to the Bodleian Library a great number of MSS. in the Oriental languages, chiefly purchased out of Colvin’s collection. He was a very learned and accomplished man. Besides sacred and profane literature, he had applied himself to mathematics and natural philosophy; he was deep in the knowledge of languages, especially the Oriental; he was also skilled in music, the practice as well as the theory. He published Man- udestoria ad logicam, written by Philip de Trieu; to which he added the Greek text of Aristotle, and some tables and schemes, and Gassendus’s small tract De demonstratione, which he illustrated with notes (Oxon. 1678) — Institutiones logicæ, in usum juventutis academici (Dublin, 1681) — An Introductory Essay to the Doc- trine of Sounds (published in the “Philosophical Transactions” of the Royal Society of London): — A Charge to his Clergy of the Diocese of Dublin (1694, 4to). See Hook, Eccles. Biog. vol. viii. s.v.; Biog. Brit. s.v.; Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. ii (see Index); ware’s Ireland, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v. (J. H. W.)

Marsh, William (1), D.D., an English divine, was incumbent of St. Mary’s, Leamington; later rector of Beddington, and died in 1666. He published Collections on the Collects (3d ed. 1824, 4to); — Plain Thoughts on Prophecy (3d ed. 1843, 8vo); — Occasional Sermons, etc. (1821, etc.). See Memoirs of the late Rev. Wm. Marsh, D.D., by his daughter (post 1830).
Marshall, George, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Belshet Parish, Derry County, Ireland, in 1880. He attended the schools of his native land, and, after his arrival in America, continued his studies, and graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., in 1852, and at the theological seminary at Princeton, N. J., in 1855.

He was immediately licensed to preach, and installed pastor of Rock Church, Cecil Co., Md., where he continued to labor until his death, Feb. 27, 1861. Mr. Marshall was a man of devoted piety, excellent natural talents, and solid attainments; his sermons were sound and instructive, his delivery earnest and impressive. See Wilson, p. 75.

Marshall, John, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington Co., Pa., Jan. 18, 1818. He received his early education in St. Clairsville, Ohio; graduated at Franklin College, Ohio, in 1889; studied theology in the seminary of the Associate Presbyterian Church in Canonsburg, Pa.; was licensed in 1843, and installed pastor of the Associate Presbyterian churches of Lordsberry and West Chester, Ohio. Owing to the discussion going on in anticipation of the union between the Associate and Associate Reformed Presbyterian churches, his mind was directed to the investigation of their views concerning an ecclesiastical union and intercommunication, which led, in 1854, to his joining the presbytery of St. Clairsville. In 1856 he became the stated supply for Woodfield Church, Ohio, and in 1857 he accepted a call to the churches of Dodsville and Huntington, Ill. He died Aug. 24, 1858.

Mr. Marshall is a practical and zealous as a preacher, social and amiable as a Christian gentleman. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 75.

Marshall, Joseph D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Stanford, Conn., in Nov., 1804, of Congregational parentage. His early years were spent in mercantile life; he was converted when about twenty years old; he felt a call to the ministry, and in 1827 entered the New York Conference, and was for two years stationed at Kingston Circuit. In 1829 he was appointed to New Palz Circuit; in 1830 to Flushing; in 1832 was transferred to Troy Conference, and appointed to St. Albans Circuit; next and successively to Peru, Charlotte, Shelburne, and Wesley Chapel, N. Y. In 1837 was transferred to the New York Conference, and appointed to Windham Circuit; in 1838 to Sag Harbor; in 1839 was supernumerary, because of failing health; and, though he returned to effective work for a time, he only recovered his health in 1843, when he entered active work, and successively preached at Green, Conn., Birmingham, Reading, and New Canaan. Thereafter he was a supernumerary. He died at Brooklyn, Jan. 9, 1860. "He magnified his office as a pastor in all the churches committed to his care. . . . He was characterized for his equanimity of disposition, and the pure tone of his devotional and experimental piety." See Smith, Sacred Memories, p. 322 sq.

Marshall, Nathaniel, D.D., an English divine, flourished in the beginning of the 18th century. But little is known of his personal history. In 1712 he was the son of the clergy of the town; in January, 1715, he was canon of Westminster, and bishop of the cathedral town; later he became canon of Windsor. He appears also to have had the lecturing of St. Martin's, from on the Wensum and Colne, and died Feb. 6, 1730-31. He published A Translation of the Gospels Works of St. Cyriacus (1717, fol.) and of St. Thomas Aquinas (1717, 1721-1730; 4 vols.; besides a number of occasional Sermons, etc.-Darling, Cyclopedia, Bibliographia Sacra, Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Author. s. v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s. v.

Marshall, Samuel Vance, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Fayette Co., Ky., Feb. 6, 1798. He was educated at Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky. (class of 1821), and was immediately licensed by the presbytery at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed in 1825, and ordained by West Lexington Presbyterian in 1826. During 1827 he labored as a missionary in South Carolina; then went
to North Middleton and Mt. Sterling churches, in Kentucky; and subsequently to Woodford, Ky. In 1735 he was elected professor of languages in Transylvania Univer-
sity; and in 1767 to the chair in Oakland Col-
lege, Miss. Here he spent the remainder of his life in teaching, and in voluntary service as an evangelist, es-
pecially among colored people. He died Nov. 30, 1860.
Mr. Marshall was a man of strong character, and of large and ample proportions, adapted to all popular and popu-

**Marshall, Stephen**, a noted commonwealth Pres-
byterian divine, lecturer at St. Margaret's Church, West-
minster, who flourished in the first half of the 17th cen-
tury, and died in 1655, was the author of several contro-
versial theological treatises, etc. (1640-81). He also published a number of occasional Sermons. *The most mem-
orable of Marshall's works is his sermon preached
at the Sun-ril of Pym* (1644, 4to). See *Life of Stephen
Marshall* (1809, 4to); *Bearing, against, duus, Gothicas
[illegible], 1739; Milbhone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s. v.

**Marshall or Mareschal, Thomas**, an English
divine of note, was born at Barkby, in Leicester,
about 1621; was entered at Lincoln College, Oxford, in
1640, and while there became a constant hearer of archi-
bishop Usher's sermons in All-balls Church. The in-
fluence of this habitus of style is a remnant in all the
writings of Mr. Marshall. Upon the breaking out of
the civil war he took up arms for the king at his own charge,
and therefore, in 1645, when he was a candidate for the
degree of bachelor of arts, was admitted without paying
fees. Upon the approach of the Parliamentary visit-
ation, he left the university, went beyond sea, and be-
came preacher to the company of English merchants at
Rotterdam and Dort. In 1661 he was made bachelor of
divinity; and, in 1668, became fellow of his college;
and, in 1669, doctor of divinity. In 1672 he was ap-
pointed professor of the College of Lincoln. Later he be-
came chaplain-in-ordinary to the king; and, in 1681, final-
dean of Gloucestershire. He died in 1685. He was
distinguished for his knowledge of the Oriental tongues
and of the Anglo-Saxon. He published *Observarionem
in Ennotare* (1659, 4to); *bearing, against, duus, Gothicas
[illegible], etc., Angulo-Saxonica, etc. (Dort, 1655); also a
Book of Archbishop Usher (Lond. 1686); *The Catechism
set forth in the Book of Common Prayer briefly explained
by short Notes* (Oct. 1679). See Wood, *Athenae Oxoni-
enses*, vol. ii (see Index); *Gen. Biog. Dict. of s. v.; Wood's
Ecclesiasts*, vol. VII, s. v.

**Marshall, Walter**, an English divine of the sec-
ond half of the 17th century, was educated at, and later
became fellow of New College, Oxford, and Winchester
College; vicar of Hursley, Hampshire; was ejected at
the Restoration; subsequently became pastor of a dis-
senting congregation at Gosport, and died in 1690. He
published *The Gospel Mystery of Sanctification Opened
in sundry Practical Directions*, together with a *Sermon
on Justification* (Lond. 1692, 8vo; often reprinted; last
s. v.; Bogue and Bennett, *Hist. Dissenters*, i, 454.

**Marshall, William**, a Presbyterian minister, was
born in Perthshire, Scotland, in 1785; was educated and
studied divinity at Glasgow; was licensed by the Pres-
bury of Dysart, Scotland; preached a number of years at
calinshow, Fife, and in 1832 came to America, and
was installed pastor of the Church at Peekskill, N. Y. In
1845, when the marriage question engaged the attention and called forth not a little of the talent and
Biblical lore of the Church, he made the argument in
that relation before the Synod of New York, which was
afterwards published under the title, *An Inquiry con-
cerning the Lawfulness of Marriage between Parties pre-
viously married; also a short history of the acts of legis-
lations in different Ages and Countries, and of the Action
of the Ecclesiastical Bodies on that Subject*. He died in
1864. Mr. Marshall possessed the analytical powers, comprehensive and penetrating; his sermons were re-
nowned throughout the lands in which he may have lived. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 99; *Sprague, Am. Amer. Pulpit*, ix, 7. (J. L. S.)

**Marshall, Sir John**, an English scholar, celebra-
ted for his acquirements in history, languages, and
chronology, was born in London in 1692, and was educated
at St. John's College, Oxford. He embraced the cause of
the Royalists in the civil war. He died in 1685. He
was the author of a work entitled *Chronological Com-
ments on the Temples and Temples of Egypt taken from
Egyptiaticus, Etruricus, etc. (Lond. 1672, 4to), in which
he attempts to reconcile Egyptian chronology with the
Hebrew Scriptures, by supposing four collateral dynas-
ties of Egyptian kings reigning at the same time. This
theory has been adopted by several eminent scholars.
He also wrote the preface to the first volume of Dug-
dale's *Monasticon Anglicum*, and left behind him at
his death, unfinished, *Cassius chronicorum Liber Quatuor: de
in narrationibus Romanis: de re numerarum; et cetera*. We are likewise
in some measure obliged to him for the history of Phi-
losophy by his very learned nephew, Thomas Stanley,
Esq., since it was chiefly at his instigation that that
excellent work was undertaken. See Wood, *Athenae
Oxonimensis*; *Shuckford, Sacred and Profane History*;

**Marsham, Joshua, D.D., a noted English Bap-
mist missionary to India, one of the "Scaremore Breth-
ren," was born in St. John's college, Cambridge, among whom
Dr. Carey were the most prominent often styled them-
selves, the person who, above all others, gave, to the
English Protestant mission in India the strength, con-
sistency, and prudence which it wanted, was born April
20, 1767, at Westbury Leigh, in Wilshire. While yet a
child, Joshua Marshman, attracted attention by his de-
votion for reading, and his quiet, heartfelt religion.
His parents were poor, and he had to struggle hard to secure
an education. In 1784 he became master of a school at
Bristol, at the same time entering a student at
"Bristol Academy," where he studied thoroughly Latin,
Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac. His mind became imbued
at this time with the missionary spirit which the noted
English cobbler, Carey, was spreading in England,
and in 1799 Marshman offered to become one of the
party sent out to India by the "Baptist Missionary
Society," a body of missionaries among whom he was
the best known in the world. His object was to
proceed to British ground, Serampore being at that time
Danish territory; but the Anglo-Indians objected to
Christian missionary enterprises in their midst, and the
mission was finally established at Serampore, to spread
hence, in God's own appointed time, the truths of the
Gospel among the heathen of all India. The fate of
the missionary enterprise has been spoken of in the
article INDIA (Q. V.); the activity of each member in the
biographical sketches of these faithful servants of Christ
[see CAREY; WARD, THOMAS]; we can here deal only
with the missionary enterprises in India, of which
Marshman, one of the most important of missionary
enterprises.

Marshman had married the daughter of a Baptist
minister before he became teacher at Bristol; his wife
now accompanied him to India, and proved a helpful
mate indeed from the very outset. Shortly after landing at
Serampore, ending the support granted by the benev-
sity of the society inadequate to the wants of the colony, Marsh-
man, with the assistance of his wife, opened two board-
ing-schools for European children, and, succeeding even
beyond their most sanguine expectations in securing
not only a support for these schools, but the continu-
eance of the mission, shortly after opened a school for the na-
tives also, which was quickly filled; and the pecuniary
return of this enterprise, together with the additional income which Carey received for his services as an instructor in the government college at Fort William, enabled these good people in a short time to render their mission nearly independent of home support. The Baptists of England, however, failed to appreciate these heroic and self-sacrificing labors of Carey, and Marshman, and with this failure was connected the disorganization and final dissolution of the committee of the general society. "There were among them many men of good intentions, but without breadth of views, and used to small economies. They listened to false reports, censured without sufficient information, pinched their missions, and dictated the management, so that Dr. Carey was but a victim of it all. . . . Moreover, the American subscribers [American Baptists] joined their English brethren until Judson went out from the American society] sent a most vexatious and absurd remonstrance against any part of their contributions for training young men to the ministry being employed in teaching science. "As if," said Dr. Marshman, "youths in America could be educated for ministers without learning science."

Had the government of the mission been in the hands of a body acquainted, by personal experience, with the needs of the converts, and unburdened by the prejudices of inherited feeling and prejudice, the difficulties springing up could easily have been allayed; but, managed by the class of men we have just spoken of, the disagreement between the Baptist Missionary Society and the Serampore missionaries (originating in 1817) lasted for many years, and was a serious check to the success of the enterprise. In 1822 Dr. Marshman had dispatched his son John to England to restore pleasant relations. The disagreement continuing, Dr. Marshman decided to go before the society in person, and in 1826 returned home. But even he failed in his mission; and in 1827, after much persistent effort, the matter ended in the separation of the Serampore mission from the general society. To a man like Dr. Marshman, now hoary with age, this matter became a serious annoyance, and his strength of body and of mind were greatly impaired. Additional trouble came when the ownership of the buildings at the Serampore mission was to be disposed of, the home society naturally enough claiming the property, although it had been secured mainly by the hard labors of Carey and Marshman. In 1825, Dr. Marshman's trials had become very heavy. At that time he was taken by cholera, and a short time later twenty-three years had the threefold cord between Carey, Marshman, and Ward been unbroken. They had lived together like brothers, alike in aim and purposes, each supplying what the other lacked; and the distress of the parting was terrible, especially to Dr. Marshman, who was a man of his friend's illness, with an attack of deafness, temporary indeed, but for some days total, so that he could only watch the final struggle without hearing a single word." His mental strength was even then sorely tried, for "he wrote as if he longed to be with those whose toils and sorrows were at an end." Greater was the shock that the treatment of the home society brought upon him. "Morbid attacks of depression came on, during which he wandered about unable to apply himself so much as even to write a letter." June 8, 1824, Dr. Carey died, and he was left alone to defend his cause. In 1826 a daughter of his, who had married the afterwards sold Christian soldier of the British army, Henry Havelock, barely escaped with her life from her bungalow, which had caught fire, losing one of her three children, a baby, in the flames. The disastrous excitement which this affair caused Dr. Marshman prostrated him completely, and he died Dec. 5, 1837. A few days previous to this event arrangements had been concluded in London for the reunion of the Serampore Mission with the parent society, and for retaining Dr. Marshman in the superintendence. So were these arrangements successful. Dr. Marshman had acquired a complete knowledge of the Bengalee, Sanscrit, and Chinese languages. Into the Chinese he translated the four Gospels, the Epistles of Paul to the Romans and the Corinthians, and the book of Psalms. He also wrote A Dissertation on the Characters and Script of the Chinese Language (1809, 4to)—The Works of Confucius, containing the original Text, with a Translation (1811, 4to, reviewed in London Quarterly Review, xi, 382)—Clara Sinicae—Elements of Chinese Grammar, with a Preliminary Dissertation on the Characters and Cog- nological Medium of the Chinese (Serampore, 1814). In Sanarict and Bengalee he assisted Dr. Carey in the preparation of a Sanscrit grammar in 1815, and a Bengalee and English dictionary in 1825. In 1827 he published an abridgment of the dictionary. He also engaged in a second London edition of Rammohan Roy's works, illustrated with a portrait of the author, and containing a reply to Dr. Marshman. In a sketch of Dr. Marshman's character at the end of the first volume of Dr. Cox's History of the Royal Missionary Society, Dr. Cox says: "In no man of great mental power and diligence, of firmness bordering upon obstinacy, and of much wariness." See Lond. Cent. Mag. 1888, pt. ii, p. 216; English Cyclopaedia of Biography (1857), iv, 120; Kaye, Christianity in India, ch. vii; Yonge, Pioneers and Founders (London, 1872, 12mo), ch. v; Trevor, A. 2, Notes and Queries, p. 310; Marshman (J.), Life and Times of Carey, Marshman, and Ward (London, 1859, 2 vols. 8vo; popular ed., N. Y., 1867, 12mo).

Marsiac, council of, (Concilium Marsiacense,) was held Dec. 8, 1526, by William de Flavacour, archbishop of Auch, and hisLegatans. The proceedings are of little interest. This council established the feast of St. Martha, the sister of S. Mary Magdalene, celebrated on the fourth of the calendar of August. See Landon, Manual of Councils, p. 390.

Marcellus, a Dutch philosopher and theologian, was born at Uffen, in the diocese of Utrecht. He was canon and treasurer of the Church of Saint Peter at Cologne, and when Rupert, the duke of Bavaria, founded the academy of Heidelberg in 1536, he called Marsile to a professorship of philosophy. He died there Aug. 20, 1595. Tribenhemius attributes to him a Didactic, and some comments on Aristotle and on Peter Lombard. Fabricius adds that his commentaries on the four books of the Sentences were published in Strasburg in 1501, folio. A volume published at La Haye (1497, fol.) contains the first two books of the Sentences, with the criticism of D'Inghen.—Fabricius, lbid. med. et inf. Lat.; Diet. des Sciences philos. B. Haureau, De la philos. scolast. ii, 468; Hoefer, Noue. Dipl. Générale, vol. xliii, a. v.

Marsilius, ficius see FICINUS.

Marsilius of Padua, an eminent opponent of the papacy, was born towards the close of the 13th century, and was probably a native of Italy. He first attracted notice at the University of Orleans, in France, and later at that at Paris, where he studied jurisprudence, and was also paid some respects. He spent some years in Athens in pursuit of his theology, and in 1312 became rector. It was not, however, until 1324 that he became particularly noted. In that year he composed his principal work, Defensor pu- cia s. de re imperatoria et pontificia. In this work, written in the interest of the emperor Louis IV, the Barba- rian, and against the papacy, he acquiesced his time as the most dangerous foe to peace and prosper- ity, supporting his assertion by a reference to events.
then current, e.g. the quarrel of Boniface VIII with Philip the Fair of France, the arrogance of Clement V towards the emperor Henry VII, and the treatment accorded by pope John XXII, then reigning, to Louis the Bavarian. In order to prevent such scandals for the future, the pope must set the example at the root of the evil; and he then proceeds to consider, 1, the nature, origin, and end of the state, with constant reference to peace and quietness as the highest good of social life; 2, the relation between Church and State, opposing to the exaggerated pretensions of the Curia a doctrine of the Church which he grounds on reason, tradition, Scripture, history, and ecclesiastical law. The leading thoughts are these: (1) The official duties and authority of every priest are confined to the ministration of the Word and sacraments. His power is spiritual and moral; the civil power alone may employ force, and the priest, even if he be bishop or pope, is subject to the civil power. (2) All priests, whatever their name, are equal in spiritual rank and authority; there was no distinction in the apostolic Church between bishops and presbyters; and the N. T. shows that there was no primacy of Peter, but that the apostles were all equal. In externals and non-essentials there may be distinctions between priests, and gradations of office, so far as circumstances require, but as a merely human arrangement. (3) There is only one divinely-appointed Head of the Church, Peter (4) The highest authority on earth in ecclesiastical matters does not inhere in a single priest or bishop, not even in the bishop of Rome, but in a general council, composed as well of intelligent laymen, who are versed in the Scriptures, as of priests. Christ has promised to be with his Church unto the end of the world, and a general council is the proper exponent and organ of the Church. The pope has not even authority to convene a council, since the case is possible that he should be guilty of conduct which itself would require the attention of a general council. This authority, therefore, belongs to the sovereign, as supreme lawmaker. (5) The Scriptures, including what must be necessarily inferred from their teaching, alone deserve an unconditional assent. The principles thus submitted by Marsilius found a practical application in 1338, when the heiress of the Tyroil sought a divorce from her husband, John of Bohemia, in order to marry a son of the emperor; a step which was sanctioned by Louis IV (in 1342), regardless of the fact that the parties were within the degrees of consanguinity in which marriage was prohibited by the Church, public opinion everywhere censuring the emperors action. Both Marsilius and the learned Franciscan William Occam, came forward in the emperor's defence, in a work bearing the title in each case, Tractatus de jurisdiction Imperatoris in causis matrimonialibus. They are complementary to each other, Marsilius treating especially of the dissolution of the former marriage, and Occam of the dispensation on account of consanguinity. Marsilius here also advanced the principle, that the ministers and teachers of the Word are to decide on the sufficiency of any reason for divorce under the divine law, but that the sovereign legislator must decide, on grounds of law, whether such sufficiency exists in any given case. Because of his work Defensor paene Marsilius was placed under the ban in 1237. His death is generally assigned to 1238, but Louis IV speaks of him as living, in a letter addressed to pope Benedict, in 1256, and there is no reason to doubt the genuineness of his work on marriage, which appeared in 1342. He must therefore have lived until after that date. In his life he appears as one of the most determined opponents of the unlimited pretensions of the papacy; and in his views of the headship of the Church as centring in Christ, and of the Scriptures as furnishing the sole rule of faith and practice for the Church, we recognize him as a forerunner of the Reformation. His works were published in Goldast's Monarchia a Rom. imp. (Frankf. 1668). See Schröckh, Kirchengesch. xxxi, 79 sq.; Neander, Christian Dogm. ii, 599 sq.; Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, vii, 89 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. xx, 109 sq.; Wetzer und Wetle, Kirchen-Lex. vi, 906 sq.; Friedberg, Zeit. f. Kirchengesch (Tubing. 1869), viii, 69 sq.

Marte (",archer", Isa. xxi. 3; also spoken of what is gained from traffic, profite, wealth, "merchants", "people", "nations", xlv. 14), a traditional epithet or appellation of emporium. The root signifies to travel about as traders, buying and selling; thus pointing out at once the general character of the commerce of the East from the earliest age to the present. See Commerce; Mark.

Marteilh, Jean, a French martyr to the Protestant cause, was born at Bergerac in 1564, and was condemned in 1702 to the gallows at Dunkirk, where he spent seven years. He died in 1777. See The Huguenot Galley-Slave (New York, 1867); Quarterly Review (July, 1866).

Maret, Andra, a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born at Montauban in 1618; studied theology at Saumur, and was appointed pastor of Saint-Affrique. In 1647 he was called to Montauban to fill the same office. In 1658 he became professor of theology in the Reformed academy of that town; he was rector there in 1660, when he was invited to Altdorf, and was received in all that could surround the pretensions of the Catholic clergy, he was nevertheless involved in a suit instituted against the pastors of Puylaurens, who were accused of having received into the Church those who, once converted to Romanism, had relapsed into Protestantism, contrary to the royal prescriptions of April, 1668, of June, 1665, and of April, 1666. He was conducted with them to the prisons of Toulouse. The attention of the government was particularly directed to him; it was hoped that if they succeeded in extracting from him an abjuration, his example would draw a great number of recusants to the Reformed churches, and would be an excuse to those who only asked a pretext for passing over to Romanism. His moderation, moreover, induced them to believe in the possibility of success. Consequently they endeavored to move him sometimes by menaces, sometimes by promises. All was useless, and they finally liberated him. After the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the ministers of Montauban and of the neighboring churches retired to Holland. Maret preferred Switzerland, and withdrew to the canton of Berne, where he very soon obtained the direction of one of the principal churches. He died at Berne towards the close of the 17th century, about seventy years of age. Of Maret's productions, we have Réponse à la méthode de M. le cardinal de Richelieu (Rouen, 1674, 4to). This reply, said Cathala-Couture, indicates in the author a profound knowledge, and, above all, a tone of moderation and propriety far removed from the bitterness and fanaticism which prevail ordinarily in the greater part of controversial works:—De Natura Fidei et de Gratia efficacis (Montauban, 1655, 4to):—inaugural thesis—a number of theses which he delivered, during his presidency, to the scholars of the academy of Montauban, from 1656 to 1674:—a collection of sermons that Cathala-Couture attributes to him, without, however, giving their titles in detail. See Cathala-Couture, Hist. du Queret, vol. iii: Haag, La France Protest.; Bayle, Nouvelles Lettres (La Haye, 1789), p. 514, 515; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, vol. xxxii, 447.

Martene, Edmund, a learned French Benedictine, was born at St. Jean de Lome, in the diocese of Dijon, Dec. 22, 1654. After completing his studies, he took the vows in the Benedictine convent of St. Remi, at Rheims, Sept. 8, 1672. He soon distinguished himself by his erudition, and was made professor of rhetoric of the ancient ascetic writers, and was sent by the superiors of the Congregation of St. Maur, upon whom his convent depended, to the head-quarters of the order, St. Germain des Prés, at Paris. Here he was placed under the guidance, and enjoyed...
the friendship of the great lights D'Achery and Malbilon. He soon afterwards published his Commentarius in regulam S. P. Benedicti (Paris, 1690, 4to), which met with great success, and he was well rewarded by the monks of the abbey. He was also appointed to the chair of archaeology, and, encouraged by Malbilon, published next De antiquis monachorum vitulis libri quingue (Lugd., 1690, 2 vols. 4to). He was then sent to the convent of Marmoutier, where he remained several years, continuing his studies, and imbibing the strong ascetic views of Claudius Martin, whose biography he wrote upon the death of Martin. His exaggerated praise of this mystic ascetic seemed to his superiors more likely to provoke ridicule than admiration in the age of Louis XIV, and its publication was forbidden. The Vie du venerable P. de Leyva, of the Spaniards, published earlier with or without the author's consent (Tours, 1697, 8vo). He was exiled to Evreux for his insubordination. He was, however, soon transferred to the convent of St. Ouen, at Rouen, and there assisted Dom Sainte Martin in his edition of the Work of Gregory the Great. Here he was permitted the use of Martin of Tours, and added Maximes spirituelles du venerable P. D. Claude Martin (Rouen, 1688, 12mo). His next work, to which the above De antiquis monachorum, etc., was but a preface, is De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus (Rotomag, 1700 sq., 3 vols. 4to), and as appendix the Procuration de antiquis ecclesiis ritibus of Hug. de Rigal (Paris, 1701, 4to). In 1700 he published also, as a complement to D'Achery's Spicilegium, his Veterum scriptorum et monumontorum... collectio nova, after which he devoted himself specially to antiquarian researches, and writing. In 1708, the general chapter of his order sent him on a journey through France, to visit all the libraries, and to collect documents for a new Gallia Christiana. Dom Ursinus Durand (q.v.) was given him as colleague in 1709, and after six years thus employed the result of their researches was the publication of the title VeterumScriptorum et Monumontorum... amplissima collection (Paris, 1715, 6 vols. fol.). This long work, with its diocese consequence of his opposition to the bull Unigenitus, thereafter devoted himself exclusively to his studies, and in 1738 published a much enlarged edition of his archaeological works. He also continued Malbion's Annales ordinis S. Benedicti, tom. vii, ab anno Christi 1117 ad 1167 (Paris, 1789), and prepared a continuation of the Acta Sanctorum ordinis S. Benedicti, and an edition of the life and works of Thomas of Canterbury. He also asked permission to publish a Historia de la Congregacion de S. Maur, but was refused on account of its too enthusiastic praise of the monastic life. He died June 20, 1739. See Tasvin, Hist. Lit. de la Congr. de S. Maur; Moréri, Dict. Hist.; Mercure de France, August, 1739; Le Pour et le Contre, vol. xii, n. 249; Christian Observer, vol. xiv: Dowling, Intro. to Ch. Hist.; Herzog, Renl-Encyclop., ix., 119; Hoefel, Nouv. Diec. Gene- rale, xxii., 1008; Pfeffer, Universal-Lexicon, s. 926. (J. N. P.)

Martha (Mārthā), of unknown signification, but a Syriac prop. name (מארתא) according to Plutarch, Vit. Mar. 17), a Jewess, the sister of Lazarus and Mary, who resided in the same house with them at Bethany (Luke x, 38, 40, 41; John xi, 1-39; xii. 2). See LAZARUS. The house at Bethany being burned in Luke x, 38, and from the leading part which Martha is always seen to take in domestic matters, it has seemed to some that she was a widow, to whom the house at Bethany belonged, and with whom her brother and sis- ter lodged; but this is uncertain, and the common opinion that the sisters managed the household of their brother is more probable. Jesus was intimate with this family, and it was well known to the monastic body in Jerusalem, being accustomed to retire thither in the evening, after having spent the day in the city. The point which the evangelists bring out most distinctly with respect to Martha lies in the contrariety of disposition between her and her sister Mary. The first notice of Christ's visiting this family occurs in Luke x, 39-42. He was received with great attention by the sisters, and Martha soon hastened to provide suitable entertainment for the Lord and his followers, while Mary remained in his presence, sitting at his feet, and drinking in the sa- cred wine poured from his lips. The active, bustling solicitude of Martha anxious that the best things in the house should be made subservient to the Master's use and solace, and the quiet earnestness of Mary, more desirous to profit by the golden opportunity of hearing his instructions than to minister to his personal wants, strongly mark the point of contrast between the characters of the two sisters. (See bishop Hall's observations on this subject in his Contemplations, iii, 4, Nos. 17, 23, 24.) She needs the reproof, "One thing is needful;" but her love, though imperfect in its form, is yet recognized as true, and she too, no less than Lazarus and Mary, has a part in the distinguishing of those who shall be saved (Matt. xiii, 9). The part taken by the sisters in the transactions connected with the death and resurrection of Lazarus (John xi, 20-40) is entirely and beautifully in accord- ance with their previous history (see Tholuck, Comment. ad loc.). The facts recorded of her indicate a strong and devout after the customary Jewish type of devotion, sharing in Messianic hopes and accepting Jesus as the Christ; sharing also in the popular belief in a resurrec- tion, but not rising, as her sister did, to the belief that Christ was making the eternal life to belong, not to the future only, but to the present. Nothing more is re- corded of Martha save that some time after, at a supper given to Christ and his disciples at Bethany, she, as usual, bustled herself in the external service. Lazarus, so marvelously restored from the grave, sat with her guests at table. "Martha served," and Mary occupied her favorite station at the feet of Jesus, which she bathed with her tears, and anointed with costly oint- ment (John xii, 1, 2). See MAR. Nowwithstanding the seeming drawbacks upon Martha's character, so vividly painted in the Gospel, there can be no doubt of her genuine piety and love for her Lord, which, though seemingly strongly touched by her sister Niemeyer, Churhak, i, 66; and Schulthess, Neueste theolog. Nachricht, 1826, ii, 413. According to tradition, she went with her brother and other disciples to Marcella, gathered round her a society of devout women, and, true to her former character, led them in administration. The wilder Provençal legends make her victorious over a dragon that laid waste the country. The town of Tarascon boasted of possessing her remains, and claimed her as its patron saint (Acta Sanctorum, and Brev. Rom. in Jul. 29; Fabrissi Lux Evangel. p. 388).

Martha, Order of, is the name sometimes given to the organization of the Hospital Sisters of St. Martha of Pontier, etc. The aim of this female order is the care of the sick and the poor, and the gratuitous instruc- tion of poor children. See HOSPITAL SISTERS.

Martha, Anne Mary, a French noblewoman, sister of Sister Martha, born at Beaunçon in 1749, deserves a place here for her devotion during the French Revolution and the wars that followed to the relief of the sick and wounded, and of prisoners of all nations. She died in 1824. The Martha Order (q.v.) is named after her.

MARTINAY, Jean, a learned Benedictine of St. Maur, was born at St. Bervier, in the diocese of Aire, Dec. 30, 1647. In 1667 he entered the convent of La Daurade, at Toulouse. He now applied himself with great zeal to the study of Oriental languages and Biblia- cal literature, both of which he afterwards taught in
colleges of his order. During his residence at Bordeaux he wrote a work against the chronicological system of Pezon, which attracted the notice of his superiors. He was called to the head-quarters of his order, the abbey of St. Germain des Prés, and intrusted with the preparation of a new edition of the works of St. Jerome, marked for their learning and ingenuity than for large-ness of thought or critical acumen. He died June 16, 1717.

Among his works we notice the above-mentioned edition of the works of St. Jerome (Paris, 1688-1706, 5 vols., fol.)—Défense du texte Hébreu et de la chronologie de la Vulgate (1689)—Continuation de la Défense du texte, etc. (Part. 1693). In both these works he endeavors to prove that the Hebrew text is to be preferred to the Septuagint, and that less than 4000 years elapsed from the creation of the world to the advent of Christ:—Tractatus de saeculis et de viris de l'Écriture Sainte (1695);—Trattato d'argomento, ou manière d'expliquer l'Écriture par le secours des trois systèmes, la propre, la figurée, et l'harmonique (1704)—Vie de St. Jerôme (1706)—Harmoïne analytique de plusieurs sons choisis et rapportés inconnus de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament (1708)—Essays d'Exégèse et de Remarques sur les traductions Françaises du Nouveau Testament (1709)—Le Nouveau Testament traduit en Français sur la Vulgate (1712)—Méthode sucrée, pour apprendre à expliquer l'Écriture suivie par l'Écriture même (1716) etc. See Journal des Savants, Aug. 9, 1717; Hist. Lit. de la Congrégation de St. Maur, p. 892-922; Herzog, Real-Encyklopäd. ix, 120; Hoefer, Nouv. Bioq. Générale, xxxiv, 2. (J. N. P.)

Martien, William Stockton, a ruling elder of the Presbyterian Church, was born June 20, 1798. He was of Huguenot descent, and received an early Christian education. In 1819 he commenced business, and in 1830, in connection with others, engaged in the establishment of The Presbyterian, of which he continued to be the chief proprietor and publisher until 1861. In 1838 he commenced the publication of religious books, and, as a member of the Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church, he issued many works of standard religious character. In 1846 he was elected and ordained ruling elder, in which office he continued to labor in the Sabbath and mission schools belonging to the congregation until his death, April 16, 1861. Mr. Martien was a man of marked ability and efficiency in the Church. He was of a faithful and conscientious in the discharge of every trust, wise in counsels, and eminently gifted in management. See Wilson, Prob. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 142.

Martin (St.) of Braga, a prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, was born in Pannonia about the beginning of the 6th century. In his youth he visited the holy places of Palestine. He afterwards went to Galicia, in Spain, where he did much to preserve orthodoxy among the population, which inclined strongly to Arianism. He established several convents there, and was himself abbot of Dona Maria until about 590. At that time he was made archbishop of Braga, now Braga, in Portugal. As such he took part in the second Council of Braga, in 563, against the Priscillianists and Arians, and in 572 presided over the third council at the suggestion of Bishop Tertullian. He died about 590. He was a very voluminous writer. Among his works we notice Formula homest vete s. a. diffrentia quattor viratum (in the Bibl. Patr. Lusii. x, 382 sq.), and Gallandi Bibl. Patr. xii, 275 sq.). This work was very well received. The Historia Fortunatorum were not translated from Greek into Latin by Martin, as some have supposed, but by Paschasius, deacon of the convent of Donnia, at Martin's instigation (Roswey, Vit. Patr. [Antr. 1615], p. 1002 sq.; see also Grisee, Handbuche d. altl. Literaturgesch. ii, 127). Some Latin poeins of Martin are to be found in Simeoni, opp. (ed. Ven.), ii, 658, and in Gallandi Bibl. Patr.). But more important than all these is his Collectio Orientalum Canonom, s. Caput-ula Lexeex collecta ex Graecia symmod et vera, etc. (in Agneta, ii, 1853; iii, 1853; iv, 1854). This was a work in which he demonstrated the incorrectness of preceding editions. His edition was violently attacked by Simon and Leclerc, but Martianay as vigorously defended it. This controversy lasted a long time, yet did not prevent him from publishing a large number of works, more remarkable for their learning and ingenuity than for large-ness of thought or critical acumen. He was a man (after the 40 years elapsed from the creation of the world to the advent of Christ:—Trattato d'argomento, ou manière d'expliquer l'Écriture par le secours des trois systèmes, la propre, la figurée, et l'harmonique (1704)—Vie de St. Jerôme (1706)—Harmoïne analytique de plusieurs sons choisis et rapportés inconnus de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament (1708)—Essays d'Exégèse et de Remarques sur les traductions Françaises du Nouveau Testament (1709)—Le Nouveau Testament traduit en Français sur la Vulgate (1712)—Méthode sucrée, pour apprendre à expliquer l'Écriture suivie par l'Écriture même (1716) etc. See Journal des Savants, Aug. 9, 1717; Hist. Lit. de la Congrégation de St. Maur, p. 892-922; Herzog, Real-Encyklopäd. ix, 120; Hoefer, Nouv. Bioq. Générale, xxxiv, 2. (J. N. P.)

Martin of Dunin, a noted Polish Roman Catholic prelate, was born in the village of Wal, near Rawa, Prussian Poland, Nov. 11, 1774. Until his twelfth year he was kept at the Jesuit school of Rawa; then entered a student at the Gymnasium of Bromberg; but, having determined to devote his life to the Church and her cause, he was sent to Rome, and became a student in the Collegium Germanicum in 1788. Upon the completion of his studies, he was promoted to the order of subdeacon; later, by papal dispensation, successively deacon and priest, when he returned to his native country, which had in the meantime lost its independence, and fallen a prey to the Russians, Austrians, and Prussians. Martin himself was not a Prussian subject, he took a position in the diocese of Cracow, and was thus in the employ of that portion of the Roman Catholic Church of Poland under control of the Austrian government. In 1806 the archbishop of Gnesen, count Raczyński, called him to Gnesen, and conferred upon Martin first a canonicate, then in the metropolitan church, and shortly after made him auditor. Thereafter honors came fast and freely. In 1815 he was made chancellor of the metropolitan chapter; in 1824 master of the Cathedral of Posen, and shortly after was intrusted by the Prussian government with the supervision of the Roman Catholic school in the diocese. In 1829 he was promoted to the position of capitular vicar and general-administrator, and in 1831 was honored with the archiepiscopal chair of Gnesen and Posen. This position came to him in an hour when great discretion and strong nerves were needed to withstand the many trials of a priest in a turbulent time. The discontent of the Poles in 1830, and the rebellion in which it resulted, caused the government of Frederick William III to look with suspicion upon the priesthood of the papal church. It was a notorious fact that the latter was leagued with the revolutionists. Poland was then a devoted daughter of Rome; Prussia decidedly Protestant, the most daring opponent of papal interests. Could it be expected that the Roman Catholics would hesitate to work for the restoration of Polish independence? Has not even in our day the Prussian government all it can do to control the priest-hood in that section of her territory? See Posen. To prevent the further spread of revolutionary tendencies among the priesthood, the Prussian government inaugurated a new policy, the execution of which resulted in a spirited contest between the representative of Rome, our Martin of Dunin, and the secular authority of the province of Posen. The difficulties commenced at the seat of the metropolitan. A school for the education of Roman priests was sustained at this place by the government. Hitherto the instructors had been chosen by the Church for whose service it was intended, but now the government insisted upon its right to choose the incumbents of the professorships. The archbishop protested, but the government proceeded without any regard to his opposition. Fresh fuel was added to the flame in 1837. By the bull Instruendum emendatum XII (June 27, 1749), consented marriages were made possible only by special dispensation from the pope, and, when permission was grar-
ed, the children of such unions were demanded for the Church of Rome. Poland had conceded this point to the Roman pontiff, but the Prussian government in 1837 declared that in its territory no such dispensation was needed, nor any understanding in regard to the religious education of any children from such a union. This action on the part of the government to the archbishop held to be illegal, and he stoutly asserted his right to dissent from the decision of all secular authority. Had he rested here, and awaited the settlement of this difficulty between the pope of Rome and the king of Prussia, all would have been well. Martin, however, proceeded on the assumption that the measures which clearly revealed him as a plotter against the government he had sworn to uphold. He secretly entered into communication with the clergy of his dioceses, and threatened with excommunication any and all priests who should obey the mandates of the government without his consent. Promptly the government, after hearing of this procedure, arrested the archbishop, and brought him to trial, and he was condemned to six months' confinement in a fortress, incapacitated for office, and burdened with the expense of his trial. Previous to his arrest the government had vacated the palaces of the archbishop and of the prince of Posen, and had assured them of the preservation of their rights and privileges as heretofore, but, notwithstanding all these precautions, the priesthood remained firmly bound to the interests of their religious shepherd, and no sooner had Martin of Dunin been condemned and arrested than the Roman Catholics, no doubt instrumental in securing an understanding between the archbishop and her royal spouse, Martin returned to Posen Aug. 5, 1840, and died Dec. 26, 1842.

See Pohl, Martin von Dunin (Marienburg, 1848, 8vo); Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, s. v. See also Pocci, F. (J. H. W.)

Martin (St.) or Tours, a prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, was born in Pannonia about the year 316. He was educated at Pavia, and, at the desire of his father, who was a military man, entered the army under Constantine I, who was then emperor. When eighteen he became a convener of Christianity was baptized, and a few years afterwards went to Gaul, and there became a pupil and follower of St. Hilarius (q. v.) Pictaviensis. He quitted the army, and zealously devoted himself to the interests of orthodox Christianity. On a visit to Lombardy, wishing to see his parents, he passed through Gaul, where he was received with great favor by the public, and especially by the bishop of Tours. This favor led to the publication of a great number of works for instruction and edification; but, zealous for the glory of God and the honor of his Church, he did not confine his efforts to this field. He was indefatigable in preaching, in catechizing, and in missionary work, and during the course of his labors traversed nearly the whole of the archbishopries of Mayence and Tours. His benevolent spirit found expression in the readiness with which he ministered to the diversified wants of the people, among whom the instruction of the unlearned and of children came to be a special note. He was more应用 with removing thorns and stones from the highways, and with placing stepping-stones in streams for the convenience of travellers. Withal, he was a thorough ascetic, eating neither flesh nor fish, and traveling without a horse or sandals in the most inclement weather; and he attended mass as often as possible each day for more than twenty years. As a teacher, he was wont to lay special stress on the adoration of the mass and the worship of the Virgin, which doctrines he was often compelled to defend against opponents. He organized a number of brotherhoods in places of importance on the Rhine, and rebuilt many churches that had been destroyed in the Thirty-years' War. He died, after a

Martin submitted, but left Trèves at once, and it is said expressed himself sorry for having purchased the pardon of Narces and Locardius at that price. He died at Candes about 316. His life by his contemporaries, and a very curious letter of the bishop of Bourges to the emperor, is the first who, without suffering death for the truth, has been honored in the Latin Church as a confessor of the faith. The festival of his birth is celebrated on the 11th of November. In Scotland this day still marks the beginning of the winter-term, which is called Martinmas (q. v.). In Germany, also, his memory continues to our day among the populace in the celebration of the Martinmas. See Gregorius Turon, Hist. Francor. lib. x; Gervaise, Vie de Saint Martin (1695); Dupuy, Histoire de Saint Martin (1802); Jean Maun, Metropol. Tournaisis; Hist. Litt. de France, i, 417; Gallia Christ. vol. xiv, col. 6; Schaff, CH. Hist. ii, 203 sq.; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. i, 278; Montalembert, Monks of the West, vol. i, bk. iii; Mrs. Jameson, Sacred and Legendary Art, p. 720; Hoefer, Nov. Hist. Generale, xxxiv, 14; Herzog, Real-Enzyklop. ix, 126 sq. (J. H. W.)

Martin of Trèves, a Capuchin monk, was born about 1630, in the archbishopric of Trèves. He took the cowl at an early age, and a little later became a lecturer of theology; but in consequence of a pestilence, whose ravages broke up his school in 1666, he devoted himself to the care of the sick. A catechist, by his ministrations, he was received with great favor by the public, and especially by the bishop of Trèves. His exertions led to the publication of a great number of works for instruction and edification; but, zealous for the glory of God and the honor of his Church, he did not confine his efforts to this field. He was indefatigable in preaching, in catechizing, and in missionary work, and during the course of his labors traversed nearly the whole of the archbishoprics of Mayence and Trèves. His benevolent spirit found expression in the readiness with which he ministered to the diversified wants of the people, among whom the instruction of the unlearned and of children came to be a special note. He was more应用 with removing thorns and stones from the highways, and with placing stepping-stones in streams for the convenience of travellers. Withal, he was a thorough ascetic, eating neither flesh nor fish, and traveling without a horse or sandals in the most inclement weather; and he attended mass as often as possible each day for more than twenty years. As a teacher, he was wont to lay special stress on the adoration of the mass and the worship of the Virgin, which doctrines he was often compelled to defend against opponents. He organized a number of brotherhoods in places of importance on the Rhine, and rebuilt many churches that had been destroyed in the Thirty-years' War. He died, after a
brief illness, Sept. 10, 1712. His works, after being dis-
regarded for a time, are again offered to the public; 
they mostly consist of contributions to practical reli-
gion. The most important are Christian Doctrine (Co-
logne, 1666) — History of the Church (1688) — Exposi-
tion of the Mass (1698); — Legends of Saints (1700): 
— All the Directories, or Precepts for the Finance of 
the Church of Christ (1731); — Life of Christ (Mayence and Augsburg, 1708). — Wetzeler u. Weise (R. C.), Kirchen Lexikon, xii, 771 sq.

Martin I, Pope, son of Fabricius, a distinguished citizen of the Papal States, was called to the papal chair July 5, 640, as successor to Theodore I. The emperor Constans II made every exertion to induce Martin to 
accept the See, but he had promised to keep his 
professed forbidding discussions between the orthodox Romanists and the Monotheletes. Martin, on the contrary, assembled a council at Rome (the first Lateran), without the emperor's consent, in Oct., 649, in which all heresies, and partic-
ularly that of the Monotheletes, were condemned, and the 
decrees of Heraclius and of Constans II denounced. (See for details the article LATERAN COUNCIL [1].) The emperor, enraged at this opposition, caused Martin to be 
taken prisoner, June 19, 653, and exiled him to the island of Naxos. On Sept. 17, 654, the pope was 
taken to Constantinople, and kept in prison there for six 
months. But he bore all his trials with great firmness, 
refusing to be reconciled to the heretics, and was finally 
transported to the Thracian Chersonesus. There, in 
the midst of unfriendly barbarians, he had to suffer the great-
dest of all the deaths he bore in. But it was with patience 
and piety, and died Sept. 16, 655. His body was later 
removed to Rome. He is commemorated by the 
Church of Rome Nov. 12. Eighteen encyclical letters 
attributed to Martin are published in the Bibliotheca 
Patrum, and in Labbe's Concilia. See F. Fagi, Breviar-
ium, etc., completea illustrata Pontificum Romanor-
um gesta conciliorum, etc.; Platinus, Vita Pontif. Romani; 
Artaud de Montor, Hist. des souverains Pontifes Ro-
main, vol. i; Bower, Hist. Popes, iii, 44 sq.; Riddle, Hist. 
Popacy, i, 297; Baur, Dreieinigkeitslehre, vol. i and ii; 
of the Christian Religion and Church, iii, 185, 187, 188, 
191; Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, ix, 122. (J. H. W.)

Martin II (Marinus I), Pope, was born at Monte-
fiascone, in the Papal States. He was thence sent to 
Constantinople (686, 688, 881) as papal legate to oppose 
the nomination of Photius as patriarch, but when he 
was about to sail, Dec. 23, 883, did not consent in the 
policy of his predecessor, John VIII, but reversed the 
consequence of Photius, of bishop Formosus of Porto, 
and others. His reign lasted only fourteen months. He 
died Feb. 14, 881. See Fleury, Hist. Eccl. iii, 542; 
F. Fagi, Breviarium Pontificum Romanorum, etc.; Mu-
ratori, Ann. Ital.; Artaud de Montor, Hist. des souve-
rains Pontifes Romains, ii, 141; Bower, Hist. Popes, v, 
Générale, xxxiv, 18; Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, ix, 124.

Martin III (called by some Marinus II), Pope, a 
Roman by birth, succeeded Stephen II, 945. He 
died only four years after, and was succeeded by Agapetus II. Martin III was a patron of learning, and an 
noble Christian exemplar.

Martin IV (Simon de la Brie), Pope, was probably a 
native of Tournai, France, and of humble origin. He 
was educated at Tours, and there entered the Franciscan 
order. St. Louis, king of France, desired him, and gave 
him a position at the church of St. Martin. In 1282 he 
was created cardinal by pope Urban IV, and by pope 
Gregory X was appointed apostolical legate to the 
French court. He continued in this office under the 
popes Hadrian V, John XXI, and Nicholas III; but upon 
the decease of the last named (Aug. 29, 1280) he was 
elected successor in the papal chair in 1281, through the 
influence of Charles of Anjou, king of Sicily and Naples. 
The "Sicilian Vespers" (q. v.), in 1282, having elected 
Charles of Sicily, Martin came to the support of his 
royal friend with all his influence, and even by the spirit-
ual censures he had at his command sought to main-
tain French domination in Sicily. He excommunicated 
Peter of Aragon, whom the Sicilians had elected king; 
but his excommunication was of no more avail than the 
arms of the new French monarchs, for the Papacy had no 
weight in Sicily. Martin also excommunicated the Byzantine 
emperor Michael, and by this measure widened the breach 
between the Greek and Latin churches. He died in 
1298, and was succeeded by Honorius IV. It is to 
the use of the Councils of the Church in the unpopular 
cause of Charles of Anjou that many Church historians 
supply the decline and ultimate extinction of the authority in 
temporals which the papacy had hitherto exercised. 
Not only did he lower the popular esteem of the papal 
authority, but he made himself a laughing-stock by 
his falsehood and inability to make good his promises. 
Letters of this pope are found in D'Achery, Spicilieg, iii, 694. His biography (Vita) was written by Bernard, Grindo, 
and by Muratori. See Muratori, Annali d'Italia, vii, 
485-482; Artaud de Montor, Hist. des souverains Pon-
tifes Romains, ii, 56-68; Bower, Hist. Popes, vi, 324; 

Martin V (Otto de Colonna), pope from 1417 to 1431, 
was the son of Agapetus de Colonna, and a de-
scendant of one of the most ancien and illustrious 
families of Italy. Martin studied canon law at Perugia, 
and, on the death of his father, was elected pope in 
1417 by Urban VI prothonotary and referendary; by Boni-
face IX nuncio to the States of Italy; under Innocent 
VII he received the appointment of cardinal deacon of 
St. George ad Aulicium Aureum; and by John XXIII he 
was appointed apostolic legate for the patrimony of St. 
Peter, and vicar-general for the apostolic see in Umbria. 
When Gregory XII, because of a breach of his oath of 
office, became so unpopular as to be deserted by his card-
inals, Martin alone adhered to him steadfastly until he 
was deposed by the Council of Pisa. He was likewise 
islanded on a Tuscany, in 1422, by his successor, 
John, and even followed him in his flight from Con-
stance, thus clearly foretokening the uncompromising 
stand which he afterwards took against all opposition 
to what he conceived to be the papal prerogative. 
The general discontent with the abusive reign of pope 
John XXIII, which Gerson, the noted tutor of the 
University of Paris, had severely attacked, not even 
hesitating to say that the pontiff was "no longer ser-
vant of servants, but John, the lord of lords," as well as 
other suspicious events, had resulted in the general 
council (1417) (q. v.), whose moving spirit Martin 
determined on reform. Their two great objects were 
the restoration of the Church's unity, and the reforma-
tion of the abuses which had crept in. One of their 
first steps, largely influenced by the emperor Sigismund, 
was to depose pope John. There still remained, how-
ever, two rival pontiffs, Benedict XIII and Gregory XII, 
each claiming the title of supreme head of the Church. 
The latter of these was induced to abdicate, and the for-
mer, being without any temporal support, was ignored 
by the council. The election of a pope was forthcoming 
considered. The choice fell upon cardinal Otto de Co-
lonna by an overwhelming majority of the electors from 
the five nations represented in the council, and the 
umanious vote of the cardinals. Neander (Ch. Hist. 
v, 126) thus narrates the proceedings for the election: 
"The Germans set the example of sacrificing their own 
will for the good of the Church by declari-
ing themselves ready to give their votes for an Italian; 
they also prevailed on the English to yield. The French 
and Spaniards were refractory at first; but finally, 
after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, on St. Martin's day, 
in November, they were persuaded to place for the 
Holy Spirit as a spirit of concord; and on the same day 
cardinal Otto of Colonna was chosen pope, af-
after the election had lasted three days." The election
having taken place on St. Martin's day, the new pope, in honor of that saint, assumed the title of Martin V. The whole assembly was in an ecstasy of joy at the result, especially because it exhibited the unanimity of Liliothio conflicting parties. Martin was immediately invested with the papal robes and placed on the altar, where the emperor hastened to do him homage by kissing his feet.

But scarcely was Martin securely seated on the pontifical throne when the whole face of affairs at Constance changed, and it soon became evident that all instabilities had been eliminated, for which the Diet of Bourg had been called and John XXIII deposed, had been put away from the mind of Martin. Mild, but sagacious and resolute, "seeming to yield everything to the emperor and council, he conceded nothing." As early as April following his election (Nov. 11, 1417), he dissolved the council, which had struggled through three years and a half for reform, without being any nearer the accomplishment of their hopes than when they began, and the spirit of advance which had inspired the uprising of Bohemia and the organization of the Lollards (q. v.) was crushed for a time, to rise only two centuries later in the Hussites and the Hussites' movements. The result of all was that Italy remained a schism nearly destroying the mother Church. So far from aiding a reform, Martin V's first act was one of tyranny. "The papal chancery had been the object of the longest, loudest, and most just clamor. The day after he entered the pope published the decree, abolishing all the regulations established by his predecessors, even by John XXII. . . . The form was not less dictatorial than the substance of the decree. It was an act of the pope, not of the council. It was an absolute resumption of the whole power of reformation, so far at least as the papal court, into his own hands" (Milman, Latin Christianity, vii, 517). The Council of Constance, instead of shaking the papal supremacy, had, by the choice of Otto de Colonna, raised it higher than ever before by producing a pope who, as Romanists will have it, "recovered the waning reverence of Christendom." Martin V was the product of no schism or party, but of the Church universal, and he was justified in seeking such supremacy; nor do we wonder that, in the last consistory of the cardinals at Constance, Martin V put forth a constitution by which, in direct contradiction to the principles so distinctly laid down at Constance, he directed that no one should be allowed to dispute any decision of the pope in matters of faith, and to appeal from him to a general council (Neander, v, 127). See INFALLIBILITY. From Constance the pope proceeded to Rome, where he was received with demonstrations of great joy, and honored with the title of the Father of His Country. He set himself with great energy to the task of restoring the fallen glory of the Eternal City, and so well did he succeed that he received the additional title of Romulus the Second. By his address and superior sagacity, Martin V succeeded in bringing a.pro-tr sensual peace with Alphonso of Aragon, and at Aix-la-Chapelle, a truce was made by which all questions of succession were left to determination, which at once secured his own ends and pacified a stubborn adversary. At the Council of Constance the next general council was appointed to meet, five years later, at Pavia. Accordingly such a council was actually opened there in the year 1418, but, on account of the spread of the pestilence called the Black Death, it was dissolved and transferred to Sienna. But at Sienna also only a few sessions were held; and, on the pretense that the small number of prelates assembled did not authorize the continuance of the council, in conformity with the determination of the Council of Constance, the next meeting was not held to be held a year later, in the year 1431 at Basle (comp. Fisher [G. F.], The Reformation [N.Y. 1873, 8vo], p. 43). See JULIAN, Cardinal. This council was intended to close the difficulty with the Hussites (q. v.), whose leaders Martin V had so summarily disposed of at Constance (q. v.), and to effect the reunion of the Greek Church. At this important crisis he died, in Rome, of an apoplectic fit, in February, 1431. As a man, Martin V was of that class who form their determinations deliberately and adhere to them steadily, and, if necessary, die in them. He was of great administrative ability. He has been accused of avarice, though perhaps unjustly. He certainly favored learning, and the palaces of his cardinals were the schools of advancement for the youth of Italy. He has also been charged, and with greater justice, with nepotism, an instance of which is the appointment of one of his nephews to the archdeaconry of Canterbury. The main features of his reign are the pacification of Italy, the restoration of peace between France and England, the rebuilding of Rome, and the wars against Bohemia. He was succeeded by pope Eugenius IV. See Bower, Hist. Popes, vii, 200 sq.; Neander, Ch. Hist., 185 sq.; Milman, Lat. Christianity, vii, 518 sq.; Muratori, Script. iii, p. ii; Leo, Gesch. v. Italien, iv, 520 sq.; Trollope, Hist. Florence, vol. ii (see Index in vol. iv); Reichel, Roman See in Middle Ages, p. 492 sq.; Life of Cardinal Julian, by De Angelis, 1855, 1857, 57 sq. and 243 sq.; Hensius, Hist. Huss and Hussians, ii, 335 sq.; Foukes, Divisions of Christendom, vol. ii, ch. vi, p. 83, 184; Butler (C. M.), Eccles. Hist. ii, 109-118; Waddington, Ch. Hist. p. 105, 110, 137, 142, 196; Jahrb. deutsch. Theol. 1871, iii, 534.

Martin, André, a French ecclesiastic and philosopher, was born in Poitou in 1621; was admitted to the oratory in 1641, and instructed in philosophy. In 1679 he became a professor of theology at Saumur, but was suspended some time after, because accused of Jansenism. He died at Poitiers, Sept. 26, 1696. He was one of the earliest advocates of the Cartesian philosophy, and wrote Philosophia Moralia Christiana (Angers, 1658). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxxiv, 32.

Martin, Asa, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington Co., Ohio; studied theology privately; was licensed by Salem Presbytery, and in 1848 ordained pastor of Mount Vernon Church, Ind. In 1848 he became pastor of Hartford Church, Ind.; in 1852, of Bloomfield, Iowa; in 1854, of West Grove, Iowa; in 1861, of Olivet, in Maharaska Co., Iowa, where he died, Nov. 9, 1866. Mr. Martin was a man of retiring manners, a silent, prudent, an excellent preacher, and a earnest and sound preacher. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almana, 1867, p. 912.

Martin, Claude, a French theologian, was born at Tours in 1619. He had scarcely attained twelve years of age when he was abandoned by his mother, who entered the convent of the Ursulines. After having studied for some time in the city of Orleans, he entered the Order of the Benedictines. In 1654 he was appointed prior of Blancs-Manteaux. He afterwards filled the same charge at Saint-Cornelle de Compiegne, at Saint-Serge d'Angers, at Bonne-Nouvelle de Rouen, and at Mar-moutiers. He died Aug. 9, 1696. Martin was distinguished both for great learning and deep piety. His works are Méditations Christiennes pour les Dimanches, les fêtes, et les principales fêtes de l'année (Paris, 1669, 2 vols. 4to)—Complété pour la retraite du mois (Paris, 1670, 12mo)—Pratique de la règle de Saint-Benoît (Paris, 1674, 12mo)—Instructions merveilleuses pour la cérémonie, supérieure des Ursulines en Canada (Paris, 1671, 4to)—Méditation pour la fête et pour l'octave de sainte Ursule (Paris, 1678, 16mo).—Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, vol. xxxiii, s. v.

Martin, C. P., a Congregational minister, was born in Illinois about 1814. He was educated at Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois; taught in a academy at Lisbon, Illinois, four years, and then entered the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, to prepare for the ministry. Upon the completion of his studies, he was
sent by the American Missionary Society to act as missionary among the Copts in Egypt. His health failing him, he was obliged to return after a three years' stay in the East. Later he became pastor of the Congregational Church in Peru, Illinois, and remained there until 1863, when he returned to the west and became a member of the western branch of the American Tract Society. He labored among the soldiers at Chattanooga until he fell in the work, March 7, 1864.

**Martin, David,** a French Protestant theologian, was born at Revel, Languedoc, in 1639. He studied philosophy at Nimes, and theology at Pay-Laurens. After acting as pastor at several places, he was obliged to leave France in consequence of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes: so great was the consideration he enjoyed that Roman Catholics themselves assisted him to flee. He next became pastor at Utrecht, and, although invited to Deventer as professor of theology in 1686, and to Haag in 1685, he remained attached to his congregation. He died at Utrecht in 1721. He wrote three volumes of sermons, some polemical and apologetic works, and some critical essays, all of which give evidence of his learning and talent. The most important of his works are: *Traité sur l'Ecriture Sainte,* explication des notes courtes et claires (Utrecht, 1696, 4to): the notes are partly dogmatic, partly literary, and were subsequently used by the editor of the French Roman Catholic translation of the N. T. published at Brussels (1700, 4 vols. 12mo): — *Les Vieux et le Nouveau Testament* (Amst. 1703, 2 vols. fol.). It contained some magnificent copper-plate engravings, and was often reprinted. But Martin's chief claim on posterity lies in his revision of the Geneva version of the Bible, which he undertook at the request of the Walloon communities. It appeared in 1707 (Amst. 2 vols. fol.), and was often reprinted in 8vo. The first edition contained theological and critical notes, with a general introduction, and special ones appended to each book; these, however, were omitted in the subsequent popular editions. It was approved by the Synod of Leuwarden in 1710. Martin's translation, subsequently revised by Osterwald, is still the one most in use in the Protestant churches of France. Among his other works we notice *Sermons sur divers textes de l'écriture sainte* (Amst. 1708, 8vo): — *L'Excellence de la foi et de ses effets, expliquée en 8x sermons* (Amst. 1710, 2 vols. 8vo):— *Traité de la Religion naturelle* (Amst. 1713, 8vo; translated into Dutch in 1720, English in 1720, and German in 1725): — *Le vrai sens du Psalme cx* (Amst. 1715, 8vo). His dissertation on natural religion caused quite a long and spirited controversy with Arian Emlyn (q.v.), Robert Licier, Miró, vol. xxi; Chaufépifie, Dict. hist.; Prosper Marchand, Dict.; Naray, Bel. Craig, vol. ii; Haag, La France Protesante, vol. vii; Hoeve, Nouv. Bel. Générale, xxxiv, 84; Herzog, Real-Encylop. ix, 130.

**Martin, Bnoch R.** a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington Cou., Ind., about the year 1811. He received a good common-school education; studied theology privately; was licensed by Cincinnati Presbytery, and ordained by Salem Presbytery in 1836. He preached for several years to the Mt. Vernon and Utica churches, in Clark Co., Ind.; thence removed to Jefferson Co., Ind., and preached to the Mt. Hebron, Sharon, and Mt. Vernon churches, and afterwards became pastor of Sharon Church, Ill. In 1862 he accepted a call to the Pisgah and Sharon churches, Ind. He died Nov. 26, 1863. Mr. Martin was a very useful minister, and a sincere Christian; he did much for the cause of education and the suppression of intemperance. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 167.

**Martin, Gregory,** an English Roman Catholic theologian of the 16th century, was a native of Sussex, and was admitted a scholar of St. John's College, Oxford, in 1557. He became professor of Hebrew at Douay, and subsequently at Rheims. He died in 1582. He is supposed to have been the author, or one of the authors, of the Rheims translation of the New Testament, and of the Old Testament in the Douay version. He wrote several theologically-controversial pamphlets, among them *A Discovery of the manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by the Heretics of our Days, specially the English Antichrists* (printed in Fulke's *Defence of the Translations, Parker Society, 1843*).—Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. a. v.; Darling, Cyclop. Biblio. a. v.

**Martin, Jacques de,** a French ecclesiastic, noted as a writer on philosophical subjects, was born in the diocese of Mirepoix, May 11, 1684; was educated at Toulouse; entered the order of the Congregation of St. Maur, and was made abbot of the monastery of St. Maur at Paris in 1727, and died there Sept. 5, 1751. He was a multifarious writer, and possessed an unusual acquaintance with the most diversified subjects of learning. But he was censured for the immodesty of his illustrations. His most important work is *La Religion des Gaulois* (Paris, 1727, 2 vols. 4to), in which he attempts to prove that the religion of the Gauls was derived from that of the patriarchs; and that, consequently, an illustration of their religious ceremonies must tend to throw light on many dark passages in the Scriptures. He wrote also *Expositions de plusieurs textes difficiles de l'Écriture Sainte:* — *De l'origine de l'âme, selon le sentiment de Saint Augustin* (1736, 12mo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Bel. Générale, xxxiv, 87.

**Martin, James,** a Presbyterian minister, was born in Union District, S. C., May 14, 1801. He graduated at the Newberry Theological Seminary, at Chapin, S. C., in 1825; studied divinity under the care of Dr. Cunningham, of Concord Church, Green Co., Ala.; was licensed in 1827, and soon after ordained as a domestic missionary in West Florida and South Alabama. In 1830 he took charge of the churches at Linden and Prairie Bluffs, Ala.; in 1837 moved to Louisi. Miss., and in 1844 he organized a Church; in 1841 became pastor of a Church at Moultona Springs, Miss.; in 1848 removed to Memphis, Tenn., where he taught school until 1850, when he went to Arkansas, and organized several churches. He died Sept. 14, 1860. Mr. Martin possessed an excellent mind; his education was sound and classical, his piety devout and habitual. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 445.

**Martin, John** (1), an English Baptist minister of the 18th century, was in early life a mechanic; but, brought under the influence of Gospel teaching, he studied, and became the Baptist clergyman of a Baptist congregation at London. He published a number of occasional *Sermons* and theological treatises (1763-1807). Of these, the most important was *The Conquest of Canaan* (Lond. 1797, 12mo). Of his occasional sermons, the one on Acts xiv, 19-22, and the special mention, entitled *The Gospel of our Salvation* (Lond. 1798, 8vo). Besides, there were published three volumes of his sermons, one treating of *The Character of Christ* (1783, 8vo); the other two were edited by Thomas Palmer (1817, 2 vols. 8vo). John Martin is described by Ivinny (Baptists) as a "man of strong mental powers," and as a truly "evangelical preacher." See his *Autobiography* (1797, 12mo). See also Darling, Cyclop. Biblio. a. v.; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. a. v.

**Martin, John** (2), an English painter of Biblical subjects, was born near Hexham, Northumberland, July 19, 1789; went to London in 1806, and, after some years spent in obscure studious, made his first appearance as an exhibitor at the Royal Academy in 1812. His picture was entitled *Saddak in Search of the Waters of Oblivion,* and attracted much notice. It was followed within two years by the *Expulsion from Paradise, Cys- tar,* and "The first Speech to the Sun," which established his name. The last of these works was a great success in point of popularity, but it was also the cause of a quarrel between Martin and the English Academy, in consequence of which he never obtained any distinction from the society. From this period till nearly the close of his life
he incessantly painted pictures in a style which was considered "sublime" by the same sort of people who thought Montgomery's Satan and Pollok's Course of Time equal to Paradise Lost. The principal of these productions are Belshazzar's Feast (1821); Creation (1824); The Deluge (1826); The Fall of Niniveh (1828); Pandemonium (1841); Morning and Evening (1844); The Last Man (1853). He died in Man. Feb. 9, 1854. — Chambers, Cyclop. s. v. See Autobiography of John Martin in the Athenæum (1854).

**Martin, John Nicholas,** a distinguished minister of the Lutheran Church, was born in the duchy of Deux Ponts, or Zweibrücken, in Rhenish Bavaria, and came to this country about the middle of the 18th century, in company with a Lutheran colony, as their spiritual teacher. They landed in Philadelphia with the intention of settling permanently on the rich soil of Pennsylvania, but, as the land they desired could not be procured, they passed on to the valley of the Shenandoah, whither many of the German emigrants had already been attracted; but the congregation to which Mr. Martin ministered finally determined to locate in South Carolina, in a district between the Broad and Saluda rivers, a favorite spot with the Germans of that day in the South. The German population in this region increased fast, and Lutheran churches were established on the neighboring rivers. The Martin editor remained for many years, all the time officiating in his vernacular German. In 1776 he took charge of the Lutheran Church in Charleston. This was his last field of labor. Many reminiscences of his life and services during this eventful period of our country's history are still preserved. The American Revolution interrupted the peaceful course of his ministry, and exposed him to various annoyances and trials. His naturally ardent temperament, as well as his love of liberty, led him to expose the cause of the American colonies with great zeal and public devotion. He was arrested by the enemy; and when it was ascertained that he would not pray for the king, and that his ministrations were not favorable to the royal cause, his culprit labors were interdicted, he was put under arrest, and a guard placed over him. Subsequently his property was confiscated, and he driven from the city. He remained in the interior of the state until the conclusion of the war. On his return in 1783, although aged and his physical vigor gone, his congregation still clung to him. They urged him to resume his pastoral relations; but he ministered to them only until a regular pastor could be procured for them from Germany. In 1787 he was released from further service, with a vote of thanks for his fidelity with which he had ministered to the spiritual interests of his people. He now retired to his little farm near Charleston, where his physical power gradually failed, and he closed his honored and useful life July 27, 1795, illustrating in his death the principles which through a long life he had advocated. Mr. Martin was faithfully devoted to his work, and exceedingly useful as a minister of the Gospel. He possessed an integrity that no considerations of personal interest or expediency could seduce from the straight line of duty. He was a man of great courage and decision, firm and persistent in the maintenance of his principles, with an energy of will and a zeal which no discouragements could repress and no failure abate. In the vindication of what he believed was the truth, he was prepared for any emergency. The people appreciated his sagacity, and relied on his clear, practical judgment. He steadfastly devoted himself to their interests. It was the constant burden of his heart and the earnest purpose of his life to honor Christ in the salvation of souls. He was regarded by the community in which he lived as a great blessing. His death was considered a public calamity. (M.L.S.)

**Martin, Margaret Maxwell,** a lady Methodist noted as a writer, was born at Dumfries, Scotland, in 1807, emigrated to America, and was married in 1836 to the Rev. William Martin, a Methodist preacher. She has published Methodism, or Christianity in Europe, and other religious works.

**Martin Mar-Prelate, Controversy of.** About 1590, the year of the Armada, there appeared in England a number of tracts—"a series of scurrilous libels in which the queen, the bishops, and the rest of the con"form ing clergy, were assailed with every kind of con"humelry" (Hutchins, p. 256).—Ezra, Ch. Hist., p. 224. Martin's tracts were printed by some radicals of the Puritan camp when the controversy between the Church and the Puritans was waxing hot. Marsden says "there is some reason to believe that the whole was a contrivance of the Jesuits." The charge against the latter is based, however, only upon assumption, and deserves no encouragement. The public printing-presseye being at the time shut against the Puritans, all their printing had to be done secretly, and it is therefore difficult to determine the origin of the "Martin Mar-Prelate" tracts. The Puritan divines Udall and Penny, on their trials, were charged with the authorship, or with a wilful knowledge of the authors; but they refused to make any revelations, and the real authors of these once dreaded and proscribed, but now ludicrous lampoons, remains a mystery. Their titles and contents are given somewhat in detail by Neale, Hist. of the Puritans (1886); Mar-Prelate tracts were reprinted as Puritan Disc. Tracts (Lond. 1843). See also Maskell, Hist. of the Martin Mar-Prelate Controversy (Lond. 1846); Marsden, Early Puritans, p. 198 sq.; id. Hist. of Christian Churches and Sects, i, 181; Hunt, Religious Thought of England, i, 72. (J.H.W.)

**Martin, Saint,** Marquise Louis Claude de, called "the Unknown Philosopher," a noted French mystic, was born at Ambaiss (Touraine) Jan. 18, 1748; was educated for the bar; preferred a military life, and, through the influence of M.de Choiseul, obtained a commission. The regiment to which he was assigned contained several officers who had been initiated into a sort of mystical freemasonry by the Portuguese mystic Martinez Pasqua, he soon became enamored with mystical doctrines, and read largely in that line. Mysticism, however, was at that time confined to rather narrow limits in France; the mind of nearly the whole country was absorbed in the rising school of materialism, and to combat the latter became the task of our obscure officer of the regiment of Foix. Saint-Martin soon threw up his commission, and gave himself wholly to writing and meditation, bent to crushed, by every means in his power, the cold, heartless form of speculation which was then prevailing over the whole country. First he flirted with the mystical works of Jacob Buxhme; but finally he originated a religious mysticism, which, according to Morell (Hist. of Philos., in the 18th Cent., p. 208), consisted of the principles of the Cambridge Platonist Henry More, "reared up under the guidance of a versatile and enthusiastic spirit, as a barrier against the philosophical sensationalism of Condillac and the religious scepticism of Voltaire," But as all mystical schools have sooner or later found their natural issue in fanaticism, so Saint-Martin also struck against this self-same rock, and, despite the guarded manner in which he handled the theoretical points of his own system, the heresies contained in his writings are neither few nor small. Yet, notwithstanding many fears and vagaries of an ultra eccentric description, Saint-Martin has left us one of the best refutations of sensualist errors on record, and can still interest the mind in his materialism. The last century has to our very day failed to receive the recognition deserved. With his eyes fixed upon the invisible world, he passed unheeded through all the horrors of the French Revolution; he saw the Reign of Terror, the Directory, the Consulate, and quietly and happily closed a life of great literary activity at Aulnay, near Paris, Oct. 13, 1808.

Among Saint-Martin's achievements, his victory over the sensationalist Garat deserves especial notice.
The legislators of the first French Revolution, in their attempt to remodel society after the Reign of Terror, had taken as their code of laws, and as their universal panacea, a debasing theory, which they, however, imagined would regenerate the world, and according to which they most naturally therefore wished to train the new generation, which was the origin of the Ecole Normale, subsequently remodelled and organized by Napoleon, and still rendering the greatest services as a seminary of teachers. Saint-Martin had been sent by the district he inhabited to attend the lectures delivered in that school; and, of course, was expected from the sound goad of the celebrated philosopher Garaud, whose precepts on 'ideology' were scarcely anything else but a rich chaff of Condillac, dressed up with much taste, but still more assurance. A disciple of Jacob Behme, the young mystic, felt that what society required was not the delusion of matter, nor the Encyclopédie made easy; he boldly rose up to refute the professor, and, by a reference to the third volume of the Débats des Écoles Normales, the reader can follow all the circumstances of a discussion which ended in Garaud's discomfiture. M. Caro (Saint-Martin's biographer) has supplied a valuable record of this whole affair—a most important epoch in the life of Saint-Martin. M. Caro, in his Essai sur la vie et la Doctrine de Saint-Martin (Paris, 1856), has given a complete list of Saint-Martin's works. They are rather numerous. The best are the following: Des États et des Hommes, ou les hommes au Pratique universel de la Science (1775); L'Homme de Désir; and De l'Esprit des Choses, ou coup d'œil Philosophiques sur la nature des êtres, et sur l'objet de leur existence (1800, 2 vols. 8vo). These supply a clue to the main features of the author's character, and by a careful study of them we are enabled to ascertain the exact position he occupied in the gallery of modern metaphysicians.

M. Damiron, in reviewing the life and works of Saint-Martin (Archives Littéraires, 1804), affords us the following résumé of Saint-Martin's views: "The system of Saint-Martin aims at explaining everything by means of man. Man is to him the key to every phenomenon, and the image of all truth. Taking, therefore, literally the famous oracle of Delphi, 'Nouss te ipsum,' he maintains that, if we fall into no mistakes respecting existence, and the harmony of all beings in the universe, we have only to understand ourselves, inasmuch as the body of man has a necessary relation to everything visible, and his spirit is the type of everything that is invisible. What we should study, then, are the physical faculties, whose exercise is often influenced by the senses and emotions, and the moral faculties, which concern the conscience, which supposes free-will. It is in this study that we must seek for truth, and we shall find in ourselves all the necessary means of arriving at it." This is it which our author calls natural revelation. For example: "The smallest attention," he says, "suffice to assure us that we can neither communicate nor form any idea without its being preceded by a picture or image of it, engendered by our own understanding; in this way it is that we originate the plan of a building or any other work. Our creative faculty is vast, active, inextinguishable; but, in order to act at all, we see that it operates only successively, and rarely by a simultaneous temporary, dependent, i.e. that it owes its origin to a creative faculty, which is superior, independent, and universal, of which ours is but a feeble copy. Man, therefore, is a type, which must have a prototype, and that prototype is God. This extract affords a fair insight, we think, into the philosophical mysticism by which Saint-Martin attempted to supplant the shallow materialism and growing infidelity of his age, and to induce his countrymen to take a deeper insight into the constitution of the human mind, and its close connection with the divine. See besides M. Caro's work above alluded to, Damiron, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de philosophie au 18e siècle, vol. i; Malter, Saint-Martin, Le Philosophie inconnu (1862); Morel, History of Modern Philosophy, p. 206, 209; London Quarterly Review, 1856 (Jan.); 1857 (Apr.), p. 177; Methodist Quarterly Review, 1863 (Apr.), p. 359. (J. H. W.)

Saint-Martin, Sarah, an English philanthropist, was born near Yarmouth in 1791, and died in 1845. She was distinguished for her labors in the cause of prison reform. See Brief Biographies, by Samuel Smiles; Rev. Erskine Neale, Christianity and Infidelity Contrasted; and Life of Madame de Staël (April, 1847).

Saint-Martin, Thomas, an English jurist noted for the part he took in the Marian persecution, was born at Cerne, in Dorsetshire, in the first half of the 16th century, and was educated at Winchester School and at New College, Oxford. In 1555 he was made chancellor of the diocese of Winchester. Martin wrote in Latin, Life of William of Wykeham, the founder of New College. He vehemently opposed the marriage of priests, and thus also created considerable excitement. He also took part with Story in the trial of archbishop Cranmer at Oxford. He died in 1584. See Hook, Eccl. Bispl. v.; Smyth, Azoil.; Wood, Athene Oxoniensis.

Saint-Martin, William Wsner, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Kahway, N. J., Dec. 18, 1857. He received a most careful parental training; pursued his preparatory studies in the Academy at Brooklyn, N. Y.; graduated at Yale College, as salutatorian of his class, in 1880; studied divinity at the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, where he graduated in 1885, and was immediately licensed and ordained as a home missionary to the Pacific coast. On his arrival there, he began his labors in Sonora, and joined Sierra Nevada Presbytery; thence he supplied the Howard Street Church, San Francisco, for a few months, and subsequently accepted a call from the Church at San José, but, before his installation took place, was taken ill and died, Oct. 16, 1865. Mr. Martin was characterized by an exceedingly frank and genial disposition, clear and discriminating habits of thought, and thorough, decided Christian principles. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 811.

Saint-Martin, Brethren, or Knights of the Order of St. Martin of Tours, were organized in 1294 by archbishop Gerhard, and renewed by archbishop Berthold in 1497, and flourished until the days of the French Revolution. Their object was the attainment of a godly life, brotherly love among the knights, and protection of the holy faith. Their sign was a golden shield, with a picture of St. Martin.—Regensburg Altn. Encyklop. a. v. Martinbrüder.

Saint-Maria, a Christian martyr in the reign of the tyrant Maximin, was a noble and beautiful virgin of Rome, and along with a host of Christians suffered martyrdom, their bodies, which were finished at length by the sword of the executioner, A.D. 235. Multitudes of Christians, in the course of these three years' persecution, were slain without trial, and buried indiscriminately in heaps, fifty or sixty being sometimes cast into a pit together.—Fox, Martials.

Saint-Maria. See ST. MARIA.

Saint-Martial, Stephen, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Maryland in 1798, and entered the itinerant ministry in 1806. He continued in active service for fifty-three years, filling the most important appointments in the Philadelphia and New York conferences. For twenty years he held the office of Conference marshal on the Rhinebeck, Long Island, Prattsville, New York, and Poughkeepsie districts. In all these posts his fidelity, prudence, and capacity were amply shown; and through his long term of ministerial service he maintained an unblemished and even exalted reputation. He was elected to nearly every General Conference between 1820 and 1856. He died at Tarrytown, N. Y., May 23, 1860. See Smith, Memorial Hist. N. Y. and N. Y. East Conf., p. 127.

Saint-Mat, Theodore Dwight, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born, of Congre-
gional parents, at Greenfield, Mass., Nov. 28, 1820; was educated at the Western Reserve Seminary; taught for a time by his conversion to serve in the local ministry for several years; was admitted into the Ohio Conference in the fall of 1852, and appointed to Blenod Circuit. His subsequent appointments were Maysville, Marietta, Logan, Pickerington, and Newark, when, in 1859, he left the Conference. Convinced, and thenceforth he sustained the relation of local preacher. In the fall of 1871 the presiding elder of the Zanesville District, at the request of the Circuit, appointed him as a supply with the venerable David Smith on the Hebron Charge, in the bounds of which he resided. He entered upon his work with commendable success, but died on April 7, 1872. He was gifted and fluent in language, and his pulpit efforts generally ranged above mediocrity. See S. C. Riker, in West. Christ. Advocate, July 10, 1872.

Martinet, Louis-François, a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Epernay, diocese of Rheims, April 19, 1758. At the age of sixteen he entered the regular canons of the Congregation of France, and during his course of studies at the abbey of St. Genevieve, in Paris, he was particularly favored by his superiors, who early made him teacher of philosophy and theology. Ordained priest in the year 1780, he was appointed, on the death of Mgr. Gaudron, archbishop of Rheims, in 1789, to succeed him as the bishop of Angers. In this capacity he was elected delegate to the provincial assembly of the clergy of Anjou, and later to the states-general of 1789. Faithful to the principles of the minority of the Constituent Assembly, he was constantly opposed to the legislative measures which, under the semblance of a useful reform, had a destructive and ruinous effect. He succeeded in escaping persecution, and emigrated to England. There he did not share in the illusions of his companions in exile of a speedy return to France; and, with a view to exercising his ministry undisturbed, he learned himself the use of the English. Gifted with indefatigable industry, and severely ascetic in his habits, he was enabled to regulate his time judiciously, and thus attain great success. In 1804 he returned to France, and at the period of the concordat was elected priest of Courbevoie. He passed from there to the parish of Saint-Leu-Saint-Gilles, at Paris. It is to Martinet that we owe the preservation of the church of Saint-Leu; and, notwithstanding the opposition of M. Frerot, the prefect of the Seine, he succeeded in interesting powerful protectors, and the church was not abandoned by the state. He was also enabled to use the funds of the abbeys for the reparation and embellishment of the edifice. In 1820 he was made priest of the parish church of Saint-Laurent, and, although advanced in age, his zeal and activity did not diminish in his administration. He died May 30, 1836. Martinet was one of the most worthy priests of the clergy of Paris. A knowledge of a great variety of subjects, an unbiased, clear, and methodical mind, a pleasing and easy eloquence, were increased by that urbanity of manner, that delicacy of tact, and that exquisite politeness which he observed in his habitual relations with persons of distinguished rank.—Biographie Universelle, Suppl., vol. Ixxii., s. v.

Martini, Antonio, an Italian prelate, was born at Prato in 1720. Having chosen an ecclesiastical career, and possessing a good knowledge of the ancient languages, he occupied his time in translating the sacred writings into Italian. Fuss VI., informed of his merits, appointed him bishop of Volterra (1770); and when the grand duke of Tuscany called him to the archiepiscopacy of Florence (1781), Martini was greatly opposed to all new ideas, and decided manifest his opinion in haughtily condemning the doctrines of Ricci in the synod.

Martini, Cornelio, a learned Belgian Lutheran, was born at Antwerp in 1567, and was educated in Germany, where he took the degree of doctor of arts and theology. In 1591 he taught logic in his native city, and for thirty years filled that chair successfully. He died at Hulsmékte, Dec. 17, 1621, at the age of fifty-four. His works are: Dialogus de veritate et falsitate (Antwerp, 1498, 12mo); — Metaphysica Commentatio, compendiariae, succinctae, et perspicue comprehendens univeram metophysicam doctrinam (Strasbourg, 1605, 12mo, et al.)—De Analysi logicae (Heilmol, 1619, et al.)—Commentarius in Apuleii Librum satyr, et moralium (Frankfort, 1621, 12mo)—Commentaria in Dogmatam aduersum Romantis libri quinque (Heilmol, 1623, 12mo)—Ethica.—Compendium Theologorum. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, vol. xxxiv., s. v.

Martini, Giambattista, best known under the title of "Padre Martini," was born at Bologna in 1706. Early in youth he entered the Order of St. Francis, and, prompted by a spirit of inquiry and love of antiquity, soon set out on travels which he extended to Asia. On his return to Europe, he devoted himself to the study of music under the celebrated Ant. Perti. In 1728 he became maestro di capella of the convent of his order, which office he retained till his death in 1784. "He was," says Dr. Burney, who knew him well, "regarded during the last fifty years of his life as the most profound harmonist, and the best acquainted with the art and science of music, in Italy. All the great masters of his time were ambitious of becoming his disciples and proud of his approbation. Martini was also a composer, and produced much music for the church, which was formerly held in esteem. His sixty canons in the unison, for two, three, and four voices, are still known, and admired for their smoothness and grace. His reputation depends, however, mainly on his Essay on Counterpoint (Bologna, 1774, 2 vols. folio), and on his History of Music (1781, 3 vols. 4to). See English Cyclop., s. v.

Martini, Martino, a Jesuit missionary, was born at Trent in 1614, visited China, and published, after his return, De Bello Tartarico in Sinia, which was translated into the principal European languages; also an excellent map of China ("Atlas Sinensis"); and a History of China previous to the Christian Era. He died in 1661.

Martini, Raymond, a Spanish Dominican friar, noted for his great attainments as an Orientalist, was born at Sobirats, Catalonia, near the middle of the 18th century. As a general chapter held at Toledo in 1720, Martini was selected as among the most promising and talented of his order to be educated as a defender of the faith. Spain was at that time the great center of the Catholic, Jewish, and Mohammedan scholarship, and the Dominican general Raymond de Penaforêt was bent upon a polemical war with the heretics. To defray the expenses of educating such of the priests and friars as might act as a polemic army, the general had secured a portion of the lands of the kings of Castile and Aragon. Both Hebrew and Arabic were assiduously studied by Martini, who, after having sufficiently qualified himself by the mastery of these Semitic tongues, promptly commenced his attack on the Jews in a work entitled Pugio fidei, which he finished in 1726. He is also reputed to have written Contra- trum Judæorum, and also A Conflagration of the Alcoran. The time of his decease is not generally known. The great knowledge which Martini displayed in his comments on the books and opinions of the Jews, has made some unjustly imagine that he was of that religion. The "Pugio fidei" is said to have been greatly enlarged after Martini's death. We are told that Bosquet, who died bishop of Montpelier, fell upon the manuscript, while he was with great ardor ruminating all the corners of the library of the College of Foix at Toulouse, about 1690, and, after copying it out of it, gave it to James Spiegel, a learned German, and his preceptor in the Hebrew tongue. Spiegel advised Maussac to publish it; but the latter, though very able to do it himself, had for an assistant Mr. de Voisin, son of a country lawyer at Paris, who took upon him the greatest part of the task. Thomas Turc, general of the Dominicans, was very earnest in
spurring on the promoters of this edition; and, not satisfied with soliciting them by letters equally important and obliging, he gave orders that they should be provided with all the manuscripts of the "Pugio fidelis" that could be recovered. In short, the Dominican Order interested themselves so much in it that they bore the charges of the impression, which was made at Paris in 1651.

Martineau, or Martinico, called by the natives Madiana, one of the Lesser Antilles, lying between latitude 14° 28′ 34″ and 14° 52′ 47″ north, and longitude 60° 50′ and 61° 19′ west, is forty miles long, about twelve miles broad, and has an area of about 880 square miles, and is inhabited by 87,000 of whom 8,000 are black. The island was discovered by the Spaniards in 1493, colonized by the French in 1635, and now belongs to them. It is of an oval form, with much indented coastline, and is everywhere mountainous; the highest peak, Mount Pelée, being considerably more than 4,000 feet above the sea-level. There are six extinct volcanoes on the island, one of them with an enormous crater. The cultivated portion (about one third of the whole of Martineau) lies chiefly along the coast. The climate is moist, but, except during the rainy season, is not unhealthy, and the soil is very productive. Of the land in cultivation, about three fifths are occupied by sugar-cane.

The government of the island consists of a governor, a privy council of seven, and a colonial council of thirty members who was abolished in 1848. The island is liable to dreadful hurricanes. The capital is Port Royal, but St. Pierre (q. v.) is the largest town and the seat of commerce. The average annual fall of rain is eighty-four inches. The year is divided into two seasons; one commences about Oct. 15, and lasts some nine months, and the other, or rainy season, the remainder of the year. During the short season the yellow-fever prevails largely. The inhabitants of the Martineau Islands are usually adherents of the Church of Rome.

Martinista, a Russian sect of mystics, which originated near the opening of our era, as a result of the labors of St. Martin, the French philosopher whose life and labors have been spoken of above. They Martinists allied themselves with freemasonry, and spread from Moscow over all Russia. Affirming to supplant infidelity by mysticism, they read largely the writings of German mystics and Pietists: Arndt and Spener were special favorites, and were widely scattered in translations. Catharine II opposed the sect, but it continued to flourish, notwithstanding all persecution, until the despotric reign of Nicholas I, when, with many other sects, the Martinists were crushed. Under Alexander I, the Martinists, favored by the patronage of Prince Galitzin, enjoyed their "golden age."

Martinian, Martinian, a German Reformed theologian, was born in 1572, and became eminent as a scholar, preacher, and instructor. He was made court-preacher in 1595, professor at Heidelberg in the following year, and placed in charge of the grammar-school connected with the academy at that place in 1597. He continued in that relation during ten years, and in 1610, after an interval spent in preaching at Emden, accepted a call from the Council of Bremen to become the rector of the famous gymnasium of their city, and to fill the chair of theology in its faculty. Under his direction this institution rose to great prosperity, and students, even from many foreign lands, thronged its halls. In 1618 he was delegated to the Synod of Dort, where he was noted for the moderation of his views. The course of that body never received his approval, although his name appears among its signers, and in later years he was often heard to exclaim, "O Dort, would to God I had never seen thee!" He died in 1630 of apoplexy, and was buried at Bremen. His chief work, the Lexicon philologico-tiologicum, is still used. His other writings, of which sixty-eight have been enumerated, are unimportant. The Lexicon was published at Breslau in folio in 1628, in a second edition at Frankfort in 1655, and at Utrecht in 1697.—Herzig, Real-Encyclopädie, xx, 118 sq. (G. M.)

Martinmas, or the Mass of St. Martin, a feast kept on the 11th of November in honor of St. Martin of Tours. The feast was often a merry one. In England and Scotland the winter's provisions were, in olden days, stored and sampled at that time of the year, and were hence called a mart. Luther derived his first name from being born on the eve of this festival; in Germany called also Martinwalde. See Eidt's Eccles. Cyclopedia, a v.; Regenbogen Real-Encyklopädie, ix, 312, col. 1 (iii).

Martinus's Day, St. See ST. MARTIN.

Martinus, Polonus or Bohemus, a Polish chronicler and ecclesiastic of the 15th century, was born at Troppau in Silesia; entered the Dominicans; became chaplain and confessor to pope Clement IV, and to several of his successors; and in 1278 was appointed archbishop of Gnesen. He died shortly after at Bologna (1278). He wrote valuable works in the department of ecclesiastical history, including biographies of the popes. His most important production is the Chronicon de Summi Pontificibus. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxxiv, 27.

Martyn, Henry, known as "the scholar missionary," one of the most distinguished missionaries of modern times, was born of humble parentage at Truro, in Cornwall, England, Oct. 18, 1781. He entered St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1800, and became a member of the grammar-school of his native place; sought for a scholarship in Corpus Christi College, Oxford, but, failing in this, he went to Cambridge, and entered St. John's College in October, 1797. He was at that time outwardly moral, but still unconverted. But, while at college, the death of his father directed his mind to religious subjects, and, by his association with the celebrated evangelical preacher Charles Simeon, he soon became one of the most thoroughly Christian students in the college, where, in 1801, he came out "senior wrangler," the highest academic honor he could achieve. He then became fellow of his college in March, 1802, and obtained the first prize for the best Latin prose composition in the university. Believing it to be his duty to preach the Gospel, he now devoted himself to the work of the ministry. English set at his elbow, in this time was the cause of missions, and Martyn finally determined that he also must go forth to propagate Christianity among the nations who sat in darkness. He sought to be employed by the "Society for Missions to Africa and the East," now the "Church Missionary Society;" but, as he was not a trained man, he was ordered, his appointment was postponed. He was ordained deacon Oct. 22, 1803; was made bachelor of divinity in March, 1805, and was the same time ordained priest, and, obtaining an appointment as missionary to India, embarked Sept. 10, 1805.

Henry Martyn reached Madras April 21, 1806. He stopped for a while at Calcutta, where he continued the study of Hindustani, which he had commenced in England, and applied himself also to Sanscrit, as the key to most of the Eastern languages, and to Persian. He then removed to the station of Diapora, where he was appointed to labor, primarily among the English troops there posted, and the families of the civilians. But to the natives also he constantly addressed himself, and, amid all these labors, yet found time to complete a translation of the English language into Hindustani (Feb. 23, 1807), a translation of the N. T. in that language, and, this finished, commenced a version of the N. T. in Persian, in which he had the assistance of an Arab translator, Sabat (q. v.).

Near the close of 1809, Mr. Martyn commenced his first public ministrations among the heathens of Cawnpore, whither he had removed in April of this year. His auditory sometimes counted as many as eight hundred. They were young, old, male, female, booted, blistered, wrinkled.
clothed with abominable rags, nearly naked, some plastered with mud or cow-dung, others with matted, uncombed locks, streaming to the heels, others bald or scabby-headed. The authorities seem to have had a wide-open eye on his proceedings, and anything which appeared to graze roughly against the superstitions of his auditory would at once have wrecked his scheme. Finally, exhausted with these and other labors, his health began to give way, and he was recommended either to try the effects of a sea-voyage, or to return to England for a time. Having embraced the latter project, he proceeded to travel through Egypt and Arabia, with a view of submitting his Persian and Arabic translations of the N. T. to the revision and critical judgment of learned Persians. He left Cawnpore in the last September of 1810, and in the early summer of 1811 landed at Bushire, and thence proceeded to Shiraz, where he resided for more than ten months. Here he created great interest by the religious discussions which, as the sole advocate of the Christian faith, he carried on in the crowded conclaves of Mollahs and Sofia. He completed his Persian version of the N. T. Feb. 24, 1812, and, which was translated into German later. From Shiraz he went to Tabriz, resolved on visiting the king in his summer camp, and presenting his work in person. His interview with the vizier, who was surrounded by a number of ignorant and intemperate Mollahs, called forth all the energies of Martyr's faith and patience. The length it was found to be related to an informality—the want of an introduction from the British ambassador—he could not be admitted to the royal presence. He now proceeded to Tabriz, where he was laid up for two months, and compelled to abandon all hopes of presenting his N. T. in person to the king, but Sir G. Ouseley, the British ambassador, relieved his anxiety by kindly promising to present the volume himself. Ten days after his recovery from the fever which had laid him up, he proceeded on his journey home-ward. His plan was to return to England via Constantinople, but, in consequence of too hurried travelling, he was laid up at Tocat with severe illness, and died Oct. 16, 1812. "No more is known of Henry Martyr save that he died at Tocat, without a European near . . . He died a pilgrim's solitary death, and lies in an unknown grave in a heathen land." The regrets in England at this event created a great interest, which was expected from him, and much probably have been done by him in the cause to which he had devoted himself. As it was, he brought not a few, both Hindoos and Mohammedans, to make profession of the Christian faith, and the body of his converts was very largely dispersed among a people who had not previously known them. "The ardent zeal of the Celtic character; the religious atmosphere that John Wesley had spread over Cornwall, even among those who did not enrol themselves among his followers; the ability and sensitiveness hereditary in the Martyr family, together with the strong influence of a university tutor—all combined to make such a bright and brief trail of light to the career of Henry Martyr" (Miss C. M. Yonge, *Pioneers and Founders*, p. 71). An interesting account of his life, compiled from the best authority, has been given by the Rev. John Sargent in 1819. Of his productions there were published *Sermons preached in Calcutta and elsewhere* (4th edit. Lond. 1822, 8vo):—*Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism* (edited by Prof. Samuel Lee, D.D., Camb. 1824, 8vo);—*Journals and Letters* (edited by the Rev. J. B. Wilberforce, later bishop of Oxford, Lond. 1837, 2 vols. 8vo; abridged 1839, post 8vo, and often). See, besides the biography already referred to, that by John Hall (N.Y. 1840, published by the American Tract Society). See also *Ecclesiastical Review, 4th series, iii, 321; Bosworth's Bibliography of the Pilgrim John Martyn* (1833), ii, 278; *Edinb. Rev. 1844 (July), lxxv, 278; Cyclopedia of Modern Religious Biography*, p. 821; *Timpson, Bible Triumpha, p. 428; Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge*; *Lond. Quart. Rev. 1865 (July)*, xxi, ii, 329; *Princeton Rev. 1855, p. 409; 1855, p. 927*. (J. H. W.)

**Martyr** (μάρτυς and μάρτων, so rendered only in Acts xxii, 20; Rev. ii, 13; xviii, 6) is properly a witness, and is applied in the New Testament (ο) to judicial witnesses (Matt. xviii, 16; xxvi, 65; Mark xiv, 63; Acts vi, 18; vii, 58; 2 Cor. xiii, 1; 1 Tim. xiv, 19; Heb. x, 28). The Septuagint also uses it for the Hebrew בְּשָׁמַר (bêšâmar), ed, in Deut. xvii, 16; Prov. xxiv, 29; (b) To one who has testified, or can testify, of the truth of the matter of which he has been heard, or known. This is a frequent sense in the New Testament, as in Luke xxiv, 48: Acts i, 8, 22; Rom. i, 9; 2 Cor. i, 23; 1 Thea. ii, 5, 10; 1 Tim. vi, 12; 2 Tim. ii, 1, 2; 1 Pet. vi, 1; Rev. i, 5; iii, 14; x, 3, and elsewhere. (c) The meaning of the word which has now become the most usual, is that in which it occurs most rarely in the Scriptures, i.e. one who by his death bears witness to the truth. In this sense we only find it in Acts xxii, 20; Rev. ii, 13; xviii, 6. This now exclusive sense of the word was brought into general use by the early ecclesiastical writers, who applied it to every one who suffered death in the Christian cause (see Suicer, *Theauros Eccles. sub. voc.)*. See *Martyrs*. Stephen was in this sense the first martyr (see Stephen), and the spiritual honors of his death tended in no small degree to raise to the most extravagant estimation, in the early Church, the memory of the testimony. The idea of martyrdom generally a martyr's death was supposed, on the alleged authority of the under-named texts, to cancel all the sins of the past life (Luke xii, 50; Mark x, 39); to supply the place of baptism (Matt. x, 39), and at once to secure admittance to the presence of the Lord in Paradise (Matt. v, 10–12). In imitation of the family custom of annually commemorating at the grave the death of deceased members, the churches celebrated the deaths of their martyrs by prayers at their graves, and by love feasts. From this high estimation of the martyrs, Christians were induced to deliver their lives for the propagation of Christianity unfeelingly to the public authorities—thus justifying the charge of fanaticism brought against them by the heathen. For the most part, however, this practice was disconceivably, the words of Christ himself being brought against it (Matt. x, 23; see Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist. i, 109, 110*). For monographs, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 75, 116. See *Confessor*. **Martyr**, Peter, one of the early Reformers, was born at Florence, Italy, in 1500. His family name was Vermiglioni, but his parents gave him that of Martyr, from one Peter, a martyr, whose house stood near their house. In 1516 he was sent by the Franciscans to the Augustinian, in the convent of Fiesole, near Florence. In 1519 he was sent to the University of Padua, where he soon distinguished himself as a good scholar. He acquired great reputation as a preacher, was made abbot of Spoleto, and afterwards principal of the College of St. Peter ad Aram, at Naples. Here he made the intimate acquaintance of Juan Valdes (q. v.), a Spaniard, who had become a convert to the doctrines of the Reformation, and from whom Vermiglioni adopted some of those tenets. He concealed them for a time; but his Biblical studies convinced him more and more of the errors of the Church of Rome, and a perusal of the works of Luther, Zwingli, and Bucer making sure his conversion, he publicly avowed his new doctrine shortly after his appointment to Lucca as prior of San Frediano, and was compelled to leave the place secretly. After a short stay at Fiesole, he was sent to Germany, and thence to Ireland. He found an asylum finally in Strasbourg, and there, in 1542, was called to a theological chair, and acted for five years as the colleague of Bucer in the ministerial office. In 1546 he married a converted nun. In 1547 he received from Cranmer and Latimer an invitation to England. The request was sent in the name of king Edward VI, acting under the advice of Seymour, the protector. In 1549 he was appointed professor of divinity at Oxford. The fame of his learning...
secured him a large auditory, many Romanists among the number: "and though they had much envying and heart-burning about him, as may easily be imagined, yet they bore him patient pretty till he came to hand- ward in public, before the Lord's Supper, where they began to break forth into outrages, to disturb him in his lectures, to fix up malicious and scandalous schedules against him, and to challenge him to disputes; which challenges he did not disdain to accept, but disputed first privately in the vice-chancellor's lodge, and after ward in public, before his majesty's commissioners, de puted for that purpose. At length, however, they stirred up the seditions multitude against him so successfully that he was obliged to retire to London till the tumult was suppressed: " and on returning again, in the year fol lowing, as for his better security, made by the king's canon of Christ-church. It is said that some cit ations in the Prayer-book were made at Peter Martyr's suggestions. On the accession of Mary he was obliged to leave England, and, returning to Strassburg, there resumed his former professorship. However, as he in clined to Calvin's views on the doctrine of the Euch arist, he accepted a pressing invitation extended to him by the Senate of Zürich, in 1556, to fill the chair of the ology in that university. In 1561 he received letters at the court of France, the king of Navarre, the prince of Condé, and others of the leading French Protestants, requesting him to attend at the famous Colloquy of Poissy, in France. Here he dis tinguished himself as well for his skill as for his prude nce and moderation. He died at Zürich Nov. 12, 1562. Peter Martyr is described as a man of an able, healthy, big-boned, and well-furred body, and of a countenance which expressed an inwardly grave and settled turn of mind. His parts and learning were very un common; as was also his skill in disputations, which made him as much admired by the Protestants as hated by the Papists. He was very singular and infallible in presenting a refutation in the Church, yet his zeal was never known to get the better of his judgment. He was always moderate and prudent in his outward behavior, nor ever in the conflict of a dispute did he suf fer himself to be transported into interminable warmth or allow unguarded expression ever to escape him. But his pains and industry were not confined to preaching and disputing against the Papists; he wrote a great many books against them, none of which raised his reputation higher than his Defence of the Orthodox Doctrine of the Lord's Supper [Defensio Doctrinae de sacramento Supp. et apotrophia de ejus usu; accessus Tractatus, et Dis putatio habita Univ. Oxon. de eodem, 1562, fol.] against bishop Gardiner. He wrote also several tracts of divinity, and commentaries on several books of Scripture, for all of which he was as much applauded by one party as he was condemned by the other. Tiraboschi, a zealous Roman Catholic, acknowledges that Martyr was free from the arrogance and virulence with which the Romanists are wont to charge the Reformers; that he was deeply acquainted with the Scriptures and the fa thers, and one of the most learned writers of the Reformed Church. He was the author of Expositio Symboli Apostolici; De Corde Domini Quaestiones, a system of theology, which was first published in England by Mazarinians, then more fully under the title Locis com manes, ex variis ipsius auctoris scriptis (Zürich, 1590, folio; translated into English, 1833, folio, etc.). His other works are, In primum librum Mosae qui vulgo Genesis dictur commentarii. Addita est initio opera vitae ejusdem ad Josias Simlero (Tiguri, 1569, folio) — In Lib rium Judicum commentarii, cum tractatione perutili rerum et locorum. Edito tertia, prioribus longe emenda tio (Tigur, 1601, folio) — In duos libros Samueli pro phete commentarii doctrinaii, cum rerum et locorum plu rimum tractatione perutili (Tiguri, 1575, folio) — In Epistolam S. Pauli ad Romanos commentarii doctrinaii, cum tractatione perutili rerum et locorum, qui ad eam epistolam pertinent. Cum indicibus (Itale, tertia editio, 1570, folio). — In epistolas ad Corinthus commentarii doctrinaii (Tiguri, edition secunda, 1567, folio) — Com mentarii in duos libros Regum (1599) — Commentarii in Throno (1629). See Simler, Oratio de vita et obitu D. Petri Martyri; Schaller, Leben des Theodor Beza u. d. P. M. Vermiglio (Heidelberg, 1807); Be den der Väter u. Begründer d. reformirten Kirche, vol. vii (Elberfeld, 1858); Schmidt, Vie de Pierre Martyr Verm iglio (Strasbourg, 1858, 8vo); McCrie, Hist. Reform. in Italy: Wordsworth, Biblo. v. iii.; Fisher, Hist. Ref. v. ii.; Biblioth. Sacra, 1864, 1865, 1866; Schleiermacher, Leben des Theoder Beza u. d. P. M. Vermiglio; v. i.; Dalring, Cyclop. Bibliol. i., 1991; Hook, Ecclesiat. Bibl. vii, 246; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. iii, 67, 192; Her zog, Real-Encyk. xvii, 82 sq.

Martyrdom is a term employed by Christian ec clesiastical writers to record the suffering of death on account of one's adherence to the faith of the Gospel. See Martyr. In times of persecution, martyrdom came to be thought so meritorious that it acquired the name of second baptism, or baptism in blood, because of the power and efficacy it was supposed to have in saving men by the invisible baptism of the Spirit, in the absence of the external element of water. In any case in which a catechumen was apprehended and slain for the name of Christ before he could be admitted among the faithful by baptism, his martyrdom was deemed suf ficient to answer all the purposes of the sacrament. In the writings of Prosper there is an epigram to this effect: "quem visum non ausi sacros baptismatis sententias, Fons quibus ipsis salutis sanguinis usus fidel; Et quocum sacri fert mystica forma lavatur, et dum ab oriente in occidentem transit gloriam martyrii." "They are not deprived of the sacred baptism of Christ who, instead of a font, are washed in their own blood; for whatever benefit accrues to any by the mystical rite of the sacred laver, is all fulfilled by the glory of martyrdom." The martyrs were supposed to enjoy very singular privileges; in some ages the doctrine was taught that immediately on death they passed to the enjoyment of the beatific vision, for which other Chris tians were required to wait till the day of judgment; and that God would grant to their prayers the hasten ing of his kingdom and the shortening the times of pe rsecution.

Martyriarius is the name, in the Roman Catholic Church, of the keoper of sacred relics. The relics of martyrs are most generally kept under the principal altar of the church.

Martyrion. See Martyrium.

Martyrium. The name of a church built over the grave of a martyr, or called by his name to preserve the memory of him, had usually the distinguishing title of Martyrium memoriae martyris. The number of this kind of designation occur with great frequency in the writings of Eusebius, Augustine, etc. Eusebius called the church which was built by Constantine on Calvary, in memory of Christ's passion and resurrection, Martyrium Salutaris.

Martyrology (Acta Martyrum) is (1) with the Protoclist a catalogue or list of those who have suffered martyrdom for their religion, including the history of their lives and sufferings; but (2) with those who believe in the adoration and intercession of saints and martyrs, a calendar of martyrs and other saints arranged in the order of the months and days, and intended partly to be read in the public services of the Church, partly for the guidance of the devotion of the faithful towards the saints and martyrs. The use of the martyrology is common both to the Latin and Greek Churches. In the latter it is called Memology (q.v.).

Eusebius, who was the first who wrote an ex tensive history of the Christian martyrs; it was trans lated into Latin by St. Jerome, but has been long irre coverably lost. St. Jerome's own work on the same subject—the oldest one now extant—is regarded as the great martyrology of the Latin Church (it is published
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in the eleventh volume of the collected edition of his works by Vallars]; but it is little used in comparison with later compilations of idle legends and pretended miracles. The latest Greek martyrlogy or menology extant dates from the 9th century. It was prepared by order of emperor Basilius Macedo (867-886), and was published in Constantinople. During the Byzantine period, martyrlogies were issued in England by Venerable Bede; in France by Florus, Ado, and Usuard; and in Germany by St. Gall, Nolter, and Rabanus Maurus. The so-called "Roman Martyrology" (Martyrologium Romanum) is designed for the entire Church, both East and West. It was published by authority of Gregory XIII, with a critical commentary by the celebrated cardinal Baronius, in 1686. A still more critical edition was issued by the learned Jesuit Herebert Rosweid. The Protestant Church possesses many accounts of martyrs, but is not a part of its system. From a Protestant standpoint, we may mention Fox's Book of Martyrs. See MArtYRS; Martyrology.

Martyrology is (8) also applied to the painted or written catalogues in the Roman churches, containing the foundations, obits, prayers, and masses to be said each day to the memory of the saint. Martyrs, those who lay down their life or suffer death for the sake of their religion. In accordance with the primitive Greek sense of the word, i.e. a witness [see Martyr], it is applied by Christian writers to such persons who fell under the trammels of the Church or of its doctrines. The Christian Church has abounded with martyrs, and history is filled with surprising accounts of their singular constancy and fortitude under the most cruel tortures that human nature is capable of suffering. The primitive Christians were accused by their enemies of playing a sort of divine worship to martyrs. Of this we have an instance in the answer of the Church of Smyrna to the suggestion of the Jews, who, at the martyrdom of Polycarp, desired the heathen judge not to suffer the Christians to carry off his body, lest they should leave their crucified Master, and worship him in his stead; but as they answered, "In Christ neither forsake Christ nor worship any other, for we worship him as the Son of God; but love the martyrs as the disciples and followers of the Lord, for the great affection they have shown to their King and Master. A like answer was given at the martyrdom of Fructuus in Spain; for when the judge asked Eulogius, his deacon, whether he would not worship Fructuus, as thinking that, though he be refused to worship the heathen idols, he might yet be inclined to worship a Christian martyr, Eulogius replied, "I do not worship Fructuus, but his heavenly Father, and I underrate this act of constancy of the sufferers naturally enough won the highest admiration from their brethren in the faith; and so it came to be held a special privilege to receive the martyr's benediction, to kiss his chains, to visit him in prison, or to converse with him; and as it was held by the primitive Christians that the martyrs enjoyed very singular privileges with God [see Martyrology], it came to be held also that their great and superabundant merit might, in the eyes of the Church, compensate for the laxity and weakness of less perfect brethren; it thus gradually a practice of intercession arose, which finally degenerated into the granting of indulgences, etc., as now common in the Roman Catholic Church. See Indulgences; Invocation.

Perhaps the admiration and veneration which Christian martyrdom secures has had a great tendency to extend beyond the limits of the primitive Church; but that is not the fact, however, that martyrdom in itself is no proof of the goodness of our cause, but only that we ourselves are persuaded that it is so. "It is not the blood, but the cause that makes the martyr" (Mead). Yet we may consider the number of those who have suffered for Christianity as a collateral proof at least of its excellency; for the thing for which they suffered was not a point of speculation, but a plain matter of fact, in which (had it been false) they could not have been mistaken. The martyrdom, therefore, of so many wise and good men, taken with a view of the whole system of Christianity, will certainly afford something considerable in its favor. In the early days of Christianity it was no unusual occurrence that a church would be constituted by martyr, calling the church after his name, in order to preserve the memory of his sufferings. See Martyrium. But soon every Church wished to possess a saint's tomb for an altar. Mere cenotaphs did not suffice. Thus, according to Augustine, Ambrose was delayed in the consecration of a new church at Milan till a seagoing dream helped him to the bones of two martyrs, Gervasius and Protasius. And the second Council of Nice (A.D. 787) went even so far as to threaten bishops with deprivation if they should undertake to consecrate churches without relics. The consequence was that no supply was produced by such a demand, and frauds of every kind were perpetrated and overlooked. Each Church also had its own Fanti, or calendar of martyrs. See Calendar; Church.

The festivals of the martyrs are also of very ancient date. On the day of their death, the Church conveys to them the solemn moment of their religion, it was natural that Christians should look back from a condition of unexpected security on the sufferings of their immediate predecessors with the most vivid sentiments of sympathy and admiration. They had witnessed the things; they had shared the constancy with which they were endured; the same we have. We have suspended over ourselves, and their own preservation they attributed, under the especial protection of divine Providence, to the perseverance of those who had perished. The gratitude and veneration thus fervently excited were loudly and passionately expressed; and the honors which were due to the virtues of the departed were profusely bestowed on their names and their memory. Enthusiasm easily passed into superstition, and those who had sealed a Christian's faith by a martyr's death were exalted above the condition of men, and enthroned among superior beings. The day of a martyrdom, moreover, as being held to be the day of the martyr's entering into eternal life, was called the "natal" or "birth" day, and as such was celebrated with peculiar honor, and with special religious services. Their bodies, clothes, books, and the other objects which they had possessed, were honored as Relics (q.v.), and their tombs were visited for the purpose of asking their intercession. See MArtYRS, Festivals of the.

Of the sayings, sufferings, and deaths of the martyrs, though preserved with great care for the purposes above specified, it is not always so well preserved as it might be. We have but very little left, the greatest part of them having been destroyed during the Diocletian persecution; for a most diligent search was then made after all their books and papers; and all of them that were found were committed to the flames. Some of those records since compiled have either never reached us at all, or, if they have, their authority is extremely suspected. See Martyrology.

The appropriate homage to be rendered to the martyrs by the Protestant world, as a reason why our respect of these sainted dead should not degenerate into martyr-worship, by the exhibition of an enthusiasm which with the early Christians was quite natural, but with us would be artificial, has been well commented upon by Gieseler (Church History, i, 108, 292), who says: "The respect paid to martyrs still maintains the same character as it had in the 2nd century, different in degree, not in kind, from the honor shown to other esteemed dead. As the churches held the yearly festivals of their martyrs at the graves of the latter, so they willingly assembled frequently in the burial-places of their deceased friends, for which they gave public support to the object called (crypted catacombe). At the celebration of the Lord's Supper, both the living who brought oblations, as well as the dead, and the martyrs for whom offerings were
presented, especially on the anniversary of their death, were included by name in the prayer of the Church. Inasmuch as the recommendation of a sinner into the Church was thought to stand in close connection with the forgiveness of sin, an opinion was associated with the older custom of recommendation to the Church common in the lapse of centuries who had been again received by the martyrs, that the martyrs could also be serviceable in obtaining the forgiveness of sins. In doing so they set out in part with the idea, which is very natural, that the dead prayed for the living, as the living prayed for the dead, but that the prayer entered into the pietas of the Church and the piety of the Lord would be of peculiar efficacy on behalf of their brethren; while they also thought that the martyrs, as assessors in the last decisive judgment, were particularly active (1 Cor. vi, 2, 8). Origent attributed very great value to that intersession of the martyrs, and it is the means that he used to help towards sanctification; but he went beyond the idea hitherto entertained in attributing to the martyrdom an importance and efficacy similar to the death of Christ. Hence he feared the cessation of persecution as a misfortune. The more the opinion that value belonged to the intercession of martyrs was established, the often it may have happened that persons commended themselves to the martyrs yet living for intercession.

The number of martyrs who suffered death during the first ages of Christianity has been a subject of great controversy among early ecclesiastical writers, with the natural pride of partisanship, have, it can hardly be doubted, leaned to the side of exaggeration. Some of their statements are palpably excessive; and Gibbon, in his well-known sixteenth chapter, throws great doubt even on the most probable of the computations of the Church historians. But it is clearly though briefly shown by Guizot, in his notes on this celebrated chapter (see Millman’s Gibbon’s Decline and Fall, i, 598), that Gibbon’s criticisms are founded on unfair and partial data, and that even the very authorities upon which he relies demonstrate the fallaciousness of his conclusions. Those who are interested in the subject will find it discussed with much learning and considerable moderation in Runrmir’s Acta Primitiva et Sancera Martyrum. No little difference of opinion has also existed as to what, in the exploration of the ancient Christian tombs in the Roman Catacombs, are to be considered as signs of martyrdom. The chief signs, in the opinion of older critics, were (1) the letters R. M., (2) the figure of a palm-tree, and (3) a phial with the remains of a red liquor believed to be blood. Each of these has in turn been considered as a sign of martyrdom, but the last is commonly regarded as the conclusive sign of martyrdom. The first recorded martyr of Christianity, called the “proto-martyr,” was the deacon Stephen, whose death is recorded in Acts vi and vii.


Martyrs, Canonization of the. The ceremony for canonizing martyrs was, in the Roman Catholic Church, varied greatly until in the middle of the fifth century, Pope Benedict XIV definitely prescribed it. It is now as follows: After the candidate’s reputation for sanctity has been duly proved, he is styled venerable, after which an investigation is entered into to establish the proof of his virtues, in a high or, as it is termed, heroic degree. For that purpose the whole life and all the actions of the candidate are scrutinized. That task devolves on the Sacred Congregation of the Rites, assisted by theolo-
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heretical authors; but this rule, it seems, did not then prescribe as to other churches. The Lord's Supper was always administered at these festivals, and at the close the rich usually made a feast for the poor, especially to the widows and orphans. —Farrell, Eccles. Dict. s. v.; Bingham, Antiquities of the Christian Church, i, 698; Cyclop. of Biblical, Biblical Knowledge, s. v.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchengesch. d. alt. u. neut. L. xxii, 777. —See FRAZER.

Marof el-Karkhi, ESSAI-MAHFOUD, an Arabian mystic, was born at Carkh, between Hamadan and Ispahan, about the year 750. The son of a Christian, he became a Mussulman, under the name of Ali. While attached to the house of the imam Ali Riza, at Bagdad, with the sacred duties of the Imam's servant, he formed a firm friendship with one of the most ancient mystic chiefs, Daud el-Thayi, and became himself one of the most celebrated mystics of Arabia. He died in 816, at Bagdad. The mystical system of Marof is neither the ascetic system of the ancient Indian and Christian Commissaries, which he rejected, nor that of the more recent Persian mystics, who are entirely absorbed in contemplations of divine love. He lays stress on the practical virtues; and if he preaches humility in saying that we should never appear before God except with the exterior of a poor mendicant, still he is not led astray in his reflections upon divine love, which, according to him, is a gift of God's grace, and not learned by the lessons of masters. Marof, it is true, elsewhere carries out his thoughts, by saying that we must turn to God if we expect God's favor upon us. These ideas have caused him to be considered as one of the orthodox mystics of Islam.

His maxims are found dispersed throughout the ascetic works of Abulfaraj Masari ibn al-Yanzi, especially in the Mawakah-Marof, or Panegyrics of Marof, and in the Kanzel Medzukioun, or Treasury of the Deistical Panegyrista. In the Mawakah el Nocte is found the most complete selection of Marof's utterances. —Hubdy Zalcha, Lexicon Bibliographicum et Encyclopedicum; Djami, Biographie des Soufra; Hammer, Gesch. der Arabischen Literatur; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. xxxii, s. v.

Mautor or Murt (Sanscrit wind) denotes in the Hindu mythology the genius or divinities presiding over the winds. In the Vedas the Murtas are often addressed as the attendants and allies of Indra, and are called the sons of Priani (or Princi), or the Earth; they are also called Roudras, or the sons of Roudra. See the Introduct. to the several volumes of professor Wilson's translation of the Rig Veda; see also the Introd. to the Puntheon, s. v.; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s. v.

Marthas, one of the most important men in the Syrian Church of the 4th and 5th centuries, was bishop of Tagrit, in Mesopotamia, called also by the Syriacs Maiphorkin, Maipharkat, and Medinat Sohde, i. e. city of the martyrs. He took an active part in the management of Church affairs, and is also known as a writer. So great, indeed, was the consideration he enjoyed at the hands of his contemporaries that he was popularly credited with power to work miracles. In 403 he made a journey to Constantinople, as agent in the negotiations between the emperors Arcadius and Theodosius II and the Persian emperor Yazdegird II, who was persecuting the Christians, and in these negotiations he gained the esteem and confidence of the Persian emperor. He was enabled by his sagacity to defeat the intrigues of the Magians to effect his downfall, and his reputation was so high that he obtained the permission for the Christians to rebuild their churches, and to hold their meetings for divine worship. The next year he went again to Constantinople to plead the cause of Chrysostom, who was exiled. He was subsequently sent again by Theodosius II to Yazdegird. He is said on one occasion to have had a vision as a part of the same or similar circumstances, during which vision he was enabled by patriarch Isaac of Seleucia Ctesiphon, but Hefele (Concilienesch. ii, 90) has proved that the documents we possess concerning this council are spurious, and the very existence of such a council is now considered doubted. On Murfo, however, took part in the Council of Antioch against the Monothelians (q. v.); it was in 483 or 480. He wrote a number of works in Syriac, described by Assamani (ut infra). Among them the following deserve special notice: A liturgical work, found in Syriac in the manuscript of Marceille (1594, p. 172), and in Latin in the manuscript of the Bibliotheque du Ecole orientale, ii, 261; an exposition of the Gospels, from which it appears that he inclined towards the doctrine of transubstantiation; a history of the Persian martyrs under king Shapur (Sapor)—this history forms the first part of Assamani's Acta Martyrum Orientalium, qui in Persica hodierna sunt, et Quinisextium apostolicae traditionis, in Acta Sactarum, et Etliche Acten heiliger Märtyrer d. Morgenlandes (Innsbruck, 1886). See Assamani, Biblioth. Orient. Clementino-Vaticano, i, 174-179; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. ix, 181; Neander, Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church, i, 110, 700. (J. N. F.)

Mar'ya (Mapia or Mapióp), from the Heb. מרים, Miriam), the name of several females mentioned in the New Test.

1. The wife of Joseph, and a lineal descendant of David (Matt. i); "the Mother of Jesus" (Acts i, 14), and "Mary, his Mother" (Matt. ii, 11); in later times generally called the "VIRGIL MARY," but never so designated in Scripture. Little is known of this highly-favored individual, in whom was fulfilled the first prophecy made to man, that the Son of God should be "formed from the woman's womb" (Gen. iii, 15). As her history was of no consequence to Christianity, it is not given at large. Her genealogy is recorded by Luke (ch. iii), in order to prove the truth of the predictions which had foretold the descent of the Messiah from Adam through Ahraham and David, with the design evidently of showing that Christ was of that royal house and lineage (comp. Davidson's Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 588 sq.). Eusebius, the early ecclesiastical historian, although unusually lengthy upon the "name Jesus," and the genealogies in Matthew's and Luke's Gospels, throws no new light upon Mary's birth and parentage. The very simplicity of the evangelical record has no doubt been one cause of the abundance of the legendary matter of which she forms the central figure. Imagination had to be called in to supply a craving which authentic narrative did not satisfy. We shall give the accounts from those sources somewhat in detail, with a full discussion of many interesting questions incidentally involved in their consideration. See MARIOLATRY.

1. Scriptural Statements.—I. We are wholly ignorant of the circumstances and the occupation of Mary's parents. If, as is most probable, the genealogy given by Luke is that of Mary (Gresswell, etc.), her father's name was Heli, which is another form of the name given to her legendary father, Jehosakim or Josephim. But if Jacob and Hel were the two sons of Matthan or Mathat, and if Joseph, being the son of the younger brother, married his cousin, the daughter of the elder brother (Hervey, Genealogies of our Lord Jesus Christ), her father was Jacob. See GENEALOGY OF OUR LORD. She was like Joseph, of the tribe of Judah, and of the lineage of David (Ps. cxxxi, 11; Luke i, 32; Rom. i, 8). What was her relationship to the so-called "sister" named Mary (John xix, 25) is uncertain (see No. 8 below), but she was connected by marriage (σύγγρυς, Luke i, 86) with Elisabeth, who was of the tribe of Levi and of the lineage of Aaron.

2. In the autumn of the year which is known as B.C. 7, Mary was living at Nazareth, probably at her parents' house, not having yet been taken by Joseph to his home. She was at this time betrothed to Joseph, and was therefore regarded by the Jewish law and custom as his wife, though she had not yet a husband, and was consequently called MARRIAGE. At this time the angel Gabriel came to her with a message from God, and announced to her that she was to be the mother of the long-expected
Messiah. He probably bore the form of an ordinary man, like the angels who manifested themselves to Giodeon and to Manoah (Judg. vi. xiii). This would appear both from the expression סיצל בשח י"ש, he came in, and also from the fact of her being troubled, not at his presence, but at the meaning of his words. Yet one cannot but feel that there was a glory in his features which was not inconsistent with his being once convinced Mary of the true nature of her visitor, entering as he did unannounced, apparently into her secret chamber—most probably at the time of her devotions. The scene as well as the salutation is very striking that commemorated in the book of Daniel, "Then there came again and touched me one like the appearance of a man, and he strengthened me, and said, O man greatly beloved, fear not: peace be unto thee, be strong, yes, be strong!" (Dan. x. 18, 19). The exact meaning of.Response is "thou that hast had bestowed upon thee a free gift of grace." The A. V. rendering of "highly favored" is therefore very exact, and much nearer to the original than the "gratia plena" of the Vulgate, on which a huge and wholly unsubstantial edifice has been built by Romanist devotional writers. The next part of the salutation, "The Lord be with thee," would probably have been better translated, "The Lord be with thee." It is the same salutation as that with which the angel accorded Giodeon (Judg. vi. 12). "Blessed art thou among women," is nearly the same expression as that used by Ozias to Judith (Judg. xili. 18). Ga- bab, the king of the Sidonians, pronounced Mary that she was "an operation of God." The Holy Ghost the everlasting Son of the Father should be born of her; that in him the prophecies relative to David's throne and kingdom should be accomplished; and that his name was to be called Jesus. He further informs her, perhaps as a sign by which she might convince herself that his prediction with regard to her son would come true, that her relative Elisabeth was within three months of being delivered of a child.

The angel left Mary, and she set off to visit Elisabeth either at Hebron or Juttah (whichever way we understand the word דג הָעָֽשַׁת, Luke i. 39), where the latter lived with her husband Zacharias about twenty miles to the south of Jerusalem, and there-fore at a very considerable distance from Nazareth. Immediately on her entrance into the house she was saluted by Elisabeth as the mother of her Lord, and had evidence of the truth of the angel's saying written with the Holy Ghost to her cousin. She embodied her feelings of exultation and thankfulness in the hymn known under the name of the Magnificat. Whether this was uttered by immediate inspiration, in reply to Elisabeth's salutation, or on the journey from Nazareth, it was written at a later period of her three months' visit at Hebron, does not appear with certainty. The hymn is founded on Hannah's song of thankfulness (1 Sam. ii. 1-10), and exhibits an intimate knowledge of the Psalms, prophetic writings, and books of Moses from which sources almost every expression in it is derived. The most remarkable clause, "From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed," is borrowed from Lea's explanation on the birth of Asher (Gen. xxx. 18). The salutation and expression are also found in Prov. xxx. 35; 1 Kings iii. 14; James x. 24. The latter passage in the case of the word מָעָ֣שַׂה is rendered with great exactness "count happy." The notion that there is conveyed in the word any anticipation of her bearing the title of "Blessed" arises solely from ignorance.

Various opinions have been held as to the purpose of divine Wisdom in causing the Savior to be born of a betrayer rather than a distinguished virgin. It seems eminently seemly and decorous that the mother of the Messiah should have some one to vouch for her virginity, and to act as her protector and the foster-father of her child, and that he should be one who, as heir of the throne of David, would give to his adopted Son the legal rights to the same dignity, while of all persons he was the most interested in reestabishing the claims of a pretended or. Origin, following Ignatius, thinks it was in order to baseline the cunning of the devil, and keep him in ignorance of the fact of the Lord's advent.

Mary returned to Nazareth shortly before the birth of John the Baptist, and continued living at her own home. In the course of a few months Joseph became aware that she was with child, and determined on giving her a bill of divorce which would make it illegal to the law to suffer the penalty which he supposed that she had incurred. Being, however, warned and satisfied by an angel who appeared to him in a dream, he took her to his own house. It was soon after this, as it would have been impossible for Joseph's death to be promulgated, and Joseph and Mary travelled to Bethlehem to have their names enrolled in the registers (B.C. 6) by way of preparation for the taxing, which, however, was not completed till several years afterwards (A.D. 6), in the governorship of Quirinius. They reached Bethlehem, and there Mary brought forth the Saviour of the world, and humbly laid him in a manger.

Bethlehem stands on the narrow ridge of a long gray hill running east and west, and its position suggests the difficulty that a crowd of travellers would have in finding shelter for offering the sacrifices at the Holy Place. A neighboring cave was fixed upon as the stable where Joseph abode, and where accordingly Christ was born and laid in the manger. The hill-sides are covered with vineyards, and a range of convents occupies the height, and incloses within it the cave of the nativity; and there, through the operation of God, shepherds may have kept watch over their flocks, seen the vision of the angelic hosts, and heard the divine song of "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace and goodwill toward men." Full of wonder and hope, they sought the lowly abode of the Virgin, and there saw with their own eyes what the Lord had made known to them. But while they published abroad and spread the wondrous tale, Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart.

8. The circumcision, the adoration of the wise men, and the presentation in the Temple, are rather scenes in the life of Christ than in that of his mother. The presentation in the Temple might not take place till forty days after the birth of the child. During this period the mother, according to the law of Moses, was unclean (Lev. xii). In the present case there could be no necessity with their own eyes what the Lord had made known to them. But while they published abroad and spread the wondrous tale, Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart.
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bom on seeing her Son expire on the cross (Tertullian, Origen, Basil, Cyril). By mistakingly referring to the pangs of grief which she experienced on witnessing the sufferings of her Son.

In the flight into Egypt, Mary and the babe had the support and protection of Joseph, as well as in their return from thence in the following year, on the death of Herod the Great (B.C. 4). It appears to have been the intention of Joseph to settle a while at Bethlehem at this time, as his home at Nazareth had been broken up for more than a year; but on finding how Herod's dominions had been disposed of, he changed his mind and returned to his old place of abode, thinking that the child's life would be safer in the retirement of A. p. 81. He bore in this, as in that of Archelaus. It is possible that Joseph might have been himself a native of Bethlehem, and that before this time he had only been a visitor at Nazareth, drawn thither by his betrothal and marriage. In that case, his fear of Archelaus would make him exchange his own native town for that of Jerusalem.

4. Henceforward, until the beginning of our Lord's ministry—i. e. from B.C. 4 to A.D. 25—we may picture Mary to ourselves as living in Nazareth, in a humble sphere of life, the wife of Joseph the carpenter, pondering over the sayings of the angels, of the shepherds, of Simeon, of Anna, and of some of her Son's sayings in the Temple and of his parables; and thus growing in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man (Luke ii. 52). Two circumstances alone, so far as we know, broke in on the otherwise even flow of the stream of her life. One of these was the temporary loss of her Son when he remained behind in Jerusalem (Ach. 8); the other was the death of Joseph. The exact date of this last event we cannot determine, but it was probably not long after the other. See Joseph.

5. From the time at which our Lord's ministry commenced, Mary is withdrawn almost wholly from sight. Four times only, as detailed below, does she reappear, which event, without reason, is thrown over her. If to these we add two references to her, the first by her Nazarene fellow-citizens (Matt. xiii. 54, 55; Mark vi. 1-3), the second by a woman in the multitude (Luke xii. 27), we have specified every event known to us in her life. It is noticeable that, on every occasion of our Lord's addressing her, or speaking of her, there is a sound of reproof in his words, with the exception of the last words spoken to her from the cross.

1. The marriage at Cana in Galilee (John ii) took place in the few months which intervened between the baptism of Christ and the Passover of the year 20. When Jesus was found by his mother and Joseph in the Temple in the year 8, we find him repudiating the name of "father" as applied to Joseph. "Thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing." How is it that he sought me? Wist ye not that I must be as not Josed, or yours, but my Father's house?" (Luke ii. 48-49). Now, in like manner, at his first miracle, which inaugurated his ministry, he solemnly withdraws himself from the authority of his earthly mother. This is Augustine's explanation of the "What have I to do with thee? my hour is not yet come." It was his humanity, not his divinity, which came from Mary. While, therefore, he was acting in his divine character, he could not acknowledge her, nor does he acknowledge her again until he was hanging on the cross, when, in that nature which he took from her, he was about to submit to death, and go out of vision, as the latter part of the outward passion (2 Kings xxi, 18; 2 Kings iii, 18), and such is the patristic explanation of them (see Iren. Advers. hiei, iii, p. 185; Apul. Bib. Patr. Par. tom. ii, par. ii, p. 298; St. Chrysost. Hom. in Joann. xxii). But the reproof is of a gentle kind (Trench, on the Miracles, p. 102 [London, 1856]; Alford, Comm. ad loc.; Wordsworth, Comm. ad loc.). Mary seems to have understood it, and accordingly to have drawn back, desiring the servants to pay more attention to the divine Son (Olahausen, Comm. ad loc.). The modern Rosenkranz translation, "What is that to you and to me?" is not a mistake, because it is a wilful misrepresentation (Douay version; Orsi, Life of Mary, etc.; see The Catholic Layman, p. 117 [Dublin, 1852]). Lightfoot supposes the marriage to have taken place at Nazareth. Mary, although a native of Nazareth, as his son Simon is called the Cananite, or man of Canaan. But this term rather describes him as a former Zealot. See Zechariah. It is clear that Mary felt herself to be involved with some authority in the house. Jesus was naturally so himself as her Son, and the disciples as those whom he had called and adopted; and yet he could say that a desire to gain edel by the powers of her Son was one motive for her wish that he should supply the deficiency of the wine, and that by his reply he meant to condemn this feeling.

2. (2) Capernaum (John ii, 12) and Nazareth (Matt. iv, 13; xii, 45; M. vi, 1) appear to have been the residence of Mary for a considerable period. The next time that she is brought before us we find her at Capernaum (Matt. xii, 46; Mark iii, 21, 81; Luke xvi. 19). It is the autumn of the year 21—a year and a half after the miracle wrought at the marriage-feast in Cana. The Lord had in the mean time attended two feasts of the Passover, and had twice made a circuit throughout Galilee, teaching and working miracles. His fame had spread, and crowds came pressing round him, so that he had not even time to "eat bread." Mary was still living with her other sons, and with James, Joses Simon, Jule, and their sisters (Matt. xiii, 55); and she and they heard of the toils which he was undergoing, and they understood that he was denying himself every relaxation from his labors. Their human affection conquered their faith. Although he was the Son of God, and, with an indignation arising from love, they exclaimed that he was beside himself, and set off to bring him home either by entreaty or compulsion. He was surrounded by eager crowds, and they could not reach him. Then, before him a message, begging him to allow them to speak to him. This message was addressed only from one person in the crowd to another, till at length it was reported aloud to him. Again he reproves; again he refuses to admit any authority on the part of his relatives, or any privilege on account of their relationship. "Who is my mother, and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand towards his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother!" (Matt. xxi, 44, 49). Compare Theoph. in Marc. iii, 22; St. Chrysost. Sermon, 10. in loc. in Aug. in Joann. tract. x, who all of them point out that the blessedness of Mary consists, not so much in having borne Christ, as in believing on him and in obeying his words (see also Quest. et Rep. ad Orthodoxos, cxxxi; In St. Just. Mart. in the Bibl. Max. Patr. tom. ii, pt. ii, p. 188). This, indeed, is the lesson taught directly by our Lord himself in the next passage in which reference is made to Mary. In the midst or at the completion of one of his addresses on the same occasion, a woman of the multitude, whose soul had been stirred by his words, cried out, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked!" Immediately the Lord replied, "Yes, rather, blessed are they that hear the word
of God, and keep it" (Luke xii, 37). He does not either affirm or deny anything with regard to the direct bearing of the woman's explanation, but passes that by as a thing indifferent, in order to point out in what alone the true blessedness of his mother and of all consists. This is the full force of the μουσεύσιμα with which he commenced.

(3.) The next scene in Mary's life brings us to the foot of the cross. She was standing there with her sister Mary and Mary Magdalene, and Salome, and other women, having no doubt followed her Son as she was able throughout the terrible morning, late into the evening (see Codd. Epist. Conc. Lat. iii, 574 a); by others, in the same century, that she was buried at Gethsemane, and this appears to have been the information given to Marcian and Pulcheria by Juvenal of Jerusalem. As soon as we lose the guidance of Scripture, we have nothing from which we can derive any sure knowledge about her. The darkness in which we are left is in itself most instructive.

7. The character of the Virgin Mary is not drawn by any of the evangelists, but some of its lineaments are incidentally manifested in the fragmentary record which is given us now of the life of the Virgin, of which the story of the Canon of the Westminster Bible is the most complete. In the Virgin Mary's Gospel, whence an attempt has been made, by a curious mixture of the imaginative and rationalistic methods of interpretation, to explain the old legend which tells us that Luke painted the Virgin's portrait (Calmet, Kitto, Migne, Mrs. Jameson). We might have a more complete and detailed account of the Virgin as an evangelist, but in his Gospel we learn nothing of her except what may be gathered from the scene at Cana and at the cross. It is clear from Luke's account, though without any such intimation we might rest assured of the fact, that her youth had been spent in the service of the holy Scriptures, and that she had set before her the example of the holy women of the Old Testament as her model. This would appear from the Magnificat (Luke i, 46). The same hymn, so far as it emanated from herself, would show no little power of mind as well as warmth of spirit. Her faith and humility exhibit themselves in her immediate surrender of herself to the divine will, though ignorant how that will should be accomplished (Luke i, 86); her energy and earnestness, in her journey from Nazareth to Hebron (Luke i, 39); her happy thankfulness, in her song of joy (Luke i, 46); her silent, unsparing thoughtfulness in her prayers over the sufferers' visit (Luke ii, 19), and in her keeping her Son's words in her heart (Luke ii, 51), though she could not fully understand their import. Again, her humility is seen in her drawing back, yet without anger, after the allegations of the Master (John xii, 6). Her very nature, and in the remarkable manner in which she shuns putting herself forward throughout the whole of her Son's ministry, or after his removal from earth. Once only does she attempt to interfere with her divine Son's freedom of action (Matt. xii, 46; Mark iii, 51; Luke xviii, 19); and even here we can hardly blame, for she seems to have been roused, not by arrogance and by a desire to show her authority and relationship, as Chrysostom supposes (Hom. xiv in Matt.), but by a woman's and a mother's feelings of affection and fear for him whom she loved. That she did not interfere, and that it was not by her that Our Lord was led through the world, was due to the fact that she had no part in the work of redemption (seebelow), and was throughout to have belonged to her. In a word, so far as Mary is portrayed to us in Scripture, she is, as we should have expected, the most tender, the most faithful, humble, patient, and loving of women, but a woman still. (See Niemeyer, Günther, 56.)

II. Christian Legends. From this point forward we know nothing of her.
house of David. The abode of the former was Nazare-
the latter passed in her early years at Bethlehem.
They lived piously in the sight of God, and faultlessly
before man, dividing their substance into three portions,
each of which they devoted to the service of the Temple,
another to the poor, and the third to their own wants.
So twenty years of their lives passed silently away.
Each in his way was prosperous, and in wealth and honor
with some others of his tribe, to make his usual of-
ering at the Feast of the Dedication. It chanced that
Isaiah was high-priest (Gospel of Birth of Mary);
that Reuben was high-priest (Protevangelion). The high-
priest Joseph was called, and he rose hastily to rise,
sic, asking how he dared to present himself in com-
pany with those who had children, while he had none;
and he refused to accept his offerings until he should
have begotten a child, for the Scripture said, "Cursed
is every one who does not beget a man-child in Israel."
Joseph was astonished before his friends and neighbors,
and he retired into the wilderness and fixed his tent
there, and fasted forty days and forty nights. At the
end of this period an angel appeared to him, and told
him that his wife should conceive, and should bring
forth a child, whom he should call Joseph. When
Anna, who was much distressed at her husband's
absence, and being reproached by her maid Judith with
her barrenness, was overcome with grief of spirit.
In her sadness she went into her garden to walk, dressed
in her wedding-dress. She there sat down under a lau-
ret tree, and was spied upon by her husband's doves, a
sparrow's nest, and she bemoaned herself as more miser-
able than the very birds, for they were fruitful and she
was barren; and she prayed that she might have a
child, even as Sarah was blessed with Isaac. At this
moment two angels appeared to her, and promised her
that she should have a child who should be spoken of
in all the world. Joachim returned joyfully to his
home, and when the time was accomplished Anna
brought forth a daughter, and they called her name
Mary. Now the child Mary increased in strength day
by day, and at nine months of age she walked nine
steps. When she was three years old her parents
brought her to the Temple, to dedicate her to the Lord.
There were fifteen stairs up to the Temple, and, while
Joseph and Mary were changing their dress, she walked
up them without help; and the high-priest placed her
upon the steps. Mary remained at the Temple until she was twelve
(Prot.), fourteen (G. B. M.), years old, ministered to by
the angels, and advancing in perfection as in years. At
the end of that time, under the command of an angel,
that were in the Temple to return to their homes and
to be married. But Mary refused, for she said that she
had vowed virginity to the Lord. Thus the high-priest
was brought into a perplexity, and he had recourse to
God to inquire what he should do. Then a voice from
the ark answered him (G. B. M.), an angel spake unto
him (Prot.); and they gathered together all the widow-
ers in Israel (Prot.), all the marriageable men of the
house of David (G. B. M.), and desired them to bring
each man his rod. Among them came Joseph and
brought his rod, but he shunned to present it, because
he was an old man and had children. Therefore the
other rods were presented and no sign occurred. Then
it was found that Joseph had not presented his rod;
and behold, as soon as he had presented it, a dove came
forth from the rod and flew upon the head of Joseph
(Prot.); a dove came from heaven and perched on the
rod (G. B. M.). So Joseph, in spite of his reluctance,
was compelled to betroth himself to Mary, and he re-
turned to Bethlehem to make preparations for his mar-
rriage (G. B. M.); he betook himself to his occupation
of building houses (Prot.); while Mary went back to
her parents' house in Galilee. Then it chanced that
the priests needed a new veil for the Temple, and seven
virgins cast lots to make different parts of it; and the
lot to spin the true purple fell to Mary. As she went
out with a pitcher to draw water at the springs, behold
there was the sight of God, and she poured water
ning to her. "Hail, thou that art highly favored, the
Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women!"
and she looked round with trembling to see whence the
voice came; and she laid down the pitcher and went
into the house, and took the purple and sat down to work at it. Then Joseph returned to his home from
building houses (Prot.); came into Galilee, to the house
of the Virgin to whom he was betrothed (G. B. M.), and
finding her with child, he resolved to put her away private-
ly; but being warned in a dream, he relinquished his
purpose and took her to his house. Then came Anna
the scribe to visit Joseph, and he went back and told
the priest that Joseph had committed a great crime, for
he had privately married the Virgin whom he had re-
cieved out of the Temple, and had not made it known
to the children of Israel. So the priest sent his ser-
vants, and they came to Mary, saying, "This is the
child that was his, and the priest made Joseph drink the bitter
water of trial (Numb. v, 18), and sent him to a moun-
tainous place to see what would follow." But Joseph
returned in perfect health, so the priest sent them away
and after seven days he came to Anna, and said to
Mary on an ass to go to Bethlehem to be taxed; and as
they were going, Mary besought him to take her down,
and Joseph took her down and carried her into a cave,
and, leaving her there with his sons, he went to seek a
midwife. When he had looked up, and he saw the
clouds astonisnished and all creation amazed. The fowls
stopped in their flight; the working people sat at their
food, but did not eat; the sheep stood still; the shep-
herds' lifted hands became fixed; the kids were touch-
ing the water with their mouths, but did not drink.
A midwife came down from the mountains, and Joseph
took her with him to the cave, and a bright cloud over-
shadowed the cave, and the cloud became a great light,
and when the bright light faded there appeared an
infant at the breast of Mary. Then the midwife went
out and told Salome that a Virgin had brought forth,
and step by step Salome could not believe it, and she went
again into the cave, and Salome received satisfaction,
but her hand withered away, nor was it restored until,
by the command of an angel, she touched the child,
whereupon she was straightway cured. See Giles, Co-
dez Apostolica, Testamentum virginum, 726.
xiii and xiv (Oxf.1827); Thilo, Codex Apocryphus; also
Vita gloriosissimae Mariae Annae per F. Petrum Dorlan-
do, appended to Ludolph of Saxony's Vita Christi (Ly-
onna, 1642); and most audacious Historia Christi, writ-
en in Persian by the Jesuit P. Jerome Xavier, and ex-
ploised by Louis de Dieu (Lugd. Bat. 1669).
Three spots lay claim to be the scene of the Annun-
ciation. Two of these are, as was to be expected, in
Nazareth, and one, as every one knows, is in Italy. The
Greeks and Latins each claim to be the guardians of the
true spot in Palestine; the third claimant is the holy
house of Loretto. The Greeks point out the spring of
water mentioned in the Protevangelion as confirmatory
of their claim. The Latins have engraved on a marble
slab in the grotto of their convent in Nazareth the words
"Terminus hic est ortus periculi", implying that this is
the place which marks the spot where the angel stood; while
the head of their Church is irretrievably committed to the
In the Gospel of the Infancy, which seems to date
from the 5th century, import on the Virgin's desire to
attend on Mary and her Son during their sojourn in
Egypt, e. g. Mary looked with pity on a woman who
was possessed, and immediately Satan came out of her
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in the form of a young man, saying, "Woe is me because of thee, Mary, and thy Son!" On another occasion they fell in with two thieves, named Titus and Dumachus; and Titus was gentle and Dumachus was harsh: the Lady Mary therefore promised Titus that God should receive him on his right hand. Accordingly, thirty-three years afterwards, Titus was the penitent thief who was hanged on the right hand, and thus was revealed on the left. These are sufficient as samples. Throughout the book we find Mary associated with her Son, in the strange facts of power attributed to them, in a way which shows us whence the culture of Mary took its origin. See Jones, On the New Test., vol. ii. (Oxf. 1827); Giles, Codex Apocryphon; Thilo, Codex Apocryphon.

2. Mary's later Life.—The foregoing legends of Mary's childhood may be traced back as far as the third or even the second century. Those of her death are probably of a later date. The chief legend was for a length of time considered to be a veritable history, written by Melito, bishop of Sardinia, in the 2d century. It is to be found in the Bibliotheca Maxima (tom. ii. pt. ii. p. 212), entitled Sancti Melitonia Episcopi Sardinae De Transitus Mariae Virginis, and there are copies of this book with this title at the end of the 5th century, which was condemned by Pope Gelasius as apocryphal (Op. Gelas. apud Migne, lxx, 192). Another form of the same legend has been published at Elberfeld, in 1854, by Maximilian Gerke. He supposes that it is an Arabic translation from a Syriac original. It was found in the library at Bonn, and is entitled Jounaia Apostoli de Transitu Beatae Mariae Virginis Libri. It is perhaps the same that referred to in Assemani (Biblioth. Orient. Rom., 1729, iii. 267), under the name of Hieronomy et Asumguntiens B. Mariae Virginis Jounaia Evangeliaster falso inscripta. We give the substance of the legend with its main variations. When the apostles separated in order to evangelize the world, Mary continued to live with John's parents in their house near the Mount of Olives, and every day she went out to pray at the tomb of Christ, and at Golgotha. But the Jews had placed a watch to prevent prayers being offered at these spots, and the watch went into the city and told the chief priest that Mary came daily to pray. Then the priest commanded the watch to stone her. At this time, however, king Algarus wrote to Tiberius to desire him to take vengeance on the Jews for slaying Christ. They feared, therefore, to add to his wrath by slaying Mary also, and yet they could not allow her to continue her prayers at Golgotha, because an exorcism was thereby made. Accordingly, they went and spoke softly to her and besought her to go and dwell in Bethlem; and thither she took with her three holy virgins who should attend upon her. In the twenty-second year after the ascension of the Lord, Mary felt her heart burn with an inexpressible longing to be with her Son; and beholding an angel appeared to her, and announced to her that her soul should be taken up from her body on the thirty-third day, and he placed a palm-branch from paradise in her hands, and desired that it should be carried before her tiber. Mary besought the apostles to accompany her, and gashed her body before she died, and the angel replaced the soul that was gone over. Then the Holy Spirit caught up John as he was preaching at Ephesus, and Peter as he was offering sacrifice at Rome, and Paul as he was disputing with the Jews near Rome, and Thomas in the extremity of India, and Matthew and James: these were all of the apostles who were still living; then the Holy Spirit awakened the dead, Philip and Andrew, and Luke and Simon, and Mark and Bartholomew; and all of them were snatched away in a bright cloud and found themselves at Bethlem. And their wives, without number descended from heaven and stood round about the house; Gabriel stood at blessed Mary's head, and Michael at her feet, and they fanned her with their wings; and Peter and John wiped away her tears; and there was a great cry, and they all said "Hail, blessed one! blessed is the fruit of thy womb!" The people of Bethlem brought their sick to the house, and they were all healed. Then news of these things was carried to Jerusalem, and the king sent and commanded that they should bring Mary and the disciples to Jerusalem. Accordingly, horsemen came to Bethlem and took Mary, but they were met with fire, and the governor gave them permission, and they brought wood and fire; but as soon as they came near to the house, beheld there burst forth a fire upon them which consumed them utterly. Now the governor saw these things after off, and in the evening he caught his son, who was sick, to Mary, and he healed him. Then, on the sixth day of the week, the Holy Spirit commanded the apostles to take up Mary, and to carry her from Jerusalem to Getsemane, and as they went the Jews saw them. Then drew near Jophia, one of the high priest's servants, and he sat in attendance on which she was carried, for the other priests had conspired with him, and they hoped to cast her down into the valley, and to throw wood upon her, and to burn her body with fire. But as soon as Jophia had touched the little child and an angel appeared, and the fiery sword which was over her remained fastened to the litter. Then he cried to the disciples and Peter for help, and they said, "Ask it of the Lady Mary;" and he cried, "O Lady, O Mother of Salvation, have mercy on me!" Then she said to Peter, "Give him back his arms;" and they were restored whole. But the disciples proceeded onwards, and they laid down the litter in a cave, as they were commanded, and gave themselves to prayer. Now the angel Gabriel announced that on the first day of the week Mary's soul should be removed from this world. So on the morning of that day there came Eve, and Anne, and Edimalith, and they kissed Mary, and told her who they were: there came Adam, Seth, Shem, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, and the rest of the old fathers: there came Enoch, and Elias, and Moses: there came twelve chariots of angels immemorial: and then appeared the Lord Christ in his humanity, and Mary bowed before him and said, "O my Lord and my God, place thy hand upon me;" and he stretched out his hand and blessed her; and she took his hand and kissed it, and placed it to her forehead, and said, "I bow before this right hand, which has made heaven and earth, and all that is therein, and blessed the name of the Lord; thou hast thought me worthy of this hour." Then she said, "O Lord, take me to thyself!" But he said to her, "Now shall thy body be in paradise to the day of the resurrection, and angels shall serve thee; but thy pure spirit shall shine in the kingdom, in the dwelling-place of my Father's fulness." Then the disciples drew near, and besought her to pray for the world which she was about to leave. So Mary prayed. After her prayer was finished her face shone with marvellous brightness, and she stretched out her hands and blessed them all; and her Son put forth his hands and received her pure soul, and bore it into his Father's treasure-house. Then there was a light and a sweet smell, sweeter than anything on earth; and a voice from heaven saying, "Hail, blessed one! blessed and celebrated art thou among women!" (The legend ascribed to John is that Mary was to be carried to paradise by Gabriel while her Son returns to heaven.)

Now the apostles carried her body to the valley of Jehoshaphat, to a place which the Lord had told them of, and John went before and carried the palm-branch. There they placed her in the tomb, and then the mouth of the sepulchre, as the Lord commanded them; and suddenly there appeared the Lord Christ surrounded by a multitude of angels, and said to the apostles, "What
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will ye that I should do with her whom my Father's command selected out of all the tribes of Israel that I should dwell in her?" So Peter and the apostles besought him that he would raise the body of Mary and take it with him in glory to heaven. Then the Saviour said, "Be it according to your word." So he commanded Michael the archangel to bring down the soul of Mary. Then the soul of Mary went to the holy stone, and the Lord said, "Rise up, my beloved, thy body shall not suffer corruption in the tomb." Immediately Mary arose, and bowed herself at his feet and worshipped; and the Lord kissed her, and gave her to the angels to carry her to paradise. Then Thomas was not content with the rest, for at the moment that he was summoned to come he was baptising Polidius, who was the son of the sister of the king. And he arrived just after all these things were accomplished, and he demanded to see the sepulchre in which they had laid his Lady: "For ye know," said he, "that I am Thomas, and unless I see I will not believe." Then Peter arose in haste and wrath, and the other disciples with him, and they opened the sepulchre and went in; but they found nothing therein save that in which her body had been wrapped. Then Thomas confessed that he had seen her body in the closed tomb, and had seen her holy body carried by the angels with great triumph into heaven; and that on his crying to her for her blessing, she had bestowed upon him her precious Girdle, which when the apostles saw they were glad. Then the apostles were carried back each to his own country. Of the tomb of this Saint, Christornost, who had been preserved at Prato, see Mrs. Jameson's Legends of the Modulun, p. 344 (London, 1852).


3. Her Assumption.—The above story gradually gained credit. At the end of the 5th century we find that there existed a legend of the Virgin Mary which was condemned by pope Gelasius as apocryphal. This book is without doubt the oldest form of the legend, of which the books ascribed to Melito and John are variations. Down to the end of the 5th century, then, the story of the Assumption of the Church, and distinctly looked upon by the Church as belonging to the heretics and not to her. But then came the change of sentiment on this subject consequent on the Nestorian controversy. The desire to protest against the early fables which had been spread abroad by the heretics had now passed away, and had been succeeded by the desire to magnify her who had brought forth him who was God. Accordingly a writer, whose date Baroniuss fixes at about this time (Ann. Eccl. i, 347, Lucca, 1738), suggested the possibility of the Assumption, but declared his inability to decide the question. The letter in which this possibility or probability is thrown out came to be attributed to Jerome, and may still be found among his works, entitled Ad Paulum et Eustochium de Assumptione B. Virginis (v. 82, Paris, 1706). About the same time, probably, or rather later, an assertion (now recognised on all hands to be a forgery) was made in Eusebius's Chronicle, to the effect that "in the year A.D. 48 Mary the Virgin was taken up into heaven, as some wrote that they had had it revealed to them." Another tract was written to prove that the Assumption was not a saying in itself, nor was this done in an attitude of St. Augustine, and may be found in the appendix to his works; and a sermon, with a similar purport, was ascribed to St. Athanasius. Thus the names of Eusebius, Jerome, Augustine, Athanasius, and others, came to be quoted as maintaining the truth of the Assumption. The first writers within the Church in whose extant writings we find the Assumption asserted, are Gregory of Tours in the 6th century, who has merely copied Melito's book, De Transitus (De Glor. Marr, li. c. 4; Migne, 71, p. 700; Andrew of Crete, who probably lived in the 7th century, as does also Constantine, and the Lord said, "Rise up, my beloved, thy body shall not suffer corruption in the tomb." The last of these authors refers to the Euthymianic history as stating that Marcius and Pulcheria, being in search of the body of Mary, sent to Juvalen of Jerusalem to inquire for it. Juvalen replied, "The holy soul and divinely inspired Scriptures, indeed, nothing is recorded of the departure of the body of Mary, Mother of God. But from an ancient and most true tradition we have received, that at the time of her glorious falling asleep all the holy apostles, who were going through the world for the salvation of the nations, boro aloft in a moment of time, came together to Jerusalem; and when they were near her they had a vision of angels, and divine melody was heard; and with divine and more than heavenly melody she delivered her holy soul into the hands of God in an unseparable manner. But that which had borne God, being carried with angels and the divine glory, was preserved in the heavens; it was deposited in a coffin at Gethsemane. In this place the chorus and singing of the angels continued three whole days. But after three days, on the angelic music ceasing, those of the apostles who were present opened the coffin, and saw the body of the Virgin Mary, and were filled with an ineffable odor of sweetness which proceeded from them. Then they closed the coffin. And they were astonished at the mysterious wonder, and they came to no other conclusion than that he who had chosen to take flesh of the Virgin Mary, and to become a man, and to be born of her—God the Word, the Lord of Glory—and had preserved her virginity after birth, was also pleased, after her departure, to honor her immaculate and unpolluted body with incorruption, and to translate her before the common resurrection of all men" (St. Joan. Damas. Op. ii, 880, Venice, 1748). It is quite clear that this is the same legend as that which we have before given. Here, then, we see it brought over the borders and planted within the Church, which was a great blow to the Euthymianic history is to be accepted as verifiable, by Juvalen of Jerusalem in the 5th century, or else by Gregory of Tours in the 6th century, or by Andrew of Crete in the 7th century, or, finally, by John of Damascus in the 8th. Moreover, it is the true tradition of the Virgin Mary, in his Opp. ii, 857-868). The same legend is given in a slightly different form as veritable history by Nicophorus Callistus in the 18th century (Niciph. i, 171, Paris, 1860); and the fact of the Assumption is stereotyped in the Breviary services for August 15 (Brev. Rom. Paro. et, p. 561, Milan, 1851). Here again, then, we see a legend originated by heretics, and remaining external to the Church till the close of the 6th century, creeping into the Church during the 6th and 7th centuries, and finally ratified by the authority both of Home and Constantinople. See Baronius, Ann. Eccl. (i, 344, Lucca, 1738) and Martyrologium (p. 814, Paris, 1607).

4. On the dogmas of Mary's sinlessness, see IMMEDIATE CONCEPTION. On her worship, see MARIOLATRY. On the alleged transportation of her dwelling to Italy, see LORETTO.

II. Jewish Traditions.—These are of a very different nature from the light-hearted fairy-tale-like stories which we have recounted above. We should expect that the miraculous birth of our Lord would be an occasion of scoffing to the unconverted, and find this to be the case. We have already a hint during our Lord's ministry of the Jewish calumnies as to his birth. "We [Jesus] be not born of fornication" (John
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viii, 41), seems to be an insinuation on the Jews' part that he was. To the Christian believer the Jewish slander becomes in the present case only a confirmation of his faith. The most definite and outspoken of these slanders is that which is contained in the book called עַבְרָיָנָא, or Toledoth Jeshu. It was grasped at with avidity by Voltaire, and declared by him to be the most ancient Jewish writing directed against Christiani-

ty. It is not improbable that the first century of the Christian Church was written, he says, before the Gospels, and is altogether contrary to them (Lettre sur les Juifs). It is proved by Ammon (Biblisch. Theologie, p. 263, Erlang. 1801) to be a composition of the 18th century, and by Wagenseil (Telci igmeu Satiana; Confut. Libr. Todos Jochua, p. 12, Altorf, 1861) to be irreconcilable with the earlier Jewish tales. In the Gospel of Nicodemus, otherwise called the Acts of Pilate, we find the Jews represented as charging our Lord with illegitimate birth (c. 2). The date of this Gospel is about the end of the third century. The origin of the charge is referred with great probability by Thilo (Codex Apoc. p. 627, Lips. 1862) to the circular letters of the Jews mentioned by Grotius (ad Matt. xxvii, 63, et al Act. Apost. xxviii, 22; Op. ii, 278 and 666, Basili, 1782), which were sent from Palestine to all the Jewish synagogues after the death of Christ, with the view of attacking "the lawless and atheistic sect which had the effrontery to call itself Jewish and orthodox" (Justin, adv. Tryph.). The first time that we find it openly proclaimed is in an extract made by Origen from the work of Celsus, which he is refuting. Celsus introduces a Jew declaring that the mother of Jesus was repudiated by her husband for adultery (υπ' αυτού γίγνεται, τίτων τοῦ γένεσεν, ἵνα δὲξια, ἐξαφανίσθησθαι μικρι

απὸ Χελοσίου, Contra Celsum, c. 25, Origenis Opera, xviii, 56, Berlin, 1845; again, οὗ τοῦ γένεσεν διί, ἵνα δὲξια, ἐξαφανίσθησθαι μικρι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χελοσίου, ἐξαφανίσθησθαι μικρι ἀπὸ τοῦ γένεσεν, ibid. 90). Storstein says that the same idea may be found in the Talmud—not in the Mishna, which dates from the 2d century, but in the Gemara, which is of the 5th or 6th (see Tract. Sanhedrín, cap. vii, fol. 67, 1; Shabbath, cap. xii, fol. 104, col. 2; and the Midrash Kohéth, cap. xvi 1). Rabanus Maurus, in the 9th century, refers to the same story: "Jehusa filium ethnicus cujusdam Pandura adulteri, more latronum pu
n
tini usae." Lightfoot quotes the same story from the Talmudist (Ecclesi. at Matt. xxvii, 56), who says, often vilify Mary under the name of Σωκρώτ. She who is called Mary, the daughter of Helil, and is represented as hanging in bondage among the damned, with the great bar of hell's gate hung at her ear (ibid. at Luke iii, 23). We then come to the Toledoth Jeshu, in which these calumnies were intended to be summed up and harmonized. In the year 4671, the story runs, in the reign of king Jannuaus, there was one Joseph Pandera who lived at Bethlehem. In the same village there was a widow who had a daugh
ter named Miriam, who was betrothed to a God-fearing man named Johanam. Now it came to pass that Johanam had been with Miriam when it was dark, deceived her into the belief that he was about to marry her, and the rabbi advised him to bring her before the great council. But Johanam was ashamed to do so, and instead he left his home and went and lived at Babylony; and there Miriam brought forth a son, and gave him the name of Jehoshua. The rest of the work, which has no merit in a literary aspect or otherwise, contains an account of how this Jehoshua gained the art of working miracles, and ascribing the knowledge of the unmentionable name from the Temple; how he ascended to the superior magical arts of one Juda; and how at last he was crucified, and his body hidden under a water-cour
e. It is offensive to make use of sacred names in connection with such tales; but in Wagenseil's quaint words we may recollect, "hec nomina non attinere ad Servatorem Nostrum autbeatissimum illius matrem cetero
cresque qua non significare videntur, sed designari iis a Diabolo supposita Spectra, Lurvas, Lemures, Lamas, Syrages, aut si quid turpis itis" (Liber Todos Jochua, in the Telci igmeu Satiana, p. 2, Altorf, 1861). It is a curious thing that a Pandera or Panther has been intro
duced into the genealogy of our Lord by Epiphanius (Herae, lxxviii), who makes him grandfather of Joseph, and by John of Damascus (De Fide orthodoxo, iv, 15), who makes him the father of Barpanther and grandfa
ter of Mary.

IV. Mohammedan Traditions.—These are again cast in a totally different mould from those of the Jews. The Mohammedans had no purpose to serve in spreading calumnious stories as to the birth of Jesus, and ac
cordingly we find none of the Jewish malignity about their traditions. Mohammed and his followers appear to have gathered up the floating Oriental traditions which originated in the legends of Mary's early years, given above, and to have drawn from them and from the Bible indifferently. It has been suggested that the Koran had an object in magnifying Mary, and that this was to insinuate that the Son was of no other nature than the mother. But this does not appear to be the case. Mohammed seems merely to have written down what had come to his ears about her, without definite purpose. He makes no special allusion to her as the mother of Jesus, and the mention of her is not prominent in the Koran.

Mary was, according to the Koran, the daughter of Amram (sur. iii) and the sister of Aaron (sur. xix). Mo-

hammed can hardly be absolved from having here con
downed Miriam the sister of Moses with Mary the mother of our Lord. It is possible, indeed, that he may have meant different persons, and such is the opinion of Sale (Koran, p. 88, 291) and of D'Herbelot (Bibl. orient. sur Mirkam); but the opposite view is more likely (see Gas
dagnoli, Apud. pro rel. Christ. c. viii, p. 277, Rom. 1831). Indeed, some of the Mohammedan commentators have said that the Koran was not written down by the Prophet, but by saying that Miriam was miraculously kept alive from the days of Moses in order that she might be the moth
er of Jesus. Her mother Hannah dedicated her to the Lord while still in the womb, and at her birth "com
cended her and her future issue to the protection of God against Satan." So Hannah brought the child to the Temple to be educated by the priests, and the priests disputed among themselves who should take charge of her. Zacharias maintained that it was his office, be
cause he had married her aunt. But when the others would not give up their claim, he was pronounced the 

man to be chosen by lot. So they were sent to the river Jordan, twenty-seven of them, each man with his rod; and they threw their rods into the river, and none of them floated save that of Zacharias, wherupon the care of the child was committed to him (Al Beidawi; Jallalludin). Then Zacharias placed her in an inner chamber by herself; and though he kept seven doors ever locked upon her (other stories make the only entrance to be by a ladder and a door always kept locked), he always found her abundantly supplied with provi
dions which God sent her from paradise, winter fruits in summer, and summer fruits in winter. All this was said unto her, "O Mary, verily God hath chosen thee, and hath purified thee, and hath chosen thee above all the women of the world" (Korana, sur. iii). So she re
tired to a place towards the east, and Gabriel appeared unto her and said, "Verily I am sent to thee from thy Lord, and am sent to give thee a holy Son" (sur. xix). Then the angels said, "O Mary, verily God sendeth thee good tidings that thou shalt bear the Word proceeding from himself: His name shall be Christ Jesus, the Son of Mary, honorable in this world and in the world to come, and his throne shall be established from the presence of God: and he shall speak unto men in his cradle and when he is grown up; and he shall be one of the righteous." But she said, "How shall I have a son, seeing I know not a man?" The angel said, "So God
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creath which he pleaseth: when he decreeth a thing, he only saith to it, 'Be,' and it is. God shall teach him the Scripture and wisdom, and the Law and the Gospel, and shall appoint him his apostle to the children of Israel' (sur. iii). So God breathed of his Spirit into the womb of Mary; and she preserved her chastity (sur. lviii); for the Jews have spoken against her, and said, 'Behold, she is an adulteress, a daughter of Solomon, and her son, and retired with him apart to a distant place; and the pains of childbirth came upon her near the trunk of a palm-tree; and God provided a rivulet for her, and she shook the palm-tree, and it let fall ripe dates thereof, and wild grapes, and when she carried the child in her arms to her people; but they said that it was a strange thing she had done. Then she made signs to the child to answer them; and he said, 'Verily I am the servant of God: he hath given me the book of the Gospel, and hath appointed me a prophet; and he hath made me blessed, wheresoever I shall be; and hath commanded me to observe prayer and to give alms so long as I shall live; and he hath made me dutiful towards my mother, and hath not made me proud or unhappy: and peace be on me the day whereon I was born, and the day whereon I shall be delivered to life.' This was Jesus the Son of Mary, the Word of Truth, concerning whom they had doubt (sur. xix).

Mohammed is reported to have said that many men have arrived at perfection, but only four women; and that they are, Asia, mother of Pharaoh, the daughter of Amram, his first wife Khatdijah, and his daughter Fatima. The commentators on the Koran tell us that every person who comes into the world is touched at his birth by the devil, and therefore cries out; but that God placed a veil between Mary and her Son and the Evil Spirit, so that he could not reach them. For this reason they were neither of them guilty of sin, like the rest of the children of Adam. This privilege they had in answer to Hannah's prayer for their protection from Satan (Jallaluddin; Al Beidawi; Kitabat). The Immaculate Conception therefore, we may note, was a Mohammedan doctrine six centuries before any Christian theologians or schoolmen maintained it.

See Salem, Koran, p. 33, 79, 250, 458 (Lond. 1784); Warnor, Compendium Historiæorum sancti Muhammadi de, et et prius evangelista evangelista, Bat. 1698; Apologia pro Christianæ Religionæ (Rom. 1631); D'Herbelot, Bibliothèque Orientale, p. 58 (Paris 1697); Weil, Biblica Legendæ der Museum, p. 280 (Frk. 1846).

V. Embata.—There was a time in the history of the Gospel when all the persons and the book of Canticles were applied at once to Mary. Consequently all the Eastern metaphors of king Solomon have been hardened into symbols, and represented in pictures or sculpture, and attached to her in popular litanies. The same method of interpretation was applied to certain parts of the book of the Revelation. Her chief emblems are the sun, moon, and stars (Rev. xii, 1; Cant. vi, 10).

The name of Star of the Sea is also given her, from a fanciful interpretation of the meaning of her name. She is the Rose of Sharon (Cant. ii, 1) and the Lily (i, 2), the Tower of David (iv, 4), the Tower of Myrrh and the Hill of Frankincense (iv, 6), the Garden enclosed, the Spring shut up, the Fountain sealed (iv, 12), the Tower of Ivory (vii, 4), the Palm-tree (vii, 7), the Closed Gate (Ezek. xlv, 2). There is no end to these metaphorical titles. See Mrs. Jameson's Legends of the Madonna, and the ordinary Litanies of the Blessed Virgin.

VI. Festivals, etc.—The Festival of Mary's Conception is said to have been instituted on the occasion of the preservation from shipwreck of St. Anselm, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, and by the direction of Mary himself, who desired that the day of her conception should be the 8th of December.

The Nativity of the Virgin.—There is a good deal of controversy as to the time of its first celebration and its origin. It is celebrated on the 8th of September, and is not traceable further back than the 9th century. There is a Romish calumny that queen Elizabeth substituted her own birthday in its place.

Her Presentation in the Temple, November 21, mentioned in very early martyrlogies, and in a constitution of the emperor Manuel Comnenus.

Her Epitaph, November 22.

The Annunciation, March 25.

The Visitation, July 2, established by Urban VIII, and approved by the Council of Basle.

The Purification, February 2, established in the East under the emperor Justinian, and a little later in the West.

The Assumption (ευανήλολος), in the Greek Church, celebrated originally at different times, but fixed to be on the 15th of August about the time of Charlemagne.

Besides the great festivals in honor of Mary, particular churches and fraternities have had their private ones. Several religious orders have chosen her for their especial patroness, and the whole kingdom of France was, in 1688, placed under her protection by a vow of Louis XIII. Festivals have been established in honor of particular objects connected with her, as the chamber in which she was born, which she afterwards adorned, which was conveyed magnificently from Nazareth to Loretto (q.v.), the Cintola at Prato, la Sainte Chemise at Chartres, the rosary which she gave to St. Dominic, and the scapular which she gave to Simon Stock; and indulgences have been granted on the occasion of these festivals, and the devotions they elicited. Books have been written to describe her miraculous pictures and images, and the boundless extent and diversity of the literature to which her worship has given rise may be inferred from a description of two of the 115 works, all on the same subject, of Hippolyte Maracci, a member of the congregation of the Clerks of the Mother of God, born 1694. Bibliotheca Mariana is a biographical and bibliographical notice in alphabetical order of all the authors who have written on any of the attributes or perfections of the holy Virgin, with a list of their works. The number of writers amounts to more than 8000, and the number of works in print or MS. to twice as many. This rare and highly-valued work is accompanied by five curious and useful indices. The other is Concepicio immaculata Deiparæ Virginæ Mariae celebrata MCXV anagroammotitos prorou parvis ec hac salutationibus ad egentos scholasticos scripta et invenita "Ave Maria gratia plena Dominus tecum." This work, of which Maracci was only the editor, certainly exceeds in laborious trifling the production of father J. B. Heburne, the Scotch Minim, who dedicated to his patron, Paul V, seventy-two encomiums on the Virgin in as many different languages.

For further literature, see Volbing, Index Programmatum, p. 9; Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, col. 1841 sq.; Danz, Wörterbuch, s. v. Maria; Winer, Reale, s. v. See Jesus Christ, Virgin, Mary, the Magdalene, Maria Magdalene, A. V. "Mary Magdalene," one of the most interesting, but at the same time most contradistinctively-interpreted characters in the N.T. In the following statements respecting her we largely follow the article in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, s. v.

1. The Name.—Four different explanations have been given of this. (1) That which at first suggests itself as the most natural, that she came from the town of Magdala. The statement that the women with whom she journeyed followed Jesus in Galilee (Mark xxi, 41), agrees with this notion. Magdala was originally a tower or fortress, as its name indicates, the situation of which is probably the same with that of the modern village of el-Mejdel, on the western shore of the Lake of Tiberias (Stanley). But Lightfoot starts another supposition, both with regard to the place of residence in the early days of Mary Magdalene. He shows that there was a place called Magdala very near Jerusalem, so near that a person who set up his candles in order on the eve of the
Sabbath, might afterwards go to Jerusalem, pray there, and return and light up his candles when the Sabbath was now coming in (Exe. John xii, 3). This place is stated in the Talmud to have been destroyed on account of its adulteries. Now, it is argued by Baronius, that Mary Magdalene must have been the same person as the Syriac Stella, the name that Lightfoot entirely agrees with him, and he thinks that, Bethany and Magdala being both near Jerusalem, she may have married a man of Magdala, and acquired the disolute morals of the place; or that Magdala may have been another name for Bethany. All this, however, is full of improbabilities. (2) Another explanation has been found in the fact that the Talmudic writers, in their calumnies against the Nazarenes, make mention of a Miriam Megaddda (ניאריה), and deriving that word from the Piel of נַעַרְשָׂה, to twine, explain it as meaning 'the twiner or plaiter of hair.' They connect with this name a story which will be mentioned later; but the derivation has been accepted by Lightfoot (Hor. Heb. on Matt. xxvi, 66; Hurm. Cro. on Luke viii, 3) as satisfactory, and pointing to the previous worldliness of 'Miriam with the braided locks' as identical with 'the woman that was a sinner' of Luke vii, 57. It has been urged in favor of this that the y kəsə́ım of Luke vii, 57 is a peculiarity, as something peculiar, is used wherever the word that follows points only to origin or residence. (3) Either seriously, or with the patronizing fondness for paronomasia, Jerome sees in her name, and in that of her town, the old Mygδła ('a watch-tower'), and dwells on the coincidence accordingly. The name denotes the seat of a watch-tower. She is his 'virgo inquiriens, verum taurus canorí et Libani, qua prospicit in factam Damas- cí,' (Epist. ad Principium). He is followed in this by later Latin writers, and the pur form the theme of a panegyric sermon by Od. Clungi (Acta Sanctorum, Absalom, July 12). (4) Or plainly, on the more common meaning of נַעַרְשָׂה (גֶּדֶשׁ), to be great, sees in her name a prophecy of her spiritual greatness as having ministered to the Lord, and been the first witness of his resurrection (Tract. in Matt. xxxv). See MAGDALENE.

II. Scripture Incidents.—1. Mary Magdalene comes before us for the first time in Luke viii, 2 (A.D. 26). It was the custom of Jewish women (Jerome on 1 Cor. ix, 5) to contribute to the support of rabbis whom they revered, and, in conformity with that custom, there were among the disciples of Jesus women who 'ministered unto him of their substance.' All appear to have occurred, not with a view to the joy, it is probable, but with the chief motive was that of gratitude for their deliverance from 'evil spirits and infirmities.' Of Mary it is said specially that 'seven demons (ἔγνωτον) went out of her;' and the number indicates, as in Matt. xii, 45, and the 'legion' of the Gadarene demoniac (Mark v, 9), a possession of more than ordinary malignity.' We must think of her, accordingly, as having had, in their most aggravated forms, some of the phenomena of mental and spiritual disease which we meet with in other demoniacs—the wretchedness of despair, the divided consciousness, the precursory frenzy, the long-continued fixity of silence. The appearance of the same description in Mark xvi, 9 (whatever opinion we may form as to the authorship of the closing section of that Gospel), indicates that this was the fact most intimately connected with her name in the minds of the early disciples. From that state of misery she had been set free by the presence of the Healer, and in the absence, as we may infer, of other ties and duties, she found her safety and her blessedness in following him. The silence of the Gospels as to the presence of these women at other periods of the Lord's ministry, makes it probable that they attended on him chiefly in his more solemn progresses through the towns and villages of Galilee, while at other times he journeyed to and fro without any other attendants than the Twelve, and sometimes without even them.

2. In the last journey to Jerusalem, to which so many had been looking with eager expectation, they again accompanied him (Matt. xxvii, 55; Mark xv, 41; Luke xxiii, 55; xxiv, 10), A.D. 29. It will explain much that follows if we remember that this life of ministraion must have brought Mary Magdalene into companionship of the Lord on his last journey to Jerusalem, and that James and John (Mark iv, 40), and even also with Mary, the mother of the Lord (John xii, 25). The women who thus devoted themselves are not prominent in the history: we have no record of their mode of life or abode, or hopes or failures in these few momentous days that preceded the crucifixion. From that hour they came forth for a brief two days' space into marvellous distinctness. They 'stood afar off, beholding these things' (Luke xxiii, 49), during the closing hours of the agony on the cross. Mary Magdalene, Mary, the mother of the Lord, and the beloved disciple, were at one time not afar off, but close to the cross, within hearing. The same close association which drew them together there is seen afterwards. She remains by the cross till all is over, waits till the body is taken down, and wrapped in the linen-cloth and placed in the Roman sepulchre of Joseph of Arimathea. She remains there in the dusk of the evening, watching what she must have looked upon as the final resting-place of the Prophet and Teacher whom she had honored (Matt. xxvii, 61; Mark xvi, 47; Luke xxi, 55). Not to her had there been given grace to see any of the resurrection appearances to whom the words that spoke of it had beenaddressed had failed to understand them, and were not likely to have reported them to her. The Sabbath that followed brought an enforced rest, but no sooner is the sun up over them they were with Salome and Mary, the mother of James, 'bought sweet spices that they might come and anoint' the body, the interment of which on the night of the crucifixion they regarded as hasty and provisional (Mark xvi, 1).

The next morning, accordingly, in the earliest dawn (Matt. xxviii, 1; Mark xvi, 2), they came with Mary, the mother of James, to the sepulchre, and successively saw the 'vision of angels' (Matt. xxviii, 5; Mark xvi, 5). A careful comparison of the relative time of the several appearances of Christ on his resurrection makes it evident that the term 'first,' applied by Mark (xvi, 9) to the appearance to Mary, must not be taken so strictly as to exclude the prior appearance to the other females who had accompanied her to the sepulchre (see Metz. Quart. Rev. 1860, p. 387 sq.). See Appearances of Christ. To her, however, after the first moment of joy, it is to belong. With all this and the chief motive was that of gratitude for their deliverance from 'evil spirits and infirmities.' Of Mary it is said specially that 'seven demons (ἔγνωτον) went out of her;' and the number indicates, as in Matt. xii, 45, and the 'legion' of the Gadarene demoniac (Mark v, 9), a possession of more than ordinary malignity.' We must think of her, accordingly, as having had, in their most aggravated forms, some of the phenomena of mental and spiritual disease which we meet with in other demoniacs—the wretchedness of despair, the divided consciousness, the precursory frenzy, the long-continued fixity of silence. The appearance of the same description in Mark xvi, 9 (whatever opinion we may form as to the authorship of the closing section of that Gospel), indicates that this was the fact most intimately connected with her name in the minds of the early disciples. From that state of misery she had been set free by the presence of the Healer, and in the absence, as we may infer, of other ties and duties, she found her safety and her blessedness in following him. The silence of the Gospels as to the presence of these women at other periods of the Lord's ministry, makes it probable that they attended on him chiefly in his more solemn progresses through the towns and villages of Galilee, while at other times he journeyed to and fro without any other attendants than the Twelve, and sometimes without even them.

That how-
ever, is not the discipline she needs. Her love had been too dependent on the visible presence of her Master. She had the same lesson to learn as the other disciples. Though they had "known Christ after the flesh," they were not taught much by it, and so, in time, she learned to hear that truth in its highest and sharpest form. "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father." For a time, till the earthly affection had been raised to a heavenly one, she was to hold back. When he had finished his work and had ascended to the Father, there should be no barrier then to the fullest communion that the most devoted love could crave. Those who sought, might draw near and touch him then. He would be one with them, and they one with him. This is the last authentic record of the Magdalene. On her character, see the Journal of Soc. Lit. in Oct. 1866.

II. Proposed Identifications with other Females mentioned in the N. T.—1. The questions which meet us connect themselves with the narratives in the four Gospels of women who came with precious ointment to anoint the feet or the head of Jesus. Each Gospel contains an account of one such anointing, and men have asked, in endeavoring to construct a harmony, "Do they tell us of four distinct acts, or of three, or of two, or of one only? On any supposition but the last, are the distinct acts performed by the same or by different persons, and if by different persons, by how many? Further, have we any grounds for identifying Mary Magdalene with the woman or with any one of the women whose acts are thus brought before us?" This opens a wide range of possible combinations, but the limits of the inquiry may, without much difficulty, be narrowed. Although the opinion seems to have been at one time maintained (Origen, Tract. in Mott. xxxv.), few would now hold that Matt. xxvi and Mark xiv are reports of two distinct events. Few, except critics bent like Schleiermacher and Strauss on getting up a case against the historical veracity of the evangelists, attempt to persuade themselves that the narrative of Luke vii, differing as it does in well-nigh every circumstance, is but a misplaced and embellished version of the incident which the first two Gospels connect with the last week of our Lord's ministry. The supposition that there were three anointings has found favor with Origen (L. c.) and Lightfoot (Harv. Exeg., ad loc., and Hor. Heb. in Matt. xxvi); but while, on the one hand, it removed some harmonistic difficulties, there is, on the other, something improbable, to the verge of being inconceivable, in the repetition within three days of the same scene, at the same place, with the same ointment, and the same former and new minister. We are left to the conclusion adopted by the great majority of interpreters, that the Gospels record two anointings, one in some city unnamed (Capernam in and Nain have been suggested), during our Lord's Galilean ministry (Luke vii), the other at Bethany, before the last entry into Jerusalem (Matt. xxvi; Mark xiv; John xii).

We come, then, to the question whether in these two narratives we meet with one woman or with two. The one passage adduced for the former conclusion is John xi, 2. "If one of us had touched (Madvon in Matt. xxvi, and Joann. xi, 2; Acts Sanctorum, July 22) that which we say there ("It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment. . . . whose brother Lazarus was sick") could not possibly refer by anticipation to the history which was about to follow in ch. xii, and must therefore presuppose some fact known through the other Gospels to the Church at large, and that fact, it is inferred, is found in the history of Luke vii. Against this it has been said, on the other side, that the assumption thus made is entirely an arbitrary one, and that there is not the slightest trace of the life of Mary of Bethany ever having been one of open and flagrant impurity. There is, therefore, but slender evidence for the assumption that the two anointings were the acts of one and the same woman, and that woman the sister of Lazarus. That she may have been in the later scene is probable, but certainly not in the earlier. See No. 3, below.

There is, if possible, still less reason for the identification of Mary Magdalene with the chief actress in either of the histories. When her name appears in Luke vii, 3, there is not one word to connect it with the best text of the Gospel, and immediately precedes. Though possible, it is at least unlikely that such a one as the "sinner" would at once have been received as the chosen companion of Joanna and Salome, and have gone from town to town with them and the disciples. Lastly, the description that is given—"Out of whom went seven devils"—points, as has been stated, to a form of suffering all but absolutely incompatible with the life implied in ἐμπορίσασθαι, and to a very different work of healing from that of the divine words of pardon—"Thy sins be forgiven thee." To say, as has been said, that the seven devils are the "many sins" (Greg. Mag. Hom. in Exeg., 25 and 53), is to identify two things which are separated in the whole tenor of the N. T. by the clearest line of demarcation. The argument that because Mary Magdalene is mentioned so soon afterwards, she must be the same as the woman of Luke vii (Butler's Lives of the Saints, July 22), is simply puerile. It would be just as reasonable to identify the "sinner" with Susanna. Never, perhaps, has a figment so utterly baseless obtained so wide an acceptance as that which we connect with the name of Mary Magdalene. It has been noted that the chapter-heading of the A. V. of Luke vii should seem to give a quasi-authoritative sanction to a tradition so utterly uncertain, and that it should have been perpetuated in connection with a great work of mercy.

2. The belief that Mary of Bethany and Mary Magdalene are identical is yet more startling. Not one single circumstance, except that of love and reverence for their Master, is common. The epithet Magdalene, whatever may be its meaning, seems chosen for the express purpose of distinguishing her from all other Marys. No one evangelist gives the slightest hint of identity, Luke mentions Martha and her sister Mary in x, 88, 39, as though neither had been named before. John, who gives the fullest account of both, keeps their distinct individuality most preciously. The only simulacrum of an argument on behalf of the identity is that, if we do not admit it, we have no record of the sister of Lazarus having been a witness of the resurrection.

III. Traditions.—1. On the above Identification.—This lack of evidence in the N. T. itself is not compensated by any number of authors who are in the really trustworthy tradition. Two of the earliest writers who allude to the histories of the anointing—Clement of Alexandria (Pedag. i, 8) and Tertullian (De Paudic. chap. 8)—say nothing that would imply that they accepted it. The language of Ireneaus (iii, 4) is against it. Origen (L. c.) discusses the question fully, and rejects it. He is followed by the whole succession of the expositors of the Eastern Church: Theophilius of Antioc, Macarius, Chrysostom, Theophylact. The traditions of that Church, when they wandered into the regions of conjecture, took another path. The chief of them is the identity of Mary Magdalene with the daughter of the Syro-Phoenician woman of Mark vii, 26 (Nicephorus, H. E. i, 83). In the Western Church, however, the other belief began to spread. At first it is mentioned hesitatingly, as by Ambrose (De Exig. V. 1), and in the Council of Carthage in (Ex. 25, 58), and stamps them with his authority. The reverence felt for him, and the constant use of his works as a text-book of theology during the whole mediaeval period, secured for the hypothesis a currency which it never would have gained on its own merit. The ser-
VICES of the Feast of St. Mary Magdalene were con-
structed on the assumption of its truth (Brev. Rom., in 
Jul., 221). Hymns, paintings, and sculptures fixed it
deep in the minds of the Western nations, France
and England being foremost in their reverence for the
saint whose history appealed to their sympathies. (See
below.) In particular, that passage in Luke has been
adapted as a hymn for the day for Mary Magdalene (Meier,
on Luke vii, 37), and her name has passed into all the
languages of Western Christendom as expressive of a
female penitent. Deleying (Obs. Sacr. iii, 261) gives
a history both of the progress of the identification of and
those controversies, especially in the Gallic Church,
dealt with in a study of her liturgical status (c. 894),
while the distinction between them; and a testimony to the success with
which this was done will be found in Daniel (Theocretus
Hymnologicus, ii, 129), who tells us that in the missals
of various churches, the words "Pecatricess absorbiestvi
were substituted for those which unquestionably belong
to that noble hymn, the Dies Irae, in its original condi-
tion, "Qui Mariam absorbiestvi." Well-nigh all ecclesi-
sastical writers, after the time of Gregory the Great (Al-
bert the Great and Thomas Aquinas are exceptions),
take it for granted. When it was first questioned by Ebrard in 1802, the authority of the early De Leyin
and calmer criticism of the 16th century, the new opinion
was formally condemned by the Sorbonne (Acta Sanctorum,
L. c.), and denounced by bishop Fisher of Rochester.
The Prayer-book of 1549 follows in the wake of the
latter, in 1552, either from want of the amount of the
uncertainty or for other reasons, the feast disappears.
The Book of Homilies gives a doubtful testimony.
In one passage the "sinful woman" is mentioned without
any notice of her being the same as the Magdalene
(Seizone on Repeaton, part ii); in another it depends
upon a comma whether the two are distinguished or
identified (ibid. part ii). The translators under James
I, as has been stated, adopted the received tradition.
Since that period there has been a gradually accumu-
lating consensus against it. Calvin, Grotius, Hammond,
Casualon, among other critics, Bengel, Lampe, Greg-
well, Alford, Wordsworth, Stier, Meyer, Ellicott, Ole-
ahsen, among later, agree in rejecting it. Romanist
writers even (Tillmont, Dapin, Estius) have borne
their protest against it in whole or in part; and books
that represent the present teaching of the Gallican
Church do not entirely identify the two Marys. But
the Magdalene as an unhappy mistake (Migne, Diet. de la Bíble).
The medieval tradition has, however, found defenders
in Baronius, the writers of the Acta Sanctorum, Maldu-
natus, bishop Andrews, Lightfoot, Isaac Williams, and
hI. W. Fairburn.
2. It remains to give the substance of the legend
formed out of these combinations. At some time before
the commencement of our Lord's ministry, a great sor-
rrow fell upon the household of Bethany. The younger
of the two sisters fell from her purity and sank into
the depths of shame. Her life was that of one possessed
by the "seven devils" of uncleanness. From the city to
which she then went, or from her harlot-like adorn-
ments, she was known by the new name of Magdalene.
Then she hears of the Deliverer, and repents, and loves,
and is forgiven. Then she is received back at once by her sister and dwells
with her, and shows that she has chosen the good part.
The death of Lazarus and his return to life are new motives
to her gratitude and love; and she shows them, as she
had shown them before, anoning no longer the feet
only, but the head also of her Lord. She watches by
the cross, and is present at the sepulchre, and witnesses
the resurrection. Then (the legend goes on, when
the work of fantastic combination is completed, after some
years of waiting) she goes with Lazarus and Martha
and Maxim (one of the seventy) to Marseilles. Comp.
Lazarus. They land there; and she, leaving Martha
to more active work, retires to a cave in the neighbor-
hood of Arles, and there leads a life of penitence for
thirty years. When she dies a church is built in her
honour, and miracles are wrought at her tomb. Then
the Frank is healed by her intercession, and his new faith
is strengthened; and the chivalry of France does
homage to her name as to that of the greater Mary.
Such was the full-grown form of the Western story.
In the literature of the French writers of the 13th cen-
tury (H. E. ii, 10) states that she went to Rome to secure
Pilate for his unrighteous judgment; Modestus, patri-
arch of Constantinople (Hom. in Marias), that she came
to Ephesus with the Virgin and St. John, and died and
was buried there. The emperor Leo the Philosopher
(cir. 894) speaks of her coming from that city to the Con-
stantinople (Acta Sanctorum, l. c.), and deposited it in
the church of St. Lazarus. The day of her festival, in both
the Eastern and Western Church, is July 22.
3. Mary, the Sister of Lazarus. For much of
the information connected with this name, comp.
Lazarus and Mary Magdalene. The facts strictly per-
nonal to her are few. Her sister Martha appears in Luke,
chap. x, 40 as receiving Christ in their house. The
contrasted temperaments of the two sisters have already
been in part discussed. See Martha. Mary sat listening eagerly for every word that fell from the
divine lips, and she chose the good part that had found its unity, the "one thing needful,
in rising from the earthly to the heavenly, no longer dis-
tracted by the "many things" of earth. The same char-
acter shows itself in the history of John xi. Her grief
is deeper, but less active. She sits still in the house.
She will not go to meet the friends who come on the
formal visit of consolation. But when her sister tells
her secretly, "The Master is come and calleth for thee,"
she rises quickly and goes forth at once (John xi, 20,
28). Those who have watched the depth of her grief
have but one explanation for the sudden change: "She
goeth to the grave to weep there!" Her first thought,
when she sees the Teacher in whose power and love she
had trusted, is one of complaint. "She fell down at his
feet, saying, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my broth-
er had not died." Up to this point her relation to the di-
vine Friend had been one of reverence, receiving rather
than giving, blessed in the consciousness of his favor,
office the joy and love which her brother's return to
life brought called up in her, poured themselves out in
larger measure than had been seen before. The treasured al-
abaster-box of ointment was poured on her feet, not on
her hands, in the final feast of Bethany (John xii, 8).
A.D. 29. Matthew and Mark keep back her name. See ANointing.
Of her after-history we know nothing. The ecclesi-
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4. MARY, THE (WIFE) OF CLOPAS (Μαρία ης τού Κλωπᾶ, A. V. "of Cleophas"), described by John as standing by the cross of Jesus in company with his mother and Mary Magdalene (John xix. 25). The same is described by Matthew as consisting of Mary Magdalene, and Mary [the mother of James and Joseph, and the mother of Zebedee's children] (Matt. xxvii. 56); and by Mark, as "Mary Magdalene, and Mary [the mother of] James the Less and of Joseph, and of Mary Cleophas" (Mark xvi. 40). From a comparison of these passages, it appears that "Mary of Cleophas," and "Mary of James the Less and of Joseph," are the same person, and that she was the sister of Mary the Virgin. The arguments, preponderating on the affirmative side, for this Mary being (according to the A. V. translation) the sister of Cleophas or Alpheus, and the mother of James the Less, Jude, Simon, and their sisters, have been given under the heading James.

To solve the difficulties of this verse the following supposition has been suggested: (1) That the two clauses "his mother's sister" and "and Mary of Clopas" are not in apposition, but the former is descriptive of the four persons as present, namely, the mother of Jesus; her sister, to whom he does not assign any name; Mary of Clopas; and Mary Magdalene (Lange). It has been further suggested that this sister's name was Salome, wife of Zebedee, and not avoiding the same difficulty. John could not have expressed himself as he does had he meant more than three persons. It has been suggested (2) that the word αδελφή is here not to be taken in its strict sense, but rather in the laxer acceptance, which it clearly does bear in other places. Mary, wife of Clopas, it has been said, was not the sister, but the cousin of the Virgin Mary (see Wordsworth, Gr. Test., Preface to the Epistle of St. James). There is nothing in this suggestion which is objectionable, or which can be disproved. But it is hardly consistent with the terms of close relationship assigned to the connected members of the holy family. See brethren of our Lord. By many, therefore, it has been contended (3) that the two Dowers were literally sisters-german. "That it is far from impossible for two sisters to have the same name may be seen by any one who will merely look at the tables of Matthew and Mark. To name none others, his eye will at once light on a pair of Antonia and a pair of Octavia, the daughters of the same father, and in one case of different mothers, in the other of the same mother. If it be objected that these are examples of a different race, another is given to the reader in Cleopatra. It is quite possible, too, that the same cause which operates at present in Spain may have been at work formerly in Judea. Miriam, the sister of Moses, may have been the holy woman after whom Jewish mothers called their daughters, just as Spanish mothers not unfrequently give the name of Mary to their children, male and female alike, in honor of the Virgin Mary. (Maria, Maria-Pia, and Maria-Imaculata, are the first names of three of the sisters of the late king of the Two Sicilies.) This is on the hypothesis that the two names are identical, but, on a close examination of the Greek texts, we find that it is possible that this was not the case. Mary the Virgin is Μαρία; her sister is Μαρία. It is more than possible that these names are the Greek representatives of two forms which the antique γυνή had then taken; and as in pronunciation the emphasis had been thrown on the last syllable in Μαρία, while the final letter in Μαρία would have been almost unheard, there would, upon this hypothesis, be a greater difference in the sisters' names than there is between Mary and Maria among ourselves. The ordinary explanation that Μαρία is the Hebraic form, and Μαρία the Greek form, and that the difference is in the use of the evangelists, not in the name itself, seems scarcely adequate: for why should the evangelist invariably employ the Hebraic form of name when writing of Mary the Virgin, and the Greek form when writing about the other Marys in the Gospel history? It is true that this distinction is not constantly observed in the readings of the Codex Vaticanus, the Codex Ephraemi, and a few other MSS.; but there is such a great amount of the codices to determine the usage. That it is possible for a name to develop into several kindred forms, and for these forms to be considered sufficiently distinct appellations for two or more brothers or sisters, is evidenced by daily experience. We find that the high priest Onias III had a brother also named Onias, who eventually succeeded him in his office under the adoptive name of Menelaus. We have the authority of the earliest traditions for the opinion that our Lord's mother had at least one sister called Mary. Indeed, it is an old opinion that Anna, the mother of the Virgin Mary, had three daughters of that name by different husbands; and Dr. Routh, in his Reliquiae Sacrae, gives us from Papia, the scholar of John (cf. Cod. M. B. Bibliothek. 2897), the following enumeration of four Marys of the N. T.: 1. Maria, Mater Domini; 2. Maria, Cleophas sive Alpheus; 3. Maria, Consobrina Mariae, et Theae, et Cujiusdam Joseph; 4. Maria Salome, uxor Zebedei, mater Johannis evangelistae et Jacobi; 4. Maria Magdalene. It is further stated, in this fragment of Papia, that both Mary, the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Salome were sisters of our Lord, and consequently sisters of the Virgin Mary." (Kitto). Finally, most interpreters, regarding all the above positions as untenable, or, at least, improbable, suppose (4) that the two Marys were sisters-in-law by virtue of having married brothers, i.e., Joseph and Alpheus or Clopas, and afterward, perhaps by a Levirite marriage, having become the wives of the same husband, namely, Joseph the survivor. See Alphius.

The only knowledge we have of this Mary, besides the above facts of her sons, and of her presence at the crucifixion, is that she was that "other Mary" who, with Mary Magdalene, attended the body of Christ to the sepulchre when taken down from the cross (Matt. xxvii. 61; Mark xv. 47; Luke xxiii. 55). She was also among those who went on the morning of the first day of the week to the sepulchre to anoint the body, and who became the first witnesses of the resurrection (Matt. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 1; Luke xxiv. 1). A.D. 29.

5. MARY, THE MOTHER OF JOHN, SURNAMED MARK (Μαρία ης Ιωάννου τού επισκοποῦ Μάρκου, Acta xii. 12). A.D. 44. The woman known by this designation was another Mary, the sister of Clopas. We learn from Col. iv. 10 that she was sister to Barnabas, and it would appear from Acts iv. 37, xii. 12, that, while the brother gave up his land and brought the proceeds of the sale into the common treasury of the Church, the sisters gave up their house to be used by one of its chief places of meeting. The fact that Peter went to that house on his release from prison indicates that there was some special intimacy (Acta xii. 12) between them, and this is confirmed by the language which he uses towards Mark as being his "son" (I Pet. v. 13). She, it may be added, must have been, like Barnabas, of the tribe of Levi, and may have been connected, as he was, with Cyprus (Acts iv. 36). It has been surmised that filial anxiety about her welfare during the persecutions and the famine which harassed the Church at Jerusalem, was the chief cause of Mark's rapid departure from the missionary labors of Paul and Barnabas. The tradition of a later age represented the place of meeting for the disciples, and therefore probably the house of Mary, as having stood on the upper slope of Zion, and affirmed that it had been the scene of the wonder of the day of Pentecost, had escaped the general destruction of the city by Titus, and was still used as a church in the 4th century (Ephiph. De Ponto et Mens, xiv; Cyril Hierosol. Catech. xvi). See Mark.
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6. A Christian female at Rome, mentioned by Paul as having formerly treated him with special kindness (Rom. xvi. 6). A.D. 54. As this is the only Hebrew name in the list (Jousta, ed.), and as the reading εἰκὴν in the Margin: it was changed, it is possible that she was not a native of Rome.

MARY OF AGERZA. See AGERZA, MARIA DE.

MARY OF EGYPT, a saint of the Roman Catholic Church, according to her legend, ran away from her parents when twelve years of age; led a very dissolute life for seventeen years at Alexandria, and then joined a party of pilgrims on their way to Jerusalem, with the intention of dying there in the same year. Arriving in that city, she wished to visit the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but was held back by an unseen power; she then knelt before an image of Mary, and vowed to reform her life. She was now permitted to enter the church, and, after praying to the cross, asked the Virgin to direct her what she should do to be acceptable to God. A supernatural voice told her to go to the other side of Jordan, into the wilderness. Mary obeyed, and lived there forty-seven years, enduring privations of all kinds, until the monk Zosimus discovered her one day, an old, naked, sunburnt woman, covered with white hair. She was very thin, very tall, and very beautiful, and she said that she had received her blessing; related to him her history, and asked him to come to see her again in a year, and to bring her the communion. As he came at the appointed time, she met him and commended him. But when he went again to see her, four years after, she was found only a corpse, and her name written beside her on the sand. After he had long tried in vain to dig a grave to bury her, a lion came and helped him. According to the general opinion, she died during the reign of Theodosius the Younger. Her grave became a great shrine, and a number of churches and chapels were placed under her protection. She is most honored in the Greek Church, and is commemorated on the 2d of April. See C. Baronii Martyrologium Romanum (Moguntiae, 1631, p. 209 sqq); Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, ix, 103. (J. N. P.)

MARY, queen of England, daughter of Henry VIII, by his first wife, Catharine of Aragon, is commonly called Bloody Queen Mary, on account of her cruel persecutions of the Protestants—"a history of horrors exceeded only by the persecutions in the Netherlands by Alva, and of Louis XIV after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes." She was born at Greenwich, on the 19th of December (O. S.), 1536. She was married at Westminster, on the 16th of December, 1540, to Lord Robert Dudley, with whom she was united by a contract, and became her father was then "out of hopes of more children," declared in 1518 princess of Wales, and sent to Ludlow, to hold her court there, divers matches being projected for her, none of which, however, were carried into effect. After the divorce of Catharine, and Henry's marriage of Anne Boleyn, Mary's position waned at court, and finally the title of princess of Wales was transferred to princess Elizabeth, soon after she came into the world. Mary had been brought up from her infancy in a strong attachment to the ancient religion, under the care of her mother, and Margaret, countess of Salisbury, the effect of whose instructions was not impaired by the subsequent lessons of the learned Ludovis Vives, who, though some time resident at the Reformed College, was appointed by Henry to be her Latin tutor. The profligate conduct of her father, and the wrongs inflicted upon her mother, naturally had the effect of making her still more attached to the Roman Catholics. But immediately after the abdication of queen Anne in 1536, a reconciliation took place between Henry and his eldest daughter, who was now prevailed upon to make a formal acknowledgment both of Henry's ecclesiastical supremacy—utterly refusing "the bishop of Rome's pretended authority, power, and jurisdiction within this realm herefore usurped"—and of the nullity of the marriage of her father and mother, which she declared was "by God's law and man's incestuous and unlawful." (See the "Confession of me, the Lady Mary," as printed by Burnet [Hist. Ref.] from the original, "all written with her own hand." This very year, however, shortly after the marriage of Jane Seymour, a new act of succession was passed, by which she was again, as well as her sister Elizabeth, declared illegitimate, and forever excluded from claiming the inheritance of the crown as a Protestant heir by line of descent. But as, by the powers reserved to Henry VIII of nominating his own successor after failure of the issue of queen Jane, or of any other queen whom he might afterwards marry, a possible chance was left to Mary, she continued to yield an outward conformity to all her father's capricious measures, and the matter was settled when she so far succeeded in regaining his favor that in the new act of succession, passed in 1544, the inheritance to the crown was expressly secured to her next her brother Edward and his heirs, and any issue the king might have by his the wife Catharine Parr. Upon the death of Henry VIII and the accession to the throne of England (1544), Mary's hopes of reigning one day over England were darkened by the persistent efforts of her half-brother to establish the religion of the Reformers. Mary's compliance with the innovations in religion was on the whole, as we have seen, more the result of necessity than of real belief. She had been dictated merely by fear or self-interest; no longer restrained, she manifested her fidelity to and affection for the court of Rome when, after Edward's accession, his ministers proceeded to place the whole doctrine, as well as discipline, of the national Church upon a new foundation. She openly refused to go along with them, nor could all their persuasions and threats, aided by those of her brother himself, move her from her ground. (Full details of the various attempts that were made to prevail upon her may be found in Burnet: History, p. 417-420, and in King Edward's Journal. Mention is made in the latter, under date of April, 1549, of a demand for the hand of the lady Mary by the duke of Brunswick, who was informed by the council that "there was talk for her marriage with the infant of Portugal, which being determined, he should have answer." About the same time it is noted that "whereas the emperor's ambassador desired leave, by letters patent, that my lady Mary might have mass, it was denied him." On the 18th of March of the following year the king writes: 'The lady Mary, my sister, came to me at St. George's Chapel, Westminster, and had, with my council, into a chamber; where was declared how long I had suffered her mass, in hope of her reconciliation, and how now being no hope, which I perceived by her letters, except I saw some short amendment, I could not bear it. She answered that her soul was God's, and her faith she would not change, nor dissemble her opinion with contrary doings. It was said, I constrained not her faith, but wished her not as a king to rule, but as a subject to obey; and that her example might breed too much inconvenience." Had it not been for the interference of Charles V, Mary would have suffered severe punishment for her persistence in remaining faithful to the pope. The emperor, who had once even asked her hand, and only withdrew his request when Catharine was divorced, made it "the condition of his friendly relations to the English government that Mary be left in the free enjoyment of her religious faith, and the king of England, rather than be subject to war, yielded—but with tears" (Lingard, Hist. of Eng., vii, 96 sq.). Yet if Mary secured liberty of conscience, she secured it at the risk of a crown, for Mary's firm adherence to the Roman faith, and her refusal to make an act of submission to the interference of his minister Northumberland, who attempted at the close of his life to exclude her from the succession, and to make over the crown by will to lady Jane Grey, an act which was certainly without any shadow of legal force, and failed to be of any effect. Although lady Jane was actually proclaimed queen upon the death
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of Edward, Mary herself claimed the crown, and with scarcely any resistance secured the throne.

Mary's reign opens a new and bloody chapter in the history of England—a period in the ecclesiastical annals when the flame of Romanism, which had been slowly dying, was fanned into new life, and, glaring up wildly, was quickly dimmed and then put out to burn anew. Mary, as we have seen, was ever a faithful adherent to the cause of Rome; she had quietly submitted to the innovations under Henry VIII to secure her father's favors, but as she grew older she grew more decided. Indeed, her own legitimacy to the throne was involved in her father's, and the effects of the pope. One of the pontiffs had confirmed her mother's marriage, and another had refused to annull it. Impressed by this truth, she had clung closely to the Church of her infancy, even when she seemed in danger of losing the privilege of succession, and she faltered not when lady Jane Grey became the avowed heiress of her half-brother.

Quite in contrast with this bearing is her conduct after the decease of Edward. Satisfied that the way to the throne could be opened only by Protestant aid, she hesitated not to pledge to the men of Suffolk, whose help she expected, a promise that she would be "more liberal in private exercise of religion, and that she would not force that of others." (Butler, ii, 437; Neale, i, 58.) She even repeated a like declaration to the council, and renewed it as late as a month after her accession to the throne. Yet at this time she was preparing the way for a speedy return of England's clergy to the communion of Rome. Even before she had made these promises she had already sent a message to the Pope announcing her accession, and giving in her allegiance to him as a dutiful daughter of the Church (Butler, ii, 437).

Mary made her accession to the throne on July 19. In the course of the month of August, Boumer (q. v.), Gardiner (q. v.), and three other bishops, who had been deposed for nonconformity in the late reign, were restored to their sees, and the mass, contrary to law, began again to be celebrated in many churches. In the following month archbishop Cranmer (q. v.) and bishop Latimer (q. v.), having opposed these papish innovations, were committed to the Tower. Soon after Ridley (q. v.) was committed, and upon the meeting of Parliament, Oct. 5, only three months after the king's death, but two of the Reformed bishops—Taylor of Lincoln and Harley of Hereford—remained in their sees, while Peter Martyr (q. v.), John A Lasko [see Lasko] , and other foreign preachers, were advised to quit the country. After the assembling of Parliament further steps were taken. An act was forced through repealing all the acts of Henry VIII concerning his divorce from Catherine, and to procure the archbishopric he now played a like unmerciful game against all who stood in his way. The crime he had perpetrated he assured Mary had been committed by Cranmer, and persuaded all that he had ever remained a most faithful servant of the pope. See GARDINER. Some writers will even have it that Mary was at this time inclined to be just to all her subjects, and that she was only led astray by this dastardly but wily ecclesiastical. But, be this as it may, certainly it is that Mary acted in the interests of Romanism only, quite unmeritoriof the obligations she had assumed before the Protestants. In the Convocation, the Book of Common Prayer and Poyntot's Catechism were pronounced "abominable and pestiferous books." In the lower house, division was disputed boldly against transubstantiation for three days; but when, overpowered by numbers, they left the house, four articles were framed which became the test of herey to all who suffered in this reign. They affirmed (1) communion in one kind; (2) a transubstantiation of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ; (3) that worship should be rendered to the host; (4) that Christ is offered up as a sacrifice in the mass (comp. Butler, ii, 440). Rome also promptly responded, and appointed a legate for England—"carnal Pole"—but, as Gardiner himself was desirous to secure the position (Short, iv, 77), he urged the queen to request the legate to return at home, at least until the match proposed between herself and Philip of Spain, the pious Catholic, be further matured. There was great opposition on the part of the people to this proposal with Spain, and it was not best to trifle with popular opinion. Indeed, as it was, these measures, and other indications given by the court of a determination to be completely reconciled with Rome, were followed by insurrection (commonly known as that of Sir Thomas Wyatt, its principal leader), which broke out in the end of January, 1554. It is true this rebellion was in a few days effectually put down, its suppression being signalized by the executions of the unfortunate lady Jane Grey and her husband, the lord Guildford Dudley, of her father, the duke of Suffolk, and, lastly, of the queen's own brother. This provocd in indignation, instead of urging Mary to her senses, led her further and further away from the people over whom she had forced herself as ruler. She was well aware that the people were daily growing in dissatisfaction because of her decision to lead them back to Rome, and yet, in the height of this open opposition (union with the greatest Roman Catholic power, the government of Charles V, by her marriage to Philip II (q. v.), July 25. Though the latter pledged himself to the performance of many concessions to the English, the Spanish match remained exceedingly unpopular.

Mary's success In quelling the rebellion which she had provoked gave her, however, most complete ascendency over the reactionists, and she promptly used her courage and capacity to intrench herself by the aid of Rome. Parliament, which was assembled in November, was completely under her sway, and, inspired by her, obediently passed acts repealing the attainer of cardinal Pole, who had long waited to make his appearance in England as the papal legate, restoring the authority of the pope, repealing all laws made against the see of Rome since Henry VIII, reviving the ancient statutes against heresy, and, in short, re-establishing the whole national system of religious policy as it had existed previous to the first innovations made by her father. By one of the acts of this session of Parliament, also, Philip was authorized to take the title of King of England during his lifetime. These measures had been accompanied by several ceremonies of a rule of bloodshed and tyranny that closed only with the decease of the principal author and executor—"Bloody Queen Mary." herself.

Not content, however, with having restored the power of the Church of England over the Anglican Church, Mary introduced new and severe measures for the suppression of those who had dared to follow her father and half-brother in measures of ecclesiastical reform. Many of the clergy had married. One of her first acts now was the ejection of these clergy. The number of such, according to Burnet, was 12,000 out of 16,000; but this seems exaggerated, and we prefer to follow Butler, who estimates them at a little over 3,000, certainly a large enough number of men so suddenly deprived of their living, and, with thousands dependent upon them, at a moment's warning shut out from the world, to say the least, the measure was most tyrannical; not even the option of dissolving the marriage-bond was given, though they had been married under the sanction of the law of the land. Many of the bishops—sixteen of them—shared a like fate with their subordinate. The question, how boldly this power was asserted, "How shall the heretic be treated?" "Cardinal Pole, from his gentler temper and larger wisdom, advised mild measures in order to win them back; but, in case
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they could not be won, he would, equally with Gardiner and Bonner, have had them burned. Gardiner was now for measures of repression and vigor. He contended that relaxation in the time of Henry VIII had been the cause, and that the hub of the hoop was the pope. At the point of the see of Canterbury (which Pole had secured, of course), and enraged because his books against the papal supremacy were reprinted and dispersed through the country. The queen was always on the side of the severest measures, and the remainder of the history of the reign of Mary is occupied chiefly with the sanguinary persecutions of the adherents to the Reformed doctrines. Most Protestant writers reckon that about 290 victims perished at the stake from Feb. 4, 1555, on which day John Rogers was burned at Smithfield, to Nov. 10, 1558, when the last "auto-da-fe" of the reign took place by the execution in the same manner of three men and two women at Colchester. Dr. Lingard, the Roman Catholic, admits that after expunging from the Protestant lists "the names of all who were condemned as felons or traitors, or who died peaceably in their beds, or who survived the publication of their martyrdom, or who would for their heterodoxy have been sent to the stake by the Reformed prelates themselves, had they been in possession of the power," and making every other possible allowance, it will still be found "that in the space of four years almost 200 persons perished in the flames of the "papal passion." The fullest. The most minute and in its details, may be found in part in Burnet, and in full in Fox's Martyrology. Among the most distinguished sufferers were Hooper, bishop of Gloucester, Ferrar of St. David's, Latimer of Worcester, Ridley of London, and Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury. Nor were the sufferings confined to the stake. Intolerance also carried grief, horror, and ferocity into all England by the persecution of those who were guilty of heresy, but were not considered fit subjects for the stake. It is said that in the last three years of Mary's reign no less than 280 persons were exiled and spoliéed of their goods (Butler, ii, 445), among whom were not less than 800 theologians (comp. Fisher, p. 328).

The question has been raised, Who were most responsible for these persecutions? Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, and lord chancellor, was Mary's chief minister till his death in November, 1555, after which the direction of affairs fell mostly into the hands of cardinal Pole, who, after Cranmer's deposition, was made archbishop of Canterbury; but the notorious Bonner, Ridley's successor in the see of London, has the credit of having been the principal and the inventor of these atrocities, which, it may be remarked, so far from contributing to put down the Reformed doctrines, appear to have had a greater effect in disgusting the nation with the restored Church than all other causes together. Says Soames (iv, 446): "The proceedings had the whole kingdom with amazement, indignation, and disgust. Unfeeling Romish bigots were disappointed because this atrocious embellishment of their party's intolerance had wholly failed to overawe the spirit of their adversaries. Timid Protestants were encouraged by the noble constancy displayed among their friends. Moderate Romanists were ashamed of their spiritual guides. The mass of men, who live in stupid forgetfulness of God, were aroused from that lethargy of sensuality, covetousness, or vanity in which they dispathe existence, to reflect upon the principles which could support the human mind, tranquill, or even exulting, amid such frightful agonies."

At the same time that the attempt was thus made to extinguish the new opinions in religion by persecution at the stake, exile, and other severe measures, the queen gave a further proof of the ardor of her faith by restoring to the Church the tenents and first-fruits, with all the rectories, glebe-lands, and tithes that had been annexed to the crown in the times of her father and brother. She also re-established several of the old monasteries which her father had dissolved, and endowed them as liberally as her means enabled her. Gladly would she have restored them all to the Church, "but it was feared that violent commotions would ensue if that course were adopted;" and the papal legate, while he "approv'd the king's policy," did "disapprove the manner of the execution," and "the whole plan of the monasteries and Church lands should not be disturbed," "admonished those who held those lands of the guilt of sacrilege, and reminded them of the doom of Delelahazar" (c). See Moxartic. Froude, whom the Romanists are so eager to prove guilty of unfaithfulness as a historian, has been one of the most lenient commentators on the conduct of Mary of England towards her people. He holds that, "To the time of her accession she had lived a blameless and, in many respects, a noble life; and few men or women have lived less capable of doing knowingly a wrong thing." He adds that her trials and disappointments, "it can hardly be doubted, affected her sanity," and ascribes the guilt chiefly to Gardiner, and measurably to Pole. Unless it be on the point of insanity, we are inclined to hold Mary responsible for the persecutions of her reign, believing, with Ranke, that "whatever is done in the name of a prince, with his will and by his authority, decides his reputation in history." In her domestic life Mary was wrecked. Philip, whom she loved with a morbid passion, proved a sour, selfish, and heartless husband; at once a bigot and a voluptuary. No man ever showed less interest and exasperation and loneliness, working upon a temperament naturally obstinate and sullen, without doubt rendered her more complaisant to the sanguinary policy of the re-actionary bishops. Fortunately for England, her reign was brief. She died—after suffering much and long from dropsey and nervous debility—Nov. 17, 1558. Her successor on the throne was her sister Elizabeth, who not only undid all the work she had accomplished, but finally and successfully established Protestantism as the faith of the nation. See Elizabeth.

Quaerulum was interpreted by some. Though of but minor interest at present, deserve mention here because of the peculiar bearing they have on her early history. She is said to have been a superior Latin scholar, and was commended by Erasmus. "Scriptum bene Latinas epistolas," says he. Towards the end of her father's reign, at the earnest solicitation of queen Catharine Parr, she undertook to translate Erasmus's Paraphrase on the Gospel of St. John, but being cast into sickness, as Udall relates, partly by overmuch study in this work, after she had made some progress therein, she left the rest to be finished. Another volume of this paraphrase is printed in the first volume of Erasmus's Paraphrase upon the New Testament (London, 1548, folio). The "Preface" was written by Udall, the famous master of Eton School, and addressed to the queen dowager. Af- ter her death it was procured to be burnt by the whole company, calling in and suppressing this very book, and all others that had any tendency towards furthering the Reforma- tion. An ingenius writer is of opinion that the sickness which came upon her while she was translating St. John was all affected; "for," says he, "she would not so easily have been cast into sickness had she been employed on the legends of St. Teresa or St. Catharine of Sienna." Strype (iii, 468) has preserved three prayers or meditations of hers: the first, A Against the Avarice of Vice; the second, A Meditation touching A Dearth; the third, A Prayer to be read at the Hour of Death. In Fox's Acts and Monuments are printed eight of her letters to king Edward and the lords of the council on her nonconformity, and on the imprisonment of her chaplain, Dr. Mallet. In the Syloge epistolarum there are several more of her letters, extremely curious: one on her divorce, another in never having written but to the king, one of affection for her sister, one after the death of Anne Boleyn, and one, very remarkable, of Cromwell to her. In Hayme's State Pape is two in Spanish, to the emperor Charles V. There is also a French letter, printed by Strype (iii, 818) from the Cotton Library.
in answer to a haughty mandate from Philip, when he had a mind to marry the lady Elizabeth to the duke of Sforza, but the queen’s bound and princes’s inclination: it is written in a most object manner and a wretched style. Bishop Tanner ascribes to her A History of her own Life and Death, and An Account of Martyrs in her Reign, but this is manifestly an error. See Homel, Mari.
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Mary Stuart, the famous queen of Scotland, whose name, Proude (Hist. of Engl. vii, 369) says, "will never be spoken of in history without sad and profound emotion, however opinions may vary on the special details of her life and actions," was, as an infant-queen, carried out of the castle of Linlithgow, Dec. 8, 1542. She was the third child of James V of Scotland, by his wife Mary of Lorraine, daughter of the duke of Guise, who had previously borne her husband two sons, both of whom died in infancy. A report prevailed that Mary too was not likely to live; but being unwedded, she was the desire of her anxious mother, in presence of the English ambassador, the latter wrote to his court that she was as a child as her mother had seen of her. At the time of her birth her father lay sick in the palace of Falkland, and in the course of a few days after he expired, at the early age of thirty, his death being hastened by distress of mind occasioned by the defeat which his nobles had sustained at Faia and Solway Moss. James was naturally a person of considerable energy and vigor both of mind and body, but previous to his death he fell into a state of listlessness and despondency, and after his decease it was found that he had made no provision for the care of the infant princess or for the administration of the government. After great convulsions among the nobility, it was decreed that the earl of Arran, as being by proximity of blood the next heir to the crown in legitimate descent, and the first peer of Scotland, should be made governor of the kingdom, and guardian of the queen, who remained in the mean time with her mother in the royal palace at Linlithgow. But while the difficulty was settling, the Roman Catholics, fearing for the decline of their power if the choice of the nobility should fall upon some one likely to join hands with Henry VIII, urged cardinal Beaton, the head of their party, to seize the regency. Ambitious for office and power, Beaton but too willingly listened to the advice of his friends, and, producing a testament which he asserted to be that of the late king, promptly claimed the control of the affairs of Scotland. The fraud was not long discovered, but as great suit had been made by king Henry, in behalf of his son Edward, for the hand of the infant queen, and as Arran and his party had been indiscreet enough to accept the offer in spite of the opposition of the pope, Beaton hold his own in the country, and finally even persuaded Arran to his views, and the engagement with England was annulled. The result was a war between Scotland and England, which ended most ignominiously for the Highlanders. It is not at all likely that this war would have broken out between England and Scotland had it not been for the encouragement France gave to the Highlanders. Scotland had thus far remained true to the cause of Rome: a scion of the house of Guise (duke Claude) was on the throne, and the Reformation, though progressing in the adjoining country, had not yet been suffered to make much of an impression on the Scots. But the new doctrine had found an entrance at least. Indeed, the regent Arran was himself favorable to the Reformers, and in Parliament, as early as 1542, an act had been passed declaring it lawful for all to read the Scriptures in their native language. It was clear, therefore, that though Romanism had hitherto sustained its supremacy, its power was tottering. At this critical juncture of affairs France came forward and offered assistance to the Roman party. The cause of the Church must be upheld at all hazards. The result was the establishment of two camps. "The friends of the Reformation," says Russell (Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland [Lond. 1834, 2 vol. 18mo], i, 181), "supported those counsellors which had for their object the union of the British crowns; while the Romanists very naturally clung to that alliance which, aided by the personal influence of the queen-mother, promised to strengthen the foundations of their establishment, already somewhat shaken by the popular tempest." Had Arran been a person of indomitable will and stability of purpose the cause of the Reformers might now have been firmly established, but he was "a weak and fickle man, liable at all times to be wrought upon and biased by those of greater decision and energy of character," and his opponent, the wily cardinal, had obtained the ascendancy, and not only neutralized Arran's opposition but actually brought him to approve and further the great master-scheme of the cardinal to give the young queen in marriage to the dauphin of France. In conscience with a treaty for this purpose, Mary was sent to France in 1548, to be educated in that country.

Mary Queen of Scots.

[The numerous portraits ascribed to this princess are so various and dissimilar in the circumstances of her life, and have excited almost as much doubt and controversy as the disputed points of her history, agreeing only in representing her as eminently beautiful. The picture which has furnished the plate before us has been preserved with the greatest care from time immemorial in the possession of Dalrymple, the principal seat in Scotland of the earl of Morton; on the upper part of it is inscribed, 'Mary Queen of Scots: said to have been painted during her confinement in Lochleven Castle by J. Morison. This picture is preserved in the Earl's possession, according to tradition in his lordship's family. It was once the property of George Douglas, the son of the Earl of Morton, and it is said to have been brought from him to his relative relations, James, fourth earl of Morton, with whose possession it remains to the present day.]
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Soon after her arrival at her destination Mary was placed with the French king's own daughters in one of the first convents of the kingdom, where she made rapid progress in the acquisition of the literature and accomplishment of the age. She received instructions in the art of making verses by the famous Ronsard, and in Latin with her by the great scholar Buchanan. When only fourteen years old she had attained to such a mastery of the language that she pronounced before Henry II a Latin oration, in which she maintained that it is becoming for women to study literature and master the liberal arts. Introduced to the court with Henry II, which, as a pietist, she felt should be the order of the times, she became a part of the court, but was soon testifying her superiority in many respects. She was one of the most learned and accomplished in Europe;

Mary, while yet a child, became the envy of her sex, surpassing the most accomplished in the elegance and fluency of her language, the grace and liveliness of her movements, and the charm of her whole manner and behavior. "Graceful alike in person and intellect," says Froude, "she possessed that peculiar beauty in which the form is lost in the expression, and which every painter, therefore, has represented differently. Rarely, perhaps, has any woman combined so many noticeable qualities as Mary—a feminine instinct into men and things and human life, she had cultivated herself to such that high perfection in which accomplishments were no longer adventitious ornaments, but were wrought into her organic constitution... She had vigor, energy, tenacity, and a perfect self-possession, and, as the one indispensable foundation for the effective use of all other qualities, she had indomitable courage" (Hist. of England, vol. vii, ch. iv).

The dauphin, to whom she was betrothed, was about two years her junior, but, as they had been playmates in early childhood, a mutual affection had sprung up between them, and when, on April 24, 1556, she was to be joined to him in wedlock, she hesitated not to submit to the most absurd stipulations. Not only was she obliged to agree that her intended husband should have the title of king of the Scots, but she was even betrayed into the signature of a secret deed, by which, if she died childless, both her Scottish realm and her right of succession to the English crown, as the granddaughter of Henry VII, were conveyed to France. The foolishness of this secret compact Mary had afterwards sufficient cause to regret more than once.

Scarce were the nuptial solemnities fairly over, when queen Mary of England died (1558). In accordance with the agreement entered into, France promptly put forward her claim to the vacant throne, and, though Elizabeth's successor Mary was not insistent upon, and continued to be urged with great persistency by her ambitious uncle the princes of Lorraine. "On every occasion on which the dauphin and dauphiness appeared in public, they were ostentatiously greeted as the king and queen of England; the English arms were engraved upon their plate, embroidered on their banners, and painted on their furniture; and Mary's own favorite device at the time was the two crowns of France and Scotland, with the motto "Aliique morum," meaning that of England." July 10, 1559, Henry died, and dauphin ascended the throne of France as Charles IX. "Surely," thought Mary, "I am soon to realize my highest expectations. Over three kingdoms I shall sway the sceptre. The holy father himself will come from Rome and pronounce his blessing upon me as his most faithful daughter. The lately-deceased queen of England received her name in honor of the blessed Virgin, I shall be pronounced more worthy of it still." Alas for human frailty! Man proposteth, but God disposeth. Mary had reached the summit of her splendor at a moment when she believed herself only ascending the heights. Fickle and selfish, Francis II was scarcely seated on the throne when he was seized by disease, and, fast wasting away, died Dec. 5, 1560. Only a year and a half had the young pair enjoyed their royal honors. Childless, Mary was obliged to yield her place on the throne, and the reins of power were seized by the queen-mother, Catharine of Medici, as regent for her son, Charles IX. Mary must have been prepared, under almost any circumstances, to quit a court which was now swayed by one whom, during her brief reign, she had taunted with being "a merchant's daughter," full of such "malignant" measures. She was of the French scholarly class, brought up in England, and educated at Tours. From France. Her presence was urgently needed in Scotland, which the death of her mother, a few months before, had left without a government, at a moment when it was convulsed by the throes of the Reformation. Her kinsmen of Lorraine had ambitious projects for her, and many a Frenchman observed, with a mixture of envy and jealousy, the fearlessness with which she accepted the offer of the French crown; and both these, it was thought, might be more successfully followed out when she was seated on her native throne. The queen of England, however, interposed; and, as Mary would not abandon all claim to the English throne, she was

Mary, notwithstanding, resolved to go, and at length, after repeated delays, still lingering on the soil where fortune had augured so much, she reached Calais, attended thus far by the cardinals of Guise and Lorraine, while three other uncles, the Dauphin, and the Count of Artois, came to see her safely to Edinburgh. August 14 she finally set sail, and, with 'Arielle, belle France,' sentimental verses, and a passionate chit-chat sighing at her feet in melodious music, she sailed away over the summer seas, and, safely reaching England, Elizabeth had despatched to intercept her, reached Leith on the 19th. Her arrival on her native shores is thus beautifully described in Harper's Magazine, Feb. 1878, p. 348: "August 19, 1561. The thickest mist and most dreching rain men remembered ever to have seen. A fog so thick that the very cannon in the harbor boomed with a muffled sound, and the peal of bells from the Edinburgh churches sounds ominously, as if it rang out the funeral knell of the young queen. Such is the day that greets French Mary when she lands on Scottish shores. Better far for her had this fog hid her squadron from the watchful eyes of her royal cousin... Better that she had fallen then into the hands of queen Elizabeth than to have become her wretched prisoner seven years later, shorn of that good name which is woman's chief protection—always and everywhere her best safe-conduct.

A great change had taken place in Scotland since Mary had left her country nearly thirteen years ago. The Roman Catholic religion was then supreme; and, under the direction of cardinal Beaton, the Romish clergy displayed a fierce tenacity of intolerance which seemed to aim at the utter extermination of every seed of dissent and reform. The same power, which gave strength to the ecclesiastics gave strength also, though more slowly, to the great body of the people; and at length, after the repeated losses of Fledden and Faiz, and Solway Moss and Pinkie—which, by the fall of nearly the whole lay nobility and leading men of the kingdom, brought all classes within the influence of public events—the energies, physical and mental, of the entire nation were drawn out, and under the guidance of the reformer Knox expended themselves with such effect that the form of the fabric of the ancient religion. The queen-regent died June 10, 1560. In August following the estates convened, adopted and approved the Calvinistic Confession of Faith, and, abolishing the Roman Catholic religion, for the same time the administers of the mass or attendance upon it—the charge which was the be- ing death. "On the morning of Aug. 25, 1560," says Burton (iv, 89), "the Romish hierarchy was supreme; in the evening of the same day Calvinistic Protestantism was established in its stead." Hardly a year had passed since these changes had been effected. A strange atmosphere this for Mary, who had been brought up in France to abhor Protestant opinions. But, fortunately for Mary, she had enjoyed a training which fitted her well for the part she was now to play. Had she not
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spent the most susceptible years of her life in the court of France under those worthy custodians of the conscience—Vasquez, Escobar, Mendoxa? These Jesuit fathers had not hesitated to defend by their casuistry, and under color of religion, fraud, forgery, falsehood, and murder. Their teachings, before counteracted by the efforts of the holy Mother Church, had made such inroads upon the holy Gospel as Luther, had brought forth their fruit in the assassination of William of Orange and of Coligni, and in the wholesale massacre of St. Bartholomew. Surely it could not be expected that Mary would prove herself unworthy of her birth and her costly education. Indeed, as early as 1552, she was publicly announced and baptized as the true heir of the dynasty of Mary, and so she remained in the eyes of the French and of most of Europe. To her they were not mere religious exiles, but a living, a direct line of succession to the ancient crown of Scotland. Thus her claim to the throne of France had a solid foundation in the Roman Catholic Church. But the Catholic Church was not the only power that could claim the throne of Scotland. The Protestant party was also strong, and the struggle between the two factions was a bitter one. The queen had to decide for herself which side she would support. Her choice would greatly influence the course of events in Scotland.

The same privilege which she accorded to her subjects—
"that of worshipping God according to her own creed."—
"So the nation rested in tolerable peace, trusting in Murray rather than in Mary, and suffering her mass, though always under protest, so long as she suffered herself to be guided by her counsellors. But of this kind of compromise the holy Mother Church is above all men, and such heretics as Luther, had brought forth their fruit in the assassination of William of Orange and of Coligni, and in the wholesale massacre of St. Bartholomew. Surely it could not be expected that Mary would prove herself unworthy of her birth and her costly education. Indeed, as early as 1552, she was publicly announced and baptized as the true heir of the dynasty of Mary, and so she remained in the eyes of the French and of most of Europe. To her they were not mere religious exiles, but a living, a direct line of succession to the ancient crown of Scotland. Thus her claim to the throne of France had a solid foundation in the Roman Catholic Church. But the Catholic Church was not the only power that could claim the throne of Scotland. The Protestant party was also strong, and the struggle between the two factions was a bitter one. The queen had to decide for herself which side she would support. Her choice would greatly influence the course of events in Scotland.

The queen's decision was made all the more difficult by the fact that she was a woman. Women were not considered to be fit to rule, and many doubted her ability to govern. However, Mary proved herself to be a capable and determined ruler.

The queen's government was marked by both successes and failures. On the one hand, she was able to strengthen the power of the crown and to assert her authority over the nobility. She also took steps to improve the economy and to promote education. On the other hand, she was unable to prevent the spread of Protestantism, which eventually led to her fall from power. Her reign was marred by conflicts with the English, who saw her as a threat to their own interests.

The queen's eventual execution was a tragic end to her long and eventful life. She was tried for heresy and treason, and was found guilty of both charges. She was executed by being beheaded on the palace green on February 8, 1587. Her head was placed on a pike and displayed on the gates of the city, a symbol of the queen's defiance.

Mary Stuart's reign was a time of great change and turbulence in Scotland. She was a complex and contradictory figure, and her legacy is still debated today. However, her influence on the country and on the history of Europe cannot be denied.
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and the envoy is yet on his way to the court of Rome, fits up a private room in the palace, where the marriage-ceremony, which the Church pronounces void, is clandestinely performed. For the papal benediction is needed, it appears, not to hallow the marriage-tie, but only to give it respectability before the public. Elizabeth might as well spare the priest, since Rizzio has not exceeded his instructions. There are no delays at the court of Rome. Fast as wind and wave can carry him he comes back the messenger with the promised dispensation. The marriage, already performed in secret, is repeated in public. It takes place on June 29, 1565. Queen Mary, as though some secret consciousness hung over her of the sorrows on which she is entering, wears at the marriage-altar her mourning dress of black velvet. It is a gloomy ceremony. When the herald proclaims in the streets of Edinburgh that Henry, earl of Ross and Albany, is heretofore king of Scotland, the crowd receive the proclamation in sullen silence. Even the money distributed in profusion among them awakens no enthusiasm. Only one voice cries, 'God save his Grace.' It is the voice of Darnley's father. My heart is long since prophesied. She hesitates, delays, falter. Mary knows no delay. She takes the field in person. Lord Darnley rides at her side. He is clad in gilt armor, she in steel bonnet and corset, with pistols at her saddle-bow and pistols in her hand. In August the marriage was announced; in October Murray and his few retainers are flying across the border into England (Barton, ix, 286). Mephystophiles no longer conceals his purpose. Mass is no longer confined to the queen's private chapel. The retainers of Darnley's father go openly to the Catholic service. The General Assembly have passed a resolution that the sovereign is not exempt from the law of the land, and that the Reformed service take the place of the mass in the royal chapel. This is Rizzio's answer to their demand. Negotiations are opened with pope Pius V and Philip. Promises sold are twelve thousand men; the other sends money, twenty thousand crowns. The Catholic powers of Europe have at length settled their political controversies, and joined in a secret league for the extirpation of heresy by fire and sword; a league of which that Alva was the founder whose aim was to restrain the Papists who were enlisting in the epigrammatic saying, 'One salmon is worth a multitude of frogs,' a league of which the outcome was the Inquisition in Holland, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew in France. That Mary was in hearty sympathy with this league is doubtless; that she was not generally a party to it is both asserted and denied by men behind the scenes who had every opportunity to know. That a vigorous attempt was to be made to re-establish the Catholic faith and worship is certain. Her most Catholic majesty assures her subjects that in any event the religion of the realm shall not be interfered with. At the same time she writes to Pius V to congratulate him on the victories already gained, and to inspire him with hopes of victories yet to come: 'With the help of God and his holiness,' she says, 'she will yet leap over the wall' (Harper's Magazine, 1867, p. 453). 'The fatal resolution,' says Robertson (History of Scotland), 'may be imputed all the subsequent calamities of Mary's life.' Many of the Protestant lords who had hitherto supported the queen now took fright lest they should suffer the same fate as the Reformed religion under Mary of England. The bloody deeds of that real woman were yet fresh in the minds of all. What was there to hinder Mary Stuart from uprooting heresy in her dominions, with her hands stayed by all the other Roman powers of Europe? Moved by such fears, several of the Scotch nobles, whose covetousness had had more to do with their interest in the new religion than their soul's salvation (Fisher, p. 351-353), determined to strike boldly against the throne. Mary, however, was not now the ruler of Scotland. She was only called so. Upon the death of her husband she sat alone on the throne of Scotland. It has failed. He has tried wife against wife, has planned to abduct lord Darnley and send him back to the queen of England. But the rough Scotsman is so match in craft for the cunning Italian. This fruitless conspiracy has only incensed the queen against him. His honest politics are good with whom the queen Mary is in love and whose infatuation has awakened all her womanly indignation. The court is no longer safe. Rumors are rife of plans for his assassination. True or false, they are probable enough to make him avoid Rizzio and Darnley. The court orders him to court, and of him a safe-conduct. But Protestants have learned to look with suspicion on safe-conducts proffered by Roman Catholic princes. Murray is conveniently sick, and cannot come. Sentence of outlawry is pronounced against him. All the hate of a hot woman's heart is aroused; 'hatred the more malignant because it was unnatural.' Revenge is sweeter than ambition. 'I would rather lose my crown than not be revenged upon him,' she is heard to say. He calls to arms. The interest of the Protestant religion is his battle-cry. But there are few responses. He despaches messengers to queen Elizabeth for the help she has long and many promised. She hesitates, delays, falter. Mary knows no delay. She takes the field in person. Lord Darnley rides at her side. He is clad in gilt armor, she in steel bonnet and corset, with pistols at her saddle-bow and pistols in her hand. In August the marriage was announced; in October Murray and his few retainers are flying across the border into England (Barton, ix, 286). Mephystophiles no longer conceals his purpose. Mass is no longer confined to the queen's private chapel. The retainers of Darnley's father go openly to the Catholic service. The General Assembly have passed a resolution that the sovereign is not exempt from the law of the land, and that the Reformed service take the place of the mass in the royal chapel. This is Rizzio's answer to their demand. Negotiations are opened with pope Pius V and Philip. Promises sold are twelve thousand men; the other sends money, twenty thousand crowns. The Catholic powers of Europe have at length settled their political controversies, and joined in a secret league for the extirpation of heresy by fire and sword; a league of which that Alva was the founder whose aim was to restrain the Papists who were enlisting in the epigrammatic saying, 'One salmon is worth a multitude of frogs,' a league of which the outcome was the Inquisition in Holland, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew in France. That Mary was in hearty sympathy with this league is doubtless; that she was not generally a party to it is both asserted and denied by men behind the scenes who had every opportunity to know. That a vigorous attempt was to be made to re-establish the Catholic faith and worship is certain. Her most Catholic maj.
MARY STUART was only momentarily; and before the boy's baptism, in December, her estrangement from the king was greater than ever. Divorce was openly discussed in her presence even darkly whispered among her friends. The king, on his part, spoke of leaving the country; but before his preparations were completed, he fell ill of the small-pox at Glasgow. The king was on Jan. 9, 1567. On the 25th Mary went to see him, and, travelling by easy stages, brought him to Edinburgh on the 31st. He was lodged in a small maison on the Kirk of the Field, nearly on the spot where the south-east corner of the University now stands. There Mary visited him daily, and slept for two nights in a room below his lodgings. She passed the evening of his illness in the bedroom, talking cheerfully with the queen, and often affectionately with him, although she is said to have dropped one remark which gave him uneasy forebodings—that it was much about that time twelvemonth that Rizzio was murdered. She left him between ten and eleven o'clock to take part in a masque at Holyrood, at the marriage of a favorite valet. The festivities had not long ceased in the palace when, about two hours after midnight, the house in which the king slept was blown up by gunpowder, and in the neighboring garden was found the lifeless body of him to whom Mary, on the evening of the 24th, had said: "I shall never rest till I give you as sorrowful heart as I have at this present."

The chief actor in this tragedy was undoubtedly James Hepburn, earl of Bothwell, a nosey, reckless, vain-glorious, licentious, and very rich man, who, since his flight to self of the murder, and still more since Rizzio's murder, had enjoyed a large share of the queen's favor. But there were suspicions that the queen herself was not wholly ignorant of the plot, and these suspicions could not but be strengthened by what followed. On the 12th of April, Bothwell was brought to a mock-trial and acquitted; on the 24th, he intercepted the queen on her way from Linlithgow to Edinburgh, and carried her, with scarcely a show of resistance, to Dunbar. On the 7th of May, he was divorced from the young and comely wife whom he had married little more than a twelvemonth before; on the 12th, Mary publicly pardoned his seizure of her person, and created him duke of Orkney; and on the 15th—only three months after her husband's murder—she married the man whom every one regarded as his murderer, married while the stain of her husband's blood was still upon her, and within a few months of carrying with her the 'indulgent temper for which her eulogist (Meline, p. 124) praises her so highly.' Impelled by a just and burning indignation, her subjects rose in rebellion, led by nobles of both the Protestant and Romish factions. Surrounded by Bothwell's men, the queen, on the morning of the night, May following him dressed in male attire. They hastily gathered the Royallists about them, but such a cause enlisted few followers. Yet the few were mustered, and, however sparse in number, Mary hesitated not to brave the storm; she even dared to enter the lists against her opponents, but on the field of Carberry (June 15) the army melted away in sight of the enemy, and no alternative was left to her but to abandon Bothwell, and surrender herself to the confederate lords. She was now escorted by the nobles as a prisoner to Edinburgh, where the insults of the rabble and grief at parting with Bothwell threw her into such a frenzy that she refused all nourishment, and, rushing to the window of the room in which she was kept prisoner, called for help, and showed herself to the people half naked, with her hair hanging about her ears. From Edinburgh she was removed to Linlithgow, where, on the 25th of July, she was prevailed upon to sign an act of abdication in favor of her son, who, five days afterwards, was crowned at Stirling [see JAMES I.]: while to her brother Murray was intrusted the government during the minority of her son. Her abdication was formally handed to Duke of Norfolk, who, in his absence, was governor of Scotland. The doors proved no confinement to Mary. She soon found ways to communicate with the world, and made even the very prison-keeper her friend and confidant. May 2, 1568, she finally succeeded in making her escape from the island-prison, and once more she made a call to arms, this time against her own government. An army was raised, and, in a few days she found herself at the head of 6000 men. Elizabeth of England, whose great political maxim was "that the head should not be subject to the foot," would gladly have extended aid to Mary had she not feared the power of the persecuting and firm leader of the Protestants who had imprisoned Mary—her own half-brother, Murray. On the 12th of May it finally came to a battle between the Royalists and the insurgents at Langside, near Glasgow. Mary was completely routed, and obliged to flee the kingdom. She entered England, married a third and impotent husband, named Lord Howard of Effingham. He was a brave and brave man, but of very doubtful politics, and quite unlike the queen. The queen of England, however, had always had cause to fear the presence of her rival on English ground. Mary had never yet renounced her claim to the crown which Elizabeth wore. Moreover, "Mary Stuart was the centre of the hopes of the enemies of Protestant England and of Elizabeth." Their plots looked to the elevation of Mary to the throne which Elizabeth filled (Fisher, p. 382). Political ambition and religious fanaticism controlled both parties, and should the stronger yield to the weaker? Mary had enemies by every possible time-honored and age-old method of defamation. But that cousin feared for her own life and the security of her throne, and therefore persistently denied the ardent and persevering solicitations of Mary for an interview, on the agreeable pretence that she should first clear herself of the murder of Rizzio. She also was a prisoner, and, after an immense amount of deceptive diplomacy, a commission was appointed, nominally to investigate the charges of Mary against her rebellious lords, really to investigate the charges of the lords against their queen. Before the commission Murray represented the Scottish government. At first he laid the guilt of the murder on Bothwell alone, and defended the insurrection only as one against the infamous, ambitious, and tyrannical Earl. But as the trial proceeded he changed his ground. He hesitated, procrastinated, faltered. At length he openly charged his sister with the murder of her husband; and he produced, in confirmation of this charge, the singularly famous "casket letters." Of their discovery he told this story: The earl of Bothwell—so said lord Murray, and so said the lords who represented—fleeing from Edinburgh, sent up a challenge back of a casket containing a silver casket to a certain drawer. James Balfour—that Balfour who drew the deed for Darnley's murder—had received the captaincy of the castle as the price of his crime. He delivered the casket; he at the same time said that the lords were not the authors of it, and the messenger was intercepted and the casket seized. This casket, with its contents, was the witness Murray produced before the English commission against the Scottish queen. Its contents were eight letters and twelve sonnets, written in French, apparently in Mary's handwriting. Among the commission's examining commissioners, more than one of Mary's friends, one of them that duke of Norfolk who subsequently attested the strength of his attachment by the sacrifice of his life: if these letters were forgeries, they were not so declared by them. Of these letters one gave a full account of Mary's interview with Darnley at Glasgow; of his unconscious confidence; of her own mournful sense of shame and guilt. Another advised the earl when and where to abduct her, and cautioned him to come with force sufficient to overcome all resistance. All breathed the language of passionate devotion, with an air, all too often, of flat and false jealousy. They were true to nature, but to a lost, though not a shameless one. Their language was that of a once noble but now ruined woman unveiling her heart's secrets in unsuspecting confidence. If forged, the forger was a man of consummate art; and if genuine, the confession was equally remarkable as contributions to the language of passion. Mary denounced them as forgeries. She de-
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manded to see the originals. Elizabeth granted the reasonableness of the demand, but never complied with it. She demanded to face her accusers. Elizabeth half promised that she should do so, but never fulfilled the pledge. The commission broke up without a verdict. Elizabeth had no interest to press for either acquittal or conviction. Murray was glad to return to his regiment and had any reason to deplore the completion of the investigation, but Mary was a prisoner, and her access to the public not the most easy. Though inconclusive, the trial had revealed enough to strengthen the worst suspicions of the Scottish people, and no one might doubt that Mary would in time be found guilty with Elizabeth, if it was necessary to retain her as a prisoner. For nineteen years Mary Stuart thus passed life. "For nineteen years both captive and captor are made miserable by plots and counterplots; and whether Mary in prison or Mary at large is the more dangerous to the security of Protestant England is a question so hard to decide that Elizabeth never fairly attempts to determine it. At length a plot is uncovered more deadly than any that has preceded. Half a score of assassins band themselves together to attempt Elizabeth's life, and to put Catholic Mary on the vacant throne of the pope is pronounced upon the enterprise. The Catholic powers of Europe stand ready to welcome its consummation. Mary gives it her cordial approbation. 'The hour of deliverance,' she writes exultingly, 'is at hand.' But plots breed counterplots. In all the diplomatic service of Europe there is no event so well remembered as the Walsingham case; the chief of Elizabeth's prime minister. Every letter of Mary's is opened and copied by his agents before sent to its destination. The conspiracy is allowed to ripen. Then, when all is ready for consummation, the leaders are arrested, the plot is brought to a daylight of day. Mary, with all her faults, never knew fear; no craven heart was hers. The more dangerous was she because so brave. She battles for her life with a heroism well worthy a nobler nature—battles to the last, though there be no hope. She receives the sentence of death with the calmness of true courage, not of despair. With all her treachery, never recreant to her faith—never but once, when her infatuated love of Bothwell swerved her from it for a few short weeks—she clings to her crucifix till the very hour of death. Almost her last words are words of courage to her friends. 'Weep not,' she says; 'I have promised the queen that she will see me the very last, and I am telling her the Prayer-book.' "In thee, O Lord, have I put my trust." And then she lays her head upon the block as peacefully as ever she laid it upon her pillow. No 'grizzled, wrinkled old woman,' but in the full bloom of ripened womanhood; no more, no more, no more, no more. Mary lay on the scaffold at Fotheringhay [whither she had been removed for trial of conspiracy from Charleyp in September, 1586] the penalty of her treachery at Edinburgh, May 8, 1587. The spirit of the stern old Puritans is satisfied, and the prophecy of the Good Book receives a new and pregnant illustration— "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." Five months after the execution her body was buried with great pomp at Peterborough, whence, in 1612, it was removed to king Henry VII's Chapel at Westminster, where it still lies in a sumptuous tomb erected by king James VI.

"Whoever has attended but little to the phenomena of human nature has discovered how inadequate is the clearest insight which he can hope to attain into character and disposition. Every one is a perplexity to himself and a perplexity to his neighbors; and men who are born in the same generation, who are exposed to the same influences, trained by the same teachers, and live from childhood to age in constant and familiar intercourse, are often little more than shadows to each other, intelligible in superficial form and outline, but diversified into the most immeasurable and inscrutable barрен."

Thus Froude opens the fourth volume of his History of England, when about to pass in review the affairs of Scotland and Ireland in the 16th century. Yet, when this same writer comes to speak of Mary Stuart, he "writes almost as a public prosecutor of the Scottish queen, and sometimes sacrifices historical accuracy to dramatic effect."

"The truth is that the character of Mary was long one of the most fiercely-vaunted questions of history, and is still in debate; hence the difficulties which beset any attempt to tell correctly the story of her career. One of her characteristic defects is an evident instinct to find impartial witnesses; few in her own time who are not ready to tell and to believe about her the most barefaced lies which will promote their own party. During her life she was calumniated and reproached with iniquity; after her death the same curiously-contradictory estimates of her character have been vigorously maintained—by those, too, who have not their judgment impaired by the prejudices which environed her. On the one hand, we are assured that she was "the most amiable of women;" "the upright queen, the noble and true woman, the faithful spouse and affectionate mother;" "the poor martyred queen;" "the helpless victim of fraud and force;" or "illustrious victim of state-craft, whose "kindly spirit in prosperity and matchless heroism in misfortune" "occupied a prominent place in the annals of her sex." On the other, we are equally competent to judge, that she was "a spoilt beauty;" "the heroine of an adulterous melodrama;" "the victim of a blind, imperious passion;" or "an apostle" in "the profound dissimulation of that school of which Catharine de Medici was the chief." Mary was, indeed, "more disguised in the livery of a martyr," having "a proud heart, a crafty wit, and indurate mind against God and his truth;" "a bold, unscrupulous, ambitious woman," with "the panther's nature—graceful, beautiful, malignant, untamable." The great preponderance of authority, however, seems to show that we believe in her criminal love for Bothwell and her guilty knowledge of his conspiracy against her husband's life. The question of her guilt as to the murder of her husband does certainly not rest on the authenticity of the "casket letters," however much these may be matter of historical interest. "Evidence which her own day deemed clear," says the writer in Harper whom we had occasion to quote before, "history deems uncertain. Circumstances which, isolated, only created a widespread suspicion in her own times, put together by history, with but little corroboration, form a strong case against her." A wife learns to loathe her husband; utter's her passionate hate in terms that are unmistakable; is reconciled to him for a purpose; casts him off when that purpose is accomplished; makes no secret of her desire for another; has been, with but little heart, engaged in his assassination; dallies while he languishes upon a sick-bed so long as death is near; hastens to him only when he is convalescent; becomes, in seeming, reconciled to him; by her blandishments allays his terror and arrests his flight, which nothing else could arrest; brings him with her to the house chosen by the assassins for his tomb—a house which has absolutely nothing else to recommend it but its singular adaptation to the deed of cruelty to be wrought there; remains with him till within two hours of his murder; bears with unconcealed the story of his tragic end, which thrills all other hearts with horror; makes no effort to bring the perpetrators of the crime to punishment; rewards the suspected with places and pensions, and the chief criminal with her hand in marriage while the blood is still wet on his. That the world should be asked to believe her the innocent victim of a diabolical conspiracy affords a singular illustration of the effrontery of the Church which claims her for a martyr. That half the world should have acquiesced in the claim affords an illustration no less singular of the credulity of mankind when sentiments and circumstances are removed from the judgment which the reason alone is qualified to render."

The genuineness of the "casket letters" is maintained by the historians Hume, Robertson, Laing, Burton,
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Macintosh, Mignet, Ranke, and Froide. The most acute writer on the other side of the question is Hosack, and Fidenz Hill's biographer, but he was never a vein as would bid him were he indeed earning a lawyer's fee by a lawyer's service." One of the latest writers on the ecclesiastical history of this period, Prof. Fisher (p. 376), of Yale College, thus comments on the question at issue: "To demand criticism may be his final verdict, that the letters contain many internal marks of genuineness which it would be exceedingly difficult for a counterfeiter to invent, and that the scrutiny to which they were subjected in the Scottish Parliament, the Scottish privy council, and the English parliament, was such that, if they were not genuine, it is hard to account for the failure to detect the imposture. Moreover, the character of Murray, although it may be admitted that he was not the immaculate person that he is sometimes considered to have been, must have been black indeed if these documents, which he brought forward to prove the guilt of his sister, were forged; but Murray is praised not only by his personal adherents and by his party, but by men like Spottiswoode and Melville (Spottiswoode, History of the Church of Scotland, ii, 121)." Yet, however writers may differ about his moral worth, very few, I think, would deny the variety of her accomplishments. She wrote poems on various occasions, in the Latin, Italian, French, and Scotch languages: "Royal advice to her son," in two books, the consolatio of her long imprisonment. A great number of her original letters are preserved in the library of France, in the Royal, Cottanion, and Ashmolean libraries. We have in print eleven to the cast of Bothwell, translated from the French by Edward Simmons, of Christ-church, Oxford, and printed at Westminster in 1726. There are ten more, with her answers to the articles against her, in "Hayman's State-papers:" six more in "Anderson's Collections;" another in the "Appendix" to her life by Dr. Jebb; and some others dispersed among the works of Pius V, Buchanan, Camden, Udall, and Sanderson.

To enumerate all that has been written on Mary would fill a volume. Among the chief works are S. Jebb, De Vita et Rebus Gestis Mariae Scotorum Reginae (London, 1725, 2 vols. fol.); J. Anderson, Collections relating to the History of Mary, Queen of Scotland (London, 1727-29, 4 vols. 4to); Burton, Hist. of Scotland, vol. iv.; Bishop Blew, Life of Queen Mary and State of Scotland (Edinburgh, 1734, fol.; 1844-50, 3 vols. 8vo); W. Goodall, Examinations of the Letters said to be written by Mary, Queen of Scots, to James, Earl of Bothwell (Edinburgh, 1734, 2 vols. 8vo); Robertson, Hist. of Scotland; W. Tyler, Inquiry into the Evidence against Mary, Queen of Scots (London, 1793, 8vo); T. P. Tyler, History of the State of Scotland; Chamier, Life of Mary, Queen of Scots (London, 1818, 2 vols. 4to; 1822, 3 vols. 8vo); Schütz, Leben Maria Stuart's (1839); P. F. Tyler, Hist. of Scotland; Prince Labanoff, Recueil des Lettres de Marie Stuart (London, 1844, 5 vols. 8vo); David Laing, edition of John Knox's Histoire de la Réformation (Edinburgh, 1846-48, 2 vols. 8vo); M. Teulet, Papiers d'Etat relatifs à l'Histoire de l'Écosse (Par. 1851-60, 3 vols. 4to; 1862, 5 vols. 8vo); Miss Agnes Strickland, Lives of the Queens of Scotland (Edinburgh, 1860-69, 8 vols. 8vo); M. Mignet, Histoire de Marie Stuart (Par. 1822, 2 vols. 8vo); A. de Montaiglon, Latin Themes of Mary Stuart (London, 1856, 8vo); Prince Labanoff, Notice sur la Collection des Portraits de Marie Stuart (St. Petersburg, 1856); M. Chenuel, Marie Stuart et Catherine de Medicis (Par. 1856, 8vo); M. Teulet, Lettres de Marie Stuart (Par. 1856, 8vo); Joseph Robertson, Catalogues of the Jewels, Dresses, Furniture, Books, and Paintings of Mary, Queen of Scots (Edinburgh, 1863, 4to); Hosack, Mary, Queen of Scots and her Accusers (2d ed. London, 1870, 2 vols. 8vo); Meline, Mary, Queen of Scots, and her latest English Historian (N. Y. 1876). The name of Mary Stuart is a subject of a celebrated English historian very bitterly, and shows him to be inaccurate in some minor details; but Meline's own "in- tense partisanship unites him for the office of a critic, and he entirely fails in his narrative." (J. H. W.)

Masaccio, called MASAO DA SAN GIOVANNI, one of the earliest and the most celebrated of the Italian painters of the end of the middle age of modelling. The unquestioned founder of the Florentine school, was born at San Giovannii, in Val d'Armo, in the year 1401. He was a disciple of Masolino da Panicale, to whom he proved as much superior as his master was to all his contemporaries. He had great readiness of invention, with unusual truth and finish of design. During the course of his constant study; and he gave in his works examples of that beauty which arises from a judicious and pleasing choice of attitudes, accompanied with spirit, boldness, and relief. He was the first who studied to give more dignity to his draperies, by designing them with greater breadth and fulness, and omitting the multitude of small folds. He was also the first who endeavored to adapt the color of his draperies to the tints of his caricatures, so that they might harmonize with each other. Masaccio was remarkably well skilled in perspective, which he was taught by Brunelleschi. His works procured him great reputation, but excited the envy of his competitors. He is supposed to have been poisoned, and died about 1443. Fussli says of him: "Masaccio was a genius, and the head of an epoch in the art. He may be considered as the precursor of the great masters who afterwards established his principles, and sometimes transcribed his figures." His most perfect works are the frescoes of St. Pietro del Carmine at Florence, "where vigor of conception, truth and vivacity of expression, correctness of design, and breadth of manner are supported by a most surprising harmony of color;" and the picture of Christ curing the Demamias. The "Arundel Society" has lately published these frescoes in a series of superior chromo-lithographs. See Vasari, Lives of the Painters; Mrs. Jameson, Memoirs of Early Italian Painters.

Masada (Masa'dah), a very strong fortress not far south of Engedi (Josephus, War; Ant. i, 12, 1), on the west of the Dead Sea (Pliny, v, 17), in a volcanic region (Strabo, xvi, p.764), minutely described by Josephus in various places, especially in the account of its final tragedy (War, vii, 8). It was built by Jonathan Macca- beus on an almost inaccessible rock, and was probably one of his "strongholds in Judea" (1 Macc. xii, 35), as well as one of the attested in Simon's time (1 Sam. xxiii, 14, 29; comp 2 Sam. v, 17). It was much enlarged and strengthened by Herod the Great, who placed Mariamme here for safety when he was driven from Jerusalem by Antigonus (Josephus, War, i, 13, 7). It resisted, at that time, the attack by the Parthians (Josephus, War, ii, 20, 2); after a siege lasting five years, by the Romans of Scythia under the command of their general. It was given over by the Romans after a long siege by the Parthians under their king Vologeses (ib. 17, 2). It was the last stronghold of the Jews in the final struggle with the Romans under Flavius Silva, who took it by assault, the garrison, in their desperation, having immo- lated themselves (sup.). The site was conjectured by Dr. Eli Smith to be that of the modern Seleh (Robin- son, Researches, ii, 24) ; which has been abundantly con- firmed by later travellers, who have attested the pro- violinous size of the place, and its exact agreement with the description of Josephus (Tailf's Josephus, ii, 109 sq.; Bickel, Beitr. zur Bibl. Wiss. 1848, p. 62 sq.; Van de Velde, Var- rotte, ii, 97 sq.; Travemat, Land of Israel, p. 295 sq.).

The description of Josephus, in whose histories Masada plays a conspicuous part, is, as follows: A lofty rock of considerable extent, surrounded on all sides by precipi- tate cliffs, and visited by the enemy only in two parts—one on the east, towards the Lake Asphaltitis, by a zigzag path, scarcely practicable, and extremely dangerous, called "the Serpent," from its sinuosities; the other more easy, towards the west, on which side the isolated rock was more nearly ap- proached by the hills. The extremities of the cliff are not pointed, but a plain of 7 stadia in circumference, sur- rounded by a wall of white stone, 12 cubits high and
yielded to the ram, when an inner wall was discovered to have been constructed by the garrison—a framework of timber filled with soil, which became more solid during the summer months by the concretions of the ram. This, however, was speedily fired. The assault was fixed for the morrow, when the garrison anticipated the arrival of the Romans by one of the most cold-blooded and atrocious massacres on record. At the instigation of Eleazar, they slew every man his wife and children; then, having collected the property into one heap, and destroyed it all by fire, they cast lots for ten men, who should act as executioners of the others while they lay in the embrace of their slaughtered families. One was then selected by lot to slay the other nine survivors; and he at last, having set fire to the palace, with a desperate effort drove his sword completely through his own body, and so perished. The total number, including men, women and children, was 660.

8 cubits thick, fortified with 87 towers of 50 cubits in height. The wall was joined within by large buildings connected with the towers, designed for barracks and magazines for the enormous stores and munitions of war which were laid up in this fortress. The remainder of the area, not occupied by buildings, was arable, the soil being richer and more genial than that of the plain below; and a further provision was thus made for the garrison in case of a failure of supplies from without. The rain-water was preserved in large cisterns excavated in the solid rock. A palace, on a grand scale, occupied the north-west aspect, on a lower level than the fortress, but connected with it by covered passages cut in the rock. This was adorned within with porticoes and baths, supported by monolithic columns; the walls and floors were covered with tessellated work. At the distance of 1000 cubits from the fortress, a massive tower guarded the western approach at its narrowest and most difficult point, and thus completed the artificial defences of this most remarkable site, which nature had rendered almost impregnable. In attacking the fortress, the first act of the Roman general was to surround the fortress with a wall, to prevent the escape of the garrison. Having distributed sentries along this line of circumvallation, he pitched his own camp on the west, where the rock was most nearly approached by the mountains, and was therefore more open to assault; for the difficulty of procuring provisions and water for his soldiers did not allow him to attempt a protracted blockade, which the enormous stores of provisions and water still found there by Eleazar would have enabled the garrison better to endure. Behind the tower which guarded the ascent was a prominent rock of considerable size and height, though 800 cubits lower than the wall of the fortress, called the White Cliff. On this a bank of 200 cubits' height was raised, which formed a base for a platform (βῆμα) of solid masonry, 50 cubits in width and height, and on this was placed a tower similar in construction to those invented and employed by Vespasian and Titus, covered with plates of iron, which reached an additional 60 cubits, so as to dominate the wall of the castle, which was quickly cleared of its defenders by the showers of missiles discharged from the scorpions and ballista. The outer wall soon

An old woman, with a female relative of Eleazar, and five children, who had contrived to conceal themselves in the reservoirs while the massacre was being perpetrated, survived, and narrated these facts to the astonished Romans when they entered the fortress the following morning, and had an actual sight of the frightful tragedy. On the present ruined site the ground-plan of the storehouses and barracks can still be traced in the foundations of the buildings on the summit, and the cisterns, excavated in the natural rock, are of enormous dimensions. One is mentioned as nearly 50 feet deep, 100 long, and 45 broad. The foundations of a round tower, 40 or 50 feet below the northern summit, may have been connected with the palace, and the windows cut in the rock near by, which Mr. Woolcot conjectures to have belonged to some large cistern, now covered up, may possibly have formed the rock-hewn gallery by which the palace communicated with the fortress. From the summit of the rock every part of the wall of circumvallation could be traced, carried along the low ground, and, wherever it met a precipice, continuing again on the high summit above, thus making the entire circuit of the place. Connected with it, at intervals, were the walls of the Roman camps, opposite the north-west and south-east corners, the former being the spot where Josephus places that of the Roman general. A third may be traced on the level near the above. The outline of the walls, as seen from the heights above, is as complete as if they had been but recently abandoned. The Roman wall is six feet broad, built, like the fortress walls and buildings above, with rough stones laid loosely together, and the interstices filled in with small pieces of stone. The wall is half a mile or more distant from the rock, so as to be without range of the stones discharged by the garrison. No water was to be found in the neighborhood but such as the recent rains had left in the hollows of the rocks, confirming the remark of Josephus that water, as well as food, was brought to the besieged by the Roman army from a distance. Its position is exactly opposite to the peninsula that runs into the Dead Sea from its eastern shore, towards its southern extremity. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s. v.

Mas'loth (Mosehâlāh in v. Mosahâlāh), a place
in Arbel, which Baccides and Aelius besieged and captured on their way from Gilgal to Juida (1 Macc. ix, 24). Pappus of Alexandria announces in the name (Acts xii, 11, 1) but of a trace of the name is thought by Robinson (Researches, ii, 388) to be found in the "steps" (ὑποθήκη, ιμισσιθή) of terraces (as in 2 Chron. ix, 11), in connection with the remarkable caverns besieged by Herod near Arbel (Josephus, War, i, 16, 4), now Kullat ibn-Man. See Arbel.

**Masaupasa**, a famous fast among the East Indian pagans. The name is derived from μαςοπας, which in the Mahābhārata also signifies a mode of fasting. It is a fast of great labor and merit, which had been discontinued for want of patronage. Le Long had published 2 vols. 8vo (Paris, 1709; republished by Börner, of Leipzig, with additions). Dr. Masch began its continuation in 1770, and completed it in 1780. It gives a full account of the literal history of the Bible, the various conditions of the original, and the ancient and modern versions. Dr. Masch also wrote several dissertations of considerable value, particularly a treatise on the Religions of the Heathen and of Christians (Gedanken von der Geistigkeits-harten Religionen, in 2 vols. 4to), intended as a contribution to the discussion between the various philosophies of the ancient nations. For a complete list of his works, see Döring, Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands d. 18. u. 19. Jahrh. ii, 122 sq.

Mas'chil (Heb. maschil, מָשׁכִּיל, instructing, Hiph. part. of מָשַׁכֵּיל, to be wise; used as a noun in Psa. xviii, 7, מַשַּׁכֵּיל, sing ye a poem, Peshito, sing praise, but the Sept., Vulg., and Auth. Vers. "sing ye with understanding") occurs in the titles or inscriptions of Psa. xxxii, xiii, xiv, xiv, lii, lii, liv, lxiv, lxxviii, lxxix, cxli. The origin of the use of this word is unknown, though it has variously been explained. The most probable meaning of maschil is a poem, song, which enfolds intelligence, wisdom, piety, q. d. didactic; which is true of every sacred song, not excepting Psa. xlv, where everything is referred to the goodness of God. It occurs elsewhere as an adjective, and is accordingly rendered wise, or some other term, equivalent to instruction (1 Sam. xviii, 14, 15; 2 Chron. xxx, 22; Job xxii, 2; Psa. xiv, 2; xli, 1; lii, 2; Prov. v, 19; xiv, 35; xxv, 26, 27; xlii, 14; xiv, 12; Jer. i, 9; Dan. i, 4; xi, 85, 86; xii, 5, 10; Amos v, 18). For other uses from the Aramaic see Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 1351. See Psalms, Book of.

Mascol, François, a noted Roman Catholic divine and Orientalist, was born at Amiens in the year 1662. He very early devoted himself to the study of Oriental languages, and attained in them an extraordinary degree of proficiency. Educated for service in the Church, he became first a curate in the diocese of Amiens, but afterwards obtained the confidence of De Brune, bishop of Amiens, who placed him at the head of the theological seminary of the district, and made him a canon. De Brune died in 1706, and Mascol, whose opinions on the Jansenistic controversy were not in accordance with those of the new prelate Sebastian, was compelled to resign his place in the theological seminary and retire from public life. From this time he devoted himself to study with such close application as to bring on a disease, of which he died, on Nov. 24, 1728, when only in his prime. Though austere in his habits, he was amiable and pious. Mascol's chief work is the Grammatica Hebraica, α ἡ υπὸ τοῦ προφήτου ἐκκοσμήσεως Ἐλληνικά έπανομένον Μασκόλιον, still considered one of the best works of the kind; it embodies an elaborate argument against the use of the vowel-points. The first edition was published in 1718, and is specially called attention to by the decree of the Lateran Council of 1680. In the year 1728 a second edition was published at Paris, containing an answer to Guarin's objections, with the addition of grammars of the Syriac, Chaldee, and Samaritan languages. Other works of Mascol are, Ecclesiastical Conferences on the Temple of Solomon, Catalogue of the Books of the Hebrew Bible, and in manuscript, Courses of Philosophy and Divinity; not printed because it is thought to contain Jansenistic opinions.

**Mass** (Heb. מַשׁ, Mass, signific. unknown; Sept. Mæsy, Vulg. Mæs), the last name of the four sons of Aram (B.C. post 2513), and a tribe descended from him, who gave their name to a region inhabited by them (Gen. x, 18); probably, therefore, to be sought in Syria or Mesopotamia. In the parallel passage (1 Chron. i, 17) the
name of Meseus has been erroneously substituted, Josephus (Ant. i. 6, 4) understands the Morium (Messeus), and states that their locality is "now called Charax of Spassium," evidently the same place (Xipad Haavvii, Ptol. vi. 3, 2), situated, according to others, at the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates (Plin. vi. 26, and Strabo. 136, Hardouin). Most interpreters, however, following Bochart (Phileg. ii. 11), understand to be meant the inhabitants of Mount Musa, which lies north of Nisibis, and forms part of the chain of Taurus separating Media from Mesopotamia (Strabo, xi. 257; Ptol. vi. 16, 2), of which latter the Sheenites occupied the northern part (Michaelis, Spicileg. ii. 140 sq.). "Knobel (Fid. orient. p. 237) seeks to reconcile this view with that of Josephus by the supposition of a migration from the north of Mesopotamia to the south of Babylonia, where the race may have been known in later times under the name of Mesebus: the progress of the population in these parts was, however, in an opposite direction, from south to north. Kalisch (Comm. on Gen. p. 286) connects the names of Mase and Mysea: this is, to say the least, extremely doubtful; both the Myanians themselves and their name (Masia) were probably of "sofic origin." (Smirn origin)." It is remarkable that among the Asiatic confederates of the Kheta or Sheba, i. e. Hitinites, who are enumerated as conquered by Ramesses II at Kadesh on the Orontes, is found the prince of Musa or Musa (Brugger, Hist. de l'Egypte, i. 148, 149)." See ETHNOLOGY.

Mash'alah (1 Chron. vii. 74 [59]). See MISHAL.

Masham, Lady Damaris, a lady celebrated for her attainments in divinity, daughter of the celebrated Codworth, was born at Cambridge, England, in 1658. Her father, perceiving the bent of her genius, took particular care of her education, so that she was early distinguished for piety and uncommon learning. She became the second wife of Sir Francis Masham, of Oates, in Essex; and repaid her father's care of her in the admirable pains she took in the education of her only son. In the study of divinity and philosophy she was greatly assisted by Locke, who lived in her family most of his last years, and who died in her house. She died in 1706. Lady Masham wrote a discourse concerning the Love of God (1691, 12mo); and Occasional Thoughts in reference to a Virtuous or Christian Life (1700, 12mo); and drew up the account of Mr. Locke published in the great Historical Dictionary. See Lord King, Life of Locke; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. a. v.

Mason (Marcus v. v. Morris), one of the "sers" or "servants" of the king, who succeeded in returning with Zorobabel from Babylon (1 Esdr. v. 84). Nothing corresponding to the name is found in the Heb. text (Ezra v. 55 sq.).

Marcus Andre, a very learned Orientalist, was born near Brussels in 1516. He was a man of excellent parts, an accomplished lawyer, and counsellor to the duke of Cleves. He died in 1573. Mason translated a variety of articles from the Syriac, which may be found in the Supplement to the Critiae Sacrae, compiled a Syriac Lexicon and Grammar, and a learned Commentary on Joshua and part of Deuteronomy. The former contains the readings of the Syriac Hexaplar version. See Hoefert, Nour. Bibl. Générale, s. v.

Msk, or notch-head, is the technical term in ecclesiastical architecture for a keystone of the arch, the shadow of which bears a close resemblance to that of the bivalve.

Masonry of Harun Wall at Hebron. (From Photograph 122 of the "Palestine Exploration Fund.")

man face. It is common in some districts in work of the 13th and 14th centuries, and is usually carved under the eaves as a corbel-table. A good example occurs in Portsmouth Church, where it is mixed with the tooth-ornament. It is a favorite ornament in Northamptonshire in the cornices of the broad spire, and under the parapet of the chancel; but it is by no means confined to any particular district. —Parker, Glossary of Architecture, s. v.
size of the lower courses of the walls of Jerusalem and other cities of Palestine attest the antique art of Solomon's day. Similar advancement in the art of stone-cutting is evidenced in the works of the Assyrians and Layard in Assyria. See HANDICRAFT: SCULPTURE.

Mason, Dralcine, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, son of Dr. John M. Mason, was born in New York City April 16, 1805; was educated at Dickinson College (class of 1823); was ordained in October, 1826; installed over the Church at Schenectady, N.Y., and was the pastor of Asbury Church, New York, from 1820 to 1851; and also professor of ecclesiastical history in Union Theological Seminary, New York, from 1836 to 1842. He died May 14, 1841. His memoir, by Rev. Wm. Adams, is prefixed to his sermons on practical subjects, entitled A Pastor's Legacy (1825, 8vo). See also Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s. v.

Mason, Francis (1), B.D., an English divine, was born in the county of Durham in 1666; was educated at Merton College, Oxford, about 1688, where he was chosen probationer fellow; became rector of Oxford, Suffolk, and chaplain to King James I, and archdeacon of Norfolk in 1618. He died in 1621. He published Sermons (Lond. 1607, 4to; Oxford, 1634, 4to).—Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae (1613, fol.; published in an English dress, entitled A Vindication of the Church of England, and of the Lawful Ministry thereof, etc.; greatly enlarged by Rev. John Linge, 14th edition, 1729, fol.; 1778, fol.). This book contains a complete refutation of the Nag's Head:—Two Sermons (1621, 8vo):—The Perversion of the Ordination of Ministers of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas (Oxford, 1641, 4to). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.; Darlington, Cyclop. Bib. (1844, 8vo).—Darling, Cyclop. Bib. (1844, 8vo).—Darling, Cyclop. Bib. (1844, 8vo).

Mason, Francis (2), D.D., a Baptist minister, and missionary, was born at York, England, April 2, 1799. He was a shoemaker's apprentice, emigrated to Philadelphia in 1818; settled at Canton, Mo., in 1825; studied at the Theological Seminary, Newton, Mo., in 1827; and in May, 1830, having been ordained, sailed with his wife for Calcutta as a missionary to the Keraus. After acquiring the language, he wrote The Sayings of the Elders, which was the first printed book in the Karen language. He prepared Pali and Burmese grammars, and acquired many of the Oriental languages. He also published a Karen translation of the Bible. He was medical adviser to this people, having studied medicine, and published a small work on materia medica and pathology in one of the Karen dialects. He also edited for many years the Morning Star, a Karen monthly, in both the Karen and Pali languages, and was master of a large number of literate and uneducated. He died at Rangoon, Burma, March 3, 1874. His English writings are, Report of the Twelfth Mission Society:—Life of Kohabun, the Karen Apostle:—Memoir of Mrs. Helen M. Mason (1847): Memoir of Son Quilla (1850);—and Burmah, Its People and Natural Productions (1852; enlarged edition, 1861).

Mason, John (1), an English dissenting divine, was born in Essex in 1703 or 1706; became pastor of a congregation at Dorking, Surrey, in 1730, and at Chestnut, Hertfordshire, in 1746. He died in 1768. Mr. Mason published a number of Sermons, various theological treatises and other works. The best known is his Self-Knowledge (1754; new edition and life of the author by John Mason Good, 1811, 12mo; new edition by Tegg, 1847, 32mo; with Melmoth's Importance of a Christian Life, published by Scott, 1855, 24mo); this work was well received a long time, and was translated into several languages:—The Lord's Day Evening Entertainments, 52 practical discourses (1751-52, 4 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1754, 4 vols. 8vo):—The Student and Pastor (1755, 8vo; new edition by Joshua Toulmin, D.D., 1807, 12mo):—Fifteen Discourses (1756, 8vo):—Christian Virtues (1761, 2 vols. 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.; Hook, Ecles. Biog. s. v.

Mason, John (2), D.D., a minister of the Associate Reformed Church, father of the celebrated John M. Mason, was born near Mid-Calder, in Linlithgowshire, Scotland, in 1724. The greatest event in his life was the ordination of the Church of Scotland occurred in his early days, and, favoring the Anti-Burgher party, he identified himself with this branch of the "Secession Church," pursued his theological studies at Abernethy, and later became an assistant professor of logic and moral philosophy at the theological school. In 1761 he was ordained for the office of the ministry, and sent to this country as pastor of the then Cedar Street Church, New York. Believing that the causes which divided the Presbyterians of Scotland did not exist here, he labored, from the moment of his arrival, for the union of all the Presbyterians, and, though his course displeased his brethren at home, and the synod suspended him, he pushed his project, and on June 18, 1782, a general union of the Reformed Presbyterians was held as "the Associate Reformed Church." Dr. Mason had the honor to be the first moderator of this body. Uniting in his services to the cause of the Church of Christ, and his own branch of it, he died April 19, 1792. "His death, like his life, was an honorable testimony to his Redeemer's power and grace." The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by New Jersey College, of which he was the president from 1779 to 1785. Dr. Mason was "a man of sound and vigorous mind, of extensive learning, and fervent piety. As a preacher, he was uncommonly judicious and instructive, and his ministers were largely attended. He was especially favorable and zealous in the cause of missions. The great object of his life was to promote the spread of the Christian religion, and he not only patronized the efforts of those who were engaged in that useful work, but zealously supported and encouraged them." Dr. Mason was a member of the Universal Church, and died on the 3rd of September, 1792. He was buried at the Village Church, West New York. In 1824, his body was removed to the New Church, New York.
honored with the provostship of Columbia College, and, though already employed as preacher and professor, accepted the position, "and by his talents and energy raised that institution to a higher character than it had ever before possessed." In 1816 failing health admonished him of the magnitude of the work he had undertaken, and he resigned his professorship and returned to the college and went to Europe. On his return in 1817 he again devoted himself to Gospel labors, but in 1821 exchanged the pulpit for the rostrum, as president of Dickinson College, Pa. In 1822 he transferred his ecclesiastical relation to the FreeEbterian Church. In 1824 he resigned as president of the college, and returned to New York to recuperate his health, but he was never again permitted to assume any official connection. He died Dec. 26, 1825. Besides the literary enterprises already mentioned, Dr. Mason wrote a number of essays, reviews, orations, and sermons, published at different times. They were collected by his son, the Rev. Ebenezer Mason, and published in 4 vols. 8vo, in 1832 (new ed., with many additions, 1849). A memoir, with some of his correspondence, was published by his son-in-law, J. Van Vechten, D.D., in 1856, 2 vols. 8vo. The mind of Dr. Mason was full of interests; the most robust order, his theology Calvinistic, and his style of eloquence powerful and irresistible as a torrent. When Robert Hail first heard him deliver before the London Missionary Society, in 1805, he celebrated discourse on "Messiah's Throne," he is said to have been startled, and exclaimed, "I can never hear this man again!" (Pusey's Pulpit Eloquence, 1857, p. 486, q. v.). "Talk, talk, altogether, no American preacher has combined more impressive qualities. His aspect was on a scale of grandeur corresponding to the majesty of mind within. Tall, robust, straight, with a head modeled after neither Grecian nor Roman standard, yet symmetrical, combining the dignity of the one and the grace of the other; with an eye that shot fire, especially when under the excitement of earnest preaching, yet tender and tearful when the pathetic cord was touched; with a forehead broad and high, running up each side, and slightly parted in the middle by a graceful pendant of hair, with mouth and chin expressive of firmness and decision. . . . Dr. Mason stood before you the prince of pulpit orators" (N. Y. Observer, Nov. 1860). See also Boot, Christ. Disciple, iii, 475; Dr. Spring, Power of the Pulpit; Duyckinck, Cyclop. Amer. Lit. (see Index in vol. 1); Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. ii, 1237; Princeton Review, 1856, p. 318. (J. H. W.)

Mason, LOWELL, doctor of music, a celebrated American composer of music, was born at Medfield, Mass., Jan. 8, 1792. When but a child he exhibited extraordinary capacity for music, and began to receive a musical education early in life. In 1812 he removed to Savannah, Ga., and there compiled his first book of Psalmody, the celebrated Händel and Haydn collection, the success of which eliciting much persuasion of his musical friends in Massachusetts to settle in his native state, he removed to Boston in 1827, devoted himself to the musical instruction of children and the introduction of vocal music into the public schools of New England; caused the Boston Academy of Music to be established, and also "Teachers' Institutes" for the training of teachers and local directors. He visited England in 1827, and acquainted himself with all the improvements in the musical teaching on the Continent. In 1855 the University of New York conferred on him the degree of doctor of music, the first ever conferred by an American college. In the later years of his life he gave much attention to congregational singing in the churches, and did much to advance the interests of Church music in general. He died at his residence, Orange, N. J., Aug. 11, 1872. His publications of interest to us are Juvenile Psalmist, Juvenile Lyre, etc. (Boston, 1829, '30, '34, '35, '36, '37, '39, '43, '45, '46; New York, 1848; Phila. 1848; London, 1838);—several sacred and Church music-books:—The Boston Händel and Haydn Collection of Church Music (1822);—The Choir, or Union Collection (1838). etc.; etc. Dr. Mason was the author and compiler of more musical works than any other American, and contributed much towards making the Americans a nation of "singing men and singing women." See Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.; Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s. v.

MASON, William, an English divine of some note, son of the vicar of St. Trinity Hall, was born in 1725; was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and made fellow of Pembroke College in 1747. In 1754 he took holy orders, became rector of Aston, Yorkshire, chaplain to the king, and was for thirty-two years precentor and canons residentiary of York. He died in 1797. His published works, both secular and religious, are chiefly in poetry, among which are several critically and critically and critically, on English Church Music (1790, 12mo). He also published Memoirs of Thomas Gray (1775, 4to). Mason was regarded by his contemporaries as a poet of more than ordinary genius, but the lack of classical culture prevented his rise. There is a tablet to his memory in Poet's Corner, Westminster Abbey. His style is, to a great extent, that of an imitator of Gray; and, not being so perfect an artist in language as his master, he has been proportionately less successful. In addition to his poetical reputation, he possessed considerable skill in painting, and, in his last years, resided on the last print, and obtained opinions not at all consonant with those of musicians in general. He wished to reduce Church music to the most dry and mechanical style possible, excluding all such expression as should depend on the powers and talents of the performers (Mason's Compendium of the History of Church Music. See Memoirs of Mason in Johnson and Chalmers' English Poets (1840, 21 vols. 8vo); Chalmers' Biog. Dict. s. v.; Blackwood's Mag. xxxiii. 482; xxvi, 565; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.

Masorah, Masoroth, or Masoreth (מָסּוֹרָה, מָסָּרֹת), the technical term given to a grammatico-critical commentary on the O. T., the design of which is to indicate the correct reading of the text with respect to words, vowels, accents, etc., so as to preserve it from all corruption, putting an end to the exercise of unbounded individual fancy. In the Hebrew Masorah denotes tradition, from מָסֶר, which is used in Chaldaic in the sense of to give over, to commit (corresponding to the Hebrew הַמֵּסֶר, וְלַמֶּסֶר), comp. Targ. on 1 Sam. xvii, 46; xxiv, 11; 1 Kings xx, 13; Exod. xxi, 8; Amos vi, 8); and hence, by the rabbinical writers, in the sense of to deliver, with reference to the oral communication of doctrine, opinion, or fact. The term is variously interpreted, to bind, to faze within strict limits, seems to have been an afterthought, recognized by the sentiment that the Masorah is a hedge to the Torah. The Masorah, however, is not confined to what is communicated by oral tradition: in the state in which it has come down to us it embraces all that has been delivered traditionally, whether orally or in writing. Its correlate is הַמֵּסֶר (מַעֲבָדָה), reception; and as the latter denotes whatever has been received traditionally, the former embraces whatever has been delivered traditionally: though in usage Kabbalah is generally restricted to matters of theologcal and mystical import [see CAHALA], while Masorah has reference rather to matters affecting the condition of the text of Scripture. It takes account not only of various readings, but contains notes of a grammatical and lexicographical character. It descends to the most minute particulars, and is a monument of prolonged industry, fidelity, and earnest devotion to the cause of sacred learning.

1. Origins of the Masorah.—The Masorah is the work of certain Jewish critics, who from whose work have received the title of הָבָלִית (Bozalim Homenaseth), masters of the Masorah, or, as they are generally designated, Masoretes. They were, and when or
MASORAH

where their work was accomplished, are points involved in some uncertainty. According to Jewish tradition, the work began with the written collection (Buxtorf, Tiberias, c. 11, p. 102; Leseuden, Philol. Heb. Diss., sec. 4; Pfeiffer, De Masorah, cap. ii, in Opp. p. 891, etc.), but the arguments which have been adduced in support of this opinion are not sufficient to sustain it. The Tiber-Zeera says expressly: "So was the usage of the wise men of Tiberias, for from them were the men the authors of the Masorah, and from them have we received the whole punctuation." (Zadok, cited by Buxtorf, T. c. p. 9), and even Buxtorf himself unconsciously gives in to the opinion he opposes by the title he has put on his work. That various readings had been noted before this, even in pre-Talmudic times, is not to be doubted. In the Talmud itself we have not only directions given for the correct writing of the Biblical books, but references to varieties of reading as then existing, (Hecor, t. Tammith, l. 68, c. 1; comp. Kennicott, Gen. ii. 84; De Wette, Rem., c. 99; Haverneick, Introd. p. 280;), especial mention is made of the Ittur Sopherim (תלמוד תורוספיא, Abelicio Scribarum; tract Nedarin, l. 37, c. 2), of the Keri ve-lo Kethib, the Kethib ve-lo Keri, and the Keri ce-keheth (Nedarim, l. c. tract Sota, v, 5; Joma, l. 21, c. 2), and of the puncta extraordinaria, which, however, are not properly of critical import, but rather point to allegorical explanations of the passages (tr. Nasir, l. 23, c. 1; comp. Jerome, Quast. in Gen. xviii., 85); and already the middle consonant, the middle word, and the middle verse of the Pentateuch are noted as in the Masorah. In the tract Sopherim, written between the Talmud and the Masorah, there are also notes of the same kind, though not exactly agreeing with those in the Masorah. But those variants had not before been formally collected and reduced to order in writing. This was the work of the Jewish scholar, who, from the 6th century after Christ, flourished in Palestine, and had his principal seat at Tiberias (Zuns, Gottesdiestliche Vorträge der Juden, p. 689).

II. Contents of the Masorah. These are partly palaeographic, partly critical, partly exegetical, partly grammatical. They embrace notes concerning:

1. The Consoments of the Hebrew Text. Concerning these, the Masoretes note thirty letters which are larger than the others, about thirty that are less, four which are suspended or placed above the line of the others in the same word, and nine which are inverted or written upside down; to these peculiarities reference is made also in the Talmud, and the use of them as merely marking the middle of a book or section indicated (tr. Kiddushin, l. 30, c. 1; Haverneick, l. c. p. 282). The Masoretes also note a case in which the final v is found in the heart of a word (סובב רה, Isa. ix. 6); one in which the initial n is found at the end (נף, Neh. ii. 13); and in which the initial v occurs at the end (כף, Job xiv. 1)—irregularities for which no reason can be assigned (comp. Leseuden, Phil. Heb. Diss., c. 3). They have noted how often each letter occurs; and it was customary to mark the middle of each book, the middle letter of the Pentateuch (the v in לא, Lev. xi. 42), the middle letter of the Psalter (the v in והי, Psa. lxxx., 14), the number of times each of the five letters which have final forms occurs in its final and in its initial form.

2. The Vowel-points and Accents in the Hebrew Text. Here the Masoretes note the peculiarities and anomalies in the vowel-points, in the dagesh and mappik, and of the accents in the text—a fact to which Buxtorf appeals with considerable force, as proving that the authors of the Masorah, as we have it, were not the inventors of the diacritical marks by which vowels and accents are indicated in the Hebrew text: for, had they been so, they would not have confined themselves to laboriously noting anomalies into which they themselves had fallen, but would at once have removed them. See Vowel-points.

3. Words. With regard to these, the Masoretes note (1) the cases of Scriptio plena (窒ליס 적용) and defectiva (יעליס 적용); (2) the number of times in which certain words occur at the beginning of a verse (as, e.g., לבר, which they say is nine times the first word of a verse), or the end of a verse (as, יתרא, which they say occurs thrice as the final word of a verse); (3) words of which the meaning is ambiguous, and to which they affix the proper meaning in the place where they occur; (4) words which have over them the puncta extraordinaria; and (5) words which present anomalies in writing or grammar, and which some have thought should be altered, or peculiarities which need to be explained.

4. Verses. The Masoretes number the verses in each book of the O. Test., as well as in each of the larger sections of the Pentateuch, and they note the middle verse of each book of the O. T.; they also note the number of verses in which certain expressions occur, the first and last letters, the number of cases the number of letters of which it is composed; and, in fine, they have marked twenty-five or twenty-eight places where there is a pause in the middle of a verse, or where a hiatus is supposed to be found in the meaning (as, e.g., in Gen. iv, 8, where, after the words בַּעַל לַעֲבֻדַּה, there is in rabbinical editions of the O. Test. a space left vacant [ץָשַׁה, piska] to indicate that something is probably omitted).

5. Tikkan Sopherim (תלמוד תורוספיא, ordinarium, sive correctio Scribarum). On the word בָּרָא (Psa. cvi, 20) the Masorah has this note: the word בָּרָא is one of eighteen words in Scripture which are an ordination of the Scribaria. These eighteen words are also enumerated in a note at the beginning of Numbers. The passages where they occur are presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen. xvii, 9</th>
<th>בָּרָא</th>
<th>בָּרָא</th>
<th>בָּרָא</th>
<th>בָּרָא</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numb. x, 15</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numb. xii, 13</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam. iii, 18</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. xvi, 12</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings xii, 16</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chron. x, 16</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek. xii, 17</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hab. l, 20</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal. x, 12</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech. ii, 8</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer. ii, 11</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos. iv, 7</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psa. cvi, 20</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job vii, 20</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job xxxiii, 8</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam. iii, 20</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
<td>בָּרָא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charges have been rashly advanced against these Sopherim of having corrupted the sacred text (Galatin, De A r e n n i a C ath o l. Ver. lib. i, c. 6), but for this there is no foundation (see ben-Chajim's Introduction to the Rabbinc Bible, translated by Ginsburg, p. 21). Eichhorn concludes from the criticism of the rabbis that "this recension took note only of certain errors which had crept into the text through transcribers, and which
were corrected by collation of MSS." [Erdel, in A. T. sec. 116]. Bleek, however, thinks that this is affirmed without evidence, and that in some cases the rejected reading is probably the original one, as e.g. in Gen. xviii, 22, and Hab. 1, 12 [Erdel, in A. T. p. 908].

6. Irr. Sophorim (יִפְשְׂרְיָה יֶרֶבֶן, abbiaco Scriba-ram).—The Masoretes have noted four instances in which the letter ℤ has been erroneously prefixed to the word יִפְשְׂרְיָה in Psa. xxxvi, 7. Of these passages, the only one in which the injunction of the Sopherim to remove the ℤ has been neglected is Numb. xii, 14—a neglect at which Buxtorf expresses surprise (Lez. Talmud, s. v. ⤶). 

7. Keri and Kethib.—But not all the dicta of the Masoretes are of equal sterling value; they are not only sometimes utterly superfluous, but downright erroneous. Of its "countings" we may adduce that it enumerates in the Pentateuch 18 greater and 48 smaller portions, 1554 verses, 63,467 words, 70,100 letters, etc.—a calculation which, is however, to a certain degree at variance with the Talmud. See the article Keri and Kethib in this work.

III. Form of the Masorah.—The language of the Masorah is Chaldean; and, besides the difficulty of this idiom, the obscure abbreviations, contractions, symbolical signs, etc., with which the work abounds, renders its study exceedingly difficult. In all probability it was compos ed out of notes that had been made from time to time on separate leaves, or in books, as occasion demanded. Afterwards they were appended as marginal notes to the text, sometimes on the upper and lower margin, sometimes in a mere brief form on the space between the text and the Chaldean version, where, from scarcity of room, many abbreviations and symbols were resorted to, and considerable omissions were made. Hence arose a distinction between the פֶּרֶשָׂת, the Masora Magna, and the קֶטֵב הַמַשְׁפֵּר, the M. Parra—the former of which comprehends the entire body of critical remark on the margins, the latter the more curt and condensed notes inserted in the intermediate space. The latter has frequently been represented as an abbreviated compend of the former; but this is not strictly correct, for the lesser Masorah contains many things not found in the greater. At an early period the scribes introduced the practice of adorning their annotations with all manner of figures, and symbols, and calligraphic ingenuities, and from this as well as from several connected with the method of selection and arrangement, the whole came into such a state of confusion that it was rendered almost useless. In this state it remained until the publication of Bomberry’s Robbibilica Bible (Venetiis, 1526: the second Bomberg Bible Robin, not the first, as is sometimes stated), for which the learned R. Jacob ben-Chajim, with immense labor, prepared and arranged the Masorah. 

See JACOB BEN-CHAJIM. To facilitate the use of the Greater Masorah, he placed at the end of his work what has been called the Masora maxima or gloss, and which forms a sort of Masoretic Concordance in alphabetical order.

IV. Value of the Masorah.—While there is much in the Masorah that can be regarded in no other light than as laborious trifling, it is far from deserving the scorn which has sometimes been poured upon it. There can be no doubt that it preserves to us much valuable traditional information concerning the constitution and the meaning of the sacred text. It is the source whence materials for a critical revision of the O.-Test. text can now alone be derived. It is a pity that it is now impossible to discriminate the older from the more recent of its forms. As against the Masora of the Talmud and the Targum, those of the Masora magna of such as Eichhorn, that some one would undertake the "bitter task" of making complete critical excerpits from the Masorah.


Maspha, the name of two places mentioned in the Apocrypha whether the ancient city of Mizpah of Gilgal (Judg. xi, 29, etc.) or Mizpeh of Moab (1 Sam. xxii, 8) is meant. The Syriac has the curious variation of Olum, "salt," and one Greek MS. has ιαύμα, another ιανόμα, another ιαμαία: but this seems to be a mere corruption from ver. 26 by some one who thought that the place mentioned in both verses should be the same. Michaelis, however, would combine both readings, and make the place Mizpeh-Elom. Perhaps Josephus also reads יִפְשֶׂרָה, "salt," as he reads מַדְאִי (Ant. xii, 8, 3), which Grimm thinks has arisen from transposition of letters (Handbuch s. a. Apokr. ad loc.).

Maserckah (Heb. מֶרְכָּה, מֶרְכָּה, merkōr; Sept. Marsek, Marsaxk, Masek), a place apparently in Idumea, the native place of Samiah, one of the Edomites kings (1st. xxxvi, 56; 1 Chron. 1, 47).—The student of the Bible will call attention to some of these kings are mentioned with the addition, and the name of the town where he was, others are introduced as 'coming from' some other place. Kalsch (ad loc.) remarks that the former seems to comprise native Idumeans, the latter foreigners. Esdras and Jerome, however (Onomast. s. a. Marsek), accentuate the difference of the names, and locate the one in the northern part of Edom (Kitto). "Interpreted as Hebrew, the name refers to vineyards— as if from סָרָנ, a root with which we are familiar in the 'vine of So rage,' that is, the choice vine; and, led by this,Knobel (Gen. p. 357) proposes to place Maserckah in the district of the Idumean Gilead, southwest of Gilead, and along the Jezreel, route, where Barchhardt found 'extensive vineyards,' and 'great quantities of dried grapes,' made by the tribe of the Rephaim for the supply of Gaza.
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and for the Mecca pilgrims (Borchhardt, Syria, p. 418). But the Mass has been a name at least since corresponding with Masrekah has been yet discovered in that locality" (Smith). According to Schwartz (Palest. p. 218), there is still a town, eight miles south of Petra, called En-Masrek, which he thinks may be the locality. He probably refers to the place marked Ab Misrauk on Palmer's Map, and Ab el-Udada in Reproof.

Mass (Latin Missa) is the technical term by which the Church of Rome designates the Eucharistic service which in that Church, as well as in the Greek and other Oriental churches, is held to be the sacrifice of the new law—a real though unbloody offering, in which Christ is the victim, in substance the same with the sacrifice of the cross. It is instituted, Romanists further teach, in commemoration of that sacrifice, and as a means of applying its merits through all ages for the sanctification of men.

Oriens and Meaning of the Word—"The first names given to the administration of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ," says Walcott (s. v.), "were the Breaking of Bread (Acts xx, 6, 7), the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. ii, 20), or Communion (1 Cor. x, 18). It was also called, by way of eminence, the mystery, the sacrament, the oblation or prophyra, the sacrifice, Dominicum (the Lord's), agenda (the action), synaxis and collecta (the assembly or congregation); the sacrifice, the consecration, the mystical or divine Eucharist or eulogy (the thanksgiving), the office, the spectacle, the consecration, the unbloody sacrifice, the supper, the table, the latria (worship), the universal canon; and, by the Greeks, also the hierurgia (sacred action), and the good by excellence, metalepsis (the communion), in the Apostolical Canons. These terms served either to explain to the faithful the meaning of the service, or, in times of persecution, to conceal its real nature from the profane and persecutors. In Acts xiii, 2, it is spoken of as the liturgy.

The term Mass, having been long used by Clement I, Alexander, Telesphorus, Soter, and Felix (cir. 100-275). In a letter of St. Ambrose to his sister Marcellina (of the 4th century), we have this passage: "Ego manst in munere, missam facere scripi, dum offers, raptos cognovit" (Ep. xxxiii.). Its origin and use, however, have given much trouble. There are at present three principal derivations of the word: (1) From the Anglo-Saxon massa, a feast, in which sense the word is of more ancient date than the Eucharist. It seems probable that the ancient word is embodied in such names as Missale (Mass), Missam (Massarum, Massenses); but it is very doubtful whether the suffix, as thus used, has any reference at all to the holy Eucharist, and it is much more probable that the coincidence of the Anglo-Saxon word for feast, with mass and missa, the holy Eucharist, is purely accidental. (2) From the Hebrew מָסָא, masah, which signifies an oblation, as in Deut. xvi, 10. This derivation would tend to show an association between the original idea of the Eucharist and the oblations of the Jewish ritual; but it is extremely improbable that the Jewish word should have found its way into every language of Europe, and yet be entirely absent from the liturgical vocabulary of the Oriental churches. (3) From the Latin missa, an offering, of the West, which was equivalent to the by εὐλογημένου Χριστοῦ ἐρωτευμονόμενον, "Let us depart in peace," of the Greek liturgies. But the words "Ite, missa est," have two senses given to them by ancient writers; thus, in Micologus, it means "Let us depart in peace," (1) and missa, a "plenary dispensation, a complete absolution of sins," (2); plene generalis conventus celebratus soli, qui per huiusmodi de extenuatione licenciam discipendi accepit solea" (Micolog. xiv.). St. Thomas Aquinas, on the other hand, explains the phrase as meaning that the sacrifice of the Eucharist has been sent up to God by the administration of the Holy Eucharist, (3) a prayer read in a laudatio sanctissimae, the Gradual (q. v.); (4) the Gospel, which is commonly followed by the Nicene Creed; (5) the Offertory (q. v.), after the reading of which comes the preparatory offering of the bread and wine, and the washing of the priest's hands in token of purity of heart, and the "a" or "the priest's prayer (cresit)," a prayer read in a laudatio sanctissimae, the Gradual (q. v.); (6) the preface, concluding with the trisagion, or "thrice holy," at which point, by the primitive use, the catechumens and penitents retired from the church; (7)
on him, and forgive him his sins, and bring him to everlasting life. Then, in the name of all there present, the clerk makes the like general confession to God, to the whole court of heaven, and to the priest, and begs his prayers. And the priest prays to God to show mercy to all his people, and to put them into remembrance and remission of all their sins. Which is done to the end that both priest and people may put themselves in a penitent spirit, in order to assist worthily at this divine sacrifice. After the Confrere the priest goes up to the altar. From afar away from us, we beseech thee, O Lord, our intercessions, that we may be worthy to enter with pure minds into the holy of holies, through Christ our Lord; amen, and kisses the altar as a figure of Christ, and the seat of the sacred mysteries. When the priest is come up to the altar, he goes to the book, and there reads what is to conclude introit; entrance of the mass, which is different every day, and is generally an anthem taken out of the Scripture, with the first verse of one of the Psalms, and the Glory be to the Father, etc., to glorify the blessed Trinity. The priest returns to the middle of the altar, and says alternately with the clerk the Kyrie eleison, or Lord have mercy on us, which is said three times to God the Father; three times Christe eleison, or Christ have mercy on us, to God the Son; and three times again Kyrie eleison, to God the Holy Ghost. After the Kyrie eleison, the priest says the Gloria in excelsis to God on high, etc., being an excellent hymn and prayer to God, the beginning of which was sung by the angels at the birth of Christ. But this, being a hymn of joy, is omitted in the masses of requiem for the dead, and in the masses of the Sundays and ferias of the penitential times of Advent and Lent, etc. At the end of the Gloria in excelsis the priest kisses the altar, and, turning about to the people, says, 'Dominus vobiscum' (The Lord be with you). Answer: 'Et cum spiritu tuo.' (And with thy spirit). The priest returns to the book, reads the lessons, and then reads the collect or collects of the day, concluding the order of the mass with the usual termination, 'Per Dominum nostrum,' etc. (Through our Lord Jesus Christ, etc.), with which the Church commonly concludes all her prayers. The collect being ended, the priest lays his hands upon the book and reads the epistle or lesson of the day, at the end of which the clerk answers, 'Deo gratias' (Thanks be to God)—viz., for the heavenly doctrine there delivered. Then follow some verses or sentences of Scripture, called the gradual, which are every day different. After this the book is removed to the other side of the altar, and the priest reads the Gospel, or, which removal of the book represents the passing from the preaching of the old law, figured by the lesson or epistle, to the Gospel of Jesus Christ published by the preachers of the new law. The priest, before he reads the Gospel, stands awhile bowing down before the middle of the altar, begging of God in secret to cleanse his heart and his lips, that he may be worthy to declare those heavenly words. At the beginning of the Gospel the priest greets the people with the usual salutation—'Dominus vobiscum' (The Lord be with you), and then tells them the name of the evangelist in the margin of the text, saying, 'Sequentia S. Evangelii secundum,' etc. (What follows is of the holy Gospel, etc.). At these words both priest and people make the sign of the cross: 1st, upon their foreheads, to signify that they are not ashamed of the cross of Christ; his spies to God, to the whole court of heaven, and to all the faithful there present, of his sins and un worthiness, and to beg their prayers for God to him. And the clerk, in the name of the people, prays for the priest, that God would have mercy

---

The "canon," which is always the same, and which contains all the prayers connected with the consecration, the elevation, the breaking, and the communion of the host and of the chalice, as also the commemorations both of the living and of the dead; (9) the "communion," which is a short scriptural prayer, usually appropriate to the particular festival; (9) the "post-communion," which, like the collect, was a joint prayer of priest and people, and is read or sung aloud; (10) the dismissal with the benediction; and, finally, the first chapter of the great mass of the above prayers were fixed, and form what is called the "ordo" or "ordinary" of the mass. The rest, which is called the "proper of the mass," differs for different occasions, many masses having nothing peculiar but the name: such are the masses of the saints—that of St. Mary of the Snow, celebrated on the 6th of August; that of St. Margaret, patroness of lying-in women; that at the feast of St. John the Baptist, at which are said three masses; that of the Innocents, at which the Gloria in excelsis and Hallelujah are omitted, and, it being a day of mourning, the altar is in a violet color. As to ordinary masses, some are for the dead, and, as it is supposed, contribute to release the soul from purgatory. At these masses the altar is put in mourning, and the only decorations are a cross in the middle of six yellow wax lights; the dress of the celebrant, and the very Mass book. The various parts of the service are omitted, and the people are dismissed without the benediction. If the mass be said for a person distinguished by his rank or virtues, it is followed with a funeral oration: they erect a chapelle ardente, that is, a representation of the deceased, with branches and tapers of yellow wax, either in the middle of the church or near the deceased's tomb, where the priest pronounces a solemn absolution of the deceased. There are likewise private masses said for stolen or strayed goods or cattle, for health, for travellers, etc., which go under the name of erecta masses. These masses are further distinguished from other masses, denominates from the countries in which they were used: thus the Gothic mass, or missa Marchrotam, is that used among the Goths when they were masters of Spain, and is still kept up at Toledo and Salamanca; the Ambrosian mass is that composed by St. Ambrose, and used only at Milan, of which city he was bishop; the Gallic mass, used by the ancient Gauls; and the Roman mass, used by almost all the churches in the Romish communion. The mass of the presanctified (missa presanctification) is a mass peculiar not only to the Roman, but also to the Greek Church. In the latter country, it is performed by the celebration of the eucharist; but, in the Greek Church, after singing some hymns, the bread and wine, which were consecrated on the preceding day, are partaken of. This mass is performed in the Greek Church not only on Good Friday, but on every day during all Lent, except on Saturdays, Sundays, and the Annunciation. The priest counts upon his fingers the days of the ensuing week on which it is to be celebrated, and cuts off as many pieces of bread at the altar as he is to say masses, and, after having consecrated them, steeps them in wine and puts them in a box, out of which, upon every occasion, he takes one with a spoon, and, putting it on a dish, sets it on the altar.

Ceremony.—The following office of the mass is extracted from the Garden of the Soul, prepared by the late bishop Challoner, and may be accepted, therefore, as the authorized rites of the English Roman Catholics: "At the beginning of the mass, the priest at the foot of the altar makes the sign of the cross, 'In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; amen,' and then recites with the clerk the 42d Psalm—'Judica me, Deus,' etc. Then the priest, bowing down, says the Collect, 'by way of general petition to God, to the whole court of heaven, and to all the faithful there present, of his sins and unworthiness, and to beg their prayers for God to him. And the clerk, in the name of the people, prays for the priest, that God would have mercy..."
upon all Sundays, and many other festival days, standing in the middle of the altar, he recites the Nicene Creed: "And in one and the same Jesus Christ..." in reversion to the great mystery of our Lord’s incarnation.

Then the priest turns about to the people and says, ‘Dominus vobiscum’ (The Lord be with you). Having read in the book a verse or sentence of the Scripture, which is called the epistle, and is every day different, he upowers the chalice, and, taking in his hand the paten, or little plate, offers up the bread to God; then, going to the corner of the altar, he takes the wine and pours it into the chalice, and mingles with it a small quantity of water, in remembrance of the blood and body of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; after which he returns to the middle of the altar and offers up the chalice. Then, bowing down, he begs that this sacrifice, which he desires to offer with a contrite and humble heart, may find acceptance with God; and, blessing the bread and wine with the sign of the cross, he invokes the host of all sanctity to sanctify this offering. At the end of the epistle, the priest goes to the corner of the altar and washes the tips of his fingers, to denote the cleanliness and purity of soul with which we ought to approach to these divine mysteries, saying, ‘Lavabo,’ etc. (I will wash my hands among the innocents, etc.) as in the latter part of the 26th Psalm. Then returning to the middle of the altar, and there bowing down, he begs of the blessed Trinity to receive this oblation in memory of the Passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, and for the souls of all the blessed Virgin and of all the saints, that they may intercede for us in heaven, whose memory we celebrate upon earth. Then the priest, kissing the altar, turns to the people and says, ‘Orate fratres,’ etc. (Brethren, pray that my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God the Father Almighty). Then the priest says in a low voice the prayers called secreta, which correspond to the collective of the day, and are different every day. The priest concludes the secreta by saying aloud, ‘Per omniam secula secundum,’ etc. (World without end). Answer: Amen. Priests: ‘Dominus vobiscum’ (The Lord be with you). Answer: ‘Et cum spiritu tuo’ (And with thy spirit). Priests: ‘Surrsum corda’ (Lift up your hearts). Answer: ‘Habemus ad Dominum’ (We have them lifted up to the Lord). Priests: ‘Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro’ (Let us give thanks to the Lord our God). Then follow the public prayers, and the Sacred Meal, and the celebration of the Eucharist.”

V.—28
mass

secrected species. Then covering the chalice, he goes to the book and reads a verse of holy Scripture, called the act of consecration; after which he turns about to the people with the usual salutation, Dominius vobiscum; and, returning to the book, reads the collects or prayers called the post-communion. After which he again greets the people with Dominius vobiscum, and gives them leave to depart. At the mental prayer, order to the priest may feel morally sure that he is in a state of grace, since for the recovery of that state by such as have once fallen from it, confession, or contrition, if confession cannot be obtained, is absolutely necessary. Confession is unattainable when there is no contrition, but when there is none but an excommunicated person, or one whose powers have expired, or whose powers do not extend to absolution from the particular sins of which the penitent is guilty, or one who is justly suspected of having betrayed the secrets of confession, or who requires an interpreter, or when it is impossible to go to confession without manifest inconvenience from distance, badness of the road, inclemency of the season, or the murmur of the congregation impatient for mass. Even if any of these reasons can be pleaded, no unconfessed priest ought to give the holy communion to a penitent in danger of death, or through fear that a sick person may die without receiving the eucharist, or to avoid scandal when a congregation is sitting, or to finish a mass in which another priest has been accidentally interrupted. If a priest, during the celebration of mass, should recall to the memory of the people who it is, that he struck his head, even if he has been excommunicated or suspended, or that the place in which he is celebrating it is interdicted, he must quit the altar, unless he has already consecrated the host; and even if he has done so, or any fear of scandal induces him to proceed (as it is morally impossible but that some such fear must arise), he must perform an act of contrition, and make a firm resolution to confess, if in his power, on the very same day. No priest, without committing venial or perhaps mortal sin, can celebrate mass before he has recited salutatins andlaus, unless from the necessity of administering the eucharist to the dying, or of excusing such a one during the night, from pressure of confessions on a holiday, or to quiet murmurs among the congregation. It is a mortal sin for a priest intending to say mass to taste food, drink, or medicine after the preceding midnight. Even an involuntary transgression of such rules is a mortal sin; so that a priest offended in that degree if he celebrates mass after having been forced to eat or drink the smallest morsel or drop while the hour of midnight is striking, or a single moment afterwards. The exceptions are—1. To save the prostration, the moment of death, the all-consuming passion of the host, and there be no one else by who can otherwise prevent it, a priest, although not fasting, may swallow it without sin. 2. When a priest has so far proceeded in mass that he cannot stop, as when water has been accidentally put into the chalice instead of wine, and he does not perceive it till he has swallowed it, or when he recollects after consecration that he is not fasting. 3. When, after having performed the lauda, he perceives any scattered fragments of hosts, provided he be still at the altar, these he may eat. 4. To prevent scandal, such as a suspicion that he had committed a crime the night before. 5. To administer the eucharist. 6. To finish a mass commenced by another priest, and accidentally interrupted. 7. When he is dispensed. It is very probably a mortal sin, by authorities, to celebrate mass before dawn. So also the mass must not be celebrated after noon, and never, unless for the dying, on Good Friday. It is a mortal sin to celebrate mass without the necessary vestments and ornaments, or with unsecrected vestments, etc., unless in cases of the uttermost necessity. These vestments lose their consecration if any portion has been torn or cut out of them. However, if they are repaired before absolute disjunction, even if it be by a downright patch. No worn-out consecrated vestment should be applied to any other purpose; but it
should be buried, and the ashes thrown in some place in which they will not be trampled on. But, on the other hand, with a very wise distinction, the precocious mass, which is one of the most solemn and important services of the Church, is not expressly prohibited to sacred purposes, after having been passed through the fire, which changes their very nature by fusion. No dispensation has ever yet been granted by any pope to qualify the rigid precept enjoining the necessity of an altar for masses; and this must have been consecrated by a bishop, not by a simple priest, unless through dispensation from the holy father himself. Three napkins are strictly necessary; two may suffice if such be the common usage of the country—one in very urgent cases; and even that, provided it be whole and clean, may be unsullied. But those tapes of any account be dispensed with, even to secure the receipt of the exuvium by a dying man. Mass must stop if the taper be extinguished and another cannot be obtained. On that account a lamp should be kept burning day and night before every altar on which the host is deposited; and those to whom the care of this lamp appertains commit a mortal sin if they neglect it for one whole day. In no case must a woman be allowed to assist a priest at the altar. Certain prevalent superstitions during the celebration of mass are forbidden—such as picking up fragments of the sacred Host, consecrated by the priest. On Sundays only, the Mass of the Passion is celebrated; on other days, the boxwood consecrated on that day, infusing it for three quarters of an hour, neither more nor less, in spring water, and drinking the water as a cure for the colic; keeping the mouth open during the sancus in the mass for the dead, as a charm against mad dogs; writing the sancus on a piece of virgin parchment, and wearing it as an amulet; saying mass for twenty Fridays running as a security against dying without confession, contrition, full satisfaction, and communion, and in order to obtain admission into heaven thirty days after death; ordering the mass of the Holy Ghost to be said in certain churches by way of divination. If a fly or a spider fall into the cup before consecration, a fresh cup should be provided; if after consecration, it should be swallowed, that if can be done without repugnance or danger, otherwise it should be removed, washed with wine, burned after mass, and its ashes thrown into the sacristy. There are some nice precautions to be observed in case of the accidental fall of a host among the clothes of a female communicant; if the wafier fall on a napkin, it suffices that the napkin be washed by a subdeacon or deacon by no means consecrated; if a single drop of wine, the office must be performed by a priest. In the celebration of the mass the priest wears peculiar vestments, five in number—two of linen, called “amice” and “albs;” and three of silk or precious stuffs, called “maniple,” “stole,” and “chasuble,” the albs being girt with a cincture of silk or satin silk or velvet. Too, of these vestments varies with the occasion, five colors being employed on different occasions—white, red, green, purple or violet, and black; and they are often richly embroidered with silk or thread of the precious metals, and occasionally with ermine in stripes. The priest is only allowed to celebrate the mass fasting, and, unless by special dispensation, is only permitted to offer it once in the day, except on Christmas day, when three masses may be celebrated. In the Greek and Oriental churches, the Eucharistic service, called in Greek Τελειωτής Λειτουργία (The Divine Liturgy), differs in the order of its parts, in the wording of most of its prayers, and in its accompanying ceremonial, from the mass of the Latin Church [see Liturgy]; but the only differences which have any importance as bearing on the question of its being a Mass have to do with its being a re-sacrament, or re-sacralized, which is called a Liturgy. The Holy Communion was celebrated at first at night, or, as Pliny says, before daybreak, and Tertullian calls the meeting the Night Convocation, or that before light. But in time the Church prescribed the mass to be said in tierce of festivals, but of the Lenten and of the Eastern and Western Easts at sexta; in Lent and on fasts at none,
or 8 P.M. In the Middle Ages the nightly celebrations were permitted on Christmas eve, on Easter eve, on St. John's Eve, and on All Saints' Day. In France, on Ember weeks, when ordinations were held; and at Easter and Pentecost on the hallowing of the candle. In 1i488 archbishop Bourchier, from regard to his infirmity, received permission to celebrate in the afternoon. Belith says that “it was daily of old, and even on Sundays, if none of those of Holy Trinity, Charity, Wisdom, the Holy Ghost, Angels, Holy Cross, and St. Mary, and that at Rome. In the province of Ravenna the mass of Easter eve was not said until after midnight. He adds that the Greek Church excommunicated all who failed to partake of the Eucharist on the Sundays. See LEV.; Gen. 4:15. 

Literature.—The most noted writers on this subject are Bon; Gerbert; Gavantini, Benterin; Augusti. Besides these, see Bochart, Traité de sacrificio de la Messe; Derodon, Le Tombeau de la Messe; Du Moulin, Pratique de la cérémonie de la Messe; Fichot, De l'origine et superstitione Missarum; Jaeger, Supposition missionaria; King, Traité de sacrifício missae; (Roman Catholic); Kiechle, Liturgia, Leonfortis; Vorlesungen über die Orgel (1826); Lom, Missa generalis; Macquarrie, De sancto eucharistia quando et quando de missa sest introduit à sa place; Blau, Erfahrung der Gräber; Buat, Gegen- satz des Katholizismus u. Protestantismus (1848, 1852, 2d ed.); Baier, Symbolik der röm.-kath. Kirche (Leipzig, 1842, 2d ed.); Mason, Herero, Theom, The Lutheran; Mackenzie, Some Hundred Defects of the Mass; Mager, Popish Mass celebrated by Heinsius; Whitty, Abridgment and Idolatry of the Mass; Bible and Missal, ch. iv.; Bosquet's Variations, vol. i; Siegel, Christliche Ahnhilfe (see Index in vol. i, s. v. Mose); Kiddle, Christiane Antiquités; Walcot, Stat. Arch. a.v.; Coleman, Christian Aniq.; Willet, Synop. Pop. (ed. Cumming, London 1852); Forbes, Considerations, ii, 582; English Rev. x, 544; Retrospective Rev. xii, 70; Westerm. Rev. 1866 (July), p. 50; Christian Ch. Rev. 1866 (April), p. 15 sq.; Evangel. Ch. Rev. 1869 (Jan.), p. 51; Christian Remembrancer, 1866 (Jan.), p. 63; New Englisher, 1869, p. 5; Haag, Les Dogmes Chrétiens (see Index); Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index, vol. ii); Cramp, Text-Book of Popey, Blunt, Dict. of Hist. and Doct. Theol. a.v.; Edide, Ecclesiast. Dict. a.v.; Aasbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, a.v. Mose.

Mass Penny, a conventional name for the offering made by a chief mourner at a funeral.

Mass Priests, mercenaries hired at a certain sum, who undertook an immediate number of annals or trelents, and were unable to say them, and sold them to be offered by others. This abuse was forbidden in 1286 by archbishop Edmund's Constitutions (2). In 1360 the mass priest was the secular, and the minister priest the conventual, and this is the earliest meaning of the term.

Ma'ssa (Heb. Massah', מַסָּה, a lifting up, as often; Sept. Massi), one of the sons of Ithmael (B.C. post 2061), who became the progenitor of an Arabian clan (Gen. xxvi, 14; 1 Chron. i, 39). The tribe is usually, and not improbably, compared with the Masa' (Mas-sa'ow, Ptol. v, 19, 2), inhabiting the Arabian desert towards BABYLONIA, doubtless the same as the Massa', a nomad tribe of Mesopotamia (Plyn, H. viii, 30). This would confirm Forster's theory that the twelve sons of Ishmael peopled the west of the Arabian peninsula (Geog. of Arabia, i, 284). As Duhm is named in connection with Seir (Isa. xxi, 11), there is some foundation for the opinion that Massa was a kingdom of considerable size, possibly reigned over by king LEMUEL (Prov. xxx, 1, מַסָּה, "the prophecy"). See LEMUEL. Hitzig arbitrarily locates Duhmah in wady el-Kora, among the ruins of the south of Asahel, and then places Massah between it and Mount Seir (Zeller's Jahrbuch, 1844, p. 288). See DUMAH.
sition, they perpetuated themselves to the 7th century, and reappeared in the Esquilles and Bogomiles (q. v.), and in the Muslims of the East, Theol. Dict. i. 18; Neander, Ch. Hist. ii. 240-247; Schaff, Ch. Hist. ii. 199.

Massiarius, a chamberlain of the massa communis, which was the common fund of a cathedral.

Masseth. See TALMUD.

Masuri (Masuri v. v. 'Asuray), given (1 Esdr. ix, 22) in place of the Masseriai (q. v.) of the Heb. Estra (x, 22).

Massie, James William, D.D., LL.D., a minister of the English Independents, for some time engaged in the ministry, was born in Ireland in 1799. He was educated for the ministry by Dr. Bogue, and went out as a missionary to India. After laboring there a few years he returned to Great Britain, was pastor for a time at Perth, Scotland, and subsequently at Dublin, Ireland, and Salford, England, from which latter place he moved to London, to act as secretary of the Home Missionary Society. Deeply interested in all the public movements of the day, he took a prominent part in the anti-slavery movement, and was an active member of the Union and Emancipation societies formed during the latter part of the last century. He visited this country several times, and was twice delegated from the Independents to our Congregationalists and Presbyterians. He died at Kingston, Ireland, May 8, 1869. Dr. Massie was the author of several works, among which were Continental India (1815, 2 vols. 8vo; 1840, 2 vols. 8vo); Theologia Palestina, illustrating the History (2 vols. 8vo).—The Nonconformist's Plea for Freedom of Education (1817).—The Evangelical Alliance, its Origin and Development (1817).—Liberty of Conscience illustrated, etc. (1847).—Social Improvement among the Working Classes, affecting the entire community (1843).—The Contrast—War and Christianity: Martial Evils and their Remedy (1855).—Christ a Learner (1856).—Revivals in Ireland: Facts, Documents, and Correspondence (1850-60).—Revival Work (1860).—The American Crisis in Relation to the Anti-Slavery Cause (1862).—America, the Origin of her present Conflict; her Prospect for the Slave, and her Claim for Anti-slavery Sympathy, illustrated by Incidents of Travel during a Tour in the Summer of 1863 throughout the United States (1864) etc.

Massieu, Guillaume, a learned French writer, was born April 13, 1665, at Caen, where he finished his classical studies. At sixteen he began a course of philosophy at the college of the Jesuits. As he proved himself an apt pupil, the Jesuits desired to attach him to their college at Reims to teach rhetoric; resigning himself ultimately for the professorship of theology; but his studies were not congenial to his tastes, and his love for belles-lettres far exceeding that for theology, he forsook the society after he had actually joined it, and returned to the world. His remarkable gifts soon gained him friends; and he formed a work as an instructor. While at Paris he made the acquaintance of the abbé De Taurreil, whom he aided in translating the works of Demosthenes; through his influence also he became a pensioner of the Academy of Inscriptions in 1705, and in the same year was professor of the Greek language in the College of France, where he distinguished himself during the twelve years that he held the position by his profound knowledge and a pure and delicate taste. In 1714 the French Academy was opened to him. His oration delivered on this occasion is printed in the collections of the academy. Having translated Pindar, he naturally defended the writers of antiquity against the attacks of Perrault and of La Motte. The mémoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions (vol. i, ii, and iii) contain a great number of dissertations from the year 1701 to 1741. They are still read with pleasure, although they are more distinguished for delineation of finial than for profound erudition; the principal are, Les Grèces, Les Hoplites, Les Bouchers voleurs, Les Serments des Anciens, and a Périlable entre Romers et Platon. He also published a work on the Poésie François, à partir du onzième siècle. Massieu was one of the many distinguished literary men who are obliged all through life to maintain an incessant struggle with poverty. In his old age he suffered many bodily grievances, and two cataracts deprived him of his sight. He rendered valuable service to Biblical literature by his edition of the New Testament in Greek (printed at Paris, 1715, in 2 vols. 12mo). He died Sept. 26, 1722, at Paris. —Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, vol. xxxiv, s. v.

Massillians, a school of theologians in Southern Gaul, who, about the year 425, with John Cassian of Marseilleis (Massilia), a pupil of Chrysostom, at their head, asserted the necessity of the co-operation of divine grace and the human will, maintained that God works differently in different men, and rejected the doctrine of predestination as a vain speculation of mischievous tendency. They were called at first Massilians; afterwards, by scholastic writers, Semi-Pelagians; although, far from taking that name themselves, they rejected all connection with Pelagianism. Cassian recognised the universal corruption of human nature as a consequence of the first transgression, and recognised grace as well as justification in the sense of St. Augustine, whom he opposed on the question of election. See Chrysostom, On Chron.; Eilen, Theol. Dict.; Neander, Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church, ii. 261, 637-638; Schaff, Ch. Hist. iii, 859 sq.; Wiggers, Gesch. des Semi-Pelagianismus, ii. 7 sq.; Guericke, Ch. Hist. i, 591 sq.; Neander, Hist. of Christian Doxmas, ii. 675; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. vol. i. See Semi-Pelagians and Cassianus.

Massillon, Jean Baptiste, prominent among the most eloquent divines of the French Roman Catholic Church, was born at Hières, in Provence, June 24, 1668. His father was a notary in moderate circumstances, and at first intended his son for the same profession, but subsequently allowed him to receive the instructions of the Fathers of the Oratory, and when eighteen years of age the young man joined that order. Soon after, forsaking the world altogether, he entered an abbey under the rule of La Trappe. Here, however, his talents attracted the attention of the bishop, afterwards cardinal de Noailles, who induced him to re-enter the Oratorian Church in which he had been educated. Yet his success was more the fruit of labor than of spontaneous genius, and his last efforts are much superior to his first. In 1696 he went to Paris as principal of the Seminary of St. Magloire, the renowned school of the Orators. Here, in the strict discipline, the harsh manners, he continued his career as a pulpit orator, the delivery of his "Ecclesiastical conferences" to ecclesiastical students affording him an opportunity of developing his talent. He admired the saintly eloquence of Bourdaloue, but chose for himself a different style, characterized by profound pathos, and an insight into the most secret motives of the human heart. He was shorty noted as the preacher of repentance and penitence; and it was declared by able contemporaries of his sermons that "they reach the heart, and produce their due effects with more certainty than the logic of Bourdaloue." He delivered the customary Lent sermons at Montpellier in 1698, and the following year at Paris. The latter were warmly applauded, and induced the king to invite Massillon to preach the "Advent" at court. On this occasion king Louis XIV paid him the highest compliment. He declaimed, "I have heard many talented preachers in my chapel before, and was much pleased with them; but every time I hear you, I feel much displesed with myself."

He again preached the Lent sermons before the court during the years 1701 to 1704, but afterwards he retired no farther to bear the miseries of the king: so fearless and plain-spoken a preacher would have been ill suited to
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the gallant and prolix gentle court of "the great king." At the death of Louis XIV, Massillon was requested to preach his funeral sermon; in other words, to pronounce a eulogy of this prince. This was an arduous task for the uncutlurée preacher; yet he undertook it, and in his discourse lauded the fame and piety of the king, yet deplored the disasters caused by the wars in consequence of the wars and the looseness of morals. Invited now to preach the Lent sermons before the young king, Louis XV, then but eight years of age, he took advantage of the occasion to censure the manners of the court; and morality, rather than the passion of Christ, formed the subject of his sermons. These are in number, and being short, to accommodate them to the youth of his royal hearer, are known under the name of Le petite carême. In 1717 Massillon became bishop of Clermont, and in 1719 member of the French Academy. Two years after he preached at St. Denis the funeral sermon of the duchess Elizabeth Charlotte of Orleans, daughter of the elector of Palatinate, and mother of the regent. This is considered one of the best of his six Orations Funèbres. Thereafter he remained quietly in his diocese, diligently fulfilling his pastoral duties until his death. Louis XV. was less than fifteen when he died; he did not wish to remain connected with the court, or in any way to take part in temporal affairs. His life was a model of Christian virtue and gentleness; he never disputed against any but infidels, and the Roman Catholics will not forgive him for his eulogy of Louis XIV. Better preserved this monarch for his efforts to destroy heresy, alluded to the massacre of St. Bartholomew's eve and pronounced it a bloody wrong, to be ever condemned in the name of religion as well as of humanity. Preaching from the fulness of his heart, he did not consider the rank of those he addressed, but spoke to them with nobleness of purpose in all simplicity and fervor. He carefully instructed the clergy of his diocese by holding numerous conferences and by synodal discourses. He died Sept. 18, 1742. D'Alembert pronounced his eulogy before the French Academy.

The fame of this celebrated man stands perhaps higher than that of any preacher who has preceded or followed him, by the number, variety, and excellence of his productions, and their eloquent and harmonious style. Grace, dignity, and force, and an inexhaustible fecundity of resources, particularly characterize his works. His Avent et Carême, consisting of six volumes, may be justly considered as so many "chef-d'oeuvres." His mode of delivery contributed not a little to his success. "We seem to behold him still in imagination," said they who had been fortunate enough to attend his discourses; "his delivered speech, that simple, that unaffected carriage, those eyes so humbly directed downwards, that unstudied gesture, that touching tone of voice, that look of a man fully impressed with the truths which he enforced, conveying the most brilliant instruction to the mind, and the most pathetic movements to the heart." The famous actor, Baron, after hearing him, told him to continue as he had begun. "You," said he, "have a manner of your own; leave the rules to others." At another time he said to an actor who was with him, "My friend, this is the true orator; we are mere players." The reader is said to have kept a volume of Massillon's sermons constantly on his desk, as a model of eloquence. He thought him "the preacher who best understood the world—whose eloquence savored of the courtier, the academician, the wit, and the philosopher." Massillon's works, consisting mainly of sermons, have been collected and published under the title (Euvres complètes (Paris, 1776, 15 vols. 12mo). In English we have, Sermons on the Duties of the Great, translated from the French; preached before Louis XV during his minority; by William Dodd, LL.D. (Lond. 1776, 2d ed. 1809); Sermons, selected and translated by William Dickson (Lond. 1826, 8vo):—Charges, with two Essays, translated by Theophilus St. John (the Rev. S. Clapham) (Lond. 1806, 8vo):—Sermons on Death, Pain, illness, 47, translated (T. Wimbolt, Sermons):—Ecclesiastical Conferences, Syndical Discourses, and Episcopal Mandates, etc. translated by C. H. Boylan, of Maynooth College (1825, 2 vols. 8vo). See La Harpe, Coeur de Litétar; Maury, Eloquence de la Chaire; F. Thermen, Democraus und Massillon (1845); D'Alembert, Dictionaire des débats de Magistrats et de Nobles (1789); Tubal, Éloge de Massillon (1772); Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Générale...; Christian Ermenbrucher, 1854 (Jan.), p. 104; Presb. Rev. 1868 (April), p. 295. (J. H. W.)

MASSON, John, a minister of the Reformed Church, who was a native of France, whence he emigrated to England after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. He returned to Holland, and assisted in a religious journal entitled Histoire Critique de la République de Lettres from 1712 to 1721. He also wrote Lives of Horace, Ovid, and Pliny the Younger, in Latin; and Histoire de Pierre Hugel et de ses Oeuvres (12mo). He died in England about 1760.

MASSON, Philip, relative of the preceding, who assisted in the same journal, and was also the author of a critical dissertation designed to show the utility of the Chinese language in explaining various passages of the Old Testament.

MASSON, Samuel, brother of John, was pastor of the English Church at Dort, and conductor of the above journal.

MASSORAH. See MASSORAH.

MASSuet, Révé, a French Benedictine monk of the Congregation of St. Maur, was born at St. Ouen, in Normandy, in 1665. He studied philosophy and theology in different Benedictine convents; was made licentiate juris at Caen; and came to the abbey of St. Germain des Prés, at Paris, in 1708. Here he commenced his scientific labors, which secured him a distinguished place in that learned congregation. After the death of Renard, Massuet was interrupted with the continuation of the annals of the order, and he furnished the fifth volume. The principal work from his pen is an edition of the works of Irenaeus, published under the title Simplici Irenaei... (Paris, 1710, fol.); considered as having been the best edition of this Church father that had appeared up to Massuet's time. He prefaced the works of Irenaeus by three dissertations, which give good proof of the editor's penetration and judgment. In the first dissertation the person, character, and condition of Irenaeus are considered, setting forth particularly the writings and heresies he encountered; in the second, the life, actions, martyrdom, and writings of this saint are treated of; and in the third his sentiments and doctrines are reviewed. Massuet traveled with the monks in the Jansenist part of France. Having undertaken to defend the edition of the works of St. Augustine against the attacks of the Jesuit Langlois, he wrote Lettre d'un Ecclesiastique au R. P. E. L. sur celle qu'il a écrite aux R. P. Bénédictins de la Cong. de Saint-Maur (Osnabruck, 1692). He is also the author of a Lettre a M. l'Enquéte de Bretonne, sur son academe du 5 Mai 1707 (La Haye, 1708, 12mo), and a book entitled Aquitanum Graecum, in which he defends the opinions of his order on grace and free agency, but which was never published. He died at Paris, Jan. 11, 1716. See Hist. Litt. de la Cong. de St. Maur, p. 372; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Générale, xxxiv, 217; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. ix, 145.

MAST is the rendering in the Auth. Ver. of two Heb. words: מַעֲשׂ (chibbel, so called from the ropes and stays with which it is fastened), occurs only in Prov. xxiii, 34, "Thou (that Artiest long at the wine) shalt be as he that lieth down in the midst of the sea, or as he that lieth upon the top of the mast (Sept. וַעֲשָׂר כְּעֻפָּנוֹ כְּעָל רָגָע, Vulg. longissimo gubernatis amans clano), doubtless correctly as referring to an intoxicated sailor falling asleep at the mast-head in a storm at sea. אֲמֵנָּה (Shosan, prob. l. אָמְנָה, a pine-tree).
the mast of a ship (Isa. xxiii, 28; Ezek. xxvii, 5; Sept. ieroc Vulg. mala, see note on p. 274) was a real pole set up on moun-
tains for an ensign (Isa. xxx, 17; Sept. ierou Vulg. mal-
aus, Auth. Ver. "beacon"). Ancient vessels had often
two or three masts (see Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. a.

Master is the rendering in the A. V. of the follow-
ing Heb. and Greek words: τάξις, adom, εὐγιον, prop-
perly lord, as usually rendered; βασιλεύς, an owner,
hence master in the prevalent sense, διοικητής; also
τάξις, rob, great or chief, usually in combination; κατά
σαρ, prince or captain, ἵππωρτος; finally διοικάνος,
teacher. On "masters of assemblies" (Eccl. xii, 11), see
Assembly. For master of the feast, see ARCHITECTU-
RIST.

MASTERY, in a Christian point of view, is a person
who has servants under him; a ruler or instructor.
The duties of masters relate, 1. To the civil concerns of the fam-
ily. They are to arrange the several businesses re-
quired of servants; to give particular instructions for
what is to be done, and how it is to be done; to take
care that no more is required of servants than they are
equal to; to be gentle in their deportment towards them;
not to reprove them when they do wrong, to commiserate
them when they do right; to make them an adequate recomp-
ense for their services, as to protection, maintenance,
and wages, and character. 2. As to the morals of servants.
Masters must look well to their servants' characters be-
fore they hire them; instruct them in the principles and
conform them in the habits of virtue; watch over their
moral, and set them good examples. 3. As to their reli-
gious interests. They should instruct them in the
knowledge of divine things (Gen. xiv, 14; xviii, 19),
pray with them and for them (Josh. xxiv, 15); allow
them time and leisure for religious services, etc. (Eph.
v, 9). See Stennett, On Domestic Duties, ser. 8; Palev-
off, Manual of Moral Philosophy, i, 233, 293; Beattie's Elements of
Moral Science, i, 150, 158; Duddridge's Lectures, ii,
256.

Masters of the Church, a name given (1) to the
learned clergy who sat as advisers of the bishops in syn-
obis; (2) also to the residuaryists in a minister, as master of
the laymen, or the head of the choralists, master of the common hall, calli-
factory, or par-
lor; master of converts, the superintendent of lay-broth-
 ers; the master of the novices, always an elderly monk;
master of the song-school, master of the shrine, masters
of the order or custodes, the great officers of the monas-
tery.

Master, Caspar Anton von, a Roman Catholic
theologian, was born at Bonn, Germany, March 3, 1766.
He became a canon at Augsburg in 1786, and was or-
dained to the priesthood, and appointed preacher at the
 cathedral of Augsburg, three years later. After filling
several subordinate positions, he was made privy-coun-
ciller to the king of Bavaria in 1806. He received the
degree of master of philosophy in 1784, doctor of laws
in 1786, doctor of divinity in 1790, and was admitted as
an honorary member to several academies and learned
societies. His published works embrace De veterum
Bipinarum statu cyclic et ecclesiasticum commentario
historico (Bonn, 1784);—A Historical and Geographical De-
scription of the Archibishopric of Cologne:—On the neg-
atives Character of Religious Principle among the Mod-
ern French,—A Sketch of Borrowed, Archbishop of Mi-
lan and Cologne in the Roman Church.—The Passion-
week, according to the Ritual of the Roman Church:—An
Essay on Chorals and Hymns for the Church:—Several
Collections of Hymns, and of Ancient and Modern Tunes:
—A number of Sermons, and of miscellaneous Speeches
in German and Latin. He served for a time as editor
of Folters' Literaturzeitung, for a short time was a Roman
Catholic faith, and was noted for his pointed and satir-
ical style. The year of his death, which occurred at
Munich, is not exactly known; it is supposed to have
been 1828. —Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. vi, 271.

Mastic (στικτής), Vulg. lenticula, A. Ver. "mastick-
tree" occurs but once, and that in the Apocalypse (San-
san, v, 54), where there is a happy play upon the word.
"Under what tree sawest thou them? ... under a
mastic-tree (στικτής στυγνών)." And Daniel said . . .
the angel of God hath received the sentence of God to cut
thee in two (στικτής καὶ μισοῦ)." This is unfortunately
lost in our version; but it is preserved by the Vulgate,
"sub schino ... sciadet te;" and by Luther, "Linde ... findet."
A similar play occurs in ver. 58, 59, between στικτής
and πωροσ στ. For the bearing of these and similar characteristics on the date and origin of the
book, see supra.

There is no doubt that the Greek word is correctly
rendered, as is evident from the description of it by
Theophrastus (Hist. Plant. i, § 2, 4, § 7, etc.), Pliny
(N. H. iii, 36; xxiv, 26), Dioscorides (i, 90), and other
writers. Herodotus (i, 177) compares the fruit of the
lotus (the Rhamus lotus, Linn., not the Egyptian Ne-
lumbum speciosum) in size with the mastic berry, and
Balbus (§, 5) says its leaves are browsed by goats.
The fragrant resin known in the arts as "mastic," and which
is obtained by incisions made in the trunk in the month
of August, is the produce of this tree, whose scientific
name is Pistacia lenticulosa. It is used with us to strength-
en the teeth and gums, and was so applied by the an-
cients, by whom it was much prized on this account,
and for its many supposed medicinal virtues. Lucian
(Leniad, 12) uses the term στικτής στυγνών of one who
chews mastic wood in order to whiten his teeth.
Mastic (Στ. xiv, 22) recommends a mastic toothpick (den-
ticalipsium). Pliny (xxiv, 7) speaks of the leaves of this
tree being rubbed on the teeth for toothache. Di-
scorides (i, 90) says the resin is often mixed with other
materials and used as tooth-powder, and that, if chewed,
it imparts a sweet odor to the breath. It is from this
use as chewing-gum that we have the derivation of
mastic, from ἀρίστης, the gum of the εὐχιον, and μα-
ταξ, πωροσ, μισοῦν, "to chew," "to masticate."

Both Pliny and Dioscorides state that the best mastic
comes from Chios, and to this day the Arabs prefer that
which is imported from that island (comp. Niebuhr,
Tournemont (Fougges, ii, 58-61, transd. 1741) has given a
full and very interesting account of the Lentisks or
Mastic plants of Scio (Chios): he says that "the
 towns of the island are distinguished into three classes,
those del Campo, those of Apanomeria, and those where
they plant Lentisk-trees, whence the mastic in tears is
produced." Tournemont enumerates several lentisk-tree vil-
lages. Of the trees he says, "These trees are very wide
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spread and circular, ten or twelve feet tall, consisting of several branchy stalks which in time grow crooked. The biggest trunks are a foot diameter, covered with a bark, grayish, rugged, chapt... the leaves are disposed in three or four couples on each side, about an inch long, narrow at the beginning, pointed at their exception, the mode in which the mastie. From the junctures of the leaves grow flowers in bunches like grapes; the fruit, too, grows like bunches of grapes, in each berry whereof is contained a white kernel. These trees blow in May; the fruit does not ripen but in autumn and winter. This writer gives the following description of the mode in which the mastie is procured. "They begin to make incisions in these trees in Scio the first of August, cutting the bark crosways with huge knives, without touching the younger branches; next day the nutritious juice distils in small teats, which by little and little form the mastic grains; they harden on the ground, and are carefully swept up from under the trees. The height of the crop is about the middle of August, if it be dry, serene weather, but if it be rainy the teats are all lost. Likewise towards the end of September the same incisions furnish mastic, but in lesser quantities." Behind is the uses to which reference has been made above, the people of Scio put grains of this resin in perfumes, and in their bread before it goes to the oven. Mastic is one of the most important products of the East, being extensively used in the preparation of perfumes, as juniper berries are with us, as a sweetmeat, as a masticatory for preserving the gums and teeth, as an antispasmodic in medicine, and as an ingredient in varnishes. The hardened mastic, in the form of roundish straw-colored teats, is much chewed by Turkish women. It consists of resin, with a minute portion of volatile oil. The Greek writers occasionally use the word ἕλασις for an entirely different plant, viz. the Squill (Scilla maritima) (see Aristoph. Plut. 715; Sprengel, Flor. Hippoc. 41; Theophr. Hist. Plant. v, 6, § 10). The Pistacia lentiscus is common on the shores of the Mediterranean. According to Strain (Flor. Paed. No. 55); it has been observed at Joppa, both by Rauwolf and Pococke. The mastic-tree belongs to the natural order Acanthaceae.—Smith, s. v. See Tristram, Nat. Hist. of Bible, p. 362; Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. col. 1250; Belon, Observ. ii, 61.

Masudi, Abu'l-Habah (Ali ben-Husein benAli), one of the most celebrated Arabian savants, an early writer in the department of comparative religion, from the Musulman stand-point, was born, according to his own statement, at Bagdad in the 8t century of the Hege- ria, or the 9th of the Christian Era. He was the descendant of an illustrious family, who were among the early and devout followers of the Prophet of Mecca. Masudi was gifted with great talents, which he applied at an early age to learned pursuits. He gathered an immense stock of knowledge in all branches of science; and his learning was not mere book learning, but he improved it in his long travels through all parts of the East, Turkey, Eastern Russia, and Spain. In A.H. 803 he visited India, Ceylon, and the coast of China, where the Arabs had founded numerous small colonies; thence he went to Madagascar and Southern Arabia; thence through Persia to the Caspian; he also visited the Rumania in Southern Russia. In A.H. 314 he was in Palestine; from 832 to 834 in Syria and Egypt; and he says in 845, when he wrote his last book, the second edition of his Golden Meadows, he was in Egypt, and had been a long time absent from his native country, Irak. He says he travelled so far to the west (Morocco and Spain) that he forgot the east, and so far east that he forgot the west. Masudi died probably at Kahirah (Cairo), A.H. 845 (A.D. 956); and, since he visited India as early as A.H. 803, it is evident that those who say he died young are mistaken.

No Arabian writer is quoted so often, and spoken with so much universal admiration. The variety of subjects on which he wrote astonishes even the learned, and the philosopher is surprised to see this Arab of the Middle Age resolving questions which remained problems to Europeans for many centuries after him. Masudi knew not only the history of the Eastern nations, but also ancient history, and that of the Europeans of his time. He had thoroughly studied the different religions of mankind—Mohammedanism, Christianity, the doctrines of Zoroaster and Confucius, and the idolatry of barbarous nations. No Arabian writer can boast, like him, of learning at once profound and almost universal. Unfortunately, however, Masudi wanted method in arranging the prodigious number of facts which a rare memory never failed to supply him with while he was writing. He illustrates the history of the geography of the West with analogies or contrasts taken from China or Arabia; he avails himself of his knowledge of Christianity to elucidate the creeds of the different Mohammedan sects; and, while he informs the reader of the mysteries of the extreme North, he will at once forget his subject, and transfer him into the Desert of Sahara. For a list of his works, which are mostly extant only in MS., see the English Cyclopaedia, s. v.

Maṭāḥī, in Hindū mythology, is the character of Indra. See Williams, Translation of Sūktain, Act VI.

Mater Dolorosa, or Lady of Sorrow, is the technical term given to such portraits of the Virgin Mary as represent her alone, weeping or holding the crown of thorns. "She appears alone," says Mrs. Jameson (Legends of the Madonnas, p. 86), "a seated or standing figure, often the head or half-length only, the hands clasped, the head bowed in sorrow, tears streaming from the heavy eyes, and the whole expression intensely mournful. The features are properly those of a woman in middle age; but in later times the sentiment of beauty predominated over that of the mother's agony, and I have seen the sublime Mater Dolorosa transformed into a merely beautiful and youthful maiden, with such an air of sentimental grief as might be felt for the loss of a sparrow. It is common also to represent the Virgin with a sword in her bosom, and even with seven swords, in allusion to the seven sorrows (Luke ii, 35)—a version of the allegorical prophecy which the Romanists have found quite profitable for the interests of the hierarchy. There are few Roman Catholic churches without this representation of Mary. See STABAT MATER.

Mater Speciosa, or Lady of Joy, the counterpart of the hymn of "Mater Dolorosa." See STABAT MATER.

Materialism may be defined as that system of philosophy which considers matter as the fundamental principle of all things, and consequently denies absolutely the independence and autonomy of the spirit. It
Materialism is sometimes considered synonymous with Naturalism, but this is erroneous; for there is a difference between the notions of nature and matter. It is also called by some Sennism, which is more correct, yet only expresses one of the characteristics of the theory of materialism. In a more extended sense, the expression materialism is made to signify the whole of the practical results which have, and are continually being, drawn from the study of such philosophy, and whose final object, although sometimes restrained by considerations of prudence or expediency, is sensual enjoyment in its fullest sense.

Materialism, strictly viewed, is the doctrine that all spirit, so called, is material in its substance, and is subject to the same laws, as well as the material particles and the activity of material forces. Strictly construed, it is a psychological doctrine or theory; but, as it implies certain philosophical assumptions or principles, it makes a place for itself in the domain of speculative philosophy. Its assumptions and conclusions are also fundamental to theology. If its positions are tenable, theology is impossible. If the human soul is but another name for an aggregation of material particles, it cannot exist when those particles are surd. Although it is conceivable that those particles may be so moving as to constitute a body, the dissolution of the larger particles which constitute the body, yet this is too improbable to relieve the materialistic theory from the charge of being inconsistent with the possibility of a future life. The moral relations of the soul, therefore, require the introduction of an essential difference in the laws which govern matter and its activities, and these moral relations give to theology—a certain to Christian theology—all its interest. If the assumptions of materialism are correct, there can be no intelligent and personal Creator. Creation itself is conceivable, and therefore impossible.

A significant fact, which strikes one at first on the study of the history of materialism, is that it never appears as a power among the masses in the early stages of civilization. On the contrary, we find that in all nations a more or less perfect spiritual contemplation of nature forms the first step towards religious consciousness. This fact is a sufficient answer in itself to the assertion that materialism is the original and true form of human consciousness. On the other hand, we find materialism spreading among the masses in the nations which have submerged the contemplation of nature by the system of sublimation. It becomes, then, the premonitory sign of their downfall, being already an evidence of their moral and spiritual decay.

The materialistic theory was in some sense sanctioned by the Greek philosophers who refer the origin of all things—the spirit of man included—to some attenuated form of matter, as water, air, or fire. From these rude speculations philosophy emerged by successive efforts, till in the Socratic school the soul of man was held to be distinct in its essence from matter, to be superior to matter, and indestructible by the dissolution of the body. The Socratic school also emphasized the doctrine that mind has infused order into the universe. The Platonic philosophy enforced these doctrines with glowing appeals to the nobler sentiments, and embalmed them with a great variety of mythological representations. Aristotle, more cautious and exact in his statements, asserted for the higher forms of intellectual activity an essence distinct from matter. The philosophers of the Epicurean school were avowed materialists, they taught explicitly and earnestly the doctrine that what is called the soul is composed of atoms, and necessarily dissipated at death. The universe itself likewise consists of atoms, and all its phenomena are the results of fortuitous combinations of atoms. Sensation, intelligence, and desire are the effects of the action and reaction of the atoms within and the atoms without the body. These doctrines are elaborately set forth by the celebrated Lucretius (B.C. 95-44) in his poem De rerum natura. The Atomic Materialism of Epicurus, and the Imaginative and Rational Spiritualism of Plato and Aristotle, separated the Greek philosophers into two leading divisions, with various important subdivisions.

Among the Jews, the Sadducees denied that there was either angel or spirit, or existence after death; but there is no evidence that they supported these doctrines by any philosophical materialistic theories. The philosophy which grew from materialism. With the revival of learning and of the ancient philosophies, the Epicurean materialism found many adherents, against whose influence the pronounced materialism of Descartes furnished a positive and most efficient check. Hobbes was the opponent of Descartes, and all his attempts to defend the original philosophy and its activity are materialistic, reducing all spiritual phenomena to bodily motions. Spinoza made spiritual beings to be modes of the universal substance which is God—every spiritual operation being the necessary counterpart of some materialistic phenomenon. But the rise of the mechanical or new philosophy of nature, to which Descartes incidentally contributed, and which Sir Isaac Newton so triumphantly established, had no little influence in developing the materialism of modern philosophy. The speculations of Locke indirectly furthered this tendency, although with the dissipation of the larger particles which constitute the body, yet this is too improbable to relieve the materialistic theory from the charge of being inconsistent with the possibility of a future life. The moral relations of the soul, therefore, require the introduction of an essential difference in the laws which govern matter and its activities, and these moral relations give to theology—a certain to Christian theology—all its interest. If the assumptions of materialism are correct, there can be no intelligent and personal Creator. Creation itself is conceivable, and therefore impossible.

In more recent times, materialism has been both metaphorical and physiological. Metaphysical materialism has resulted in some cases by logical deduction, or, rather, a logical tendency, from the idealistic assumption that matter and spirit are identical. The argument which seeks to make matter and spirit one, lends plausibility to the conclusion that it is indifferent whether matter should be resolved into spirit, or spirit resolved into matter. The extreme idealism of some of the German schools has prepared the way for the materialism with which they would seem to have had the least possible sympathy. The real pantheism of Spinoza and the logical pantheism of Hegel have furnished axioms and a method, which have been applied in the service of materialism. It is in physiology, however, that modern materialism has found its most efficient ally. Physiology has renewed the previously-exploited doctrine of vibrations, which again has found confirmation in that view of the correlated activity of every agency of nature into some mode of motion. If heat, light, and electricity are but modes of motion, why not nervous activity? and if nervous activity, why
not vital energy? and if vital energy, why not spiritual judgments and emotions? This argument has been urged with great earnestness and pertinacity by certain physiologists both of the German and English schools. Conspicuous among them are Carl Vogt, Physiologische Briefe für Gebildete; Köhler-Glaube und Wissenschaft, 1855; J. Molders, Psychologie, 1852; L. Krüdener, Leben, etc.; Louis Büchner, Kraft und Stoff (1855); Natur u. Geist, etc.; Haeckel, Natür- schaftspychologie; Uber die Entstehung und den Staatsum des Menschengeistes, etc. T. H. Huxley, On the External Sources of Life. edit. by J. H. H. Sterling. As regards Protoklos, etc., edit. 1860-72, and H. Maudsley, Physiological and Psychology of the Human Mind (Lond. and N.Y. 1867), approximate to the same opinions among the English. Alexander Bain (The Senses and the Intellect, Lond. 1853, 1864); The Emotions and the Will, 2d ed. 1865; Mental and Moral Science, Lond. 1867) sympathizes with these tendencies, treating the soul in the main as though it were but a capacity in the nervous system for special functions which obey physiological laws. The doctrine of evolutionist is thus reduced to a necessary conception, which has been derived by the celebrated Darwin from a limited cycle of physiological facts, and extended by him to explain the production of all complex forms of being, inorganic and organic, is materialistic in its assumptions and its conclusions, even if neither of these and all the theories of its advocates. The metaphysical doctrine of development by successive processes of differentiation and integration, which has been hardened into an axiom by Herbert Spencer, and applied to the explanation of all forms of being, and even of the primordial truths of metaphysical science itself, can lead to no other than a materialistic psychology. The doctrine of unconscious cerebration, which is taught more or less explicitly by Dr. W. B. Carpenter and other eminent physiologists, though not necessarily involving the materialistic hypothesis, is yet materialistic in its tendencies and associations. The positive school of Comte teaches directly that the brain is the only substance of the soul, and that what are usually called spiritual activities are simply biological phenomena. J. S. Mill, though not avowedly a materialist, follows Hume in reducing matter and mind to idealistic formulae, which, as conceived by him, are not distinguishable from physiological phenomena or products.

According to the materialistic philosophy, as developed by whatever writer, but especially in its once popular form of Epicureanism, the perception of our senses is only a reflex action of the human organism. The remembrance of many previous perceptions of the same nature gives rise to general views, and the comparison of these to judgments. Ethica are thus but the doctrine of happiness, and its highest maxim: Seek Joy, avoid pain! Yet Epicurus sought to give a certain moral tendency to this fundamental axiom of his system, by declaring every pleasure objectionable which is followed by a greater unpleasantness, and every pain is desirable which is followed by a greater pleasure; according to which principle freedom from care and insensibility become the chief aim of man. See Lutteroth, Neureutestamentliche Lexebegräbn (Mainz, 1852), i, 38-58; H. Ritter, Gesch. d. Philosophie; Fries, Gesch. d. Philosophie, vol. i. See EPICUREAN PHILOSOPHY. In Boston a paper entitled The Investigator, is now published in the interests of materialism. The German-Americans are also quite active in this work. They have two papers—the Pioneer (Boston) and the Neue Zeit (New York). The editor of the former, Carl Heinen, is frequently before the public all over the country to press the interests of his abominable work. Edward Feinhold, of New York, published a pamphlet entitled Naturwissenschaft gegen Philosophie (New York, Schmidt, 1871, 2dmo) to controvert Hurtmann's Philosophy of the Unknown.

The defects of the materialistic hypothesis are manifold. It considers only the similarities, and overlooks the differences of two classes of actual phenomena. Though its overweening desire of unity, it becomes one-sided and imperfect in all its conceptions and conclusions, and fails to do justice to the peculiarities of spiritual experiences, which are as real as the more obtrusive and palpable ones of sense. Moreover, it fails to discern that the intellectual and moral function of the soul is not only have a right to be recognised in their full import, but that they have a certain supremacy and authority over all others, inasmuch as the agent which knows must furnish the principles and axioms which all science assumes and on which all science must rest. If the soul is only a function of matter, then to know one is of the functions of matter. It follows that the authority of knowledge may be as changeable and uncertain as the changes of form, the varieties of motion, the manifold chemical combinations, or the more or less complex developments of which matter is capable. The materialistic hypothesis not only overlooks and does injustice to the facts which are open to common apprehension, but is a suicidal theory, which destroys, by its own positions and its method, the very foundations on which its own coherence stand—cf. the scientific theory of materialism itself. See SOUL.
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Maternus. See Firmicus. Maternus 2, bishop of Cologne. See COLOGNE.

Mather, Alexander, one of Mr. Wesley's most useful preachers, was born at Brechin, North Britain, in Feb. 1738. When a boy he had some instruction at a Latin school, and afterwards ran away with the rebels, and was in the battle of Culloden. On account of this he was treated with great harshness, was finally discharged, and deprived of all educational advantages. In 1751 he left home and went to Perth, and in 1752 to London, to earn his living as a mechanic. Here, in 1758, he married. He had been religiously inclined from boyhood, and had long followed his convictions with great faith and perseverance, and in the means of grace; finally converted under a sermon of John Wesley's, April 14, 1754, he soon became very useful as a band and class leader and local preacher. In 1757 he began itinerating under Mr. Wesley, and with
Mather, Cotton, a very celebrated American divine of colonial days, the most noted of the Mather family, the grandson of Richard Mather and son of Increase, is one of the trio spoken of in the old doggerel tombstone inscription:

"Under this stone lies Richard Mather,
Who had a son greater than his father,
And a grandam greater than either."

Cotton Mather was born at Boston Feb. 12, 1662-63. His early education he received under the eye of his father, and as a lad of twelve he entered at Harvard. At this time he is spoken of as a fine classical scholar. Four years afterwards, when he graduated, Dr. Oakes, the president, addressed him in glowing terms his past conduct and attainments, and predicting a glorious future. But it was not in worldly knowledge only that he was so advanced a student. The descendant of a line of ministers, he seemed to be himself, by his aptness in learning and early seriousness, specially marked out for the ministry. When only in his fourteenth year, Cotton Mather's mind had begun to be greatly exercised with religious thoughts. He at this time laid down a system of rigid fidelity, which he continued to practice monthly or weekly, as a fast, the days of fasting being the result of his life, of strict and regular self-examination, and of prolonged times of prayer, to which he afterwards added frequent nightly vigils. It is necessary to mention these things in order to understand some points in his character and conduct in future years. For awhile he was diverted from his purpose of becoming a minister by a growing impediment in his speech, and he began to study medicine. But being shown how by a "dilated deliberation" of speech he might avoid stammering, he returned to his theological studies, and commenced preaching when scarcely sixteen years of age. In 1681, the year of his father's congregation, the largest in Boston, to become assistant pastor, and in January, 1682, was settled as a colleague of his father. His labors in the ministry were characterized by great zeal and earnestness, and he soon came to be considered a prodigy of learning and ability. He was not only a most attentive pastor, but a superior preacher, and withal found time for a large amount of literary labors: he published three hundred and eighty-two distinct works, most of them of course small, consisting, besides his sermons, of devotional works, and other contributions to practical religion. In addition to all these labors he was engaged in the accumulation of material for greater works. Nor did he any more than his father shrink from the political duties which the ministerial office had been supposed to cast upon those who held it. "New

"England," he wrote, "being a country whose interests are remarkably inwrought in ecclesiastical circumstances, ministers ought to concern themselves in politics." When, therefore, his father was sent to England to seek relief from the arbitrary proceedings of Charles II and James II, Cotton Mather was ordered to remain with the temporal affairs of the church, as leader of the citizens, and on their seizing and imprisoning the obnoxious governor, he drew up their declaration justifying that extreme measure.

The freedom of thought in politics, however, made no inroads into the Church of England, and fearing a falling away from the purity of the old faith, and fancying that he saw the evil one busy in turning away the hearts of the people, he was led to a life of asceticism, which involved him in religious controversies.

The daughter of one Goodwin, a respectable mechanic of Boston, accused a laundress of having stolen some of the family linen. The mother of the suspected person, an Irish emigrant, expostulated in no very gentle terms against such a charge, and, as was averred, not content with abuse, cast a spell over the accuser. The younger children soon began to suffer similarly, and the poor Irishwoman was denounced as a witch. Cotton Mather, fearing that the excesses of superstition would have a still more derogatory effect on the religious life of the colonists, determined to investigate this case of witchcraft. He took the eldest girl, then about sixteen years old, into his house; and in a very short time she confessed, with great contrition, that she was really under the influence of an evil spirit. The poor Irishwoman was tried, condemned, and executed; and Mather printed a relation of the circumstances, and an account of such influences in other places. The book, which was published with the recommendation of all the ministers of Boston and Charlestown, was entitled Memorables Provincials relating to Witchcraft and Possessions, with Discoveries and Appendices (London and Boston, 1699, 8vo; 2nd ed. 1719, 12mo; Edinb. 1697, 12mo). Both in the colony and in England the book met with little success; but in the opinion of many it had the honor to be introduced by the eminent divine, Dr. Richard Baxter, who wrote a preface for the work, and argued that it was "sufficient to convince all but the most obstinate Sadducees." The question here arises whether or not Cotton Mather was himself a believer in witchcraft, and whether or not he wrote the book simply to explode the "delusion" which was fast making converts, especially in and about Massachusetts.

Even to our day this question has not been satisfactorily solved.

Mr. Bancroft, our great historian, has treated Cotton Mather as guilty of having provoked the excitement known as the "Saleme witchcraft delusion." Within the last few years, however, one of our ablest writers, Mr. Poole, formerly librarian of the "Boston Library," has come forward to clear Cotton Mather of any and all imputations, holding that "the opportune" of what is generally charged against Mr. Mather "is the truth." "His gentler treatment," we are told, "cured and Christianized them [the believers of witchcraft]." He opposed, with his father and the rest of the clergy—with but three exceptions of the court—he opposed every possessed person guilty, the ministry holding that the devil might enter innocent persons, and that the fact of their improper conduct was no ground for adjudging them criminals. He also opposed taking spectral testimony, or the words of a spectre as proved or makes it quite credible that it was Mather and not Mr. Willard who wrote the most vigorous tract of the times against the Salem movements, and who made the Boston and Salem treatment noted for their difference even at that day. See Salem; Witchcraft."
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There can hardly be any question about the fact that Cotton Mather is, in a measure at least, responsible for the blood that was shed at Salem between 1692 and 1693. But it is fully acknowledged that he never denied his connection with his persecutors, and that he never did anything to mitigate their severity; because of his fanatical treatment of the deluded Salemites. We need only remember that even the very men who built up the Church of Protestantism in the 18th century were entirely free from mistakes, and failed in a manner very much like their good Puritan descendant. Sublimely ridiculous, then, appears the judgment pronounced by a writer in a late number of Zion's Herald (May 20, 1809): "At twenty-three he was in the midst of this terrific panic of mortal fear and its fatal consequences; at this impose, he bore himself with such manly courage, prudence, and coolness that he was the only minister, and even the only person, except his father, who may have been said to have stood solidly on his feet, and who won from his contemporary the praise that 'had his honors been heard to and followed, these troubles would never have grown unto that height which they now have.'" The quotation is from Pook's article in the North American Review of April, 1809. While we would not forget the merits of our ancestors, but would rather extol them and laud them, we cannot but be blind to their faults and mistakes. Salem witchcraft persecution certainly must not find an advocate in the present century, surely not at the expense of the truths of history. But to turn to the brighter side of Mather's life. Such was his delineating character, while acknowledging the failing we have felt constrained to condemn: "It was the great ambition of his whole life to do good. His heart was set upon it; he did not therefore content himself with merely embracing opportunities of doing good that occasionally offered themselves, but he very frequently set apart much time on purpose to devise good; and he seldom came into any company without having this directly in his view. It was constantly one of his first thoughts in the morning, What good may I do this day? And that he might more certainly attend to the various branches of so large and comprehensive a duty, he resolved this general question, What good shall I do? into several particulars, one of which he took into consideration while he was dressing himself every morning, and as soon as he came into his study he set down some brief hints of his meditations upon it. He was thus unfixed to any distinct time for each morning in the week. His question for the Lord's-day morning constantly was, What shall I do, as pastor of a Church, for the good of the flock under my care? Upon this he considered what subjects were most suitable and seasonable for him to preach on; what families of his flock were to be visited, and with what particular view; and how he might make his ministry still more acceptable and useful." He died Feb. 13, 1728.

Though many of Cotton Mather's productions are indeed but small volumes, as single Sermons, Essays, etc., yet there are several among them of a much larger size. As his Magnalia Christi Americana, or the Ecclesiastical History of New England from its first Planting in 1620 to 1698 (London, 1702, folio; Hartford, Conn., 1820, 2 vols. 8vo); his Christian Philosopher (London, 1721, 12mo); his Ratio Disciplinum Pratum Non-Anglorum; his Directions to a Candidate for the Ministry, a work which brought him as many letters of thanks as would fill a volume. Besides all these, the doctor left behind him several books in manuscript; one of which, viz. his Biblia Americana, or Illustrations of the Sacred Scriptures, was proposed for the press in three volumes; a work which brought him many letters of thanks as would fill a volume. Of these books, one appeared from the motto that he wrote on the outside of the catalogue which he kept of his own works, viz. John xv. 8, "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit." Dr. Mather was one of the most learned men America had produced. He doubtless possessed larger learning than any other minister of his time, but his mind was better adapted to acquire than to create. He lacked in strong judgment, in original genius, and in sustained power. He had no ability to generalize, no wide and penetrating vision. The most noted benefaction of his life to the country was introducing vaccination for small-pox, which proved a great blessing. See his Life, written by his son (Boston, 1729); also by Enoch Pond and Dr. Jennings; Jones, Ideas, 12th ed.; and Dr. Bushnell's Life, 2d ed., and E. J. Sparks, Am. Biog. xxxvii. 221 sq. Sherman, New England Divines, p. 76; Bancroft, History of the U. S. iii. 71, 76, 56, 58; North Amer. Rev. xliii, 519; xlvi, 477; li, 2; Meikl Quar. Rev. i, 430; Christian Examiner, 1853, 960; etc. (ALY.)

Mather, Eleazer, a Puritan minister of New England, son of Richard, and brother of Increase Mather, was born at Dorchester May 18, 1657; graduated at Harvard in 1656; was ordained pastor of the Church at Northampton in 1661; and there died, July 24, 1699. He was a fine scholar, a sound thinker, and a devoted and evangelical minister. Many souls were converted through his labors, and his early death was lamented by all the churches.—Sherman, New England Divines, p. 107; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, i, 159; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. a. v.

Mather, Increase, D.D., an eminent American divine, was born at Dorchester, Mass., June 21, 1669. His father, Richard Mather (q. v.), had emigrated from England and settled in Boston. In early childhood Increase exhibited signs of unusual mental endowments; he entered Harvard College at the age of twelve, and graduated with the class of 1656. Shortly after this he was converted, and determined to devote his life to the ministry. In the year following that of his graduation he went to Dublin, where his brother was preaching. There he entered Trinity College, and, after securing the degree of M.A., was chosen a fellow of the college, an honor, however, which he declined. The climate of Ireland being unfavorable to his health, he removed to England, and preached there for a while. At the time of the Restoration he was residing in the island of Guernsey, as chaplain to an English regiment; but when, as a commissioned officer, he was required to sign a paper declaring "that the times then were and would be happy," he refused to do it, and was dismissed. Soon after this he returned to his native country, and was called and settled as pastor of the North Church in Boston. In this city he married, in 1662, a daughter of the Rev. John Cotton, and from this marriage sprang Cotton's five sons, of the most celebrated of whose was Increase. In the controversy as to "who are the legitimate subjects of baptism," he opposed his father, and likewise the decision of the synod of 1662, until caused to change his views by the arguments of Mr. Mitchell, of Cambridge. Largely by his instrumentalities the government was induced to call the general synod of 1673 from the whole colony, for the purpose of "correcting the evils that had provoked God to send judgment on New England." The synod had its second session the following year, and Mr. Mather acted as moderator. At this meeting the Confession of Faith was adopted, and he became general face to face. On the death of President Oakes of Harvard University, Mather temporarily supplied the place. By the sudden death of the appointive, president Rogers, Mather was, in 1684, again called to the head of the college. This time he accepted the appointment and remained president for thirty-nine years. The trust of his pastoral. In 1692 he was presented with a diploma of doctor of divinity, "the first instance in which such a degree was conferred in British America." On the accession of Charles II Massachusetts was thrown into trouble. His majesty required full securities of the charter to his pleasure, on pain, in case of refusal, of having a quo warranto issued against it. To this op-
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prestation Mather was staunch in his opposition, and before an assembly in Boston dissuaded his countrymen from yielding their liberties tamely. As a result of their resistance, judgment was entered against the charter of the Massachusetts colony. About this time Charles died, and James II, being his successor, published his specious declaration for liberty of conscience.

This dissipated temporary relief, and Mather was delegated to convey to his majesty in England the grateful acknowledgment of the churches, and to sue for a further redress of their wrongs. James received him kindly, and promised him more than he ever granted. Mather remained, however, until the close of the revolution of 1688, which deposed James and placed William and Mary on the throne of England. After much diplomacy with the prince of Orange, a new charter was at length procured in lieu of the old one, and Mather himself was allowed the privilege of nominating the governor, lieutenant governor, and board of council. After four years thus spent among the nobility at Whitehall, Dr. Mather returned to Boston with the consciousness of having faithfully discharged his duty and rendered his country an important service. He found the Church in great excitement about witchcraft, which called forth his work entitled "Concerning Witchcraft." He retained his natural bodily and mental vigor until past his eightieth birthday. After this he endured great bodily and consequent mental derangements for four years, during all of which time his great burden seemed to be to bear suffering, but the patience of his inactivity to labor. At last, on Aug. 23, 1723, he died peacefully in the arms of his eldest son. His loss was deeply mourned by those for whom he had spent his long and laborious life. According to Sprague, "he was the last of more than twenty-two hundred ministers who had been ejected and silenced on the restoration of Charles II and on the Act of Uniformity." He was an industrious student, and published ninety-two separate works, most of which are now very scarce. A noted writer thus comments upon him in the North Amer. Rev. 1840 (July), p. 5: "Increase Mather not only stood most conspicuous among the scholars and divines of New England, as president of Harvard College and pastor of a church in Boston, but by his political influence was supposed at times to have controlled the administration of the government." He was a learned, earnest, and devoted man in whose piety was mingled profound and full of love. His sermons were elaborate and powerful, and many souls were converted by his labors. He studied earnestly for sixty years, and was regarded as the most learned American minister of his day. —Sherman, New Eng. Divines, vol. 57; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth., vol. ii, s. v.; Bancroft, Hist. U. S. (see Index in vol. iii); Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog., s. v.; Duyckinck, Cyclop. Amer. Lit., vol. i.

Mather, Moses, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Lyme, Connecticut, March 6, 1719; graduated at Yale College in 1739, and soon after was licensed to preach by the New London Association. In 1742 he commenced preaching in a Congregational church in Middletown, now Darien, Connecticut, and in 1744 was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church, and this position he held until his death in 1806. Dr. Mather was a fellow of Yale College from 1777 to 1790. He warmly espoused the cause of the Colonies in the Revolutionary War, and was twice taken by the British and Tories, carried to New York, and confined in the provost prison. He published a Reply to Dr. Bellamy on the Half-way Covenant: -Infant Baptism Defended (1759) -- A Sermon, entitled Divine Sovereignty displayed in the Death of Dr. Bellamy (1763) -- and was described as a most posthumous work, A Systematic View of Divinity (1813, 12mo). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, i, 425, s. v.

Mather, Nathaniel, an English minister, a brother of Increase Mather, was born in Lancashire in 1680; graduated at Harvard College, 1647, and spent his ministerial labors in England and Holland. He died in 1697. He published Two Sermons (Oxon. 1660, 4to; Lond. 1718, 12mo) -- A Discussion on the Lawfulness of a Pastor's Officiating in Another Church: -- A True Sermon: -- and Sermons preached at Pinner's Hall and Lime Street (1701). "In his public discourses there was neither a lack of depth nor an inferiority of ecclesiastical excellence, while the dignity of his subjects surpassed the necessity of rhetorical embellishments." -- Calamy, Continuation of the Nonconformists' Memorial; Wilson, Dissenters; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth., s. v.

Mather, Richard, an Episcopalian and later a Puritan minister, was born at Lawtown, Lancashire, Eng., in 1566; was converted when a young man; spent two years at Oxford; entered the ministry in 1618, near Liverpool, and at the end of fifteen years of devoted and successful labor was suspended for nonconformity. He then emigrated to Massachusetts, and became pastor of a congregation at Dorchester. There he died, April 22, 1669. He was a sound and earnest preacher, not captivating, but solid, pious, and very useful. He was an active theologian, and a member of every synod in New England after his arrival. He was staidus, a good scholar, and a very able writer. Richard Mather emulated Eliot in the New England version of the Psalms, and furnished the synod of 1648 a model of Church Discipline. He published a discourse on the Church Covenant (1639), a treatise on Justification (1652), and an elaborate defense of the churches of New England. See Increase Mather, Life and Death of Robert Kneeland (1710, 4to); Drake, Cyclop. of Amer. Biog., s. v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth., vol. ii, s. v.; Roger, New England Divines; Sherman, New England Divines, p. 26.

Mather, Samuel (1), brother of Increase Mather, was born in Lancashire, England, May 13, 1626; graduated at Harvard College in 1644, was for some time assistant pastor to Rev. Mr. Rogers, in Bowly, and was pastor of the North Church, Boston, in 1649. In 1660 he returned to England, and was appointed chaplain of Magdalen College, Oxford; preached in Scotland and Ireland; went to Dublin in 1655, and became senior fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, and minister of the Church of St. Nicholas. Soon after the Restoration he was suspended on a charge of sedition, but afterwards continued to preach to a small congregation privately. He died Oct. 29, 1671. Mr. Mather held the first rank as a preacher. He published Sermons and Tracts: -- Old Testament Explained and Improved (1654, 4to); rewritten by Caroline Fry, as Gospel of the Old Testament (1833, 1851) -- Life of Nathaniel Mather (1688). See Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog., s. v.; Darling; Cyclop. Bibliog., vol. ii, s. v.

Mather, Samuel (2), D.D., minister of the Trinitarian Congregational Church, son of Cotton Mather, was born in Boston, Oct. 30, 1706, graduated at Harvard College in 1723, having studied theology probably under the direction of his father; was licensed to preach, and in 1728 became colleague-pastor with the Rev. Mr. Gee, of the Second Church in Boston, and was ordained the same year. In 1741 much dissatisfaction was brought against him in this church, partly from the charge of looseness of doctrine, and also of improwetry of conduct, and he, with the smaller part of his membership, withdrew, and established a separate Church in Hanover Street, on the corner of North Bremen. The fact," says Robbins, in his History of the Church, "that the pious society of good character supported Mr. Mather, affords good reason to doubt whether the charges of improperity were well founded." He sustained his relation as pastor of Hanover Street Church until his death, June 27, 1783. Dr. Mather's Sermon on the Death of Cotton Mather (1729) -- Life of Cotton Mather (1729) -- An Essay concerning Gratitude (1732) -- Vita A. H. Franckii, cui addecta est narratio rerum memorabilium in Ecclesias
Mathesius, Johann, a German Protestant theologian, was a native of Saxony. He studied at Wittenberg in 1526, and was there for a while Luther's fellow learner. He was appointed rector of the Weimar school in 1532, pastor in 1545, and died in 1564. He had witnessed many abuses resulting from the misconception of the doctrine of salvation by grace: we learn from him that there were parties in the Church who claimed, on the strength of it, that faith alone was necessary, and that works were of no importance whatever, so that it did not matter whether the actions of believers were good or bad. Mathesius strongly opposed such heretical views, and thus became involved in controversies which embittered the end of his life. He is especially known for seventeen sermons on the doctrine, the confession, and the death of Luther (Nuremberg, 1588; in recent times the biographical portions were collected and published under the title, J. Mathesius, d. Leben d. Dr. Martin Luthcr, mit einer Vorrede von G. H. v. Schubert, Stuttgart, 1859). He wrote also various sermons on the law of justification, a catechism, and several hymns. His biography was published by Balthasar Mathesius in 1705. See Jücher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, and Döllinger, Die Reformations, ii, 127; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, ix, 160; Winkworth, Christian Singers of Germany, p. 160 sq. (J. P. N.)

Mathëtës (Μαθηταί, disciples) is one of the names by which the early followers of our Lord were known among their contemporaries. All the common appellations of the professors of the Christian religion which occur in the N. T. were expressive of certain dispositions and privileges belonging to the sincere professor of the Gospel. See CHRISTIANS; DISCIPLE.

Mathew, Father Thorhall's, the celebrated apostle of temperance, a Catholic priest, was born in the county of Tipperary, Ireland, Oct. 10, 1790; was educated at the Roman Catholic seminary in Maynooth; was appointed, after hisordination, to a missionary charge at Cork, was subsequently attached to a mission on the model of that of St. Vincent de Paul. About 1838 he became president of a temperance society, and in a few months administered the pledge to 150,000 persons in Cork alone. He afterwards visited different parts of Ireland, the cities of London, Manchester, and Liverpool, and the United States of America, and was everywhere received with enthusiasm. For these eminent services in the cause of religion and morality, queen Victoria bestowed upon father Mathew an annuity of £200. He died Dec. 6, 1856, at Queenstown, Ireland. See Maguire, Father Mathew, a Biography (London, 1863); Morris, Memoirs of the Life of Theodore Mathews (New York, 1841); Henshaw, Life of Father Mathew (New York, 1849), s. v.; Harriet Martineau, Biographical Sketches (1869); Fraser's Magazine for January, 1841; Thomas, Dict. Biol. and Mythol. s. v.

Mathews, James M., D.D., a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born in Salem, N. Y., in 1785; graduated at Union College in 1803; at the Seminary of the Associate Reformed Church in 1807; was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Associate Reformed Presbytery in New York in 1807; became assistant professor and a summer missionary of his great predecessor Rev. Dr. John M. Mason, in 1809, and continued there until 1818. After supplying the South Dutch Church in Garden Street, New York, for one year, he became its pastor in 1812, and retained that relation until 1840. Thereafter he never again took a pastoral charge. He was the principal founder of the University of the City of New York, and was its first chancellor—1831 to 1838. The elegant marble edifice of the university and the adjoining Reformed church on Washington Square are monuments of his architectural taste and liberal projects. Dr. Mathews published, in addition to various occasional pamphlets, a book of Autobiographical Recollections, a volume of lectures On the Relations of Science to Christianity, and another on The Bible and Men of Learning (1835). He was a man of noble presence and courteous manners, scholarly in his tastes and habits, a powerful preacher, and fertile in large prophetic visions of Christian usefulness. His last labors were given for many months before his decease to preparations for an evangelical council, held in New York, composed of representatives from most of the American churches, and over which he presided. In October, 1842. He was a zealous advocate of the Evangelical Alliance, and of other forms of Christian union; and it is believed that his latest efforts in this cause exhausted his strength and hastened his end. Dr. Mathews was naturally a leader of men. His learning was extensive, his tact and skill were great, and his zeal was ardent. Associated with prominent men and events for more than three-score years, he bore an active part in nearly all of the great religious and philanthropic movements of our country during this period. He died January, 1870, after a brief illness, in the city of New York, where his life was spent. (W. J. R. T.)

Mathilda, a Roman Catholic saint, and queen of Germany, was born at Westphalia, towards the close of the 9th century. She was the daughter of the Thuringian count of Oldenburg, a descendant of the famed Wittikind, and of a princess of Denmark. She was educated by her grandmother, abbess of the convent of Herwold. In 909 she was married to Henry, afterwards king of Germany. On the throne she preserved the piety and simplicity which distinguished her from her youth. A great part of her time was spent in prayer. She gave liberally to the poor, whom she often nursed herself. She had three sons: the emperor Otto the Great; Henry, duke of Bavaria; and Bruno, archbishop of Cologne. One of her daughters, Hedwig, was married to Hugh the Great, duke of France, and became mother of Hugh Capet. After the death of her husband, Otto and Henry of Bavaria quarrelled concerning the crown of Germany. Henry, for whom his mother showed great partiality on this occasion, having subsequently been reconciled with Otto, joined him in despoothing Mathilda of her dowry and of all her possessions, under pretense that she was squandering the money of the state in giving alms to the poor. Her property was, however, subsequently returned to her through the intercession of her son, Otto the Great. The remainder of her life was passed in meditation and works of charity. She founded several convents, and died at Quedlinburg, March 14, 968. See Acta Sanctorum, March 14; Balliet, Vie des Saints; Mabillon, Secula Ordinis Brematicorum; Schwarz, De Mathildis, abbatissae Quedlinburgensi (Altdorf, 1736, 4to); Breitenbach, Leben d. Kaiserin Mathilde (Revai, 1780, 8vo); Treitschke, Heinrich i. und Mathilde (Lpz. 1814, 8vo); Mathilde Gemahlin Heinrichs I. (Augsburg, 1832, 8vo).—Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, i, 161; Hoefer, Nouv. Biol. Générale, xxx, 250, 251 (O. T.)

Mathilda, countess of Tuscany, well known in history through her close political connection with pope Gregory VII (q. v.), was a daughter of Boniface, count of Tuscany, and was born in 1046. She is said to have married Godfrey (surnamed Il Gobbo, or the "Hunchback"), duke of Lorraine, in 1069, by procuration; but, if so, her marriage did not make his appearance in Italy until four years after the wedding certificate, and if the two, if they were ever united, soon afterwards separated. Godfrey went back to his duchy, and became a supporter of the emperor Henry IV, while Mathilda made herself conspicuous by the zealous with which she espoused the cause of Gregory VII. She became his inseparable se
sociate, was ever ready to assist him in all he undertook, and to share every danger from which he could not protect him. In 1777, when Henry had suddenly made his appearance in Italy, and Gregory was fearing for his safety, she gave the pontiff shelter in her own castle. This intimacy of Mathilda with the pope has given rise to much scandal, though every unprejudiced man will see that the guilt itself is far enough from the goodness of the two. Both the countess and the vicar were pure in character, if their correspondence may serve as an index of their thoughts. (See on this point Neander, Ch. Hist. iv. 118, 86.) In 1769 Mathilda made a gift of all her goods and possessions to the Church. In 1691 she alone stood by Henry when Henry promised his troops into Italy, burning to avenge his humiliation at Canossa; she supported him with money when he was besieged in Rome; and after his death at Salerno boldly carried on the war against the emperor. She died at the Benedentine monastery of Polironne in 1115. Her death gave rise to new feuds between the emperor and pope Paschal III on account of her gift to the Church, which finally resulted in the former wresting from the latter a portion of Mathilda’s possessions, but even what remained constituted nearly the whole of the subsequent “Patrimony of Peter” See the mouth of Pern.”

Matthursins, or Brethren of the Holy Trinity, an order of monks which arose at the end of the 12th century, and got this name from having a church at Paris which claims St. Matthurin for its patron saint. All their churches were dedicated to the Holy Trinity. Some of the brethren are called Brothers of the Union of Cypriote, because, originating at the period of the Crusades, they gave their labor and a third of their revenue to liberate Christian captives from Mohammedan masters. Their foundress were two French recluse in the diocese of Meaux—Jean de Mattia and Felix de Valois. By some they seem to have been called the Order of Aces, as they were permitted to use those animals only, and were debarred from riding on horses. A similar order was founded in Spain in 1228, and there called the Order of St. Mary. See also Trinitarians.

Matthursins. See Trinitarians.


Matina, or Matutina, the “new morning service,” or the first of the morning services, and so called in contradistinction from the “old morning service,” which was before day, whereas this was after day began. Cassian says this was first set up in Bethlehem, for till that time the old morning service was used to end with the nocturnal prayer, and then they used to betake themselves to rest till the third hour, which was the first hour of diurnal prayer. The name for morning prayer, in more modern Church-language, is matina. Before the Reformation the hours of prayer were seven in number, namely, matins, the first or prime, the third, sext, and ninth hours, and vespers, and compline. The office of matins in the Church of England is an abridgment of her ancient services for matins, lauds, and prime. Ritualists divide the office of matins, or morning prayers, into three parts: first, the introduction, which extends from the beginning of the office to the end of the Lord’s Prayer; secondly, the psalmody and lessons, extending to the end of the Apostles’ Creed; thirdly, the prayers and collects, which occupy the remainder of the service. See Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s. v.; Eadie, Eccles. Dict. s. v.; Neale, Intro. East. Churc.). See also How, Canon of Christ’s Church.

Ma’tre (Heb. ‘Matri’, מָתִית [but with the def. art.], prob. expectant; Sept. Marroth, Vulg. Metri), a Benja-
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and not a future consent. There are others who would make the words of the priest the essential element whereby the marriage union is created, "Ego vos in matrimonium conjungeo," etc.; in the English office, "I tie you together," superstitiously. Who married whom was never considered. It was "familiar suander," followed by the declaration of complete union, "I pronounce that they be man and wife together, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." If the previous consent had made the two persons man and wife, these words on the priest's lips would seem to be strictly speaking, superstitious. From primitive times it has been the custom to acquaint the Church beforehand with an intended marriage, which is evident from the passages above quoted. The object was to prevent unlawful marriage; not that the Church claimed any power to prevent a "greater" from leave to marry, but that in case a person was about to marry a Jew, or a heathen, or a heretic, or one within the forbidden degrees of consanguinity, etc., the marriage might be prevented, or at least not obtain the sanction of the Church.

The earliest allusion to the necessity of such notice in England is contained in the eleventh canon of the Synod of Westminster (A.D. 1200), which enacts that no marriage shall be contracted without banns thrice published in church (Johnson, Cemona, ii. 91). See Banns. The existing law of the Church of England is expressed in the following words: "No minister of any persuasion or denomination, without the special licence of the proper Bishop, shall celebrate marriage between any persons, without a faculty or license granted by some of the persons in our constitutions expressed, except the banns of marriage have been first published three several Sundays or holydays in the time of divine service in the parish churches and chapels where the said parties dwell, according to the book of Common Prayer." The only substitute for banns recognised by the Church of England is an ordinary or special license. The power of granting the former has belonged to English bishops since very early date, but the latter is in the hands of the Pope (25 Henry VIII. c. 21).

The right to grant special licenses, which are free from all restrictions as to time or place, was originally a privilege of the archbishop of Canterbury, as "legatus manus". The ritual of the Church of Rome teaches that "the end of the sacrament of marriage is that man and wife may mutually help and comfort each other, in order that they may spend this life in a holy manner, and thereby gain a blessed immortality; and to contribute to the edification of the Church by the lawful procreation of children, and by the care of procuring them a moral education and an education on the latter". Every person, before entering into wedlock, is required to beseech God to join them with such a person as he may work out his salvation with, and examine whether or not the person he has fixed his affections on has the fear of God before his eyes; is prudent, discreet, and able to take a care of a family.

The Council of Trent, at its twenty-fourth session, held Nov. 11, 1668, legislated upon the subject of matrimony in twelve canons, as follows:

1. Whoever shall affirm that marriage is not truly by the form of the evangelical law, instituted by Christ our Lord, but that it is a human invention, introduced into the Church, and does not obtain the indifference of grace; let him be accursed.

2. Whoever shall affirm that Christians may have more wives than one, and that this is prohibited by no divine law; let him be accursed.

3. Whoever shall affirm that only those degrees of consanguinity which are mentioned in the book of Leviticus can hinder or disannul the marriage contract; and that the Church has no power to dispense with some of them, or to consider moral hindrances or reasons for disannulling the contract; let him be accursed.

4. Whoever shall affirm that the Church cannot constitute any impediments, with power to disannul matrimonial contracts; in constituting them she has erred; let him be accursed.

5. Whoever shall affirm that the marriage-bond may be broken by death of one, or by voluntary absence from the husband or wife; let him be accursed.

6. Whoever shall affirm that a marriage solemnised but not consummated is not disannulled if one of the parties enters into a religious order; let him be accursed.

7. Whoever shall affirm that the Church is in teaching, according to the evangelical and apostolic doctrine, that the marriage-bond cannot be dissolved by the minister of one, the party of the other, or of them, even the innocent party, who has given no occasion for the divorce; and shall proceed to disannul another, while the other party lives; and that the husband who puts away his adulterous wife, and marries another, commits adultery, as if he were the wife, who puts away her unfaithful husband, and marries another (whoever shall affirm that the Church has erred in maltreating these sentiments); let him be accursed.

8. Whoever shall affirm that the Church has erred in decreeing that such persons as marry may be separated, as far as regards actual cohabitation, either for a certain or an uncertain time; let him be accursed.

9. Whoever shall affirm that persons not in religious orders, who have made a solemn profession of charity, may contract marriage, and that the contract is valid, notwithstanding any ecclesiastical law or law; and that to maintain the contrary is nothing less than to condemn marriage; and that all persons may marry who feel that, though they should make a vow of chastity, they have not the gift thereof; let him be accursed; for God does not deny his gifts to those who ask and seek, and when he suffers us to be tempted above as we are able.

10. Whoever shall affirm that the conjugal state is to be and is only valid to a life of virginity, or of marriage, and that it is not better and more conducive to happiness to remain in virginity, or celibacy, than to be married; let him be accursed.

11. Whoever shall affirm that to prohibit the solemnisation of marriage with persons subject to ecclesiastical supervision, borrowed from the superstition of the pagans; or to condemn the benevolence and other ceremonies used by the Church at those times, let him be accursed.

12. Whoever shall affirm that matrimonial causes do not belong to the ecclesiastical judges; let him be accursed.

"Marriage as a Sacrament unbidical. 1. In many most important points respecting marriage, Protestants and Roman Catholics agree; yet, when the Church of Rome advances marriage to a sacrament instituted by Christ, and endows it with sacramental qualities, there are several points of consideration of importance to Christianity in which Protestant and Romanist must disagree. The latter asserts that marriage as a sacrament was instituted by Christ, and confers grace, and supports this dogma by quoting Ephesians v. 2: 'This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the Church,' where the Douay translation renders by sacrament the word μυστήριον, which we Protestants prefer to translate mystery. 'Or, indeed, if we render the word 'sacrament,' still they have no advantage, inasmuch as the original word μυστήριον, 'mystery,' which they read as 'sacrament,' signifies nothing more than a secret, or a mystery of godliness' (1 Tim. iii. 16), 'a mystery, Babylon the great' (Rev. xvii. 6). Papists must know that there is no force in their argument. The text, as found in their version, can only influence the minds of ignorant persons, who are not versed in the Scriptures. The answer is, not say that marriage is a mystery, for he speaks concerning Christ and the Church. It is acknowledged that marriage is instituted in God, and is a sign of a holy thing, yet it is no sacrament; the Sabbath was ordained of God, and signified the rest in Christ (Heb. iv. 9), yet it was not a sacrament. All significant and mystic signs are not necessarily sacraments" (Elliot, Romanism, p. 428). "Romanists," says the same able polemic whom we have just had occasion to cite, "further quote the following passage to support their doctrine: 'She shall be as naked as she was clothed, as 'faith and love' (1 Tim. ii. 15), inferring that the grace of sanctification is given to the parties married. To this we answer: (1) We deny that any sacraments give or confer grace; they are only means or instruments of its communication. (2) It is allowed that God does give to persons married persons grace to live in piety and holiness; but it is unnecessary to constitute marriage into a sacrament for this purpose. (3) Those who are not married may possess the sanctifying grace of God, which is sufficient to preserve all in a state of inward as well as outward holiness.
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2. That marriage is no sacrament of the Gospel, speaking of such an institution in its proper scriptural acceptance, may be proved by the following arguments: (1) Matrimony was instituted in Paradise long before sin had entered, therefore it cannot be a sacrament of the Gospel; marriage is observed among infidels and wicked people, and is incapable of revealing worthily the sacraments of the Church. (2) Papists are inconsistent with themselves in calling marriage a profanation of orders; some with consummate effrontery assert that to live in a state of concubinage is more tolerable for a priest than to marry. Can they really believe marriage to be a sin, which is so offensive to God, yet accept it as the end and perpetual purpose? Pope Siricius applied the words of St. Paul, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God," in favor of the celibacy of the clergy—thus proving that this pope, in common with many other pontiffs, knew but little of scriptural interpretation, seeing the reference is plainly to deep human depravity and wickedness, but not to the marriage state. (3) In every sacrament there must be an external sensible sign as the matter, and an appropriate order of words as the form; but in matrimony there is neither, therefore it is no sacrament. (4) All persons of a good and discreet mind can receive the sacraments of the Church; but piety is not a necessary condition of marriage, therefore marriage is not a sacrament. The conditions of confession and absolution, which are sometimes enjoined in the Church of Rome, cannot be considered as teaching that piety is required of those who are to be married; for confession and absolution are not proper concomitants of true piety, seeing the greatest part of those who confess and receive absolution are not otherwise religious than as members of the Church of Rome, and membership in that community is rather a presumption against, than in favor of true religion. It does not alter the case to introduce the distinctions which have been made by their theologians, namely, that marriage is often a civil or natural contract, and not a sacrament. This distinction is founded on mere technicalities, and not on any scriptural authority, either direct or inferential.

3. It is necessary, as they acknowledge, that a sacrament should be instituted by Christ; but matrimony was not instituted by him, therefore, according to their own rule, it is no sacrament. It is in vain for them to say that Christ instituted the sacrament of marriage, when they are unable to produce the words of institution, or to adduce a single circumstance connected with its institution. It is true, the Council of Trent most positively, in their first canon, affirm that Christ did institute the sacrament of matrimony; but then neither chapter nor canon is given to prove it, and indeed, so divided among themselves they are respecting the time in which Christ converted marriage into a sacrament, that the most discordant opinions exist. Let the Roman Catholic Divus speak on the subject: "Some," says he, "say that it was instituted when Christ was present at the marriage in Cana of Galilee, which he is said to honor with his presence and bless it (John ii): according to others, when Christ, revoking matrimony to its primordial unity and indissolubleness, rejecting the bill of divorce, said, 'What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder' (Matt. vii); but others refer its institution to the time of the forty days between the resurrection and ascension, during which Christ often taugh his apostles concerning the kingdom of God, or his Church; others say the time is uncertain." Thus the institution of marriage as a sacrament cannot be discovered by their ablest divines. The reason is evident; it is unable to find the place where Christ established it; the Roman Catechism adroitly evade this point, and leave the matter in the same uncertainty as it found it. We therefore hesitate not to affirm that, although marriage was originally instituted by Almighty God, recognised by Christ, and its duties enforced by the apostles, nevertheless its institution as a sacrament cannot be found in any part of the New Testament.

MATTANAH

See, besides, Elliot's 'Delitination of Romanism,' ch. xvi; Hagenbach, 'Hist. of Doctrines' (see Index, vol. ii); Weitzer u. Weitel, 'Kirchen-Lexikon,' art. Ehe; Herzog, 'Real-Encyclopädie; art. Ehe. See also Celibacy; Dispensation; Divorce; Marriage; Sacrament.

Matum (Heb. 'Mattan,' מָתַן, a gift, as in Gen. xxv. xii, 12). The name of two men in the Old Testament and one in the New. See also MINTHRA.

1. (Sept. Mattaw, Masawaw v. r. Mašawaw and Mašawaw.) The priest of Baal alone before his idolatrous altar during the reformation instituted by Jehoiada (2 Kings xi, 18; 2 Chron. xxii, 17). B.C. 876. "He probably accompanied Athaliah from Samaria, and would thus be the first priest of the Babylonian worship which Jehoram, king of Judah, following in the steps of his father-in-law Ahaz, established at Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxii, 6, 13). Josephus (Ant. ix, 7, 3) calls him Mašawaw ("Smith")."

2. (Sept. Našawaw v. r. Mašawaw.) The father of the Shephatiah who was one of the nobles that charged Jeremiah with treason (Jer. xxxvii, 1). B.C. ante 589.

3. (Masaewaw, Auth. Vers. "Matthew.") The son of Eleazar and father of Jacob, who last was father of Joseph, the husband of the Virgin Mary (Matt. i, 15). According to tradition he was a priest (which disagrees with his tribe aren's), and father of Anna, the mother of the same Mary (Nicæan. Hist. Ec. ii, 3). B.C. considerably ante 40. See GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

Matanah (Heb. 'Matanah,' מָטַן, a gift, as in Gen. xxv, 6, etc.; Sept. 'Mattanathasivev'), the fifty-third station of the Israelites on the south-eastern edge of Palestine, between the well (Beer) in the desert and Nahalbed (Num. xxi, 18, 19). It was no doubt a Moabitisb, or rather Ammonitis city, and is placed by Eusebius and Jerome ("Germ. in loc." in the region of Hesbon) v. i. In the years nine miles eastward of Medeba, which Hengstenberg corrects to "southward" ("Bibleam," p. 240), i.e. apparently in the plain of Ar Ramdan, perhaps between the branches of wady Wilal. Lelccere (ad loc.) suggests that Mattanah may be identified with the mysterious word Jotub (ver. 14; A. V. "what he desired"), since the meaning of that word in Arabic is the same as that of Mattanah in Hebrew. This is nearly the same with the explanation of the Targums of Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan, which make it an appellation for the well or Beer just mentioned, as being a gift of God (see Kennicott, *Remarks on O. T.* p. 60). See EXOD.

Mattanah (Heb. 'Matanah,' מָטַן, a gift of Je-hoebah, also in the prolonged form Matanah ha, מָטַןָה, 1 Chron. xxvi, 4; 2 Chron. xxii, 19; Sept. MasawawEq or Masawaw or v. r. Mašawaw and Baršawaw), the name of several men.

1. A Levite, one of the sons of Heman, appointed by David Temple singers, and head of the ninth class of musicians (1 Chron. xxv, 4, 16). B.C. 1014. He is possibly the same with the father of Jeiel the Jorked of the Jahaziel who predicted Jehoshaphat's victory over the Moabites (2 Chron. xx, 14, 15).

2. A Levite of the descendants of Asaph, who assisted in purifying the Temple at the reformation undertaken by Jehoiada (2 Chron. xxix, 13).

3. The original name of Zedkiah (q. v.), the last king of Judah (2 Kings xxiv, 17). In like manner Pha-
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rach had changed the name of his brother Eliakim to
lehiothaim on a similar occasion (2 Kings xxiii, 34),
when he restored the succession to the elder branch of
the royal family (comp. 2 Kings xxiii, 31, 36).
4. An Israelite of the "sons" (residents) of Elam, who
divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity (Exra x, 26).
B.C. 450. 
5. Another Israelite of the "sons" (residents) of Zaf-
tu, who did the same (Exra x, 27). B.C. 459.
6. Another Israelite of the "sons" (i. e. inhabitants) of
Zahath-Moab, who did likewise (Exra x, 80). B.C. 459.
7. Another Israelite of the descendants (or residents) of
Bani, who acted similarly (Exra x, 37). B.C. 459.
8. A descendant of Asaph (but named as one of "the
priests' sons," i.e. perhaps assistants, for Asaph was only
a Levite), and great-grandfather of the Zechariah
who assisted in celebrating upon trumpets the completion
of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 35). B.C. much ante
446. His father's name, Michaiah, and grandfather's,
Zechar, present features of identity with Nos. 9 and 10,
but in other respects the notices are different. Some
interpreters suspect a corruption of the text, and in that
case all discrepancies may be removed.
9. A Levite, son of Micah, of the family of Asaph,
resident in the neighborhood of Jerusalem after the ex-
ile (1 Chron. ix, 15). B.C. cir. 440. He is evidently the
same as the Levite mentioned in Nos. 3, 5, and 8, who
was praised in the Temple after the captivity (Neh. xi, 17;
xii, 8), and also guarded the gates (Neh. xii, 25). He
also appears to be the same with the father of Hasha-
iah and great-grandfather of Uzzai, mentioned as one of
the chief Levites in the same connection (Neh. xii, 22),
but in that case he must have been a very aged man
at the time. See also No. 8.
10. A Levite, father of Zacur, and grandfather of the
Hanun whom Nehemiah set over the distribution of
the tithes (Neh. xii, 13). B.C. considerably ante 410.
See also No. 9.
Mattathah (Heb. Mattath'ah, מַתְתָּח, probably a
contraction of Mattathiakh, the name of a person in the
Old Test. and of another in the New.
1. (Mərəṣqā, Auth. Vers. "Mattathah"). The son
of Nathan and grandson of David, among Christ's mat-
2. (Sequit, Məz̄eqā v. r. Məśeqā.) An Israelite of the
"sons" (i.e. inhabitants) of Hashum, who divorced his
Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Exra x, 37).
B.C. 458.
Mattathias (Məz̄eqāq), the Greek form of
Mattathia(h) (q. v.), and standing for several persons
in the Apocrypha and New Test.
1. One who supported Ezra in reading the law (1
Ezra ix, 49), the Mattithiah of Neh. viii, 4.
2. The father of the Maccabean brothers (1 Macc. ii, 14, 16, 17, 19, 24, 27, 39, 45, 49; xiv, 29). See Mac-
cabees.
3. The son of Absalom and brother of the Maccabean
Jonathan, the high-priest (1 Macc. xi, 70; xiii, 11). In
the battle fought by the latter with the forces of Demes-
trius on the plain of Naor (the old Hazor), his two gen-
erals Mattathias andudas alone stood by him when
his army was seized with a panic and fled, and with their
assistance the fortunes of the day were restored.
4. The son of Simon Maccabaeus, who was treacher-
sously murdered, together with his father and brother, in
the fortress of Docus, by Ptolomeus, the son of Abubus
(1 Macc. xvi, 14). See Maccabees.
5. One of the three envoys sent by Nicanor to treat
with Judas Maccabaeus (2 Macc. xiv, 19). See Maccae-
ces.
6. Son of Amos, in the genealogy of Jesus Christ
(Luke iii, 25).
7. Son of Semai, in the same catalogue (Luke iii, 25).
For both these last, see Mattithiah, 5, 6.
Mattati, MARIUS, a noted Roman Catholic prelate,
lately the presiding officer of the College of Cardinals at
Rome, and in ecclesiastical dignity ranked next to the
pope himself, was born at Pergola, States of the Church,
Sept. 6, 1792: was educated at Rome, and entered the
priesthood in 1814. In 1822 he received his appointment
as cardinal. In December, 1860, he became the bishop
of Ostia and legate of Velletri. Among other eminent
distinctions, he held the post of "archpriest" to the
Church of the Vatican, and was the prefect of the com-
mision for the preservation of St. Peter's Church. He
died Oct. 8, 1870. Cardinal Mattaei was a great favorite
of pope Pius IX, and owed most of his distinctions to
his friend "the infallible." 
Mattes (or Mattel). PAOLO, an Italian painter
and engraver, was born near Naples in 1662, and died
in 1728. Among his masterpieces are the pictures of
the "Saviour and St. Gattano," in the church of St. Paul
di Pietro, and the "Meeting of Erminia and the Shep-
herds," in the Museum of Vienna. See LANZI, History of
Painting in Italy.
Matteo (Heb. Mattayaw, מַטָּע, prob. contract-
ed for Mattathiah; Sept. Məšəm, Məšəm). the name of three
men after the exile.
1. An Israelite of the "sons" (citizens) of Hashum,
who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from
Babylon (Exra x, 80). B.C. 459.
2. Another Israelite of the "sons" (or inhabitants) of
Bani, who did the same (Exra x, 37). B.C. 459.
3. A priest, "son" (descendant or representative) of
Joahib, among those last registered in the Old Test.
(Neh. xii, 19). B.C. post 536.
Matter, as used to signify "mind or spirit (q. v.), is that
which occupies space, and with which we become ac-
quainted by means of our bodily senses or organs.
Everything of which we have any knowledge is either
matter or mind, i. e. spirit. Mind is that which know
and thinks. Matter is that which makes itself known
to mind by certain properties. "The first form which
matter assumes is extension, or length, breadth, and
thickness; it then becomes body. If body were infinite
there could be no figure, which is body bounded. But
body is not physical body, unless it partake of or is con-
stituted of one or more of the elements, fire, air, earth,
or water" (Menabde, Ancient Metaphysics, b. ii, c. 2).
According to Des Cartes the essence of mind is thought,
and the essence of matter is extension. He said, Give
me extension and motion, and I shall make the world.
Leibnitz said the essence of all being, whether mind or
matter, is an assembly of material, celestial forces or monads. His system of physics may be called
dynamical, in opposition to that of Newton, which may be
called mecanical; because Leibnitz held that the
monads possessed a vital or living energy. We may
explain the phenomena of matter by the movements of
either, by gravity and electricity; but the ultimate rea-
son of all movement is a force primitively communicated
at creation, a force which is everywhere, but which,
while it is present in all bodies, is differently limited;
and this force, this virtue or power of action, is inherent
in all substantial matter, spiritual and material. Created
substances received from the creative substance not only
the faculty to act, but also to exercise their activity each
after its own manner. See Leibnitz, De Primo Philoso-
phio Ennennandae et de Notione Substantivae, or Nouveau
Systeme de la Nature et de la Communication des Sub-
stances, or Journal des Sceux, 1685. There are vari-
ous hypotheses to explain the activity of matter, see
Stewart (Outline, pt. ii, ch. ii, sect. 1, and Art. and Mor.
Poe. last edit., vol. ii, note A). See also PERCEPTION.
The properties which have been predicated as essen-
tial to body, consist in extensibility, extensity, invisibility,
inertia, weight. To the senses it manifests color, sound,
smell, taste, heat, and motion; and by observation it is
discovered to possess elasticity, electricity, magnetism,
etc. Metaphysicians have distinguished the qualities
of matter into primary and secondary, and have said that our knowledge of the former, as of impenetrability and extension, is clear and absolute; while our knowledge of the latter, as of sound and smell, is obscure and relative. This distinction taken by Des Cartes, adopted by Locke and also by Reid and Stewart, is rejected by Kant, as already stated, as not making any new discovery. Others who do not doubt the objective reality of matter, hold that our knowledge of all its qualities is the same in kind. See the distinctions precisely stated and strenuously upheld by Sir William Hamilton (Reid's "Words, note B"); and ingeniously controverted by Mme. Emilie Saisset, in *Dict. des Sciences Philosoph. art. "Matière."* See MATERIALISM.

The metaphysical history of this term, like that of most others, begins with Aristotle; its theological significance may be said to begin with the first two verses of Genesis. Three questions of theological as well as philosophical interest grow out of this subject.

I. Popular language, in spite of Berkeley's own appeal to popular opinion, must be admitted to be framed on the hypothesis that matter exists in itself, independently of any mind perceiving it; and theologians have in general been content to accept popular language on the point, so that the language of theologians represents the popular opinion. But as Berkeley's system does not, when understood, contradict any of the ordinary facts of experience, so the language of theologians, like that of other men, necessarily comes into frequent use in ordinary conversation, and in the sequence of the system being accepted. For a system invented or advanced from a theological motive, it affects theology singularly little.

It can hardly be denied, that a belief in the reality of matter, however relative this may be defined, is necessary to orthodox Christianity. The narrative of the Creation becomes meaningless, or at least deceptive, if the things created be no more than "permanent possibilities of sensation," things that would be perceived, or rather groups of phenomena that would make impressions, if there were any minds placed ready to observe them, which there are not; and, to tell the truth, even Berkeley's system confuses or obscures the notion of creation. The existence of a material substance means, according to him, that some mind or minds are affected with certain sensations, from a cause external to themselves. Now in this there is nothing to conflict with Christian doctrine; when we say that God created all material substances, we shall mean, on this hypothesis, that he is the sole and ultimate cause of the laws, external to created minds, whereby their consciousness is modified in the various ways which we ascribe to the presence of matter.

So far, then, all is clear. If Berkeley has not yet given any support to the doctrines of religion, he certainly has not assailed them. But when we come to the part of his theory which was to confute atheism, it is more possible to bring him into collision with that Revelation which he undertakes to defend. Matter, it is said, exists in virtue of being perceived by a mind: e.g., "my inkstand exists," means "my mind has a group of sensations, simultaneous or successive, which I describe by a glass of water, a cup, and a table, in which I hear it ring when struck or thrown down, etc., or otherwise as being conscious of the presence of a hard, smooth, round, hollow body, of a heavy, greyish, transparent substance." But if I go out of the room, I believe that my inkstand still exists, though no longer perceived by me. What do I mean by the "believe" in this case?

We have rejected the answer, "You mean that you believe that, if you went into the room again, you would again experience the same sensations." In the first place, I do mean more than that, though I am unable to prove that anything more than that is true. And further, as has been said above, unless the inkstand exists when not seen, how is it true that the Creator caused the flint, sand, alkalii, copper and zinc ore, etc., of which it is made, to exist ages before they were discovered and used, and sustains the manufactured product of his works in being now?

To these objections the sensationalist has no answer, the Berkeleyan has. "When you say that the inkstand exists in your absence, you mean that when it is not perceived by you, it is perceived by somebody else. You only refer to existence (except the existence of a mind, a conscious subject) of existence as the object of consciousness of a mind. If you believe, as you doubtless do, that matter exists absolutely, not only in relation to the finite minds that perceive it, but are bound to admit that there is an infinite mind, which always perceives all matter existent, even what is perceived by no other mind."

Injustice is done to Berkeley by a sensationalist philosopher, if he regards the negative part of his system, the denial of an objective substratum to material phenomena, as separate from this, its positive part. Berkeley was a real idealist, not a mutilated or inconsistent sensationalist; and any one who denies an objective substratum to matter, but does not recognize its absolute existence as an object of consciousness to a necessarily existing mind, is not taking half Berkeley's system and leaving the other half, but framing a new one, suggested, it may be, by Berkeley's, but essentially different from it. His religious philosophy was not an amiable excrescence on his metaphysical, but an essential correlative to it; and therefore his system has no sceptical tendency. The system does not, in other words, lead to a sceptical tendency to pantheism (Mansel's "Prolegomena Logica", App. B); for God is distinguished adequately, on the one hand, from the created objects, i.e., groups of ideas, which he perceives; on the other, from the created minds in which he chooses to perceive certain ideas as real. Now this is almost shockingly contrary to the generally-received notion of an eternal present in the divine mind; and it is hard to see that it does not contradict the doctrines of his eternal foreknowledge and immutability. Doubtless God began (on this hypothesis) to be conscious of the world at his first creation; wherewith and not otherwise, from an external cause. But his nature seems lowered, if we confess that by his creating we mean that he caused certain ideas to become present to his mind, which therefore were not present to it before. We have, in fact, a curious conveyance of pantheism. Pantheism (as the term is commonly used) merges the personal God in union with the universe, a universe consisting of matter, or spirit, or both. Here the personality as well as the spirituality of the Eternal is preserved; but instead of his being so merged in the world as to deify it, the world is described as a glass, invented to introduce its own finite and mutable qualities into his nature.

Creation is a mystery on any hypothesis. On any hypothesis, God, at some finite time, came into new relations with things that are not God. He assumed new characters (as those of Creator, Preserver, Ruler, Judge) which he had not before; and he was then to be without any change in his nature, or even in his purpose. Whether this necessary difficulty is aggravated by the above form of stating it; whether the theory of creation in the divine mind implies more of a change of a nature than that of a creation of things outside it, may be a question. It is one that at least deserves to be stated. If it be admitted that idealism is not logically opposed to Christianity on this ground, there remain only two slighter objections to it.
Existence has, on this hypothesis, a twofold aspect. Things material exist, absolutely as being perceived by God, relatively as being caused by God to be perceived by his sensitive creatures. Now if, to avoid the objection above stated, it be said that while creation existed eternally in the person of God, so the works were always known by him, yet it may be said that creation had a beginning in time, when God first made it known to other intelligences than his own. In itself, no doubt, this would be inadequate as an account of creation, however fair a defence it might be against the charge of introducing an absurdity into the divine purpose or thought. And it just stops short of making the world eternal, though it comes dangerously near to it. It may be added that the hypothesis of a subjective creation is not invented on behalf of this system. One of the recognised explanations of the double account, the creation in Genesis is that the former or Elohist narrative describes the order in which God's purpose was made known to the holy angels, the second that in which it was executed.

But the reality (in whatever sense) of the material universe is presupposed, not only in the doctrine of the creation, but in that of the sacraments, inasmuch that "matter" is used as a technical term in relation to them, describing one of their essential requisites. Speaking generally, any hypothesis that allows the reality of matter would be sufficient, and therefore the idealistic, since it is not necessarily an intelligible modal. The command to use certain material substances, and the promise of certain spiritual effects to follow on their use, is not eradicated if we describe their use as "taking the known means to occasion, to our own mind and others, including the divine, certain states of consciousness." But it seems hard to see how the theory can fail to affect the doctrine of the holy Eucharist. If the presence of a body means the fact that its bodily properties are manifest to all intelligences capable of observing them, then a presence of a body, real but not sensible, becomes self-contradictory. If, however, the point be urged with sufficient boldness, that absolute truth is not "truth relative to all intelligences," but truth relative to the Infinite intelligence, then it is of course possible to believe that God regards as that present which does not recognise as present by the ordinary test of manifesting the properties, in manifesting which bodily presence consists; and this will, by an adherent of the system, be regarded as constituting a real but not sensible presence.

II. Whether matter exists only in virtue of minds to which it is self-evident, or whether it exists in itself, the source of its being must be determined. For not even, if it be said that matter is a mode of the mind of a spirit, it is yet proved that matter is not self-caused or eternal: it might be a necessary mode of an eternal Spirit's thought, and so coeternal with his being. However, the motives that have led to the belief in the eternity of matter have been, in general, such as would involve a belief in its independence. It is conceding either too much or too little to make matter merely the thought of God, yet a thought which he never was with which he could not have existed. Eternal matter was usually conceived as an antithetic power, whether active or passive; sometimes so passive as to be no more than an imperfect medium for the divine operation. It is hardly worth while to frame a system in which matter should have a subjective eternity, if the system has been to secularise it. It has already been pointed out, however, that such a system is a conceivable corollary of Berkeley's. But, supposing matter to be something external to the divine mind which (all theists will probably admit) knows or contemplates it, what is the relation between the two? Is one the work of the other, or are they both independent?

Strictly speaking, there are three possible answers to this question, viz., that matter is the product of mind, that mind is the product of matter, and that the two are independent. But the second, in this exact form, has probably never been maintained. Matter, being inactive, cannot be conceived as producing, unless it be first personified. Materialism, however, or regarding mind as a mode of matter, is a fair representative of this view. Setting this on one side, we come to the two alternatives, that matter is the work of mind, and that it is coeternal with mind—between theism and dualism.

The Jewish and Christian religions are theistic; most other religions of any claim to such speculative value are dualistic. Attempts to import dualism into Christianity have been numerous, but it has in every age been so obvious that the hybrid system was inconsistent—for if Christianity was a coherent system, its authorities and documents denounced dualism, and its instinctive consciousness rejected it—that it is unnecessary to reopen a question which is practically closed. All who claim to be, strictly speaking, theists, would now admit the prerogative of creation to belong to God in the fullest sense. It will be enough here to classify the forms of dualism which have either been opposed to the theistic doctrine of Christianity, or which it has been sought to amalgamate with it, as they refer to the subject before us, all of them being separately and fully noticed elsewhere. See DUALISM.

1. The Buddhist dualism assumes two eternal and impersonal, finite and (eminent) human nature exists in virtue of the union or collision of the two; they are not only the good and evil, but the positive and negative elements of existence: existence consists in partaking of both, as the Hegelian system makes it consist in the union of being and nothing. The victory of the human spirit is to be free from matter, and one with all pure spirit; but since matter as well as spirit is necessary to existence, this pure being, though not conceived as nothingness, is unconditionally from it.

2. The Manichean dualism (to use the name of its most famous and permanently vital form, for a system not confined to the Manichean sect, or those affiliated to it) assumes two eternal principles, matter and spirit, of which both are more or less distinctly personified. The strange and grotesque mythology by which the Manicheans (in the stricter sense) accounted for the intermixture of good and evil in the world, may have been meant to be understood allegorically; but this is hardly likely—the allegory is too vivid to have been less than a myth, in the minds of its hearers, if not of its inventors. Two systems which make war on each other, exclude and devour and assimilate from each other's substance, or create and beget from their own, are strangely personal if regarded as abstractions: indeed, the best reason for thinking them so is that, if the Manichean cosmogony be taken literally, the eternal Spirit is entirely carnal. But because the system is unphilosophical or inconsistent, if understood in the natural way, it does not follow that it ought to be understood otherwise: there being such things as inconsistent systems. It, however, is to be remembered that Manicheanism always maintained a Manichaean doctrine, which may have allegorized the known good of being. 3. The Platonistic dualism (if one may take a title from a single enunciation of it—it does not appear to have been a consistent or permanent conviction with Plato) assumes an eternal personal Spirit, acting on an eternal impersonal matter, and vice versa. Out of this, the material universe is supposed to be formed, which that is: not deriving them from his own being, lest he should impoverish himself, yet being in a real sense their author. Matter is conceived as negatively but not positively evil—unable to be made entirely good, even by a good spirit—and passively but not actively resisting his will.

4. The general character of Gnostic systems was not strictly dualistic. They assumed two eternal principles of spirit and matter, of which the first at least was con-
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ceived, more or less distinctly, as personal: but matter was made into finite beings, not by the action of the eternal Spirit, but of a created or generated one; who, though the eternal, held a place so exalted as to be technically a third God; and usurped, more or less, the bad eminence of the eternal matter, since, in opposition to orthodox Christians, it was necessary to distinguish him from the eternal Spirit. See DEMIURGUS.

The term of dualism, as the Perianian, does not come in for consideration here, as its antithesis is not between spirit and matter, but between light and darkness. Owing to its antiquity, the distinction between personal and impersonal principles is not formulated in it.

III. Has matter ever existed abstracted from those conditions of concrete form in which we meet with it? The third and fourth of the forms of dualism just enumerated make their cosmogony depend on the distinction devised by Anaxagoras, and formulated by Aristotle, between matter and form. If matter be conceived as eternal, and yet a creation by a spiritual Being be in some sense admitted, this is necessary. If matter be believed to be itself the work of a Spirit, it is possible, but by no means necessary, still to believe that he first created matter, and then formed it. Such was, perhaps, the general notion of the scholastic period; but in the widest sense of the term: the belief recognised absolute creation by God out of nothing, while it left a meaning for the Aristotelian distinction which was familiar. It seemed to derive direct support from the narrative of the creation in Gen. i. 2. But it is evident that the word "formless" is used in this passage not to be presented in so strict a philosophical sense: if the meaning of the word were less general, it would still follow from the fact that the "formless" matter is already called (not the universe merely, but) "the earth." It therefore follows that the scriptural or Aristotelian doctrine of creation admits, but does not require, the complication of this intermediate step. It probably is ignored by almost all modern thought on the subject: in the last age of scholasticism, Sir Thomas Browne still continued to assume it, and his critic Digby thought it needless. See Creation.

Matter, Jacques, a noted French historian and philosopher, was born in Alt-Eckendorf, Alsace, May 81, 1791. His parents were Germans, and, though living under French rule, remained true to the fatherland. Jacques, however, was taught French from his childhood, and used to take a part in the discussions on matters of state under the French government. He was intended for the legal profession, and, after receiving the highest educational advantages of private instructors, was sent to the gymnasium at Strasbourg, and then entered as a student at the University of Göttingen, Germany, where he enjoyed the instruction and association of Herren, the noted historian, and Eichborn, the celebrated Orientalist. He removed to Paris with a diplomatic career in view, attended the lectures of the Faculty of Letters, and wrote his Essai historique sur l'école d'Alexandrie (published in 1820), which, crowned by the academy in 1816, gave him a reputation among those French scholars who were interested in German erudition. By favor of Royer-Collard and Guizot, he received in 1819 a professorship in the College of Strasbourg, which he exchanged two years afterwards for the directorship of the gymnasium and the professorship of ecclesiastical history in the Protestant academy of the same city. Applying himself to the study of ecclesiastical history and philosophy, he wrote Histoire critique du Gnosticisme (Paris, 1828, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1845-46, 3 vols. 8vo), and Histoire universelle de la philosophie chrétienne (Paris, 1832; 3d edit. 1838). In 1829 he was appointed inspector of the academy of Strasbourg, and, in 1831, corresponding member of the Academy of Inscriptions. His treatise De l'influence des mouvres sur les lois et des mouvres sur les mouvres (Paris, 1833) was received from the academy the extraordinary prize of 10,000 francs. In 1829 he was appointed by Guizot general inspector of the University of Paris, and removed to that city. Among his later productions are, Histoire des doctrines morales et politiques des trois derniers siècles (1836-37, 3 vols.); De l'influence, bientôt de se fait, des idées et des études morales (1841); Schelling et la philosophie de la nature (1842); De l'état moral et politique de l'Allemagne (1847, 2 vols.); Histoire de la philosophie de l'état politique et de la nature des sciences (1849).—Kantius, philos. innocens (1862);—Emmanuel de Swedenberg (1865);—Le Mystique en Francs au temps de Fenelon (1864). He has also written occasional treatises concerning schools and education, and numerous articles in the Dictionnaire de la connaissance humaine and other cyclopaedia. He died at Strasbourg June 23, 1864.

Matthi, Christian Friedrich von, a noted German theologian, was born in Thuringia in 1744; was educated at the University of Leipsic, and immediately upon the completion of his studies became rector of the Gymnasium at Moscow. While here he devoted himself to a critical study of the Greek fathers of the Church, and published editions of the writings of Chrysostom, Basil the Great, and others. He was promoted to a professorship in the university about 1776, but in 1785 gladly accepted the position of rector at Meissen,—this affording him the opportunity to return to his beloved land. In 1789 he was called to the University of Wittenberg, whence he again returned to Moscow in 1805. He died in Russia Sept. 26, 1811. Matthi, besides patriotic studies, devoted himself largely to exegesis. He edited the commentary of Euthymius Zigabenus on the Gospels, with notes, and Nemesius of Enessa on the Nature of Man. But his most celebrated critical labor is his edition of the Greek Testament, for which he made an extensive collation of manuscripts; though, as he chiefly followed the authority of one class, the Byzantine, his edition is less valuable in itself than as a collection of materials for the further labors of the critical editor. A second edition of this Testament appeared in 1803-7, in 3 vols. 8vo. The work is entitled Novum Test. Graec. et Lat. : Textum demum recognovit, varias Lectiones nuncupavit antea vulgatae colligit, scholia Graeca addidit, annotations crit. adjectae, &c. (Rige, 1782-98, 12 vols. 8vo). The competent judgment of Michaelis pronounces its great value in few words. He says: "He has made his collection of various readings with great labor and diligence; he found in his MSS. a confirmation of many passages, which he should have passed by, if they are not found in MSS. of a different kind and of a different country from those which he used; many, even those of the Western edition, of which he speaks with the utmost contempt, he has corroborated by the evidence of MSS. This edition is, however, absolutely necessary for every man who is engaged in the criticism of the Greek Testament." See Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands d. 18. u. 19. Jahrh., vol. ii, s. v.; Horne, Introd. to the Crit. Study of the Scriptures; Kitto, Cyclop. Bib. Lit. vol. iii, s. v. 

Matthæus, Constantinus, co-emperor of Constantinople, was the eldest son of the far-more illustrious John V Constantinou (Johns VI). At twenty-one, four years before he was of age, he was associated by his father in the supreme government as a means of checking the rebellion of John Palaeologus. This measure of Constantine's father boiled down to the situation of Palaeologus, failed in its design, and in 1355 the associate emperors, father and son, were compelled to abdicate the throne in favor of their rival. Matthæus now retired with his father to a monastic life in the convents of Mount Athos. He married Irene Palaeologina, and became the father of six children. His father, according that of his father, occurred towards the end of the 14th century. He was a man of much learning, and the author of various works, mostly Biblical commentaries, several of which are still extant in MS. The one enti- titled Commentarius in Cantica Cantorum has been pub-
fished. See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, s. v.

Mat'than (Mic. i, 15). See Mattan.

Mat'thæus (Mark 1, prob. some form of the name Matthias), the name of two men mentioned only in the New Testament as maternal ancestors of Jesus. See Genealogy of Jesus Christ.


2. The son of another Levi, and father of the Eli who was the father of the Virgin Mary (Luke iii, 24). B.C. considerably ante 22.

Matthe'las (Μαθαλάς v. a. Μαθαλάς, Vulg. Mare'a), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. ix, 19) of the Massah (q. v.) of the Hebrew text (Exra x, 8). "The reading of the Septuagint, which is followed in the A.V., might easily arise from a mistake between the uncial Θ and Σ (C)."

Matthæus, Karl, a Lutheran minister in the duchy of Altenburg, in Germany, was born Dec. 26, 1811, at Eisenberg. His early studies were pursued at the lyceum of his native town, and in 1830 he entered the University of Jena as a student of theology. After completing his studies in 1835, he spent several years in the capacity of family tutor and as a teacher, and finally, in 1843, became the pastor of Ober-Armendorf. In 1864 he was transferred to Bornhain, where he died suddenly July 3, 1865. Matthæus possessed in a rare degree the love and esteem of his acquaintances, who applied to him the saying of Luther, "He lived what we preach." His ripe culture, theological knowledge, and penetrating judgment find expression in his works, which comprise a Leben Philipp Melanchthons (of which a second edition appeared in 1846) and a Vergleichende Symbolik (published in 1854). In the latter year he assumed the publication of the Deutsche Kirchenchrönik, a brief but comprehensive annual, reviewing important matters in the field of Church and theology.

Matthæus (Marcus v. a. Matthes), one of the apostles and evangelists. In the following account of him and his Gospel we have endeavored to collect and arrange all that is definitely known on the subject.

I. His Name. — According to Genesis, the names Matthew and Matthias are both contractions of Matthias (םתתא, "gift of Jehovah; τεθησομενος, θεησεν), a common Jewish name after the exile. See Matthew. Matthew had also the name of Levi (Mark ii, 14; Luke xi, 27). In the catalogues—Mark iii, 18; Luke vi, 15—he is coupled with Thomas, which has given rise to the conjecture that Matthew was the twin brother of Thomas (Σωτερ, a twin), whose real name, according to Eusebius, II. E. ii, 13, was Judas, and that they were both "brethren of our Lord" (Donatison, Januar, p. 10; comp. Matt. xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3). This last supposition would account for Matthew's immediate obedience to the call of Christ, but is hardly consistent with the indefiniteness of the words with which he is introduced—"δια θω σω τιμος τουτον τουτοματαλεον (Matt. ix, 9)—"τιλανων ιηματα λυκον (Luke v, 27)—or the unbelief of our Lord's brothers (John vi, 5). However, as quoted by Clem. Alex. Strom. iv, 11, mentions Levi as well as Matthew among the early teachers who did not suffer martyrdom. Origen also (Contr. Cels. i, sec. 02 [48]) speaks of ου λεγεθ υπολεγεν ζησαι ανδρον ζησας τυ ιηματολατου, together with "Matthew the publican;" but the names Léb'ath and Léth'ath are by no means identical, and there is a hesitation about his language which shows that the truth the tradition was highly trustworthy. The attempt of Theod. Hase (Hild. Brev., v, 475) to identify Levi with the apostle Lebbeus is an example of misspelled ingenuity which deserves little attention (comp. Woll. Curt. ad Marc. ii, 14). The distinction between Levi and Matthew has, however, been maintained by Grothius (though he acknowledges that the voice of antiquity is against him, "et saepe congruentiae..."), Michaelis, De Wette, Sieffert, Ewald, etc. But it is unnecessary. The name is a maternal one, and it was the custom for such names to be borne by women as well as men; and at the same time the names are not infrequent in the New Testament. In the apocryphal works of Sieffert (Ueber d. erst. Kom. Ex., p. 59) and Ewald (Drit. Erst. Ex., p. 344: Christs, p. 289, 321) that the name "Matthew" is due to the Greek editor of Matthew's Gospel, who substituted it by an error in the narrative of the call of Levi. On the other hand, their identity was assumed by Wachter, Conybeare, and Jerome, and has been accepted by the most important commentators (Tischendorf, Meyer, Neander, Lardner, Eicso, etc.). The double name only supplies a difficulty to those who are resolved to find such everywhere in the Gospel narrative. It is analogous to what we find in the case of Simon Peter, John Mark, Paul, Jude, etc., which may all admit of the same explanation, and be regarded as indicating a crisis in the spiritual life of the individual, and his passing into new external relations. He was no longer "τους την λεγενην", not Levi but Theodore—one who might well deem both himself and all his future a "gift of God" (Eicso, Hist. Ind., p. 172: comp. Harnack, Meyer, Curt., ex. eis, etc. v. α. Mattathius, Name). See Michaelis, Einl. ii, 934; Kraft, Matt. Oec. s. v.; Breda, in the Bibl. Brem. vi, 1038; Heumann, Ekkir. d. N. T., 1, 538; Frisch, Dias, de Levi s. v. Matth. non confundendo (Leips. 1746); Thiess, Kris. Comm. i, 90; Sieffert, Ueber d. Kom. Exeg. p. 54. See Name.

II. Scripture Statements respecting him. — His father's name was Alpheus (Mark ii, 14), probably different from the father of James the son of Mary, the wife of Clopas, which was a "sister of the mother of Jesus" (John xiii, 25). Matthew was called an apostle (A.D. 27) is related by all three evangelists in the same words, except that Matthew (ix, 9) gives the usual name, and Mark (ii, 14) and Luke (v, 27) that of Levi. Matthew's special occupation was probably the collection of dues and customs from persons who crossed the Lake of Geneva. It was while he was actually engaged in his duties ηπιημαν προ τοι τολων, that he received the call, which he obeyed without delay. Our Lord was then invited by him to a "great feast" (Luke v, 28), to which perhaps, as Neander has said (Life of Christ, p. 290), there was an allusion in the Blunt, Undes. Coincid. p. 257), by way of farewell, his old associates, ιηματα τοιων τοιων, were summoned. The publicans, properly so called (publicani), were persons who farmed the Roman taxes, and they were usually, in later times, knaves, and persons of wealth and credit. They employed under them inferior officers, natives of the province where the taxes were collected, called properly porities, to which class Matthew no doubt belonged. These latter were notorious for impudent exactions everywhere (Plautus, Menec. i, 2, 5; Cic. ad Quint. Fr. 1, 1; Plut. De Curiosis, p. 518 e); but to the Jews they were especially odious, for they were the very spot where the Roman chain gall them, the visible proof of the degraded state of their nation. As a rule, none but the lowest would accept such an unprivileged office, and thus the class became more worthy of the hatred with which in any case the Jews would have regarded it. The readiness, however, with which Matthew obeyed the call of Jesus seems to show that his heart was still open to religious impressions. We find in Luke vi, 13, that when Jesus, before delivering the Sermon on the Mount, selected twelve disciples, who were to form the circle of his more intimate associates, Matthew was one of them. On a subsequent occasion (Luke vi, 26), Matthew gave the partake entertainment to his friends. After this event he is mentioned only in Mark i, 18, A.D. 30.

III. Traditionary Notices. — According to a statement
in Clemens Alexandrinus (Pædagog. ii. 3), Matthew abstained from animal food. Hence some writers have rather hastily concluded that he belonged to the sect of the Essenes. It is true that the Essenes practiced abstinance in a high degree, but it is not true that they rejected animal food altogether. Admitting the account in Clemens Alexandrinus to be correct, it proves only that Matthew possessed the Essene abstinence, of which the occurrence of vestiges in the habits of other Jews (comp. Josephus, "Life," 2 and 3). Some interpreters find also in Rom. xiv. an allusion to Jews of ascetic principles.

According to another account, which is as old as the first century, and which occurs in the Kýrýpus Hýbris in Clemens Alexandrinus (Hist. Ecles. vi. 15), Matthew, after the death of Jesus, remained about fifteen years in Jerusalem. This agrees with the statement in Eusebius (Hist. Ecles. iii. 24), that Matthew preached to his own nation before he went to foreign countries. Buxinus (Hist. Ecles. x. 9) and Socrates (Hist. Ecles. i. 19) state that he afterwards went into Ethiopia (Meroë); but Ambrose says that God opened to him the country of the Persians (Ps. 85); Isodore, the Macedonians (Isodore Hist. De Sanct. 77); and others the Parthians, the Maccabees, and Ephraim of Edessa. Florinius Exercit. hist. phil. p. 29; Credner, "Jesu. ins. N. T. 1. i. 58." There also he probably preached specially to the Jews. See Abride, Histor. Aporit. vii. in Fabriici Cod. apocr. i. 686; Perizonii Vit. p. 114; comp. Martyr. Rom. Sept. 21. According to Hæraclean (about A. D. 202), and Eusebius, who showed him the churches of Thrace (Hist. Ecles. i. 19), Matthew was one of those apostles who did not suffer martyrdom, which Clement, Origen, and Tertullian seem to accept: the tradition that he died a martyr, be it true or false, came in afterwards (Niceph. H. E. ii. 41). Tischendorf has published the apocryphal "Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew" (Acta Apocrypha, Lips., 1841). See Acts, SPODVS.

MATTHEW, GOSPEL of, the first of the four memoirs of our Lord in all the arrangements. See New Testament.

I. Author.—There is no ancient book with regard to the authorship of which we have earlier, fuller, and more unanimous testimony. From Papias, almost if not quite contemporary with the apostles, downwards, we have a stream of unimpeachable witnesses to the fact that Matthew was the author of a gospel; while the quotations which abound in the works of the fathers prove that at least as early as Ireneus—if we may not also add Justin, whose "Memorabilia of Christ" we cannot but identify with the "Gospels" he speaks of as in public use—the Gospel received by the Church under the direct inspiration of those who therefrom, and that these events to times in which they did not happen; for instance, the rejection at Nazareth, mentioned in Luke iv. 14–30, must have happened at the commencement of Christ's public career, but Matthew relates it as late as xii. 38. But, on the other hand, there is no reason to suppose that the evangelists intended to write a chronological biography. On the contrary, we learn from Luke i. 4, and John xx. 31, that their object was of a more practical and apologetic tendency. With the exception of John, the evangelists have grouped their communications more according to subjects than according to chronological succession. This fact is now generally admitted. As to the particular event above referred to, namely, the rejection of Christ at Nazareth, it appears to have occurred twice; Luke (iv. 14–31) giving the earlier, and Matthew (xxi. 23–31) the later instance. See Strong's Harmony of the Gospels, § 32, 60, and notes.

II. (4th.) He embodies in one discourse several sayings of Christ which, according to Luke, were pronounced at different times (comp. Matt. v.–vii., and xxii.). But if the evangelist arranged his utterances as subjects, and not chronologically, we must not be surprised that he connects similar sayings of Christ, inserting them in the longer discourses after analogous topics had

example, Matt. iv. 18 with Luke v. 1 sq.; Matt. viii. 5 sq. with Luke vii. 1 sq. This is most striking in the history of his own call, where we should expect a clearer representation. To this it may be replied that the gift of narrating luminously is a personal qualification of which even an apostle might be desirous, and which is rarely found among the lower orders of people; this argument is strengthened, too, by the occurrence of vestiges in the habits of other Jews (comp. Josephus, "Life," 2 and 3). Some interpreters find also in Rom. xiv. an allusion to Jews of ascetic principles. According to another account, which is as old as the first century, and which occurs in the Kýrýpus Hýbris in Clemens Alexandrinus (Hist. Ecles. vi. 15), Matthew, after the death of Jesus, remained about fifteen years in Jerusalem. This agrees with the statement in Eusebius (Hist. Ecles. iii. 24), that Matthew preached to his own nation before he went to foreign countries. Buxinus (Hist. Ecles. x. 9) and Socrates (Hist. Ecles. i. 19) state that he afterwards went into Ethiopia (Meroë); but Ambrose says that God opened to him the country of the Persians (Ps. 85); Isodore, the Macedonians (Isodore Hist. De Sanct. 77); and others the Parthians, the Maccabees, and Ephraim of Edessa. Florinius Exercit. hist. phil. p. 29; Credner, "Jesu. ins. N. T. 1. i. 58." There also he probably preached specially to the Jews. See Abride, Histor. Aporit. vii. in Fabriici Cod. apocr. i. 686; Perizonii Vit. p. 114; comp. Martyr. Rom. Sept. 21. According to Hæraclean (about A. D. 202), and Eusebius, who showed him the churches of Thrace (Hist. Ecles. i. 19), Matthew was one of those apostles who did not suffer martyrdom, which Clement, Origen, and Tertullian seem to accept: the tradition that he died a martyr, be it true or false, came in afterwards (Niceph. H. E. ii. 41). Tischendorf has published the apocryphal "Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew" (Acta Apocrypha, Lips., 1841). See Acts, SPODVS.

MATTHEW, GOSPEL of, the first of the four memoirs of our Lord in all the arrangements. See New Testament.

I. Author.—There is no ancient book with regard to the authorship of which we have earlier, fuller, and more unanimous testimony. From Papias, almost if not quite contemporary with the apostles, downwards, we have a stream of unimpeachable witnesses to the fact that Matthew was the author of a gospel; while the quotations which abound in the works of the fathers prove that at least as early as Ireneus—if we may not also add Justin, whose "Memorabilia of Christ" we cannot but identify with the "Gospels" he speaks of as in public use—the Gospel received by the Church under the direct inspiration of those who therefrom, and that these
been mentioned. These discourses are not, in fact, compiled by the evangelist, but always form the fundamental framework to which sometimes analogous subjects are attached. Moreover, it can be proved that several sayings are more correctly placed by Matthew than by Luke (compare especially Matt. xxii. 8-37 with Luke xii. 35-38). (6th) He falls, it is asserted, into positive errors. In ch. i. and ii he seems not to know that the real dwelling-place of the parents of Jesus was at Nazareth, and that their abode at Bethlehem was only temporary (compare Matt. ii. 1, 23; 23 with Luke ii. 4, 39). According to Mark xi. 20, 21, the temple was in ruins when the day after it was cursed; but according to Matt. xxv. 19, it was withdrawn immediately. Accordingly to Matt. xxii. 12, Christ purified the Temple immediately after his entrance into Jerusalem; but according to Mark he on that day went out to Bethany, and purified the Temple on the day following (Mark xi. 11-15). Matthew says (xxii. 7) that Christ rode on a she-ass and on a colt, which is impossible; the other Gospels speak only of a she-ass. But it depends entirely upon the mode of interpretation whether such positive errors as are alleged to exist are really characterized as such. The controversies, for instance, between the narrative of the birth of Christ, as severally recorded by Matthew and Luke, may easily be solved without questioning the correctness of either, if we suppose that each of them narrates what he knows from his individual sources of information. The history of Joseph's childhood does not appear in Luke, but it is the same story as that of the Hebrews, when he was about to go to others also, he committed to writing in his native tongue his Gospel (vó eur' aútov t' inýýkōlon), so filled up by his writing that which was lacking of his presence to whom whom he was departing from" (Eusebius, H. E. iii. 34). The text of Matthew can, therefore, conclude that it was derived from the acquaintance of Mary, while the statements in Matthew seem to be derived from the friends of Joseph. As to the transaction recorded in Matt. xxii. 18-22, and Mark xi. 11, 15, 20, 21, it appears that Mark describes what occurred most accurately; and yet there is nothing in Matthew's account really inconsistent with the true order of events.

On the other hand, some of the most beautiful and most important sayings of our Lord, the historical creditability of which no sceptic can attack, have been preserved by Matthew alone (Matt. xi. 28-30; xvi. 16-18; xxviii. 20; compare also xi. 2-21; xii. 3-5, 23-29; xvii. 12, 25, 26; xxvi. 18). Above all, the Sermon on the Mount, although containing some things apparently not coincident in time (for instance, the Lord's prayer), is yet far more complete and systematic than the comparatively meagre report of Luke. It may also be proved that in many particulars the reports of several discourses in Matthew are more exact than in the other evangelists, as may be seen by comparing Matt. xxiii with the various references in Luke and by the concordance "Ueber den Ursprung des Evangelium Mattheus" (Tübingen, 1834); Obhausen, Drei Programme, 1855; and the two Lucubrations of Harles, 1840 and 1843.

II. Time and Place of Its Composition. There is little in the Gospel itself to throw any light on the date of its composition. In xxvii. 7, 8; xxviii. 15, we have evidence of a date some years subsequent to the resurrection; but these may well be additions of a later hand, and prove nothing as to the age of the substance of the Gospel. Little trust can be placed in the dates given by some late writers — e. g. Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Eusebius's Chron., eight years after the Ascension; Niceph., Callist., and the Chron. Pasch., A.D. 45. The only early testimony is that of Ireneaus (Her. iii. 1, p. 174), that it was written "when Peter and Paul were preaching in Rome, and founding the Church." This would bring it down to about A.D. 63 — probably somewhat earlier, as this is the latest date assigned for Luke's Gospel; and we have the authority of a tradition, accepted by Origen, for the priority of that of Matthew (νυ πατριας μίν . . . ἔτοι πρῶτον μίν γίγνεται το εὐαγγελίον τοι Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου, Eusebius, H. E. vi. 12). This or that event happening, in order that a particular prophecy might be fulfilled (τὸ καὶ προφητεύων ἐκ τοῦ Κυρίου [οὐ θεοῦ] καὶ τοῦ προφητεύοντος, i. 22; ii. 15; xxi. 4; xxvii. 56; comp. ii. 17; iii. 3; iv. 14; viii. 17, etc.), while his whole Gospel is full of allusions to those passages and sayings of the O. T. recorded in the Gospels, no trace of which is detected and foreshadowed. As Da Costa has remarked (Four Witnesses, p. 20), he regards the events he narrates as "realized prophecy," and everything is recorded with

after the Ascension — i. e. about A.D. 51; and then the present Greek edition may have been issued not much later, or shortly before Matthew's removal from Judea, i.e. about A.D. 47. Tilleman maintains A.D. 33; Townsend, A.D. 37; Owen and Tomline, A.D. 38; David- son, Introd. N. T., inclines to A.D. 41-45; while Hug, Eichhorn, and others, in considering the evidence, considering the faith of Zacharias the son of Baruch, whose murder is recorded by Josephus (War, iv. 6, 4), place its composition shortly after the fall of Jerusalem, a theory which is rejected by De Wette and Meyer, and may safely be dismissed as untenable.

With regard to the place, there is no difference of opinion. All ancient authorities agree that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Palestine, and this has been as unanimously received by modern critics.

III. For what Readers was it Written? — The concordant testimony of the early Church that Matthew drew up his Gospel for the benefit of the Jewish Christians of Palestine (τοις ἀχικούσις παιδευόμενοι, Orig. ap. Eusebius, H. E. vi. 25), has been accepted without question, and may be regarded as a settled point. The statement of Matthew as to the first readers, that he wrote it "to the Hebrews, when he was about to go to others also," is committed to writing in his native tongue his Gospel (τὸ καὶ προφητεύων ἐκ τοῦ Κυρίου [οὐ θεοῦ] καὶ τοῦ προφητεύοντος, i. 22; ii. 15; xxi. 4; xxvii. 56; comp. ii. 17; iii. 3; iv. 14; viii. 17, etc.), while his whole Gospel is full of allusions to those passages and sayings of the O. T. recorded in the Gospels, no trace of which is detected and foreshadowed. As Da Costa has remarked (Four Witnesses, p. 20), he regards the events he narrates as "realized prophecy," and everything is recorded with
this view, that he may lead his countrymen to recognise in Jesus their promised Deliverer and King.

It is in keeping with the destination of his Gospel that we find in Matthew less frequent explanations of Jewish customs, laws, and localities than in the other Gospels. Knowledge of these is presupposed in the readers (Matt. xxv. 1, 2 with Mark vii, 1-4; Matt. xxvii. 66, and xxviii. 17; Mark xiv. 11, 22, 26, 30, xxi, 2, and other places). Jerusalem is the holy city (see below, Style and Diction). Jesus is of the elect line (i. 1; ix. 27; xii. 22; xxv. 22; xx. 39; xxi. 9, 15); is to be born of a virgin in David's place, Bethlehem (i. 22; llii. v. 49); must sit in the midst of the altar (i. 19); must have a forerunner, John the Baptist (iii. 3; xii. 19); to labor in the east out Galilee that sat in darkness (iv. 14-16); his healing was a promised mark of his office (vii. 17; xii. 17), and so was his mode of teaching by parables (xiii. 14); he entered the holy city as Messiah (xxvi. 5-16); was rejected by the people, in fulfillment of a prophecy (xxxi. 42), and deserted by his disciples in the same way (xxxi. 31, 56). The Gospel is pervaded by one principle, the fulfillment of the law and of the Messianic prophecies in the person of Jesus. This sets it in opposition to the Judaism of the time, for it refused to make Pharisaic interpretation of the law (v, xxiii), and proclaimed Jesus as the Son of God, and the Saviour of the world through his blood, ideas which were strange to the cramped and limited Judaism of the Christian era. In the Sermon on the Mount (v. 3-21) he was scattering fire over the defiler but the fullifier of the Mosaic law. When the twelve are sent forth they are forbidden to go "into the way of the Gentiles" (x. 5; comp. xv. 24). In the same passage—the only one in which the Samaritans are mentioned—that abhorred race is put on a level with the heathen, not at once to be gladdened with the Gospel message.

But while we keep this in view, as the evangelist's first object, we must not strain it too narrowly, as if he had no other purpose than to combat the objections and to satisfy the prepossessions of the Jews. No evangelist expresses with greater distinctness the universality of Christ's mission, or does more to break down the narrow notion of a Messiah for Israel who was not one also for the whole world; none delivers stronger warnings against trusting to an Abrahamic descent for acceptance in Christ, and none shows more clearly the visit of the magi (i. 1 sq.), symbolizing the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles; it is he that speaks of the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy, when "the nations that sat in darkness saw a great light" (iv. 15, 16), and when the sum of the law of the centurion is the servant what is wanting to the universalistic Luke, that "many should come from the East and West," etc. (vii. 11). The narrative of the Syro-Phoenician woman, omitted by Luke, is given by Matthew, in whom alone we also find the command to "make disciples of all nations" (xxxi. 19), and the unrestricted invitation to "all that labor and are heavy laden" (xi. 28). Nowhere are we made more conscious of the deep contrast between the spiritual teaching of Christ and the formal teaching of the rulers of the Jewish Church. We see also that others besides Jewish readers were contemplated, from the interpretations and explanations occasionally added, e.g. Immanuel, i. 33; Golgotha, xxvii. 38; Eli, lama sabbachthani, ver. 46.

IV. Original Language.—While there is absolutely nothing in the Gospel itself to lead us to imagine that it is a translation, and, on the contrary, everything favors the view that in the present Greek text, with its perpetual verbal correspondence with the other synoptists, we have the original composition of the author himself; yet the unanimous testimony of all antiquity affirms that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, i.e. the Aramaic or Syro- Chaldaic dialect, which was the vernacular tongue of the then inhabitants of Palestine. The internal evidence, therefore, is at variance with the external, and it is by no means easy to adjust the claims of the two.

1. External Evidence.—The unanimity of all ancient authorities as to the Hebrew origin of this Gospel is complete. In the words of the late canon Cureton (Syrac. Recension, p. lxxviii), "no fact relating to the history of the Gospel is more fully and satisfactorily established. From the days of the apostles down to the end of the 4th century, every writer who had occasion to refer to this matter has testified the same thing. Papias, Irenaeus, Pantasius, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Jerome, all with one consent confirm this. In the chain of traditions which it behooves us to be amply sufficient to establish the fact that Matthew wrote his Gospel originally in the Hebrew dialect of that time, for the benefit of Jews who understood and spoke the language. To look at the evidence more particularly.—(1) The earliest witness is Papias, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, in the beginning of the 2d century; a hearer of the apostle, or more probably of the presbyter John, and a companion of Polycarp (Irenaeus, Haer. v. 38, 4). Eusebius describes him (H. E. iii. 86) as "a man of the widest general information, and well acquainted with the Scriptures" (ἀνωφή τοῦ συναγωνίου ἔχασαν καὶ τοῦ νόημας τῶν μάρτυρων, H. E. iii. 89), this unfavorable view seems chiefly to have reference to his millenarian views (comp. Irenaeus, Haer. v. 38, 4), and can hardly involve any doubt of his testimony. Papias says, it would seem on the authority of John the Presbyter, "Matthew compiled his Gospel (or the oracles) in the Hebrew dialect; while each interpreted them accordingly to his ability." (Mαθητος καὶ οἱ των Ἱβραϊκήν διαλέκτου τῆς λόγου συναγωνίου εἰς τοὺς τοῦ τῆς λόγου τοῦ Παπίαν οὖν καὶ τῆς γλώσσας τῆς λόγου, H. E. iii. 89). In estimating the value of this testimony, two important points have to be considered—the meaning of the term λόγος, and whether Papias is speaking of the present or the past. On the latter point there can be little doubt. His use of the aorist, ἀποκαλύφθη, not ἀπεκαλύφθη, evidently shows that the state of things to which he or his original authority referred had passed away, and that individual translation was no longer necessary. It would seem, therefore, to follow, that "an authorized Greek representative of the Hebrew Matthew" had come into use (comp. ib. p. 207, note). The signification of λόγος has been much controverted. Schleiermacher (Stud. u. Krit. 1832, p. 785) was the first to explain the term of a supposed "collection of discourses" which is held to have been the basis that, by gradual addition of historical information, was transformed into the existing Gospel (Meyer, Comm. i. 19). This view has found wide acceptance, and has been strenuously maintained by Lachmann (Stud. u. Krit. 1885), Meyer, De Wette, Creuzer, Weizsäcker, Lobeck, Hug, Ebrard, Balz, Delitzsch, Hilgenfeld, Thiersch, Alford, Westcott, etc. But λόγος, in the N. T., signifies the whole revelation made by God, rather than the mere words in which that revelation is contained (Acts vii. 58; Rom. iii. 2; Heb. v. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 11); and, as has been convincingly shown by Hug and Ebrard, the passage in which the word is used confirms the opinion that, as used by Papias, both in this passage and in the title of his own work (λόγων εκείνων έχθροφρος), it implies a combined record of facts and discourses corresponding to the latter use of the word gospel. (2.) The next witness is Irenaeus, who, as quoted by Eusebius (H. E. v. 8), says that "Matthew among the Hebrews published also a written Gospel in their own language" (τῷ ἱδίῳ αὐτῶν έξηγήσεως), it implies a combined record of facts and discourses corresponding to the latter use of the word gospel. (3.) The next witness is Irenaeus, who, as quoted by Eusebius (H. E. v. 8), says that "Matthew among the Hebrews published also a written Gospel in their own language." Hug and Ebrard have attempted to invalidate this testimony, as a mere repetition of that of Papias, whose discourse corresponding to the latter use of the word gospel; but the more safely accept it as independent evidence. (3.) Pantanasmus, the next witness, cannot be considered as strengthening the case
for the Hebrew original much; though, as far as it goes, his evidence is definite enough. His story, as reported by Eusebius, is that "he is said to have gone to the Indians (probably in the south of Arabia), where it is reported that the Gospel of Matthew had preceded him among some who had ther acknowledged Christ, to whom it is said that he taught the doctrines and habits of the Sermon on the Mount. And left with them the writing of Matthew in Hebrew letters (Ἑβραϊκα γραμματα την τον Ματθαιου καταληψις γραφην), and that it was preserved to the time mentioned." Jerome tells the same tale, with the same result. The apostle Barnabas had preached there, and had left with them the writing of Matthew in Hebrew letters (Ἑβραϊκα γραμματα την τον Ματθαιου καταληψις γραφην), and that it was preserved to the time mentioned. Jerome says: "I believe the same relates, with the same result, even by Eusebius. (4) The testimony of Origen has already been referred to. It is equally definite with those quoted above on the fact that the Gospel was "published for Hebrew believers, and composed in Hebrew letters" (εις διδακτην αυτο δοσος τοις απο του αυτοιν καταληπτον γραμματην αναπτυγμαν Εβραιους ουσιων αναπτυγμενον), whereas the testimony for questioning the independence of Origen's evidence, or for tracing it back to Papia. He clearly states what was the belief of the Church at that time, and without a doubt as to its correctness. (For a refutation of the objections brought against it by Masch and Hug, etc., see Benade, "De Vir. Ill. 20, 196, p. 941) in which he ascribes the words ψηφι τω συμβατου to the translator (παρα του επεξεργασαι της γραφης), adding: "For the evangelists Matthew delivered his Gospel in the Hebrew tongue." This is very important evidence as to the belief of Eusebius, which was clearly that of the Church generally, that the Gospel was originally composed in Hebrew. (6) Ephraimus (Harr. xxi., p. 124) states the same fact without the shadow of a doubt, adding that Matthew was the only evangelist who wrote Εβραϊκα και Εβραιους γραμματην. The value of his evidence, however, is impaired by his identification of the Hebrew original with that employed by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, by whom he asserts it was still preserved (της αυτης ειρήνης). (7) The same observation may also be made concerning the testimony of Jerome, whose references to this subject are very frequent, and who is the only one of the fathers that appears to have actually seen the supposed Hebrew archetype (Pref. ad Matt.; De Vir. Ill. 8 and 86; In Gospels, xvi. 1; Pfaff, Comment. in Evangel. Hedii, quod. v.; Comm. in Hosa, v.) A perusal of these passages shows that there was a book preserved in the library collected by Pamphilus at Cesarea, which was supposed to be the Hebrew original ("ipsem Hebraicam"), and was as such transcribed and translated into Greek and Latin by Jerome, about A.D. 892, from a copy obtained from the Nazarenes at the Syrian city of Berœa. Afterwards, about A.D. 898 (Comm. in Matt. xxi, 13), he speaks more emphatically of it, "quod vocatur a plerique Matt. authenticum." Later on, on A.D. 416 (Contra Polagr., ii. 9), the same opinion is still held, and he must have received the book used by the Nazarenes, and preserved in the library at Cesarea, as "Ev. juxta Hebraeos. . . sequendum Apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant juxta Mattheum" (comp. Edib. Rev. July, 1861, p. 39; De Wette, Eclog. p. 10). While, then, we may safely accept Jerome as an additional witness to the belief of the early Church that Matthew's Gospel was originally composed in Hebrew (Aramaic), which he mentions as something universally recognised without a hint of a doubt, we may reasonably question whether the book he translated had any sound claim to be considered the genuine work of Matthew. The evidence of Jerome himself is not unreasonably discovered, though he be shrunk from openly confessing it. We may remark, in confirmation of this, that the Aramaic book had suffered considerably from the Greek Gospel. Jerome would hardly have taken the trouble to translate it; and that while, whenever he refers to Matthew, he cites it according to the present text, he never quotes the Nazarene Gospel as a work of canonical authority, but only in such terms as "quo stument Nazareni," "quod lectionis Nazareni," "quod inter Genuites, sub Ille Hes. Nazar.," and "subtilior," doubtfully, "qui crediderit evangelum, quod secundum Hebreosedition eorum translatum," language inconsistent with his having regarded it as canonical Scripture. (9) The statements of later writers, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzen, etc., merely echo the same testimony, and need not be more particularly referred to.

An impartial survey of the above evidence leads to the conclusion that, in the face of so many independent witnesses, we should be violating the first principles of historical criticism if we refused to accept the fact that Matthew wrote his Gospel originally in Hebrew. But whether this original was ever seen by Jerome or Ephraimus is more than questionable.

2. Internal Evidence.—What, then, is the origin of our present text? It is generally supposed to have been brought by the Hebrew Gospel to the Gentiles through the labours of Jerome, and through a series of joint translators, from the Greek text of the Old Testament, which is generally regarded as its source. (2) The existing form and language? What is its authority? These are the questions which now meet us, and to which it must be confessed it is not easy to give a satisfactory answer. We may at the outset lay down as indisputable, in opposition to Cureton (who asserts, ut supra, the text of the Greek New Testament is the text of the Hebrew original), that the phenomena of the Greek text as we have it—its language, its coincidences with and divergences from the other synoptists, the quotations from the Old Testament, etc., and the citations made from it by ancient writers, all oppose the notion of the present Greek text being a translation, and support its canonical authority. (1) An important argument may be drawn from the use made of the existing Greek text by all ancient writers. As Olshausen remarks (Clark's ed., i. xxvii), while all the fathers of the Church assert the Hebrew origin of the Gospel, they without exception make use of the existing Greek text as canonical Scripture, and that without doubt or question, or anything that would lead to the belief that they regarded it as of less authority than the original Hebrew, or possessed it in any other form than that in which we now have it. (3) Another argument in favor of the authoritative character of our present Gospel arises from its universal diffusion and general acceptance, both in the Church and among her adversaries. Had the Hebrew Gospel been the original, the Church, as theology and a profane science, would hardly have been so much in debt to the existing form of the Greek text, and our Greek Gospel been a mere translation, executed, as Jerome asserts, by some unknown individual ("quid postea in Grecum translatetur non satis certum est," De Vir. Ill. 8), would not, as Olshausen remarks, ut supra, objections to it have been urged in some quarter or other, particularly in the country where Matthew himself labored, and for whose inhabitants the Hebrew was written? Would its statements have been accepted without a cavil by the opponents of the Church? No trace of such opposition is, however, to be found, and it may be fairly doubted whether the Greek text has any canonical authority. (4) Again, the text itself bears no marks of a translation. This is especially evident in the mode of dealing with the citations from the Old Testament. These are of two kinds: (a) those standing in the discourse of our Lord himself, and the interlocutors; and (b) those inserted by the compiler as proofs of our Lord's Messiahship. Now if we assume, as is certainly most probable (though the contrary has been maintained by Hug, the late duke of Manchester, and more recently by the Rev. Alexander Roberts, whose learned and able "Discourse" work on the Greek text merits the attentive consideration from every Biblical student), that Aramaic, not Greek, was the language ordinarly used by our Lord and his Jewish contemporaries, we should certainly expect that any citations from the Old
Test., made by them in ordinary discourse, would be from the original Hebrew or its Aramaic counterpart, not from the deformed version, and would stand as such in the Aramaic record; while it would argue more than the ordinary license of a mere translator to substitute the Sept. renderings, even when at variance with the Hebrew before him. Yet what is the case? While in the class (b), our canonicity, which may be assumed to have had no representative in the current Greek oral tradition which we assume as the basis of the synoptical Gospels, we find original renderings of the Hebrew text; in the class (a), on the other hand, where we might, a priori, have looked for an even closer connection, Asiatic tradition exists from the time of the Sept., even where it deviates from the Hebrew. In (a) we may reckon iii, 8; iv, 4, 6, 7, 10; xv, 4, 8, 9, xix, 5, 18; xxi, 18, 42; xxxii, 59, 44; xxxiii, 89; xxiv, 16, xxxvi, 51; xxvii, 46. In (b), called by Westcott (Introd. p. 206, note 1) "Cyproc quotations," i, 20; ii, 6, 15, 18; iv, 15, 16; vii, 17; xii, 16 sq.; xxxii, 85; xxxv, 5; xxvii, 9, 10). In two cases Matthew's citations agree with the synoptic parallels in a derivation from the Sept., all being drawn from the same oral groundwork. Matthew's quotations have been examined by Codriner, one of the ablest modern scholars who profess to decide for their derivation from the Greek (Kinloch, p. 94.; comp. De Wette, Eiat. p. 198). We may therefore not unreasonably find here additional evidence that in the existing Greek text we have the work, not of a mere translator, but of an independent and authoritative writer. (4.) The verbal correspondences between Matthew and the other synoptists in their narratives, and especially in the report of the speeches of our Lord and others, are difficult to account for if we regard it as a translation. As Alford remarks (Gr. Text. Proleg. i, 28), "The translator must have been either acquainted with the other two Gospels, in which case it is inconceivable that, in the midst of the present coincidences in many passages, such divergences should have occurred, or unacquainted with them, in which case the identity itself would be altogether inexplicable." Indeed, in the words of Codriner (Kinloch, p. 94, 85), "the Greek original of this Gospel is affirmed by its continual correspondence with those of Mark and Luke, and that not only in general and important facts, but in particulars and minute details, in the general plan, in entire clauses, and in separates; and phenomena which admit of no explanation under the hypothesis of a translation from the Hebrew." (5.) This inference in favor of an original Greek Gospel is strongly confirmed by the fact that all versions, even the Peshito Syriac, the language in which the Gospel is said to have been originally written, are taken from the Greek text. The first of the three canon Cureton (Syriac Recens., p. lxx sq.) argues with much ability against this, and expends much learning and skill in proof of his hypothesis that the Syriac version of Matthew published by him is more ancient than the Peshito, and may be regarded, as in the main, identical with the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew; which he also considers to have been identical with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, "modified by some additions, interpolations, and perhaps some omissions." His statement (p. xiii) that "there is a manifest difference between the recension of Matthew and that of the other Gospels, proving that they are by different hands—the former showing no signs, as the others do, of translation from the Greek"—demands the respect due to so careful a scholar; but he fails entirely to explain the extraordinary fact that, in the very country where Matthew published his Gospel, and within a comparatively short period, a version from the Greek was substituted for the authentic original; nor have his views met with general acceptance among scholars.

So far as Matthew stated the arguments in favor of a Hebrew and Greek original respectively, it remains for us to inquire whether there is any way of adjusting the claims of the two. Were there no explanation of this inconsistency between the external assertions and the internal facts, it would be hard to doubt the correctness of testimony of so many old writers, whose belief in it is shown by the tenacity with which they held it in spite of their own experience.

(1.) But it is certain that a Gospel, not the same as ours, may have been the basis of the Apocryphal Gospels mentioned above; and some of the witnesses we have quoted appear to have referred to this in one or other of its various forms or names. The Christians in Palestine still held that the Mosaic ritual was binding on them, even after the destruction of Jerusalem. At the close of the first century, Christianity existed from the spiritual law was only binding on Jewish converts; this was the Nazarenes. Another, the Ebionites, held that it was of universal obligation on Christians, and rejected Paul's Epistles as teaching the opposite doctrine. These two sects, who differed also in the most important tenets to our Lord's person, possessed each a modification of the same Gospel, which no doubt each altered more and more, as their tenets diverged, and which bore various names—the Gospel of the twelve Apostles, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel of Peter, or the Gospel according to Matthew. The question now is to decide that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was not identical with our Gospel of Matthew; but it had many points of resemblance to the synoptical Gospels, and especially to Matthew. What was its origin it is impossible to say; it may have been a description of the oral teaching of the apostles, especially Peter, and may have come in its early and pure form from the hand of Matthew, or it may have been a version of the Greek Gospel of Matthew, as the evangelist who wrote especially for Hebrews. Now this Gospel, "the Proteus of criticism" (Thiersch), did exist, it is impossible that when the Hebrew Matthew is spoken of, this questionable document, the Gospel of the Hebrews, was really referred to? Observe that all accounts of it are at second hand (with a notable exception); no one quotes it; in cases of doubt about the text, Origen even does not appeal from the Greek to the Hebrew. All that is certain is, that Nazarenes or Ebionites, or both, boasted that they possessed the original Gospel of Matthew. Jerome is the exception, and him we can convict of the very mistake of confusing the two, and almost on his own confession. As first brought before the world by an anonymous writer (Edinburgh Review, 1801, July, p. 39), "that it was the authentic Matthew, and translated it into both Greek and Latin from a copy which he obtained at Berea, in Syria. This appears from his De Vir. Ill., written in the year 892. Six years later, in his Commentaries on the Pentateuch, he says that it is the same which he has quoted in his other works—"Vocatur a pluribus Mercatius authenticum. Later still, in his book on the Pelagian heresy, written in the year 415, he modifies his account still further, describing the work as the Evangelium Iuxta Hebrom, quod Chaldaice uidem Syro-Necensarum, sed Hebraicis literis coniecturam est, quo unutur usque hodie Nazareneri secundum Apostolos, sive ut plerique autem iuxta Matthewum, quod et in Casariensi habetur Bibliotheca." There have pronounced for a Greek original—Erasmus, Calvin, Lefebvre, Fabricius, Lightfoot, Wetstein, Paulus, Lardner, Hey, Hales, Hug. Schott, De Wette, Moses Stuart, Frischathe, Credner, Thiersch, and many others. Great names are ranged also on the other side, as Simon, Mill, Michaelis, Marsh, Eichhorn, Storr, Osnabrun, and others. May not the truth be that Paul, knowing more of one than any Greek Gospel in use among the Judaic sects, may have assumed the existence of a Hebrew original from which these were supposed to be taken, and knowing also the genuine Greek Gospel may have looked on all these, in the loose, uncrirical way which seems for him so convenient, as the various "interpolations" to which he alludes? It is by no means improbable that after several inaccurate and imperfect translations of the Aramaic
original came into circulation, Matthew himself was prompted by this circumstance to publish a Greek translation, or to have his Gospel translated under his own supervision. It is very likely that this Greek translation did not soon come into general circulation, so that it is even possible that Papen may have remained ignorant of its existence, and not to the last sentence. Stuart, in the Amer. Bibl. Repos. 1838, p. 130-179, 815-356.

(2.) We think that Mr. Westcott—to whom the study of the Gospels owes so much—has pointed out the road to a still better solution. Not that the difficulties which beset this matter can be regarded as cleared up, or the question finally and satisfactorily settled, but a mode of reconciling the inconsistency between testimony and fact has been indicated, which, if pursued, may, we think, lead to a decision. “It has been shown,” says Mr. Westcott (Intro. p. 206, note), “that the oral Gospel probably existed from the first both in Aramaic and in Greek, and in this way a preparation for a fresh representation of the Hebrew Gospel was at once found. The parts of the Aramaic oral Gospels which were adopted by Matthew already existed in the Greek counterpart. The change was not so much a version as a substitution; and frequent coincidence with common parts of Mark and Luke, which were derived from the same oral Greek Gospel, was a necessary consequence. Yet it may have happened that, as long as the Hebrew and Greek churches were in close communion, perhaps till the time of the Barbabastican or of the death of Jesus (c. 30), no Gospel of Matthew—i.e. such a version of the Greek oral Gospel as would exactly answer to Matthew's version of the Aramaic—was committed to writing. When, however, the separation between the two sections grew more marked, the Greek Gospel was written, not indeed as a translation, but as a representation of the original, as a Greek oral counterpart was already current.”

This theory of the origin of the Greek Gospel, it appears to us, meets the facts of the case, and satisfies its requirements more fully than any other. We have seen above that the language of Papias indicates that, even in his day, the Gospel of Matthew existed substantially in Greek, and its universal diffusion and general authority in the earliest ages of the Church prove that its composition cannot be placed much after the times of the apostles. May it not have been then that the two—the Aramaic and the Greek Gospel—existed for some time in their most important portions as an old tradition side by side—that the Aramaic was the first to be committed to writing, and gained a wide though temporary circulation among the Hebrew Christians of Syria and Palestine, as would accord with the want of a Greek Gospel for the use of the Hellenistic Jews was felt, this also was published in its written form, either by Matthew himself (as is maintained by Thiersch, Olshausen, and Lee), or by those to whom, from constant repetition, the main portions were familiar; perhaps under the apostle's eye, and with the virtual, if not the formal sanction of the Church at Jerusalem? As it supplied a need widely felt by the Gentile Christians, it would at once obtain currency, and as the Gentile Church rapidly extended her borders, while that of the Hebrews was confined within narrower limits, this Greek Gospel would speedily supplant its Hebrew predecessor, and thus furnish a fresh and most striking example of what Mr. Westcott, in his excellent work on The Bible in the Church (Intro. p. viii), calls “that doctrine of a divine providence separating (as it were) and preserving special books for the perpetual instruction of the Church, which is the true correlative and complement of every sound and reverend theory of inspiration.” No other hypothesis, as Dr. Lee has satisfactorily shown (Inspr. of H., Sec. Appendix M.), than the Greek Gospel being either actually or substantially the production of Matthew himself, accounts for the profound silence of ancient writers respecting the translation, or for the absence of the least trace of any other Greek translation of the Hebrew original.” The hypotheses which assign the translation to Barnabas (Isid. Hispel, Chron. p. 272), John (Theophyl. Euthym. Zigab.) Mark (Greswell), Luke and Paul conjointly (Anastas. Sinaiai), or James the brother of our Lord (Syn. Sacr. Scr. apud Athanass. ii. 295), are mere arbitrary assertions without any foundation in tradition. “The last mentioned are ingenious, as we may reasonably suppose that the bishop of Jerusalem would feel solicitude for the spiritual wants of the Hellenistic Christians of that city.

Those who desire to pursue the investigation of this subject will find ample material for doing so in the Introductions of Hug, De Wette, Credner, etc.; Marsh's Michaelis, vol. iii. pt. i. where the patristic authorities are fully discussed; and they will be found, for the most part, in Kirchhofer, Quellen- und sammlung, where there will also be found the passages referring to the Gospel of the Hebrews, p. 448; also in most of the commentaries. The following have written monographs on this point: Sonntag (Allor, 1696), Schröder (Viteb. 1699, 1702), Masch (Halle, 1755), Williams (London. 1790), Elenner (F. v. 1781), Bualav (Vratsal. 1826), Stuart (Bibl. Repos. 1838), Harless (Erlang, 1841, also 1842, the latter tr. in Bibl. Repos. 1844), Tregelles (Kitto's Journals. 1850, and separately), Alexander (Bibl. 1850), Roberts (London. 1864). More general discussions may be found in Lardner's Credibility, vol. v.; Reuss's Geschi. d. Kains; Tregelles on The Original Language of St. Matthew; Herr. A. Robert's Der Herr und seine eigentliche Offenbarung—etc. Of Olshausen, Meyer, Alford, Wetstein, Kuinol, Fritzsche, Lange, etc.; and the works on the Gospels of Norton (Credibility), Westcott, Baur, Giseler (Entstehung), Hillefledt, etc.; Cureton's Syriac Recension Preface; and Dr. W. Lee on Inspiration, Appendix M.; Jeremiah Jones's Vindication of St. Matthew; Ewald, Die drei Erst. Er., and Jaboobch d. Bibl. Wissemack. 1848-49.

V. Characteristics.—Matthew's emphatically is the Gospel of the Kingdom. The main object of the evangelist is to portray the kingly character of Christ, and to show that in him the ideal of the King reigning in righteousness, the true Heir of David's throne, was fulfilled (comp. Augustine, De Consens. Ev. passim). Thus the tone throughout is majestic and kingly. He views things in the grand general aspect, and, indifferent to the details in which Matthew labors so much to dwell, he gathers up all in the great result. His narrative proceeds with a majesty and simplicity, regardless of time and place, according to another and deeper order, ready to sacrifice mere chronology or locality to the development of this idea. Thus he brings together events separated by many years, connected in the case, the unity of their nature or purpose, and with a grand but simple power accumulates in groups the discourses, parables, and miracles of our Lord (I. Williams, Study of Gospels, p. 26). From the formation and objects of the Gospels, we should expect that their prevailing characteristic would be marked not by a general tone and spirit than by minute peculiarities. Not, however, that these latter are wanting. It has already been remarked how the genealogy with which Matthew's Gospel opens sets our Lord forth in his kingly character, as a king destined to reign over a new秦国 the royal line of which he was the true successor and fulfillment. As we advance we find his birth hailed, not by lowly shepherds as in Luke, but by wise men coming to wait on him with royal gifts, inquiring, “Where is he that is born king of the Jews?” and when they, on the Mount the same majesty and authority appear. We hear the Judge himself delivering his sentence; the King laying down the laws of his kingdom, “I say unto you,” and astonish his hearers with the “authority” with which he speaks. The awful majesty of our Lord's supreme power in his teaching and Gospel being illustrated by the narrations of the Scribes and Pharisees, also evidence the authority of a king and lawgiver—“one who knew the mind of God and could reveal it;” which may also be noticed in the lengthened discourses that mark the close
of his ministry, in which "the king" and "the kingdom of heaven" come forward with so much frequency (xxi, 8, 15, 22; xxii, 2; xxiii, 14; xxiv, 14; xxv, 1, 9, 44, 49). Nor can we overlook the remarkable circumstance that, in the parable of the marriage-feast, so similar in its general circumstances with that in Luke (xv, 16), instead of "a certain man," it is "a king" making a marriage for his son; and inquiringly speaking for both his armies and binding the unworthy guest. The addition of the doxology also to the Lord's Prayer, with its ascription of "the kingdom, the power, and the glory," is in such true harmony with the same prevailing tone as to lead one to see this fact alone the strongest argument in its genuineness.

But we must not in this, or in any of the Gospels, direct our attention too exclusively to any one side of our Lord's character. "The King is one and the same in all, and so is the Son of Man and the Priest. . . . He who is the King is also the Sacrifice" (Williamson, pp. 82).

The Gospel is that of the King, but it is the King "meek" (xxi, 5), "meek and lowly of heart" (xi, 29); the kingdom is that of "the poor in spirit," "the persecuted for righteousness' sake" (ver. 8, 10), into which "the weary and heavy laden are invited, and which they shall inherit together with its king" (ver. 8). He tells us, was to be one of ourselves, "whose brotherhood with man answered all the anticipations the Jewish prophets had formed of their king, and whose power to relieve the woes of humanity could not be separated from his participation in them, who himself took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses" (viii, 17) (Maurice, Unity of N. T. p. 190).

As the son of David and the son of Abraham, he was the partaker of the sorrows as well as the glories of the throne—the heir of the curse as well as the blessing. The source of all blessings to mankind, fulfilling all the promises to Abraham, the curse due to man's sin meets and centres in him, and is transformed into a blessing when the cross becomes his kingly throne; and from the lowest point of his degradation he reappears, in his resurrection, as the Lord and King to whom "all power is given in heaven and earth." He fulfils the promise, "in thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed"; in the command to "go and make disciples of all nations," he "expands the I AM, which was the ground of the national polity, into the name of 'the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost'" (Maurice, at p. 280).

Once more, the kingdom he came to establish was to be a fatherly kingdom. The King he made known was one reigning in God's name, and as his representative. That God was the father of his people, as of himself, and through whom human beings were to be adopted as the children of God, the visit of the magi to Abraham, the return thence, the massacre of the innocents, and the reason of the settlement at Nazareth, are given by Matthew alone. To him we owe the notice that "the Pharisées and Sadducees" came to John's baptism (iii, 7); that John was unwilling to baptize our Lord, and the words in which Jesus satisfied his scruples (ver. 13-15); the Sermon on the Mount in its fullest form (ch. vi, vii); the prediction of the call of the Gentiles, appended to the miracle of the centurion's servant (viii, 11, 12); the cure of the two blind men (ix, 25-30); and that memorable passage by which, if by nothing else, Matthew will forever be remembered with thankfulness—which, as perhaps the fullest exposition of the spirit of the Gospel anywhere to be found in Holy Scripture, taught Augustine the difference between the teaching of Christ and that of the best philosophers (xi, 28-30); the sermons of the best writers about the Scriptures, and the most profound commentaries. Four of the parables in ch. xiii, the tares, the bad husbandmen, the pearl, and the draw-net; several incidents relating to Peter, his walking on the water (xix, 28, 31), the blessing pronounced upon him (xvi, 17-19), the tribute-money (xvii, 24, 57); nearly the whole of ch. xxiii, with its lessons of humility and forgiveness, and the parable of the unmerciful servant; the lessons on voluntary continence (xix, 10, 12); the promise to the twelve (ver. 38); the parables of the laborers in the vineyard (xx, 1-16), the two sons (xxii, 28, 32); the transference of the kingdom to the Gentiles (ver. 43); the parable of the marriage of the king's son (xxii, 1-14); nearly the whole of the denunciations against the Scribes and Pharisees in ch. xxiii; the parables of the last things in ch. xxiv. In the history of the passion the peculiarities are numerous and uniform in character, tending to show how deeply the events foretold of his death, our Lord's Messiahship was attested. It is in Matthew alone that we read of the covenant with Judas for "thirty pieces of silver" (xxvi, 15); his inquiry "Is it I?" (xxvi, 25), as well as the restoration of the money in his despair of its ultimate recovery; a signalistic fulness of prophecy (xxvii, 3-10); the cup "for the remission of sins" (xxvi, 28); the mention of the
"twelve legions of angels" (ver. 52-54). Filate's wife's vision (xxvi, 19), his washing his hands (ver. 24), and the impression "His blood be on us, etc." (verse 25); the opening of the graves (ver. 53, 59), and the watch placed at the sepulchre (ver. 62-66). In the account of the resurrection we find only in Matthew the great earthquake, the descent of the angel, the glorious appearance striking terror into the guards (vers 2-4), their flight, and the falsehood spread by them at the instigation of the priests (ver. 11-15); our Lord's appearance to the women (ver. 9, 10); the adoration and doubting of the apostles (ver. 17); and finally, the parting commission and promise of his ever-abiding presence (ver. 18-20).

This review of the Gospel will show us that of the matter peculiar to Matthew, the larger part consists of parables and discourses, and that he adds comparatively little to the narrative. Of thirty-three recorded miracles eighteen are given by Matthew, but only two, the cure of the blind men (ix, 27-30) and the tribute money (xxvii. 27-29), are peculiar to him. Of twenty-nine parables Matthew records fifteen; ten, as noticed above, being peculiar to him. Reums, dividing the matter contained in the synoptical Gospels into 100 sections, finds 78 of them in Matthew, 68 in Mark, in Luke, the richest of all, 82. Of these, 49 are common to all three; 9 common to Matthew and Mark; 8 to Matthew and Luke; 3 to Mark and Luke. Only 7 of these are peculiar to the Gospel of Matthew; 2 to Mark; while Luke contains no less than 22.

Matthew's narrative, as a rule, is the least graphic. The great features of the history which bring into prominence our Lord's character as teacher and prophet, the sublimity of his teaching, the Messianic king, are traced with broad outline, without minute or circumstantial details. We are conscious of a want of that pictur-esque power and vivid painting which delight us in the other Gospels, especially in that of Mark. This deficiency, however, is more than compensated for by the grand simplicity of the narrative, in which everything is secondary to the evangelist's great object. The facts which prove the Messianic dignity of our Lord are all in all with him, the circumstantial almost nothing; while he portrays the earthly form and theocratic glory of the new dispensation, and unfolds the glorious con

VII. Arrangement and Contents. — Matthew's order, we have already seen, is according to subject-matter rather than chronological sequence, which in the first half is completely disregarded. More attention is paid to the relation of the matter he has arranged, and agreement agrees with that of Mark. The main body of his Gospel divides itself into groups of discourses collected according to their leading tendency, and separated from each other by groups of anecdotes and miracles. We may distinguish seven such collections of discourses—(1) The Sermon on the Mount, a specimen of our Lord's ordinary didactic instruction (ch. v. vii.); divided by a group of works of healing, comprising no less than ten out of eighteen recorded miracles, from (2) the commission of the twelve (ch. x.). The following chapters (ch. xii. xlii.) give the tradition of the church as to the baptism of Jesus, his miraculous works, the introduction of a change of feeling towards him, prepare us for (3) his first open denunciation of his enemies (xiv. 23, 45), and pave the way for (4), the group of parables, including seven out of fifteen recorded by him (ch. xiii.). The next four chapters, containing the culminating point of our Lord's public ministry, the confessions of the blind and the transfiguration (ch. xvi. 23, 27, 31; xvi. 12), are bound together by historical sequence. In (5), comprising ch. xxviii., we have a complete treatise in itself, made up of fragments on humility and brotherly love, the divine confession, in x., 1-xx., 16, are followed by the disputes with the Scribes and Pharisees (xxxi. 28-33, 46), which supply the ground for (6), the solemn denunciations of the hypocrites and sophists by which they nullified the spirit of the law (ch. xxiii.).

More particularly its principal divisions are—1. The introduction to the ministry (ch. i. iv.). 2. The laying down of the new law for the Church in the Sermon on the Mount (ch. v. vii.). 3. Events in historical order, showing the development of the work of redemption (ch. viii. xii.). 4. The appointment of apostles to preach the kingdom (ch. x.). 5. The doubts and opposition excited by his activity in diverse minds—John's disciples, in sunry cities, in the Pharisees (ch. x. xii.). 6. A series of parables on the nature of the kingdom (ch. xiii.). 7. Similar to 5. The effects of his ministry on his countrymen, on Herod, the people of Gennesaret, Scribes and Pharisees, and on multitudes, whom he feeds (ch., xiii. xvi.). 8. Revelation to his disciples of his sufferings. His instructions to them thereupon (xvi. xix. xx.).

VIII. The Language of the Gospels. — The language of Matthew is less characteristic than that of the other evangelists. Of the three synoptic Gospels it is the most decidedly Hebrewistic, both in diction and construction, but less so than that of John. Cremer and others have remarked the following: (1.) ἐκαθορίζεται ὁ άνθρωπος, which occurs thirty-two times in Matthew and not once in the other evangelists, who use instead ἐκαθορίζεται ἐν τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ τοῦ άνθρώπου, which occurs forty times; (2.) ὁ νομός ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἐνεργείᾳ (ὁ οὐρανός, four times), sixteen times, only twice in Mark, not at all in Luke. (3.) τὸ ἄνω οὖν, seven times; (4.) ἐν ὅλης ἀνάπτυξις, three times each in Matthew and in Luke. (5.) ἢ ἁγία πώλης, and ὁ δύναμις τῶν, for Jerusalem, three times; not in the other evangelists. (6.) ἡ συνέλευσις τοῦ αἰῶνος, "the consummation of the age"—"the end of the world," is found five times in Matthew, nowhere else in the New Test. except Heb. ix. 26, in the plural, αἰώνων. (7.) τοῖς ἐν οὐρανοῖς πληρωθήτω τὸ μάθημα, eight times, nowhere else in the New Test. John uses ἐν οὐρανοῖς πληρωθήτω τὸ μάθημα, τὸ μάθημα ὑπό του θεοῦ τὸ ἐν οὐρανοῖς πληρωθήτω τὸ μάθημα (τό ἐν οὐρανόις, τό μάθημα, τὸ μάθημα ὑπό του θεοῦ), (v. xix. 14), nine times. Mark uses ἐν οὐρανοῖς τὸ μάθημα, (v. xiv. 14), nine times. Mark uses ἐν οὐρανοῖς τὸ μάθημα, (v. xiv. 14), nine times; nowhere else in the New Test. (v. xiv. 14) ἐν οὐρανοῖς, seven times; (10.) ἐν οὐρανοῖς, in narrative, twenty-three times; in Luke sixteen times; not in Mark. ἐν οὐρανοῖς, after a genitive absolute, nine times. (11.) κοπιῶντες καὶ πολιτευόμενοι, continually used to give a pictorial coloring to the narrative (e. g. i. 4; viii. 5, 19, 29; ix. 14, 20; x. 14, 32, 42, etc.; li. 15, etc.), absolutely, without the dative of the person (e. g. i. 20; iii. 2, 13, 20; iii. 2, 14, 17; v. 2; vi. 81, etc.). (12.) ἐν οὐρανοῖς, the name of the holy city with Matthew always, except xxi. 37. It is the same in Mark, with one (doubtful) exception (xii. 1). (13.) θεοσφορεῖν, used absolutely, ten times. Other peculiarities, establishing the unity of authorship, may be noticed: (1.) The use of ῥόις, as the ordinary particle of transition, ninety times; six times in Mark, and fourteen in Luke. (2.) καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ωρός, five times; Luke uses ὁ ωρός ἐγένετο, five times. (3.) ἐχωρίων, seven times. (4.) ἐν ἑτέρον τοῦ καθὼς, in ἑτέρον χρόνον, and ἐν τῷ δόξῳ, etc., scarcely found in Mark or Luke. (5.) ἄνωθεν, "to retire," ten times. (6.) κατῴκησε, six times. (7.) ποιοῦντι ῥήτορα, καθώς,
The page contains a continuation of the text from the previous page, discussing the apostolic antiquity of the Gospel of Matthew. It mentions the Church's adoption of the Gospel and its resistance to changes that arose from different translations or versions. The text argues for the importance of maintaining the original form of the Gospel.
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References:

1. Some critics, admitting the apostolic antiquity of a part of the Gospel, apply to Matthew, as they do to Luke, the gratuitous supposition of a later editor or compiler, who, by augmenting and altering the earlier text, made it as it now stands. The curious features of Matthew, arising from style and diction, are entirely in favor of the whole having substantially proceeded from one hand. Other supposed internal evidence varies so much, according to the subjective position of critics, that nothing can be inferred from it that is of consistent value.

2. On the other hand, the alterations which are made in the text by the differences between the various readings (the text is given, as far as possible, in the usual manner), are not always to be interpreted in a manner which upholds the theory of an earlier Gospel.

To these may be added (28), "He shall be called a Nazarene," and the appeal to the words of the prophet generally (xxvi, 54, 56).
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Septuagint. He transposes words, brings separate passages together, attributes the words of one prophet to another, and even quotes the Pentateuch for facts not recorded in it. Many of the quotations from the Septuagint are indeed precise, but these are chiefly in the Dialogue with Trypho, where, reasoning with a Jew on the 2nd and 3d centuries, Irenaeus, Clem. Alex., etc., and are referred to by Celsus (Orig. C. Cels. i. 38; ii. 92). (b) The facts they record are perfectly in keeping with a Gospel for Jewish Christians (3). The opening of chap. iii, tvroi raqt guk, i.e., refers back, by its construction, to the close of chap. ii; and iv, 13 would be unintelligible without ii, 23. (4) There is no difference between the diction and constructions and those in the other parts of the Gospel.

Matthew 1 (fig. 2x): Tyndale's chapt. rest chiefly on their alleged absence from the Gospel of the Hebrews in use among the Ebionites (Epiphanius, Har. xxxix. 18). But Epiphanius describes that book as "incomplete, adulterated, and mutilated;" and as the Ebionites regarded the human body as co-ordinate with Adam and Moses, the absence of the two chapters may readily be accounted for on doctrinal grounds. The same explanation may be given for the alleged absence from the Diatessaron of Tatian of these chapters, and the corresponding parts of Luke containing the genealogy, and all the other passages which show that the Lord was born of the seed of David "according to the flesh" (Theodoret, Har. fab. i. 20). The case must be a weak one which requires us to appeal to acknowledged heretics for the correction of our canon. The supposed discrepancy between the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke, which has led even professor Norton to follow Strauss, Paulus, Schleiermacher, etc., in rejecting them, has been abundantly discussed in all recent commentaries, and by Wieseler (Synopsis), Neander (Life of Christ), Mill (Pistischristian), Kern (Uebrigung d. Ev. Matt.), etc., as well as in the various answers to Strauss. It is sufficient here to note the following points in reply: (1.) Such questions are by no means confined to those chapters, but are found in places of which the apostolic origin is admitted. (2.) The treatment of Luke's Gospel by Marcion suggests how the Jewish Christians dropped out of the canon as soon as the new dispensation was accepted. (3.) Prof. Norton stands alone, among those who object to the two chapters, in assigning the genealogy to the same author as the rest of the chapters (Hilgenfeld, p. 46, 47). (4.) The difficulties in the harmony are all reconcilable, and the case has passed, that the MSS. and the testimony of early writers, for subjective impressions about its contents. XI. Commentaries.—The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole of Matthew's Gospel, a few of the most important of which we indicate prefixed: Origens, Commentarii (in Opp. iii. 440 sqq., 880 sqq.); also Scholl (in Galland, Bibl. Patr. xiv.); Athanasius, Fragmenta (in Opp. i. pt. 2; also iii. 18); Hilarius Pietavensis, Commentarii (in Opp. i. 669); Jerome, Commentarii (in Opp. v. 1); Faustus Rheginus, Sermo, etc., Matt. (in Jerome, Opp. xxi. 27; 304, 366); Chrysostom, Homiliae (in Opp. Spurian. vi. 731-790; also ed. Field, Cantab. 1839, 3 vols. 8vo; in English, in Lib. of Fathers, Oxf. 1845-51, vol. xvi, xx., xxxiv.); Cyril of Alexandria, Fragmenta (in Mai, Script. vet. vii. pt. ii. 142); Paulus Alfraden, Commentarius in Matthew (in Opp. i. 162; also in Bibl. Patr. xiv.); Chromatius Aquilinius, Tractatus (in Galland, Bibl. Patr. viii. 383); Bede, Expositio (in Opp. v. 1); Anselm, Enarrationes (in Opp. ed. Pi-
Matthew (Matthew) of Paris, an English monk, of great celebrity as a chronicler of England's early history, was born about the end of the 12th century. He took the religious habit in the Benedictine monastery of St. Albans in 1157. About the only event of his life that has been recorded is a journey he made to Norway, by command of the pope, to introduce some reforms into the monastic establishments of that country, which mission he has the credit of having executed with great ability and success. He is said to have stored up in the faveur of the king and the abbots of St. Albans, and to have obtained various privileges for the University of Oxford through his influence with that king. His acquisitions embraced all the learning and science of his age; besides theology and history; oratory, poetry, painting, architecture, and a practical knowledge of mechanics, are reckoned among his accomplishments by his biographers or panegyrists. His memory is preserved mainly by his history of England, entitled Historia Major, really a continuation of a work begun at St. Albans by Roger of Wendover (who died in May, 1296), and who subsequently entitled his work Historia Minor, or Chronica Majora Sanci Albani. Roger's name, however, was obscured by that of our subject, Matthew of Paris, who, though he adopted the plan of Roger's work, really furnished a most valuable chronicle, especially of mediæval history. In the British Museum, and in the libraries of Corpus Christi and Beneficents colleges, Cambridge, there are manuscripts of an epitome, by Matthew of Paris himself, of his history, generally referred to by the names of the Historia Minor, or the Chronicum, which, bishop Nicholson says, contains several particulars of notes omitted in the larger history. This smaller work was for a long time ascribed to a Matthew of Westminster (q. v.). Of late, however, the question of authorship has been fairly settled by Sir Frederick Madden, who edited and published these chronicles. He pronounced the Westminster Matthew "a phantom who never existed," and observes that even the late Mr. Buckle was so deceived by the general tone of confidence manifested in quoting this writer that he characterized him as, after Frouard, the most celebrated historian of the 14th century. "The mystery of the Westminster Matthew," says his Life of Becket (Rev., Oct., 1860, p. 288), "has been happily unveiled by Sir Frederick Madden, whose correct anticipation is unexpectedly confirmed by his discovery of the original copy of the work, now in the Chetham Library at Manchester. This manuscript establishes beyond all doubt that the largest portion of the Flores Historiarum has been attributed to the pseudo Matthew of Westminster, was written at St. Albans, under the eye and by direction of Matthew of Paris, as an abridgment of his greater chronicle; and the text from the close of the year 1241 to about two years prior to the date of the original manuscript, after the death of the pseudo Matthew, was composed by a Westminster monk, that the entire work commences with the year 1140, the period about the time of the appearance of a papal schism, and the year in which the schism, though never formally recognised by the popes, was a matter of public talk, and the appearance of Matthew's work. The first portion of the manuscript, it is probable, was written at the request of a person of influence in the court of the church.
was afterwards attributed to a Matthew of Westminster, for the name of Matthew really belonged to Matthew of Paris, whilst the affix of Westminster was supplied by conjecture; and this pseudonym having been recognised by Bale and Joscelin, and adopted by archbishop Parker, the error has been perpetuated to our own times. The first editor of the work under this title is Matthew Parisiensis, Monachi Sancti Albani, Historia Anglicorum, sive ut vulgo dicitur, Historia Minor, item, ejusdem abbreviatio Chronicorum Angliae (published by the authority of the lords commissioners of her majesty's treasury, 1641, London, Longman, 1740, London, 1741). He was the first to have one of the manuscripts of bishop Parker (London, 1571, folio; reprinted at Lugur, Zürich, 1606; London, 1640 [or in some copies 1641], fol., by Dr. William Watte; Par. 1644, fol.; Lond. 1684, fol.). Watte's edition, which is sometimes divided into two volumes, contains, besides various readings and corrections, a work or works of the author never before printed, namely, his Duorum Officiorum Mercuriorum Regum (S. Albani Fundatorum) Vita, and his Vignati Trium Abbatum S. Albani Vitae, together with what he calls his Adhæcium to those treatises. "Matthew of Paris writes with considerable spirit and rhetorical display, a notable freedom of speech; and his work, which is continued to the death of Henry III (1272) by William Rahanger, another monk of the same abbey, has been the chief authority commonly relied upon for the history of that reign. Its spirit, however, is besmirched by that freeness and naughtiness in English; and from the freedom with which it inveighs against what he regards as the usurpations of the papal see, Romanist writers have always expressed strong dissatisfaction especially with his accounts of ecclesiastical affairs. With Prossean critics, on the other hand, Matthew of Paris has been a favorite in proportion to the dislike he has incurred from their opponents. At one time it was used to be affirmed by the Roman Catholics that the printed Matthew of Paris was in many things a mere modern fabrication of the Reformers; but Watte, by collating all the manuscript copies he could find, and noting the various readings, proved that there was no foundation for this charge" (Engl. Cyclop. s. v.). A translation of the History of Matthew of Paris, by Dr. Giles, forms a volume of Bohn's "Antiquarian Library," and the Flower of History of Roger of Wenvoe forms two volumes of the same series. See Oudin, Specul. Eccles. iii. 394 sq.; also Herzog, Rent-Kennzppabellen, i. 176; Wetzer u. Weitel, Kirchen-Lexikon, vi. 982; North British Rev. Oct. 1869, p. 119. See Room of Vindover.

Matthew of Westminster, an early English chronicler, flourished in the reign of Edward II. Nothing whatever is known of his personal history except that he was a monk of the Benedictine Abbey of Westminster. He is supposed to have died about 1267 or 1337. His chronicle, written in Latin, is entitled Flores Historiarum, pum Matthaeum Westmonasteriensem collecti, precipue de Rebus Britannie, ab Eboraco Mundi, usque ad annum 1307 (Lond. 1567; with additions, Prkk. 1911). Bohn has published an English version (Lond. 1852, 2 vols. 8vo.). Another work formerly ascribed to him is now definitely settled to be the production of Matthew of Paris (q. v.).

Matthew of York (Tobias), a noted English prelate, was born in Bristol in 1546. In childhood he manifested unusual talent, and was prepared for Oxford when only thirteen years of age. He took the bachelor's degree in 1563, and three years later, as master of a monastery, and immediately entered into "holy orders"—a young man much respected for his great learning, eloquence, sweet conversation, friendly disposition, and the sharpness of his wit. In 1568 he was made university orator; in 1570, canon of Christ Church and dean of Bath; in 1572, prebendary of Sarum and president of St. John's College, Oxford, and one of the queen's chaplains in ordinary. In 1588 he was installed dean of Durham, in 1595 he was created bishop of Durham, and in 1606 archbishop of York. He died at Cawood Castle March 29, 1628. The learning and piety of archbishop Matthew have been warmly eulogised by Camden. It is to be much lamented that his sermons, which are said to have been superior productions, were not preserved to us in print. The only publication of his is entitled Concilia Apostolicae (Oct. 1571, 1606; 1572, 1606), in which was there converted and joined the Missionary Baptist Church. In the winter of 1682-83 he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, after advising with his pastor and members of his own Church. Soon after he received license to preach. In the spring of 1864, the health of the pastor of the Buda Circuit failing, the circuit was vacated, and Matthew was appointed his successor. At the close of the year he was admitted on trial into the Illinois Conference, and returned to the Buda charge. From the Conference of 1866 to that of 1885 he was in charge of the Buda Station. At the Conference of 1886 he was appointed to Chillicothe, and there he labored most acceptably to the people and most successfully for the cause to which he gave his life. He died quite suddenly at this place, Aug. 1, 1889. "From his boyhood days he was a diligent student; from his esposure of the Talmud; and the Christ, a devoted and untiring friend from the time he received license to preach, a very zealous and successful minister of the Gospel. At Buda, his first charge, he sought and found the blessing of perfect love, and lived in the enjoyment of the blessing until the day of his death." See Conf. Minutes, 1889, p. 241.

Matthew, Henry, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Prince George County, Md. Blessed with pious and good parents, he was early led to Christ, and connected himself with Asbury Church, in Howard County. In 1849 he moved to Baltimore, and joined the Sharp Street Church. In 1851 he was licensed to preach, and in 1857 was ordained a local deacon. In 1864 he joined the Washington Conference, just then organizing, and was appointed to Gunpowder Circuit, where he labored with great zeal for three years; was then appointed to West River Circuit, and in 1870 was stationed at Andrews Monastery; but his health suddenly failed, and he was compelled to relinquish his arduous labors. He died Dec. 31, 1870. "Brother Matthew was a faithful, patient, and dependent minister. Wherever he went his solidity of character was acknowledged; and the firm faith which he himself was disposed in the doctrines he preached, and his prayerful reliance on God, stamped on his efforts an unsurpassed success." See Conf. Minutes, 1871, p. 28.

Matthew, John, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Beaver Co., Pa., Feb. 7, 1778. He enjoyed the advantages of a good parental training, graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1795, and took theology under Rev. Dr. John McMillan. He was licensed in 1809, and in 1810 ordained pastor of Gravel Run and Waterford churches; in 1817 he became an itinerating missionary, and took charge of the Church at Louisiana, Pike Co., Mo., where he continued itinerating, especially among the Missouri Indians until 1825, when he settled at Apple Creek Church, in Cape Girardeau Co., Mo.; in 1827 he took charge of the Church at Kaskaskia, Ill., thence went to Missouri, where he labored till his health failed, and then removed to George Town, Ill., where he died May 12, 1861. Mr. Matthew was characterized by a cheerful and warm-hearted disposition. As a pastor he was faithful and zealous; as a friend, kind and affectionate. See Wilson, Prefi. Hist. Amealas, 1862, p. 102.
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William, a Quaker preacher, was born in Stafford Co., Va., in 1732. His parents died when he was quite young. He entered the ministry at twenty-three years of age, and gave convincing evidence of sound judgment and great Christian piety. He spent several years in ministerial work in England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. The exact date of his death is not known. See Jenney, Hist. of Friends, iii, 398.

Matthew's Day. A festal day observed in the Roman Catholic and the Anglican churches on Sept. 21, and in the Greek churches on Nov. 16, mentioned in St. Jerome's Cateches, and was first generally observed in the 11th century.—Walcott, Sac. Archæol. s. v.

Matthiæ, Johann, a noted Swedish prelate, was born in Ostrogotia in 1592, and after enjoying the best educational advantages of his country, entered the ministry. After filling several important positions, he became court preacher and almoner to Gustavus Adolphus. He was next appointed preceptor to Christina, the daughter of that monarch, and was created bishop of Strängnäs in 1643. He died in 1670. Matthiæ wrote several moral and theological works, the most important of which are, Opuscula Theologica (Strängnäs, 1661, 8vo), Disquisitiones Theologicae, re Disputationum, athenæ et suacentiis (Stockholm, 1668, 4to). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gèn. vol. xxxiii., s. v.

Matthias (MarSiæq) a contraction of Matthew or Mathew, a form frequently met with in Josephus [see below], one of the constant attendants from the first upon our Lord's ministry, who was chosen by lot, in preference to Joseph Barnabas, into the number of the apostles, to supply the vacancy caused by the treachery and suicide of Judas (Acts i, 23-26). A.D. 29. We may accept as probable the opinion which is shared by Eusebius (H. E. lib. i, 19) and Ephraimanius (i, 20) that he was one of the seventy disciples whom our Lord is said to have preached the Gospel in Ethiopia (Niceph, ii, 40; accord. to Sophronius, "in altera Ethiopia," i. e. Colchis; comp. Collar. Notit. ii, 809), or Cappadocia accord. to Cave, and to have at last suffered martyrdom (comp. Menæoly. Græc. iii, 198). According to another tradition, he preached in Judæa, and was stoned to death by the Jews (see Pionii Via Apostol. p. 178; Acta Sanctorum, Feb. 24; comp. Augustini, Denkewürdigk. iii, 241). There was early an apocryphal gospel bearing his name (Eusebius, H. E. iii, 25, 3; Clemens Alex. Strom. i, 16, vii, 318; Græcilis, Apologet. patr. ii, 1, p. 117; Fauber Cod. cod. N. T. i, 260). Different opinions have prevailed as to the manner of the election of Matthias. The most natural construction of the words of Scripture seems to be this: After the address of Peter, the whole assembled body of the brethren, amounting to number to about 120 (Acts i, 15), proceeded to nominate two, namely, Joseph, sur-named Barnabas, and Matthias, who answered the requirements of an apostle: the subsequent selection between the two was referred in prayer to him who, knowing the hearts of men, knew which of them was the fitter to be his witness and apostle. The brethren then, under the heavenly guidance which they had invoked, proceeded to give forth their lots, probably by each writing the name of one of the candidates on a tablet, and casting it into the urn. The urn was then shaken, and its contents were cast from it, that first came out determined the election. Lightfoot (Hor. Heb. Luc. i, 9) describes another way of casting lots which was used in assigning to the priests their several parts in the service of the Temple. The apostles, it will be remembered, had not yet received the gift of the Holy Ghost, and this solemn mode of casting the lots, in accordance with a practice enjoined in the Levitical law (Lev. xvi, 8), is to be regarded as a way of referring the decision to God (comp. Prov. xvi, 33). Chrysostom remarks that it was never repeated after the descent of the Holy Spirit. The election of Matthias is discussed by bishop Beveridge (Works, vol. i, serm. 2). It would seem, however, that Paul was the divine appointee to fill the vacancy in the college of the apostles. Monographs in Latin on his election have been written by Scharff (Viteb, 1652), Bittel-mair (III, 1670), and Honour maschmuid (Prag, 1760).

MATTHIAS is likewise the name of one person mentioned in the Apocalypse (MarSiæq) and of several in Josephus (MarSiæg), especially as Jewish high-priests.

2. Given (1 Esdr. ix, 38) in place of the Heb. Mat-tathiah (Ezra x, 38).

2. A son of Ananus, made high-priest by Agrippa (soon after the appointment of Petronius as president of Syria), in place of Simon Cantharos, after that honor had been declined by Jonathan as a second term (Josephus, Antiq. xix, 4).

3. Son of Theophilus of Jerusalem, made high-priest by Herod in place of Simon, son of Boethius (Ant. xviii, 4, 2); removed again by Herod to make room for Joaaz (ib. 6, 4, where Josephus relates his temporary disqualification on the day of annual atonement), and again reinstated by Agrippa in place of Jesus, son of Gamaliel (ib. xx, 9, 7).

Josephus likewise mentions Matthias, son of Boethius, as "one of the high-priests" betrayed by Simon during the last siege of Jerusalem (War, v, 8, 1), but it does not appear whether he was one of the above. See High-priests.

Matthias, a religious impostor whose real name was Robert Matthews, was born in Washington County, N. Y., about 1700. He kept a country store, but failed in 1816, and went to New York City. In 1827 he removed to Albany, where he became much excited by the preaching of Moses Kirk and Finney; made himself active in the temperance cause; claimed to have received a revelation, and began street-preaching; failing to convert Albany, he prophesied its destruction, and fled secretly to New York City, where he was tried and acquitted on the charge of poisoning a wealthy disciple in whose family he had lived. His impostures exposed, he soon disappeared from public view. See Matthews and his Impostures, by W. L. Stone (New York, 1835).

Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s. v.

Matthias Corvinus, king of Hungary, second son of John Hunyadi (q. v.), was born in 1443, and came to the throne in 1448. His accession was hailed with the utmost enthusiasm over the whole country. But the Hungarian crown at this time was no cheaper than roses; open warfare was the order of the day, and the Turks, who had ravaged the country as far as Temesvár, inflicted upon them a bloody defeat, pursued them as far as Bos-nia, took the stronghold Szeja, there liberated 10,000 Christian prisoners, and then returned to Weisenberg, to be crowned with the sacred crown of St. Stephen, in 1456. He next suppressed the disorders of Wallachia and Moldavia; but feeling that his plans were counteracted by the intrigues of the emperor Frederick III to gain possession of Hungary, Matthias besought the assistance of pope Pius II, but to no purpose. After a second successful campaign against the Turks, he next turned his attention to the encouragement of arts and letters, and adorned his capital with the works of renowned sculptors, in addition to a library of 50,000 volumes. He sent a large staff of literary men to Italy for the purpose of obtaining copies of valuable MSS. (even now the Codex Petropolitanus, which was celebrated), and adorned his court by the presence of the most eminent men of Italy and Germany. He was himself an author of no mean ability, and possessed a delicate appreciation of the fine arts. At the same time the affairs of government were not neglected. The finances were brought into a flour-
Matthias was also influenced especially by pope Pius II and his successor, Paul II. See HUSSEK, vol. 1, especially p. 424, col. 2. After a bloody contest of seven years' duration between these kings, the greatest generals of the age, the Hungarian power prevailed, and Moravia, Silesia, and Lusatia were wrested from Bohemia. A third war with the Turks closed as successfully as the former two. The emperor also was humiliated by Matthias, and expiated his guilt in poverty and disgrace. Matthias was suddenly cut down in the midst of his successes at Vienna, April 5, 1490. See Butler, Eccles. Hist. iii; 370 sqq. See LABIEBAS OF POLAND: PIUS II.

Matthias of Kunwald, one of the first ministers of the Ancient Moravian Brethren (q. v.), flourished in the 16th century. He was appointed at the Synod of Lhotá, in Bohemia, in 1467. On that occasion nine men, of high repute for piety, were elected by ballot. Three were prepared, nine were blank, and three inscribed with the Bohemian word Jest (He is). Thereupon a fervent prayer was offered up beseeching God to designate of these nine nominees, either one, or two, or three, as the ministers of the Church; but, if this should not be the time which he had ordained for such a consummation, to cause all the nine to receive blank cards. In this event the Brethren would have deferred further action to some future period. Nine lots having been drawn singly from a vase and given to the nominees, it appeared that Matthias of Kunwald, Thomas of Preuß, and Elias of Chrenovic, had each received one marked Jest. The synod rose to its feet, sang a thanksgiving hymn, composed for the occasion, and accepted these three men as the future ministers of the Church. In the same year, after the episcopacy had been secured, Matthias, although only twenty-five years of age, was consecrated a bishop, and, upon the resignation of bishop Michael, became president of the Church Council. He administered its affairs, according to the extreme views of discipline entertained by Gregory (q. v.), until 1494, when he resigned his presidency and returned to the liberal party. While on his way to a synod in Moravia, he died at Leipzig, after having, in his last will and testament, which he addressed to the Brethren, exhorted them to avoid schisms, and to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. He was buried at Praha. (E. de S.)

Matthias I, emperor of Germany, son of Maximilian II and Mary, daughter of Charles V, deserves a place here because of his relation to one of the most eventful periods in the earliest stages of modern history. He was born in 1557. In 1578 he was invited by the Romanists of the Netherlands to assume the government of that country, but he held the position only a short time. He was appointed stadtholder of Austria in 1585, and in 1611 was invited by the Bohemians to become their ruler. On the death of his brother Rudolf, emperor of Germany, in 1612, he succeeded to the throne, and was called upon to sit in judgment between Protestant and Romanist in the ensuing contest between these two great sects of the Christian Church; but the proceedings of his policy, and, while striving to direct, made himself distrusted by both. He concluded a disadvantageous treaty with the Turks, then in possession of Hungary (1615), and soon after caused his cousin Ferdinando to be proclaimed king of Bohemia and Hungary. In the midst of the disturbed conditions which prevailed during the Thirty Years' War he died, in 1619. See Kuehnebultler, Anales Ferdinandi; P. Santorius, Vite di Ridolfo e Mattia Imperatori (1664); Vehse, Memoire of the Court of Austr. Bernhurst, i, 1688, ii, 66 sq.; Kohlrauch, Hist. of Germany, p. 311 sqq. See also Thirty Years' War.

Matthias, John B., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Germantown, Pa., Jan. 1, 1767; was converted while residing in New York, after his majority; was there licensed to preach in 1788; preached much and with excellent success as a local deacon until 1811, when he joined the itinerancy. Thereafter he labored very usefully until 1841, when, because of infirmities and the constant necessity of extra work, he retired to his pastoral charge of Williamsville, New York, and there labored very usefully until 1843. He lived in great godliness and usefulness, and was held in great esteem. In 1843, he removed to the Oriskany District, but lived there only a short time. He died, Oct. 27, 1843.

Matthias, John J., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at New York Jan. 17, 1796. His childhood home was near by, and nearly all youth were spent among the Methodists at Greenwich, etc. He came to New York in 1825 and entered upon the ministry when twenty-one years old, in the New York Conference at Gothenburg. In 1818 he was appointed to Pittsfield Circuit; in 1819 to Stockton; in 1820 to Leyden; in 1821 and 1822 to Cortlandt; in 1823 to Middlebury, Vt.; in 1824 to St. Albans; in 1825 to Pittsfield; in 1826 to Cortlandt. He was stationed in the city of New York in 1827 and 1828, and in the city of Albany in 1829 and 1830; was transferred to the Philadelphia Conference in 1831, and stationed in the city of New York. In 1835, 1838, and 1839 he travelled the East Jersey District; in 1836 he was stationed at the Nazareth Church, in the city of Philadelphia. His health failing, he took a superannuated relation, and continued to hold it until 1841.

While sustaining this relation to his Conference, the Pennsylvania and New York Colonization Societies appointed him governor of Massas GG (then called) West Coast of Africa, and in 1841 he was appointed to the colony of African about a year, but, subject to severe suffering by the African fever, he returned to the States. In 1842 he was reappointed to the New York Conference, and stationed at Flushing, L. I.; in 1848 at Rockaway; in 1844 to the charge of the Governor of the New York District, and stationed at Flushing, L. I.; in 1848 and 1849 was stationed in Williamsburg; in 1850 and 1851 in the Twenty-seventh Street Church, New York; in 1852 was superannuated at Hempstead, L. I.; but was given an effective relation in 1853, and stationed at Jamaica. In 1854 he was obliged again to superannuate, but his relation was changed to effective at the ensuing Conference, and in 1851 to 1857 served as chaplain to the Seamen's Friend Retreat on Staten Island. "He was held in high esteem by the managers and officers of that institution. At the bedside of the sick and in his chapel services he was found to be well adapted to the duties of his office." The tax upon his sympathies and the labors of the position were more than his enfeebled health could sustain, and in 1858 he resigned the chaplaincy, and received a superannuated relation. He retired to a quiet and comfortable residence near by, and there spent his declining years. He died at the age of eighty-five years, in 1861, and was buried at the Klunk Street Cemetery. Few ministers have a longer or more worthy record than this. Some of these fields of labor were very arduous, others of them very responsible. In all of them he was faithful and usefulness. He was a high-minded, intelligent, and honorable man. His tastes were refined, his feelings delicate, his conversation chaste, and his manners dignified but affable. His
Christian Restoration is without blemish. He possessed the disciplinary attributes of a minister—"gifts, grace, and usefulness." His preaching was practical and experimental. He sought his audience and succeeded in leading the members of his Church to a higher spiritual state, and a holy, active, religious life. As a pastor he had few superiors. Gentle, affectionate, and sympatetic in his manners, his pastoral visits were highly praised by his flock. He was a man of the people. He was the head and the heart of the school and the church, and the backbone of the church. He was the leader of the church, and the backbone of the nation. His publications embraced a range from the little Sunday-school card to the stately volume, all intended to aid the public movement in favor of temperance, and in opposition to slavery and Romanism. He was too much the life of the world to admit of a summing up in the space allotted to this brief sketch. We need only say that to know him, especially to know him well, was to admire, esteem, and love him as a man, a friend, a scholar, a minister, a hero, a Christian. Bishop Thomson, in his introduction to the writer's life and works, says: "Matthew's life is the very epitome of the Baptist, and delineates him: "Before the world he stood as the able preacher, the gifted writer, the stern controversialist, the unsparring antagonist; but he was not without the gentler and more attractive elements of character. He was an able, communicative, emotional companion, a generous friend, and loving husband and father."

From his rough heart a babe could press Soft milk of human tenderness.

On all the storms of his life were rainbows, but only his intimate friends were in position to see them." His first book, "The Original Defence of the Doctrines of the Trinity," a small volume issued in 1848, and to which saulum in parco was peculiarly applicable. In the same year he began his publication of Tracts for the Times, which at length grew into a small but piquant monthly, called after the Museums, and afterwards the Primitive Christians. In 1866 he published a work on Astronomy, with large astronomical maps—a work of rare merit and popularity. Soon after he issued his Elementary Astronomy, and in 1850 edited a new and improved edition of Barrett's Geography of the Heavens, for which he is spoken of as one of the most competent astronomers in the country." In 1858 he published his High-School Astronomy, and the same year was associated with Prof. J. B. Woodbury in bringing out a music-book, The Lute of Zion, which, becoming widely popular, led in a short time to an enlarged edition under the title of New Lute of Zion. The next year his work on Spiritual Rappings was issued, and bad a large circulation. In 1856 his celebrated controversy with Dr. J. H. Perry, on the Wesleyan Doctrine of Christian Perfection, was published in successive pamphlets. Three years later he published a book which was elevated to the rank of a classic, and for use on all occasions of public worship; and the same year also sent forth his Impending Crisis, a stout pamphlet of pungent facts and impassioned appeals on the slavery question. In 1864 his Minister's Pocket Manual was published, and within the next two years followed (in 1866, with the aid of R. B. Smith) the compilation of his famous work, Immortality of the Soul, and Resurrection of the Body, books of superior and permanent value. During 1866 he published Select Lessons from the Holy Scriptures, and his Defence of American Methodism, and in the next year a timely treatise on Forgivness and the Resurrection of the Dead. The year 1868, the last of his life, was perhaps the busiest, and the most prolific of result in the line of authorship. Besides editing and bringing through the press the work on Perfect Love, he wrote and published Mary Ann Smith, and a surprising number of other works on Romanism, from the tract of a few pages to the heavy pamphlet. He left an unfinished treatise on Depravity in its Relation to Entire Sanctification, and the outlines of several other theological works. His contributions to the periodical press were abundant and able. He was the most prolific writer of a series of articles and notes, and among his issues from the press were various Church and Sunday-school requisites. He composed with remarkable ease and rapidity, and seldom rewrote a sentence or even a word. His busy life suddenly closed at his residence, Jersey City, N.J., in a signal proclaim death, February 3rd, 1886, aged 67 years. His life and work are described in the Spurgeon of May 5th; also Work Here, Rest Hereafter, or the Life

Mattison, Seth, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Shaftesbury, Vt., Feb. 22, 1788; joined the Methodist Church in 1865; entered the Genesee Conference in 1810; and died Oct. 18, 1845, having preached with eminent usefulness and great holiness the Gospel of Christ for thirty-four years. Minutes of Conferences, iii, 645.

Mattison, Spencer, A.M., a Methodist Episcopal minister and educator, was born at Plainfield, N. Y., Aug. 2, 1806; was converted in 1825; graduated, with first honors, at Middlebury College, Vt., in 1835; joined Troy Conference the same year, but on his second charge his health failed, and he went to Georgia. On recovery he spent five years there as principal of Vineville Academy, and then rejoined the Troy Conference in 1842. In 1846 he was elected professor of ancient languages and literature in M'Kendree College, Illinois, where he spent six years, and then resigned and re-entered the regular work of the ministry, but at the close of a year he accepted the principalship of Rock River Seminary, Mount Morris, Ill. His health again failed, and he died Nov. 5, 1858. Professor Mattison was an excellent linguist and instructor, and greatly beloved by his pupils. He was a minister of fine talents and uniform piety, and a most accomplished Christian gentleman. Minutes of Conferences, v, 465. (G. L. T.)

Mattithi'ah (Heb. Mattityah'; מַטְתִּיָּהוּ, gift of Jehovah; compare τόδετος, Theodore; also in the prolonged form Mattia'has, מַטְתִּיָּחַס, 1 Chron. xv, 21; xxiv, 3, 31; Sept. Mattasia, but in Ezra x, 48 Mattasias v. Mattasia; so also Mattasia, i Macc. ii, 1; Luke iii, 25, 26) the name of three or four men in the Old Testament and of one or two (Auth. Vers. "Matthaius") in the New. See also Mattathiah; Matthew; Matthias, etc.; and especially Mattathiah.

1. One of the sons of the Levite Jeduthun, appointed by David chief of the fourteenth section of the Temple musicians (1 Chron. xxv, 3, 21). B.C. 1014. He is probably the same with one of the Levitical wardens who were assigned to the performance of the sacred anthems on the removal of the sacred ark to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xvi, 21; xvi, 5). B.C. cir. 1048.

2. An Israelite of the "sons" (residents) of Nebo, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Babylonian exile (Ezra x, 48). B.C. 459. He was possibly identical with No. 4.

3. The eldest son of Shallum, a Levite of the family of Korah, who had charge of the baked offerings of the Temple on the re-establishment after the exile (1 Chron. ix, 81). B.C. cir. 440.

4. One of those (apparently chief Israelites) who supported Ezra on the right hand while reading the law to the people after the captivity (Neh. viii, 4). B.C. cir. 410.

5. A person named in Luke iii, 26 as the son of Semel, among the maternal ancestors of Jesus; but as no such name appears in the parallel passages of the Old Testament and would here unduly protract the interval limited by other intimations of the generations, it is probably interpolated from No. 6. (See Strong's H.'arm. and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 16.)


Mattock, an old English name for an agricultural implement like a pickaxe with a wide point, for grubbing up and digging out roots and stones, is the rendering adopted in the Auth. Ver. for three Hebrew words. מַדֶּר (mader', an instrument for dressing or pruning a vineyard; occurs only in Isa. vii, 25) denotes a weed-
MAUDUIT

elected prior (Nov., 1500), then regular abbot by the resignation of Nicholas de Haequeville in his favor (Jan., 1602). The zeal of Maulburm was not confined to his own order; he was interested in the Benedictine, and labored much for the reformation of the congregation of Chézal, which served as a model to the houses of Saint-Vanne and Saint-Maur. Taken ill in consequence of the fatigue caused by his religious labors, he was carried to Paris, and died there about the beginning of the month of June. He included among his works "Sancta Francisci de Paule, Geoffroi de Bousard, chancellor of Notre-Dame of Paris; the bishop Louis Pinel, Pierre de Bruges, and probably Erasmus, who addressed several letters to him. His principal works are, Rosarium exercitium (Maulbronn, margrave of Baden and hessians [Bale, 1491, et al.]). "This book," says Gene, "is the first where some passages of the Imitation have been introduced and given under the name of Kemps. -- Venatorio investigatatorium sanctorum omnium ordinis, a historical manuscript which appears to be an abridgment of that of Bischies, and in which Maulburm again attributes to Kemps the book Qui sequiut me of the Imitation. We find in the ancient Gallia Christiana (vii, col. 281-282) two letters addressed to this priest by Erasmus, and written at Paris. See Swart, Athenes Belgica, p. 325; Neerland, Neerland, Flacius Illici, Sander, Biblioth. Belgica; Gallia Christiana, vii, 383-389; Moret, Grand Dict. Hist. s. v.; Paquot, Memoires, vol. iii. Hist. des Dogmes, s. v., Hoeser, Nouv. Biog. Genev., s. v."

Maulbronn, a learned French theologian, was born at Vire, Normandy, in 1644. While still young he entered the brotherhood of the Oratorians, where for a long time he studied the classics; then he devoted himself to preaching, and instructing the country people. The study of the Bible occupied the remainder of his life. He possessed a great variety of knowledge, understood Greek well, also Hebrew and Latin, and obtained many prizes in the academic competitions of Rouen and Caen. He died at Paris January 19, 1706. Of Maulbronn's works we have Traité de religion contre les Athées, Les Deistes et les nouveaux Pyrhomians (Paris, 1677, 12mo); the 2d edition (1698) has been greatly enlarged: -- Milanges de diverses pieces; discours en IV lieux (Lyons; the edition of 1725, 12mo, is preferable on account of the additions to it). We find in this a well-written preface on the good use of poetry: -- Dissertation sur le sujet de la goutte, with the moyens de l'en garer (Paris, 1687, 1689, 12mo) -- Analyse des Épitres de Saint Paul et des Épitres canoniques, with Des dissertation sur les endroits difficiles (Paris, 1691, 2 vols. 12mo; reprinted in 1702). -- Analyse de l'Esquifon selon l'ordre historique de la concorde (Paris, 1695, 3 vols. 12mo, et al.). This work, to which the author devoted nearly all his life, has had many editions (later editions, Malines, 1821, 7 vol. 12mo; Paris, 1843-44, 4 vol. 8vo): -- Analyse des Actes des Apotres (Paris, 1657, 2 vol. 12mo) -- Méditations sur une retraite ecclésiastique de dix jours (Lyons, 1729, 12mo). Maulbronn also left in M.S., Analyse de l'Aposcalypse and Traduction complète du Nouveau Testament. See Mercure de France, May, 1709; Moret, Dict. Hist. s. v.; Hoeser, Nouvelle Biog. Genev., s. v.

Mauermann, Franz Lauf, a German Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Neunelle in 1789; entered the priesthood in 1797, and, after filling various positions, was in 1825 made chaplain to the royal house of Saxony, and in 1827 presbyer of the Roman Catholic Consistory of the kingdom. In 1842 he was made bishop of Eisleben and confessor of the royal house of Saxony. Later he became apostolic vicar. He died in October, 1845. -- Regensburger Recht-Encyklopädie, s. v.

Maul or Mall is an old name for a hammer or mallet, and stands in the Auth. Vers. for the Heb. יָּחַל (mephit), only occurs in Prov. xxv, 18; but kindred is יָּחַל, mappetis, "battle-axe," Jer. ii, 39; both from יָּחַל, or יָּחַל, to break in pieces, a war-club, such as was ancient in common use, and even in the Middle Ages, the memory of which is still preserved in the modern mace as a sign of authority. "Probably such was that which is said to have suggested the name of Charles Martel. The mace is frequently mentioned in the accounts of the wars of the Europeans with Saracens, Turks, and other Orientals, and several kinds are still in use among the Bedouin Arabs of remoter parts (Burckhardt, Notes on Bedouins, i, 55). In their European wars the Turks were notorious for the use they made of the mace (Knollys, Hist. of the Turks) (Smith). Various kinds of maces were used by the ancient Egyptians, either with or without a ball at the end to give weight to the blow, and generally with a guard at the handle. The curved club or throw-stick, the Arabian hadis or "tonguey" is a very general Oriental weapon.

Ancient Throw-sticks: 1, Egyptian; 2, Assyrian.

Among the Australians, this implement is yet a formidable one, called the boomerang. Unmistakable traces of its use occur on the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments (Wilkinson, Anc. Eng. i, 365; Bonomi, Nissoch, p. 134-6). See Armor.

Maulbronn, originally a Cistercian convent in the bishopric of Speier, was founded by bishop Gunther of Speier, on a tract of land given him by Walther von Lomersheim in 1148, previously infested with robbers. The convent soon became very rich, partly through donations, and partly by the zeal and activity of the monks. It was at first placed under the jurisdiction of the empire, by Frederick I and other emperors, but in the 14th century was placed under that of the Palatinate. In 1604 it was conquered by duke Ulrich of Württemberg, and when the Reformation commenced, it was appointed by him for the monks of his province who wished to remain Roman Catholics; duke Christopher, in 1657, took this also from them, appointed an evangelical abbot, and established a school in it. It is yet the seat of one of the four minor theological seminaries. The remaining portions of the building, i.e., the church, cloisters, entrance-hall, and refectory, are considered among the finest specimens of German Gothic architecture. The place has become renowned in the annals of Protestantism by its connection with two important transactions, the Collegium Maulbronnense, in 1564, and the Formula Maulbronnensis, in 1576. (1) The introduction of Calvinism into the Palatinate by duke Frederick III after 1560, and in particular the publication of the Heidelberg Catechism in 1563, provoked great opposition on the part of the Lutherans. The authorities, and especially duke Christopher of Württemberg, Wolfgang of Pfalzneuburg, and margrave Charles of Baden, mainly endeavored to heal the dissension by means of a colloquy held between the theologians of the Palatinate and Württemberg at Maulbronn in 1564. The elector of the Palatinate was accompanied by his court preacher, M. Michael Diller, and the theologians Dr. Peter Boquin, Caspar Olevian, Zacharias Ursinus, and Peter Dathenus; also the church counselor Thomas Erastus, chancellor Dr. Eheim, and notary Wilhelm Xylader, professor of Greek at Heidelberg. The representatives of Württemberg were Valentin
Vannius, abbot of Maulbronn, Johannes Brenz, provost of Stuttgart, Jacob Andreis, provost and chancellor of the University of Tubingen, Dietrich Schnepf, professor at Tubingen, and the court preacher Balthasar Bidebend; also as notary, Lucas Osianer, then preacher at Stuttgart, and as civil counselor and chancellor of the county of Heilbronn, Johann Fries, canon of St. Mary's Church. The colloquy lasted from April 10th to April 16th. Chancellor Eheimm, in his opening speech, invited the theologians, since the object of the conference was to heal their dissensions, to avoid all merely human views and arguments, and to confine themselves to the positive testimony of Scripture on the points of controversy. Yet, instead of treating of the doctrine of the Eucharist, which was their chief point of difference, the theologians at once launched into arguments concerning the ubiquity, or, as Andreis termed it, the majestasnullo loco circumspecta, of the body of Christ. Thus all possibility of harmony was at once destroyed. During eight sessions this same question was discussed without either party coming any nearer to the views of the other. The theologians of the Palatinate, and in particular Boquin, Olevian, and Ursin, partly denied the importance of the doctrine of the ubiquity of the body of Christ, and partly refuted their opponents by the Scriptures, the articles of faith, and by an exposi of the errors into which these principles must lead. Those of Wurtemberg tried especially to defend the idea of the ubiquity of Christ's body from mere human representation and to treat it as a necessary consequence of unio personalis and the communicatio idiomatum; they rejected the accusation of mixing up the two natures, and accused their opponents of making a mere man of Christ. As the others said when, in their view, the body of Christ was considered as omnipresent even in the womb, Andreis, who was spokesman of the Wurtemberg party, drew a distinction between the possession and the use of the attribute, and asserted that Christ could not have been omnipresent in the womb, but only became so actually after his ascension—a view which the Heidelberg theologians rejected as contrary to reason and unsupported by Scripture.

At the last two sessions, finally, the question of the Eucharist was discussed, as the princes wished that the two parties should seek to arrive at some understanding concerning this important point, leaving aside all Christological questions. Yet, after a few very speeches, the question of ubiquity was again started, this time by the Reformed theologians, and the discussion receded to its original ground. The colloquy now came to a close. The parties agreed and separated, and the two parties separated, each holding as firmly to its own views as previously to the meeting, and considering itself as having obtained the advantage. In spite of the promise of secrecy, the Heidelberg theologians boasted of having silenced their opponents, claiming even that Duke Christoper himself was now more inclined to their doctrines. The Wurtemberg party would not brook this, and Brenz wrote an account of the colloquy, denying the statements of the Heidelbergians, which was at first circulated privately, and was finally printed in 1565, under the title of Maulbronnensis inter theologos Heidelbergenses et Wurtembergenses de Cena Domini et Majestate Christi, and also in Wahrhaftiger u. gründlicher Bericht v. d. Ge spräch, etc. gestellt durch d. Württembergischen Theol ogen (Frankfort, 1564, 4to); in these works he accused his opponent of having had recourse to sophistry, and, when they found it impossible longer to defend their views, to have caused the colloquy to be brought to a close. Heidelberg answered by the Epitome collog. Maulbr., cum responsione Palatinorum ad epi. Würt temberg. (4to), and published the same year the time of the protocol of the conference, which was followed up by the opposite party with a new edition of the protocols, "without changes or additions" (Tubingen, 1565, 4to). Both parties now accused each other of interposing the protocols. The theologians of Wittenberg were also drawn into the quarrel, as duke Christopher submitted them to the protocols of Maulbronn and the De Majestate Christi of Andreis and Brenz, both of which they severely condemned. The dispute lasted for several years, finally at rest by the wise and Christian efforts of elector Frederick the Wise of Sax onburg in 1566. See Osianer, Histor. ecccl. cent. xvi, c. 59, p. 791; Struve, J.fylla. K. Hist. p. 149 sq.; Hos pinian, Hist. sacr. t. ii; Arnold, Unsp. K. Hist. cent. xvii, § 17, p. 14; Sattler, Gesch. d. Herzogth. Württem berg, iv, 207 sq.; Pflil, Gesch. d. Prot. Lehrbegr., vol. v, pt. ii, p. 487 sq.; Heppe, Gesch. des deutschen Pro test. ii, 71 sq.; KIinquinger, D. Religionsgesch. zu M. (Zeitschr. f. histor. Theol. 1849, i, 166 sq.); Leben u. ausgewählte Schrift. d. Väter, etc., d. refor. Kirche (Elberfeld, 1857, p. 366).

(3.) Another conference, held twelve years later at Maulbronn, between theologians from Wurtemberg, Baden, and Heumenne, secured a better result. The theologians were L. Osianer, Balthasar, Bidebend, provost of Stuttgart, Abel Scherdinger, court preacher of Heumenne, Peter Streckor, pastor at Suhl, and some others. The object of the conference was to discuss a formula of union drawn up by Osianer and Bidebend. The meeting took place Jan. 19, 1576, and the formula itself, which may be considered as a forerunner of the Formula Conciliari, received the name of Formula Maulbronnensis. At the conclusion of the meeting the two parties sent, together with an address by count George Ernest of Heumenne, to the elector August of Saxony, who received also about the same time the so-called Saxon and Formula of duke Julius of Brunswick. The elector submitted them both to Andreis, who declared that, in his opinion, the formula of Maulbronn was the most serviceable for the purpose of uniting the different parties. Yet in the conference held at Torgau, May 29, Andreis consented to use nominally the other formula as a basis, but took good care to include all the principal points of the Maulbronn formula into the so-called Book of Torgau. See Hutter, Concord. conc. p. 305 sq.; Osian er, Hist. Ecccl. cent. xvi, lib. iv, pt. iii, p. 806; Planck, Gesch. d. protest. Lehrbegr. vi, 428; Hepe, Gesch. d. thuth. Concordienformel, 1858, p. 78 sq.

(3.) In September of the same year (1556), still another meeting was held at Maulbronn, in which Heerbrand, Schneip, Magirus, Bidebend, L. Osianer, Dietz, Scherdinger, and Strecker took part. Its object was to discuss the Book of Torgau, and it ended in expressing its approbation of it as a whole. See Hepe, Gesch. d. thuth. Concordienformel, p. 78 sq.—Hertzog, Reis.-Encyklop. ix, 178 sq. (J. N. P.)

Maulmont (or Malmont), Jean de, a learned Frenchman, was born in Limousin, in the 16th century, of an ancient noble family, which possessed one of the baronies of Limousin, the chateau of Maulmont. Of his personal history but little is known except that he was principal of the College of Saint-Michel, otherwise called Chanac, which had been founded in 1530 by the Pompadour house for the Limousin students. According to La Croix du Maine, "Maulmont was a very learned writer under the title of many laquers as a Greek, a great theologian, and a prolific orator." He was an intimate friend of Julius Scaliger. Many of his contemporaries have pretended that he was the true author of the translation of Plutarch which bears the name of Amyot; this assertion is testified to by La Monnoye in a note on L'Ame-Beaute de Menage. We have of Maulmont's works, Les Oeuvres de Saint Justin, philosophe et martyr (Paris, 1588, fol.):—Les Histories et Chroniques du monde, factes tant du gros volume de Jean Zonare, auteur Dyonisien, que de plusieurs autres (Tours, 1568, fol.);—Les annales de l'empe- reur Ferdinand au Pape Pie IV sur le Concile de Trente (Paris, 1568, 8vo);—Rememoires Chretiens en forme d'Epitre a la reine d'Angleterre, trad. du Lat.
MAUR de Histoire des Oeuvres, époque portugaise (Paris, 1688, 8vo). The same author has written in Italian a life of René de Birague, chancellor of France, who died in 1588, and the Gallia Christiana quotes it as a correct and useful work. See La Croix du Maine et Du Verdier, Bibliothèque Française; Goujet, Bibliothèque Française, vol. xii: Gallia Christiana, vi, 571.—Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, vol. xxxiv, 6 v.

MAURANDY, also known under the term DIES CENA DOMINICE (q.v.), is the name given to the Thursday before Easter. The origin of this name is Dies mandatu —madiate Thursday; either from the commandment which our Saviour gave to his disciples to commemorate the sacrifice of his supper, which he instituted on this day (hence dies mensis, day of bread; and dies lucis, day of light); or because on this day our Saviour washed his disciples' feet, and gave them commandment to follow his example. Others derive it from the Saxon mand, which means a basket, and subsequently any gift or offering contained in the basket. On this day penitents who had been put out of the Church on Ash-Wednesday were readmitted. There was also a general celebration of the Lord's Supper, with which the ceremony of washing the feet was connected.

Candidates for baptism publicly recited the Creed. The origin of this practice is generally put to the 7th century, but Riddle (Christian Antiquités, p. 669) contends that "it appears to have been of much earlier institution." See Pediatum.

Maunoir, Joliffe, a learned French ecclesiastic, was born Oct. 1, 1606, in the province of Saint-Georges de Reinhembault, diocese of Rennes. At the age of twenty he entered the Order of the Jesuits at Paris, and finished his studies at La Flèche. A professorship in the College of Quimper was offered him, but he preferred to preach, and accordingly entered the ministry. He studied the dialect of Brittany, began to travel over the country, and displayed so much zeal in his preaching that his health became impaired, and he was obliged to resume the career of teaching, which he followed at Tours. After having been ordained at Nevers, he consecrated the remainder of his life, according to a vow that he had made, to the evangelization of Brittany. For forty-two consecutive years Maunoir labored for the accomplishment of his project. Unmoved by the injury and violence with which his devotion was often repaid, accepting or imposing on himself the rudest privations, travelling on foot, with a wallet on his shoulders, and carrying only the clothing and nourishment absolutely indispensable, he visited successively and repeatedly nearly all the parishes in the dioceses of Cornouaille and Léon, the islands of Ouessant, of Molène, of Sizène, etc., mentioning a great number of localities in the other dioceses of Brittany, and everywhere his preaching was attended with success. He died Jan. 29, 1683, at Plein, near Guincamp. In accordance with his expressed desire, he was buried like a pauper, but later a site was erected to him in the church of Plein. With the triple object in view of understanding thoroughly a language so indispensable to him, of partaking of it from the mixed dialect used by the people, and of generalizing the learning of the language, Maunoir aided in the promotion of the colleges of Quimper and of Morlaix, where the language of Brittany was generally used. The same motives actuated him in the composition of the following works, in which he has been the chief benefactor of ecclesiastics of the country: Caution spirituel hanc instructionem profestab eur quiquis in hac et vostra aur baronum (Quimper) — Vita S. Cornutii, Armoarcii; Casoocii (Quimper, 1685, 12mo, et al.); far from being written in Breton, as is often stated. Le Temple consacré à la passion de Jésus-Christ, in Breton, prose and verse (Quimper, 1679, 1686, 8vo) — Le sacré College de Jésus décrit en cinq classes, où l'on enseigne en langue Armorique les leges Christianae, avec les trois clés pour y entrer. These and other works of this character are curious in a philological point of view as monuments of the changes in the Breton language. A very competent judge, M. de la Villermarqué, has given the following opinion: "Born in the French part of Brit- tany, father and son, he was shocked by the idea of certain sounds in the Breton language. In order to soften them, he suppressed or modified certain signs necessary for preserving the primitive signification of the words, and for showing their etymology, derivation, and affinities. The expressions thus disfigured, of which he has written, are called by his contemporaries the 19th century, and he left an orthography without fixed principles or method, an orthography ad libitum, which has very properly been abandoned, since Le Pelléart has substituted the ancient Breton orthography in his Dictionnaire. See Boeche, Le Partout Missionnaire en la vie du P. Julien Maunoir (Paris, 1697, 12mo); Lobineau, Vie des Saints, etc., de Bretagne, v, 23-137; G. Leroux, Recueil des vertus et des miracles du P. Julien Maunoir (Quimper, 1716, 12mo); La Villermarqué, Essai sur l'Histoire de la Langue Bretonne, at the head of his edition of the Dictionnaire de la langue bretonne de la Compagnie de Jésus, 1847, 4to.)—Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, vol. xxxiv, 6 v.

Maupas du Tourn, Henri Cauhoff de, a French prelate, was born in 1600 at the chateau of Cosson, near Rheims. Descended from an ancient family of Champagne, he had for his godfather king Henry IV, and was scarcely sixteen years of age when he was elected abbot of Saint-Denis of Rheims, with a regular benefice. In 1626 he founded there the society of Saint Geneviève. He next became chief vicar of the diocese of Rheims, then first chaplain to the queen, Anne of Austria, and in 1641 was finally elected bishop of Puy, whence he was transferred in 1601 to the see of Evreux. In the following year, being called to Puy to settle a lawsuit originating in François de Sales, he was chosen assistant prelate to the pontifical throne. January 14, 1667, he founded a seminary at Evreux, resigned his bishopric in 1680, and died at Evreux August 12 of the same year. Of his works we have Vie de Mme de Chantal (Paris, 1644, 4to) — Vie de saint François de Sales (Paris, 1657, 4to): —Oraison funèbre de saint Vincent de Paul (Paris, 1661, 4to): —Statuts d'égodous (Evreux, 1664, 1665, 8vo). See Gallia Christiana, vols. ii and xi; Le Brasseur, Hist. du Diocèse d'Évreux, Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, vol. xxxiv, 6 v.

Maupeul, Milton, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Campbell County, Tennessee, Dec. 24, 1829. He was educated at Emory and Henry College, Virginia; was licensed to preach about the year 1849; and was engaged for two or three years teaching school and preaching in the local relation. He went to California in 1852, and in 1853 joined the Pacific Conference, California. In 1856 he returned to Tennessee; in 1859 joined the Holston Conference, and was appointed to Grayson Circuit, in Western Virginia; in 1860 to Newport Circuit; in 1861 to Maynardsville Circuit. In 1862 he was appointed to the Conference as a missionary and member of the regiment in the Confederate States army; but, as the regiment was disbanded before the close of the year, he returned home, and was without regular work until 1866, when he was appointed to Knox and Maynardsville Circuit. In 1867 he was transferred to the Conference in Texas, and in 1869 to Gainesville Circuit; in 1871 to Decatur Mission, where he finished his life and ministry, April 1, 1871. He was faithful to his calling while his strength lasted. "He left the aroma of a good name, and the assurance that he went to his rest." Minutes of the M. E. Church South, 1871.

Maur (St.), Congregation of. The Benedictines afford the only example of a monastic order which, after declining from an originally high position, and after remaining, so to speak, dead for two centuries, re-
vived and took again a leading place in the Church by its activity and learning.

As early as the latter part of the Middle Ages the Order of Benedectines had lost much of their influence. The convents had become too wealthy, and the monks, instead of being used to their religious exercises, were entirely given up to idleness and worldly enjoyments. This state of things continued through the 16th century. In the early part of the 17th a reform took place in the Convent of St. Vannes, near Verdun, under the influence of Didier de la Cour, but it was soon imitated by the formerly renowned convents of Moyenmoutier and Sénonais. Clement VIII confirmed the organization of this Congrégation de St. Vannes, which produced some distinguished men, among them Dom Calmet and Dom Cellier. In 1614 the assembly of the French clergy, understanding the necessity of united action, began to examine the cloistered convents throughout the country should connect themselves with St. Vannes; the general chapter of the congregation, however, was afraid of the consequences which might result from such extended power. In 1618, however, Dom Bénard, one of the monks of St. Vannes who had been employed in reforming other convents, obtained from Louis XIII authority to establish a congregation, which when organized took the name of St. Maur, for fear of awakening jealousy if it took that of any particular convent. This congregation was confirmed by Gregory XV in 1621, and by Urban VIII in 1627. The first procession celebrated by Bénard in July, 1620, according to the regulations that of the Blanes-Mantes at Paris. Soon a number of others joined it. In 1622 they counted forty convents; in the beginning of the 18th century their number reached 168, divided into six provinces. The most important of all these establishments was the convent of St. Germain des Prés, near Paris. It was the residence of the general of the order, was endowed with episcopal authority, and possessed a library particularly rich in ancient MSS. Its statutes, drawn up according to the spirit of the times, the strict morality, intellectual pursuits, and general influence of its members, gained universal respect for the congregation. Amid the looseness of morals which then prevailed among the French clergy, the Congregation of St. Maur belongs to the few exceptions which reflect honor on the Church of Rome. According to the confession of a Romanist writer, they are perhaps the only order in the history of convents of which this can be said. It is also to be remembered that, conscious of serving higher and universal interests, they remained entirely strangers to all persecutions both of the Jesuits and the Gallican clergy.

The first officers among the Congregation, the first general, Dom Tarife, carefully prepared a scheme of studies; and as early as the 17th and 18th centuries the congregation counted a large number of distinguished men. Their labors were promptly directed to the gathering of materials for the history of the converts belonging to the congregation, and to that of the saints. These researches soon led them into paleological and diplomatic works. The finished education given to the novices required a large number of new books or improved reprints of old ones, which were prepared by subscriptions by members of the congregation. Thus arose a large number of very important and valuable works. They treat of a great variety of subjects, but especially of the history of France and of the Church. The most distinguished among the men of letters interested in the editorship, and the others were employed in gathering the materials, or making up some particular part of it: if one of them died before his task was complete, another took his place, and continued it in the same spirit and with the same learning. No other order ever made the same use of its riches: they bought the materials of MSS. and books, made journeys to visit foreign libraries and to establish relations with foreign savans. Their publications also possessed an outward finish previously unknown in typography. Their religious independence is shown in the fact that they remained in friendly relation with the representatives of the Papal See (q. v.), and suffered persecution for their refusal to endorse the bull Unigenitus (q. v.), and they were often and severely attacked by the Jesuits. The order continued in existence until the French Revolution.

The historical works of the Congregation of St. Maur are numerous, and embrace an extensive field. Dom Mabillon may be considered as the founder of diplomacy, of which he established the basis in his De re diplomatica (1691, 6 vols. 4to); this was followed by a supplement in 1704, in consequence of the attacks of the Jesuit Germot. As these works related almost exclusively to France, a general work on the same subject was published by Dom Toussain and Dom Tassin, under the title Nouveau traité de diplomatie (1750-65, 6 vols. 4to), which is now the most perfect of the kind. To these must be added Montauperné's Paléographie Grecque (1708, fol.), which, however, has been surpassed by subsequent publications. Chronology may almost be said to have been created by them. The Art de vérifier les dates, commenced by Dantion and finished by Clémen
cet (1756, 2 vols. 4to), is well known to every student of history. A second edition was published by Clement (1770, fol.), and then a third (1783-92, 3 vols. fol.), each time with numerous additions. The fourth, much enlarged edition, due also to Clement, appeared first in 1818 (5 vols. 8vo), and was often reprinted; there are also an American edition, and one in Latin. The following has justly been called the most important monument of French learning in the 18th century. Montaupernes's Antiquités expliquées en figures (1719, 10 vols. fol.) has now become somewhat antiquated in consequence of the new sources discovered since. In the domain of philology, the congregation took an active part in a yet unper
cessed work, the Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis of Dufresne Ducange (1678), which, if it did not originate with them, was at least increased one half by Dom Dantion and Dom Charpentier (1738-86, 9 vols. fol., with an appendix by D. Bernard, 1767, 4 vols. fol.), and acquired its full importance by their labors. This work is not only important for its philological value, but also for the information it contains on the literature, laws, and civil and ecclesiastical customs of the Middle Ages. Charpentier is also the author of the Alphabetorum typogra
corum (1747, fol.). They published the sources of the history of France. Such as had been furnished by Pi
ton and Duchesne were insufficient, and Colbert and Louvois vainly sought to have the work continued; but D'Agenau finally succeeded in inducing the Benedic
tines to undertake it, and to this task, which had been taken into the hands of Dom Bouquet, who completed the first eight volumes of the Scriptores rerum Gallicarum et Franciarum; Dom J. B. Haudiguier and C. Hau
diguier accomplished the xth, xth, and xth; Dom Clé
tin the xth and xvth, and Dom Brial, the last of the Benedicines of St. Maur, the xvth and xvth (1738-
1818, fol.). The work has since been continued by the Académie des Inscriptions, which published the xst volume in 1855. To this class of works belongs the edition of the writings of Grégoire de Tours, published by Dom Bourret (1759, 4 vols. fol.), and a complete history of France, but only the beginning of it, and the history of particular parts. Dom Martin wrote La Religion des Gaulois (1727, 2 vols. 4to), and Dom de Breteuil Histoire des Gaules et des Conquêtes des Gaulois (1752, 2 vols. 4to), both of little importance, their histories of particular provinces are more valuable. The most important are Histoire générale du Languedoc, by Vaimette and De Vic (1730-45) 5 vols. fol.; Histoire de Bretagne, by Veissiere (who subsequently became a Protestant) and Lobineau (1707, 2 vols. fol.). This was afterwards entirely remade, and completed by Maurice de Beaufort (1742, 8 vols. fol., and 2 vols. 4to); Histoire de Bourgogne, by Blancher (1789 sq. 8 vols. fol.); Histoire de la Ville de Paris, by Flébillien and Lobineau (1785, 8 vols. fol.). Finally, the Histoire Littéraire
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de la France (1788–88, 12 vols. 4to), inaugurated by Dom Rivet and others, and continued by the order till 1814, when it was taken up by the Académie des Inscriptions; the xxth volume was published in 1842. It is a very valuable collection of documents, not only for the history of French literature, but also for the history of the order. Generally, the collection is a rich storehouse in the libraries of the convents, also the journeys, principally in Italy, Germany, and the Netherlands, gave occasion to publish extensive catalogues and descriptions of them. Among these we notice the Speculum veterum aliquot scriptorum of D'Acchery (1610, 17 vols. of which 6 vols. are written in Middle Age Latin and 12 vols. in Latin), and the Venera Alsecta, by Mabillon (1675–85, 4 vols. 4to); Collectio nova veterum scriptorum, by Martène (1700, 4to); Theuarum nouarum Anecdotorum, by Martène and Durand (1717, 5 vols. fol.); Voyage littéraire de deux religieux Basiliens, by the same (1724, 4to); Dissertations Italiens (1732, 4to), and Bibliotheca bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova (1739, 2 vols. fol.), both by Montfaucon. In Church history, their most important works are their revision of the Gallia Christiana of the brothers De Sainte-Marthe (1655, 4 vols. fol.). The new work was authorized by the distinguished family, Dom Denis de Sainte-Marthe. It was intended as an introduction to a contemplated Orbis Christianus, for which a large amount of documents were collected, yet this work was never completed. The first volume of this Orm Christianus appeared in 1730. Sainte-Marthe died on the completion of the third volume, in 1725. The order continued the work until the thirteenth volume, which appeared in 1785. It was then interrupted, until of late years Hauréau, the author of the Histoire de la Philosophie scholastique (1850, 2 vols.), took it up again, and in 1846 he published his continuation. The Gallia Christiana was used as a model for other similar works, such as the Italie sacrée, the Espagne sagrada, the Italiens sacrés, etc. It also gave rise to numerous histories of special convents by others of the congregation; the greater part of them, however, remain unpublished. The only two which appear as the Histoire de l'Abbaye de St. Denis de FelbienJou (1705, fol.) and the Histoire de l'Abbaye de St. Germain des Prés de Bossart (1724, fol.). The collection of the French councils, commenced by Dom de Coniac, and afterwards continued by Dom Labat, was to be appended to the Gallia Christiana. The first volume appeared in 1789, at the moment of the outbreak of the French Revolution, and the congregation was dispersed before the second was complete. The history of martyrs was treated by Dom Batut in his Acta primorum martyrum (1869, 4to). Of greater interest in these papers are the old liturgies and convent customs, some of which are among the earliest works of the congregation. Menard published the Sacramentarium of Gregory the Great (1842, 4to), Mabillon the Liturgia Gallica (1645, 4to), Martine his Libri V de antiquis monachorum ritibus (1690, 2 vols. 4to), and his De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus (1700, 4 vols. 4to; 2d edit. 1736, 4 vols. fol.); finally, among the most renowned works in that line, we must mention the Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti, compiled by Mabillon and Ruinart (1668, etc., 9 vols. fol.; the tenth remained unpublished); the Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti, the celebrated work of Mabillon, compiled by Massuet (1703, etc., 6 vols. fol.). The same congregation wrote also a history of their own order, which formed 3 vols. fol. in MS., but the superiors refused permission for publication. Dom Tassin published, however, an abstract from it, down to 1765. Dom Clémence wrote a history of Port Royal, of which the first part alone appeared (1755, 10 vols. 12mo); the second part remained in MS., as being too favorable to the Jesuits.

The studia humanitatis of the Benedictines of St. Maur to the gratitude of theologians lies in their editions of the works of the fathers. They had at first contemplated only publishing the complete works of authors of their own order; but the favor with which their productions were received, as also the requirements of their schools, induced them to publish first the works of the Latin fathers, and afterwards of the Greek also. For this purpose they compared the various texts of the different works existing in France, Italy, England, Holland, Germany, etc. The result was, except generally in the libraries of the convents, also the journeys, principally in Italy, Germany, and the Netherlands, gave occasion to publish extensive catalogues and descriptions of them. Among these we notice the Speculum veterum aliquot scriptorum of D'Acchery (1610–1617, 18 vols. in Middle Age Latin and 6 vols. in Latin), 3 vols of which were included in St. 4th vol. His views afforded them powerful weapons in the Janissarian controversy. The edition was commenced by Dom Delfau, and continued by Blampin and Constant (1678–1706, 11 vols. fol.); Garet published Cassiodor (1679, 2 vols. fol.). Du Fréche and Le Nourri, Ambrosius (1658–90, 2 vols. fol.); Constant, Hilarius of Poitiers (1698, fol.); Martianus, Jerome (1668–1706, 5 vols. fol.). The works of Cyprynus, commenced by Baluze, who was not of St. Maur, were completed by Dom Maran (1726, fol.). In 1645 the Benedictines published the Ephet de l'ordre de Benoit (4 to), a work in the close of the 17th century that they seriously applied themselves to this branch of ancient ecclesiastical literature. Montfaucon published the works of Athanasius (1698, 3 vols. fol.); this was followed by his Collectio nova et nova patrum patrum de 16 vols. fol. Maran published the works of Athanasius; the works of Eusebius of Caesarea, and the Topography of Cosmas. Massuet published Irenæus (1710, fol.); Montfaucon, Chrysostom (1718–38, 13 vols. fol.); Tousée, Cyril of Jerusalem (1720, fol.); Garnier, Basil the Great (1731–30, 5 vols. fol.); Charles de la Rue and his nephew Vincent de la Rue, Origen (1728–29, 4 vols. fol.); Maran, Justin and the other apologists (1742, fol.). Maran commenced an edition of the works of Gregory of Nazianzus, which was commenced by Clémence, but the breaking out of the French Revolution prevented the publication of any but the first volume (1788, fol.). Among the works of writers of their order and others of the Middle Ages which they published, we notice the rule of St. Benedict of Aniane, Concordia regulorum, published by Menard (1628, 4to); Lombraye, by D'Acchery (1648, fol.); and Guibert of Nogent, by the same (1611, fol.); St. Bernard, by Mabillon (1667, fol.; 2d ed. 1690, 2 vols. fol.; 3d ed. 1719, 2 vols. fol.); Anselm of Canterbury, by Gerberon (1675, fol.; 2d ed. 1721); Gregory the Great, by Denis de Sainte-Marthe (1705, 4 vols. fol.); Hibault de Main, by Beaupendre (1706, fol.). Dom Constant published the letters and works of the popes, only the first volume of which appeared (1721, fol.). To aid in the use of the Bibliothèque maxima of Lyon, Le Nourri wrote his Apparatus (1708, fol.), which, however, does not extend further than the 4th century; it consists of biographical, historical, and literary notices of the writers whose works are contained in the Bibliothèque. Finally, among their most valuable publications are those relating to the ancient translations of the Bible. Such are the Hexapla of Origen, by Montfaucon (1718, 2 vols. fol.); the Bible of Jerome, by Mariani (1685, 1 vol. of the works of Jerome), and the Latina versione antiquae, by Sabatier, Boulard, and Vincent de la Rue (1749–49, 3 vols. fol.). Their zeal and the liberal views could not fail to involve them in numerous and bitter controversies; yet even then they generally pursued a middle course, whilst their greater learning often gave them the advantage over their adversaries. Perhaps the weakest contest they ever engaged in was their defence of the claims of their fellow Benedictine abbots Ceremon as the author of the Instructio Christi, against the attacks of the Augustinian canon regulars (see Kämmerer). They ably defended themselves against the insinuations of De Rancé, founder of La Trappe, who accused them of worldliness on account of their studies. Mabillon
was thus provoked to publish his renowned Tracté des
études Monastiques (1591, 4to, and 1692, 2 vols. 12mo; it
was translated into Latin and Italian). They also got
into difficulties with the Jesuits, who accused them of
Jansenism on account of their edition of St. Augustine,
and other books; but they were never in the French
Church. During this controversy they published very important
essays against the bull Unigenitus. Gerberon published the
Histoire générale du Jansénisme (1700, 3 vols. 12mo),
and Le Cist the Histoire de la Constitution Unigenitus
en ce qui regarde la Congrégation de St. Maur. The
French Revolution, in forbidding the existence of con-
vents, dispersed also the Benedictines. Several of the
works they had then on hand remained incomplete.
The Académie des Inscriptions undertook to finish such
as related to the history of France. The last of the
Benedictines of St. Maur, Dom Brial, died a member of
the French Academy in 1833. In later times an attempt
was made to revive the order. La Menais (q.v.) with
some of his friends bought the abbey of Solesmes, for-
merly occupied by the Benedictines of St. Maur. The
pope made it the regular abbey of the restored Order of
Benedictines Sept. 1, 1837, and Geranger (afterwards
called Guéranger), a German professor, formerly a Prot-
estant, was made superior-general of the order. Yet so
far, the attempts of the new monks to rival the fame of
their predecessors have proved unsuccessful; the ultra-
montane party in the French Church is not favor-
able to profound studies. Its first work gave evi-
dence of the spirit which now animates the institution:
Origines catholiques, origines de l'Église Romaine (Paris,
1836, 4to; vol. i only has appeared). By its Institutions
liturgiques (Paris, 1846) Guéranger helped to introduce
the use of the Roman liturgy in the French dioceses,
in spite of the remonstrances of the Gallican clergy.
The most eminent of the new Benedictines is Piria, yet
even his works will prove of more value to the papacy than
to science. In an article published in the Correspondant
of the 30th May 1854, he directed attention to the
papal Brief in which the Church's position was stated
and asserted that the making of the pseudo-decreets (q. v.)
affects the purity of the See of Rome which was
then already recognised by all. Piria has published a
Histoire de St. Léger et de l'Église de France au 7e siè-
cle (Paris, 1848):—Études sur la Collection des Actes des
Saints par les Hollandais (Paris, 1850), a valuable work.
Since 1852 he has been working at a Speculum Soles-
mens, of which three volumes have been published (Paris,
royal 8vo). They do not continue the impor-
tant works commenced by the old order, leaving even that restoration unfinished. Benedicto-
Mauricianum (Vienna, 1761, 8vo): Le Cist, Bibli-
othèque historique, etc., des Auteurs de la Cong. de St. Maur
(Hague, 1762, 12mo); Tasmin, Histoire littér. de la
Congr. de St. Maur (Paris, 1785, 8vo); Herbst, Die
Verdiente Deutscher (2 vols. Berlin, 1817-23 in 4to);
Wert, der Theologischen Quartalschrift, 1838, part
i, ii, iii (1834, pt. i.)—Herzog, Real-Enzyklopädie, xii, 190 sq.
Maurand (or Mauran), Pierre, the first leader of the
Albigenses in Southern France, was born at Tou-
louse, of a noted family, in the early part of the 12th
century. From his youth he gave himself entirely
in spreading the doctrines of the Albigenses (q. v.)
throughout Languedoc. Rich and learned, preaching
incessantly, travelling barefooted, sleeping on the
ground, living in the midst of danger, he strongly im-
pressed the southern mind, always easily excited, and
in short time made a great number of converts, whom
he assembled in two of his mansions, one in the city,
the other in the country. Maurand said boldly "that
the clergy performed their ecclesiastical duties without
learning, without morals, and without capacity; that
usually their names were known in many places, and
this all was venal, the sacraments and the benefices; that the
clerks, the priests, the canons, and even the bishops, associated
publicly with abandoned women; that if the same vices
were remarked in the lords and laity, it was owing to
the general ignorance, an excuse which the clergy could
not plead." As for his belief, he admitted two grand
directing principles, independent and uncreated; good
and evil; light and darkness. He did not consider
almsgiving a means of salvation; and life should not be
an incessant commerce. He did not admit that a priest
could, by a few words on the lips, and wax into the
body and blood of Christ, and persisted in see-
ing in the mass and sacrifice only a commemoration, a
symbol. He rejected all the ceremonial service of the
Church as an abuse which should be destroyed. He led,
however, the most regular and sober life, prayed on his
knees seven times a day and seven times each night.
He did not acknowledge the remission of sins on the
earth, not being able to believe that a mere mortal, a
priest "all covered with the leprosy of vice," could ab-
solve that of which he himself knowingly guilty
each day. For as the members of the clergy, he cal-
celled them not pastors, but ravishing wolves, etc. The
court of Rome was not slow in being roused, and the number
of heretics multiplied so prodigiously that an appeal
was made to the secular arm. After having condemned
the sectarians in several methods, the archbishops of Nar-
bonne and Lyons made some arrests, and burnt alive
those who would not recant. After the action of the
Council of Albi in 1176, pope Alexander III himself in-
agurated a crusade against the heretics, who were par-
ticularly strong in the dominion of Raymond V of Tou-
louse. Maurand and the Albigenses resisted the in-
vasion of the invading clanners of the people. One of
the prelates however preached, and attempted to re-
sume the doctrines of the Albigenses; the latter, ap-
parently convinced not so much by his reasoning as by
the fear of the count of Toulouse, did not dare to be seen or
to speak in public. The legate, not contented with this
success, caused the Roman Catholics to promise with an
oath to denounce and deliver up all the heretics they
knew. Pierre Maurand was one of the first reached
by this measure. They induced him by caresses and prom-
ises to agree to the legate's terms. Maurand, to which
he was obliged to submit, declared that the bread
was not the body of Christ. The inquisitors asked
nothing more; they delivered him to the count of
Toulouse, who immediately imprisoned him, order-
ing that his goods should be forthwith confiscated
and his mansions demolished, whilst other punishment was
yet to follow. Pierre Maurand, seeing himself on the
verge of an ignominious death, promised to abjure his
faith. They then brought him out of prison, and on
the public square, before the assembled people, he
bowed down before the Holy Cross, asked the pope to
grant him pardon, and promised to submit to their orders.
The next day the bishop of Toulouse and the abbot of Saint-
Sernin took Maurand from his prison, naked and bare-
footed, and led him through the city, flogging him from
time to time to the crying and neighing of the horse. A
heavy fine, renewed the abjuration of his faith, and
heard the sentence which condemned him to start with
in forty days for Jerusalem, and remain there three years
in the service of the poor; his goods were confiscated,
half to the profit of Raymond V, half to the profit of the
clergy. He was also obliged to pay a fine of five hun-
dred pounds' weight of silver to the count of Toulouse,
to make numerous gifts to religious establishments, to
the poor, etc. However, when Maurand returned from
Palestine, he recovered the greater part of his estates.
See Dom Vaisette, Histoire de Languedoc, t. iii, chap.
xix; Dict. des Histoires, article Albig hometown, Encyc-
lopedie theologique de l'abbé Migne; Benoît, Hlist.
des Albigéois, t. i; Langlois, Histoire des Croisades-con-
tre les Albigéois; Bannier de Beauval, Hist. de l'Église,
xxxiv, 6, v.
Maurice, St. See MAURITIUS.
Maurice (duke and afterwards elector) of SAXONY,
one of the most prominent characters in the history of
the Reformation in the Church of Germany, a celebrated
MAURICE

general and champion of the Protestant cause, was the eldest son of duke Henry of the Albertine line and nephew of duke George the Bearded, the most bitter opponent of the Reformation. Maurice was born at Freiburg March 21, 1521; he espoused in 1541 Agnes, daughter of the landgrave Philip of Hesse; and later in the same year succeeded his father in the duchy of Saxony and its dependencies. He was hardly well established in his dominion when a dispute arose between him and his cousin, the elector of Saxony, John Frederick, regarding their respective rights over the bishopric of Meissen, which was the common property of the Ernestine and Albertine lines; but by the influence of Luther and of the landgrave Philip a temporary reconciliation was effected; but the Turks, who had distinguished himself as a soldier, and became the favourite of Charles V. Whether, however, Maurice was at this time the sincere friend of the emperor is a question that has never yet been determined. This much is certain that Maurice was selfish by nature, and sought rather the furtherance of his own interests than the welfare of his associates and those who befriended him. A professed Protestant, he took part in the deliberations at Smalcald (q. v.; see also Holy League), but refused to become a member of the league for the safety of the empire; and, finding no chance to co-operate at that time to secure the protectorate of the bishoprics of Magdeburg and Halberstadt. No sooner had the emperor bestowed upon him this much-coveted favor, and honored him with the title of elector (June 19, 1540), than Maurice deserted the Protestant camp, and played the part of a most devoted adherent of the emperor's cause. In consequence of this unexpected hostility to the Protestants the imperial army gained a decisive victory at Mühlberg in April, 1547, wellnigh proving the death-stroke of the Protestant cause. By this defeat of the Protestants, and the imprisonment of his rival, John Frederick, Maurice, according to a previous understanding with the emperor, became himself the ruler of all Saxony. Thus gratified in all the ambitious desires in which he could expect aid from Charles V, Maurice became quite uneasy in his present relation, and hesitated not to embrace the very first opportunity to seek anew the favor of the leaders he had so basely deserted. It is true as late as 1547 Maurice was still found on the side of the imperialists, for he this year supported the Interim (q. v.) of Augsburg; but gradually he lessened his support and by 1551 we find him a party to a secret treaty of the Protestant princes with Henry II of France, at the very time that he was professing to besiege the rebellious city of Magdeburg. As treacherously and unhesitatingly as he had abandoned the cause of the Reformers he now forsook the imperial cause and became as it were in building up vast schemes of ambition, little dreaming of the mine which the man who had assembled all of confided in was preparing to spring under his feet. When suddenly the word came to him that he must release Henry Philip of Hesse whom he had imprisoned for his opposition to the imperial cause, even before he had time to decide the case, news came to him that Maurice of Saxony was marching against him. Without money, without troops, without allies, Charles was compelled to yield to the demands of the man whom he had himself made powerful. On April 18, by the mediation of Ferdinand, king of the Romans, a treaty was concluded at Lina granting the demands of the Protestants; but as it was not to take effect till May 26, Maurice employed himself in attacking (May 11) the fortress of Heilin, in which soldiers were assembling for the emperor's service. He expected, no doubt, to terrify the imperialists, and advanced on Innsbruck with the view of taking Charles captive. Had it not been that a mutiny stopped his progress, the emperor would have been rudely handled, as Maurice knew his antagonist, and was uncertain of the consequences of his attack. Baffled, Maurice also was frightened. His advance on Innsbruck so alarmed the members of the Council of Trent, then in session there, that they fled from the town, and the sittings were thenceforth suspended for some years. Finally came the conclusion of the Peace of Passau; Maurice directing the cause of the Protestants, and Ferdinand attending to the imperial interests. To the Protestants this meeting must ever be memorable. It was here that a treaty of peace was established which secured to Protestants free exercise of worship; and it was by the Passau treaty that the Romanists of Germany agreed that the imperial chamber, from which Lutherans were not to be excluded, should render justice irrespective of religion; and that the Aulic Council should be composed exclusively of the Romanists. As a result of this treaty in political matters secured "Germany for the Germans," and in religious affairs permanently established the principles of toleration, were embodied in the agreement called the Peace of Passau (Aug. 22, 1552). Charles, though he professed reconciliation, never lost an opportunity to wreck his vengeance on the elector. The latter, with his usual subtlety and address, patched up a reconciliation with the emperor, and engaged in the campaign of 1553 against the Turks, who were gradually gaining ground in Hungary. Returning soon, he found the former emperor in the midst of Kulmbach, had refused to accede to the treaty of Passau, and continued the war on his own account, making raids on the ecclesiastical princes of the Rhine and Franconia. Maurice also speedily discovered that behind the margrave stood the emperor, who had secured the services of the margrave because he had found in him a general and an army capable of wreaking his vengeance on the perfidious Saxon prince. But Maurice was equal to the occasion. Putting himself at the head of 20,000 men, he marched to protect his bishopric of Magdeburg against the attacks of the emperor, and, falling in with him at Sievershausen, completely defeated him (July 9, 1558), but fell himself in the conflict, mortally wounded, and died July 11, 1553. "So thoughtful and reticent, so enterprising and energetic, so correct in judgment and unfailing in action, and at the same time wholly devoid of moral sentiment, he is one of the most prominent instances of power without principle which the world's history has ever presented." Kohlrausch has perhaps furnished the most moderate comment on the perjured life of Maurice of Saxony. "The final efforts he so patriotically made for the promotion and establishment of a German empire, to have for peace and order, which he sealed with his own blood, have in a great degree served to throw the mantle of oblivion over his earlier proceedings, and conciliated the critical voice of public opinion" (Hist. Germany, p. 290). Robertson failed to be conviction as to the last act of Maurice, and to let it stand forth only as the life-work of this faithless prince. He excuses him on the ground that "his long and intimate union with the emperor had afforded him many opportunities of observing narrowly the dangerous tendency of that monarch's (Charles) schemes. He saw the yoke that was preparing for his country, and was convinced that but a few steps more remained to be taken in order to render Charles as absolute a monarch in Germany as he had become in Spain. At the same time he perceived that Charles was bent on exacting a rigid conformity to the doctrines and rites of the Romish Church, instead of allowing liberty of conscience, the promise of which had allured several Protestant princes to assist him in the war against the confederates of Smalcald. As he himself, notwithstanding all the compliances which he had made from the outset, and the excess of confidence in the emperor, was sincerely attached to the Lutheran tenets, he determined not to be a tame spectator of the overthrow of a system which he believed to be founded in truth" (p. 866). Though we would gladly like to come out at this point, truly anxious to lend the last from the opinion of the noted historian. We doubt very
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much whether Maurice of Saxonify, in any period of his life be either 'Belgium Protestantism' "to be founded in truth," or doubt even that he ever believed himself "to be founded in truth." Let us say, rather, that he was possessed of an ambition which knew no bounds, and that, seeking honor for himself, he reapplied all the glory of having converted and completed that universe to the Pietists which closed the Imperial authority of the religious and absolute and hereditary in his family; and established the Protestant Church, which had hitherto subsisted precariously in Germany, through conjunction or by expedients, upon a firm and secure basis" (p. 416; comp. p. 424, 425). It is indeed a singular circumstance that the Reformation should be indebted for its security and full establishment in Germany to the same hand which had brought it to the brink of destruction, and that both events should have been accompanied by the same acts of dissimulation. See J. Camerarius, Vita Mauritii Bellicarii Elisirani; friends of George Adam von Muisen (1719); F. A. von Langenm, Moritz Herzog and Curt von Sachsen (1841, 2 vols.); Schlenkert, Moritz Curt von Sachsen (1728-1800, 4 vols.); R. v. We- bster, Moritz Graf von Sachsen, etc. of Lpa. (1808); Taillan- dier, Maurice de Saxe (Paris, 1865); Cox, House of Austrain, Memel, 254; Kothaush, Hist. of Germany, ch. iv.1; Robertson, Charles V, book x. See also CHARLES V; INTERIM; REFORMATION.

Maurice, Antoine (1), a French Protestant theologian, was born at Lausanne, in Provençal, Sept. 27, 1679. He belonged to a Provençal family which had embraced the Reformed religion in the 16th century, and furnished many pastors to the churches of the south. When the revocation of the Edict of Nantes forced his father to retire to Geneva, he was not permitted to follow him, and remained for some time in the hands of priests, who hoped to educate him to the service of the Church of Rome. Two officers, friends of his family, coming to his aid, he succeeded finally in escaping the vigilance of his guardians and arrived at Venice; being denounced during a hal, fled along the coast, landed on foot at Bourg in Bresme (1666). Although it was in the middle of winter, he resumed his route with a faithful servant, and, after having wandered in the mountains of Jura, he succeeded in reaching Basle, from whence he was conducted to Geneva in a pillage, 1680. He was then only 11 years old. Consecrated to the ministry, he entered it in 1697, at Geneva, where, in 1704, he assumed pastoral duty. Gifted with a happy memory and great talent for the study of languages, he learned the greater part of the Oriental tongues, and perfected himself by speaking fluently with a rabbi and priest from the Levant whom he had invited to his house. He was also fond of the sciences, and abandoned the system of Des Cartes for that of Newton, of whom he became a zealous partisan. In 1710 he was elected professor of belles-lettres and of history in the Academy of Geneva, later he taught the Oriental languages, and after 1724 theology. He was twice called to the rectoryship. In 1718 he was made a member of the Royal Society of the Sciences of Berlin, on the proposition of Leibnitz. Maurice died in Geneva Aug. 20, 1766. Of his works we have an edition of the Maxima Quaestiones, Printed at Poteau near Geneva, 1721, 3 vols. 8vo.; = = = twelve Sermons (ibid. 1729, 8vo.).= = = twenty different dissertations, among others, De Conscientia (1725-1744, 4to.); = = = De Resurrectione Jesu Christi (1743-1745); = = = =cilia (1746, fol.); = = = = = De Jus Gentium (1749, fol.); = = = = = De Constitutione Ecclesiae Christianae (1750, fol.). His scientific and philosophical works have not been published. Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, a v.

Maurice, Antoine (2), a Swiss theologian, was born at Geneva April 11, 1718. He showed at an early age a decided talent for the physical sciences; at the age of sixteen he maintained before the celebrated professors Caumes and Calendrini some theses, De Actione Solis et Luna in atrium et aquam (Geneva, 1732, 4to.), which were then considered very remarkable. He became pastor in 1748, and in 1756 succeeded his father in the chair of Divinity in the Theological Faculty of Geneva. He has left some dissertations on philosophical and theological points: De Musica in Sacris (Geneva, 1717, 4to.); De Fide et Jus Jus Canondarum circa futurum post hanc vitam statum (ibid. 1780, 8vo.): De Toleran- tiea aephsico (ibid. 1781): De Slavica Erassios (ibid. 1782): De Concordia ecclesiastica. See Sénébier, Hist. litt. de Ge- nève; Ménzel, Celebretz-Leizikon, a v. Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, a v.

Maurice, Frederick Denison, a very celebrated English divine of our day, the successor of Dr. Arnold as leader of the "Broad Church" party of the Anglican clergy, was born in 1805, the son of a Unitarian minister of high reputation for intelligence and philanthropic zeal. Young Maurice at an early age entered at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he formed an intimate friendship with the Rev. Dr. George Adams (q.v.), a friendship which lasted through the whole of Sterling's life, and which was made closer in the end by the marriage of the friends to two sisters. From Trinity College both Maurice and Sterling removed to the smaller corporation of Trinity Hall; and here early in life they began to display a talent partly intellectual and partly moral, upon all who came near him, which accompanied him throughout his whole career. His examinations at college were passed with such great distinction that he was recommended for a fellowship over the whole of the country with such a prospect, he would be subjecting his intellectual independence to the risk of a temptation, and bribing his conscience. Accordingly, quitting Cambridge without a degree, he removed to London, where for some time he devoted himself to literature. With his friend Sterling he became connected with the "Athenaeum," then just starting, and opened a literary career that lasted for a period of forty-four years, within which "the ink of his pen was seldom dry." Experiencing a change in his religious sentiments, he finally decided to enter the ministry of the Established Church, but, lest his motives should be questioned, he was then only 11 years old. Consecrated to the ministry, he entered it in 1897, at Cambridge, where, in 1704, he assumed pastoral duty. Gifted with a happy memory and great talent for the study of languages, he learned the greater part of the Oriental tongues, and perfected himself by speaking fluently with a rabbi and priest from the Levant whom he had invited to his house. He was also fond of the sciences, and abandoned the system of Des Cartes for that of Newton, of whom he became a zealous partisan. In 1710 he was elected professor of belles-lettres and of history in the Academy of Geneva, later he taught the Oriental languages, and after 1724 theology. He was twice called to the rectoryship. In 1718 he was made a member of the Royal Society of the Sciences of Berlin, on the proposition of Leibnitz. Maurice died in Geneva Aug. 20, 1766. Of his works we have an edition of the Maxima Quaestiones, Printed at Poteau near Geneva, 1721, 3 vols. 8vo. = = = twelve Sermons (ibid. 1729, 8vo.).= = = twenty different dissertations, among others, De Conscientia (1725-1744, 4to.); = = = De Resurrectione Jesu Christi (1743-1745); = = = =cilia (1746, fol.); = = = = = De Jus Gentium (1749, fol.); = = = = = De Constitutione Ecclesiae Christianae (1750, fol.). His scientific and philosophical works have not been published. Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, a v.
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this man is impossible without a glance at his works, we proceed to a hasty consideration of his written productions in the field of theology and philosophy. Omitting numerous separate sermons and occasional tracts, we note his Doctrine of Sacrifice deduced from the Scripturæ.—Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First and Second Centuries.—Lectures on the Epistles of the New Testament.—Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament.—The Unity of the New Testament.—Christmas Day and other Sermons.—On the Religions of the World.—On the Prayer-book.—The Church a Family.—On the Lord's Prayer: —On the Sabbath.—On the Law before the Failure of the Law. To the "Encyclopedia Britannica" he contributed History of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy, in ancient and in mediæval times, which was afterwards collected into book form and republished (2 vols. 8vo). He also published a reply to Mansel's "Bampton Lectures" in 1853. Particularly noteworthy among all these productions are his Theological Essays (Lond, 1853, 8vo; N.Y. 1854). A Unitarian by birth and education, Mr. Maurice had imbued much of the humanitarian principles. In these essays he proposed for himself the task of influencing the Church of England of his time to see that it was a faithful ambassador of its Saviour, to meet the actual wants of the disturbed and reluctantly sceptical age in which he lived. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Maurice had failed to make due allowance for the moderate degree of tolerance that was in vogue twenty years ago, which has since in fact grown to act as a revolutionizing and theoreti cally a logical reformer, and for the ignorance that prevailed among his fellow-men concerning the man who sought to do this work. Now that careful inquiry and inves tigation have clearly revealed his character, even the most orthodox of all orthodox Christians need not hesitate to speak in terms of highest commendation of the labors and services of Frederick Denison Maurice. But not so in the days of his travails. "It was the specialty of his position," says a writer in the British Quart. Rev. (Jan. 1857, p. 80), "that he stood midway, as it were, between the professors of the Christian faith, as commonly received, and the modern sceptical and rationalizing spirit which attracted his sympathies, in so far as it was a spirit of free and earnest inquiry, aiming sincerely at the attainment of the truth. Thus he came to be considered by many as affording a sort of half-way house of shelter to those who did not or could not accept the ordinary orthodoxy, and who were yet too much in earnest about life and destiny to be satisfied with the cheerless negations of atheism or the cold comforts of a provisional scepticism. It was natural that he should meet them; and yet he seemed to recede the more that they were owned by orthodoxy—which is no matter for wonder—he was rejected and often also despised by scepticism. By the one party he was charged with unsitting the faith of ingenious youth, while the others accused him of paling in words in a double sense, and seeking to reconcile things really irreconcilable." The Letters of the English Church, he held many views akin with the great German writer. Seeking, like the latter, to spread truth by giving it a fair test, Mr. Maurice often went beyond reasonable limits, and unknowingly en dangered the interests of the cause he so unhesitatingly served; his language respecting both the atonement and the question of eternal punishment was made the text of many attacks, the most noted of which was that by Dr. Candish of the Scottish Church, in a sermon entitled Examination of Mr. Maurice's "Theological Essays.

Starting from the divine centre as the root and source of all, religion is to Mr. Maurice a mode of life conditioned and determined on all sides by dependence upon God—the human personality upon the divine Person. "As the life come forth from the experiences through which man is acted upon by God, so as to be filled full out of the Infinite fulness. But how shall there be a communion between God and man? In order to the revealing of God, there must be a revelation. This reve- lation must be able to manifest forth what is in God, who is the Father universal, and to do this by such means that man may thereby know him as his Father. A mediator between God and man is essential to the satisfying and fulfilling of human wants. Only one who was himself God could adequately unfold the Eternal. And he must be able by man to be unfolded through the human, otherwise man could not apprehend the revelation; the light would continue shining in darkness without being comprehended of the latter. . . . The Father has shown us what he is by an actual man like ourselves, who told us that he came forth from the Father, and that he knew him. . . . He could reveal God to men because, having been ever with the Father, he had also been near to all men from their beginning, as the Light lightening every man coming into the world. He was the Root, and because he was the Root, he was also the Head of humanity. He could redeem humanity, and he alone could, because it was his own: because he was in some way already one with it; because in its deepest roots the human personality was bound to him. He did not, therefore, first become a Rev erend, but came to us to teach us his Fatherhood; he could redeem in time, because he had been the Deliverer before his incarnation—because it was his nature to be so." So far so well. There is, however, one great as pect of the work and mission of Christ which Mr. Mau rice ignored, that brought the charge of heterodoxy to his door. The necessity of an atonement and the identification of a broken law, the obligation from which even God himself could not escape of only pardoning when justice had been satisfied, and which, therefore, magnified and made honorable the law that man had disowned and the au thority he had imposed were altogether to be set aside by Mr. Maurice. According to him, it is the sin, and not alone, if at all, the penalty of the sin of the world that Christ takes away. The penalty is and must always be borne by those against whom it is di rected, and cannot be endured by any at second hand. Need we wonder that this view of the atonement exposed Mr. Maurice to much obloquy? "He transforms the atonement," says the writer already quoted, "into a mere means of reconciling man to God by a process of education. The subjective influence of the sacrifice of Christ—its effects, that is, upon the souls of men, ethically and spiritually—was alone emphasized by him. And whatever benefits may have been wrought by bringing this aspect of the atonement into prominence, obviously it is not the whole scriptural doctrine of sac rifice, as unfolded in the work in which he seeks to declare it, but a part of it. The authoritative atonement of this one great doctrine of Christianity, there are yet others in which its influence was mainly pernicious. "Grateful to him as we are for the power with which he vindicated that great truth on which Christianity rests—the incarnation of God in the man Jesus—it is not evident that he was apt to resolve this, and with it the whole work of Christ, into the fulfillment of a merely naturalistic order? . . . He clung to the indefinite, afraid of losing hold of the reality by putting thoughts in the place of things—opinions, theories, and speculations about the real, for true contact with and genuine apprehension (or laying hold and grasping) of it. He would not let go his hold upon reality, which somehow was brought near by being revealed to man; but he was satisfied with the somehow." And yet, while there are some points like those mentioned above on which theological differ ences from the writings of Mr. Maurice, we must concede that, in face of a rationalism which menaces the foundations of Christianity, Mr. Maurice might well be counted, even by the most orthodox, "a champion of revelation." We do not so much refer to his influence upon those accepting his teachings and ideas, which in its entirety, may be called his disciples, as to the far more diffused influence exercised by him upon the general religious thought of England. The very corner
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stone of this influence lies in his vivid and unflagging appre-

hension of the revelation of God in Christ as a pres-

ent reality, exactly fitted to accomplish all that the

world needs.

Mr. Maurice held for many years the professorship of

divinity in King's College. The peculiar views ad-

vanced in his Theological Essays deprived him of his

position, and he was thereafter confined to the office of

chaplain to Lincoln's Inn. In 1800 the queen, in addi-

tion, appointed him incumbent of the district church

of Vere Street, Marylebone, and in 1866 he was hon-

ored with a call to the chair of moral philosophy at

Cambridge. He died at his residence in London, April 1,

1872, the object of universal admiration. "By not a

few he was 'worshipped on this side idolatry,' while by

a large number of outsiders he was regarded with

affectionate veneration. These feelings culminated at

his death in a display of feeling such as it is given to

every one to call forth. The unanimity of the testimony

borne to his character and work by the many journals, secular

and religious, that chronicled his decease, was an index of

the general sentiment. It was felt everywhere that

England had lost a veritable hero in the battle for truth,

and the Church a bright ornament and exemplar of the

practical graces of the Christian life."

It must not be believed that Mr. Maurice's labors were

confined to the theological or philosophical arena. It

had been his function in the Athenaeum to "witness

during his allotted term the lives of many men." He

was the originator, or one of the originators, of the

Christian socialistic movement, the design of which was

to break down the system of competitive labor, and ele-

vate the working classes by teaching them to associate

in little companies, undertaking work in common,

and sharing the proceeds. With a view to prepar-

ing working-men for such a task, he founded a work-


ing-men's college in London, to which in his last years

he devoted much of his time and attention. He also

took a prominent part in the cause of adult educa-

tion. Indeed, there are few social questions of any

importance to which his sympathies did not extend. See

Fraser's Magazine, 1854 (April); Scrutineer's Monthly, 1872

(Sept.); British Quarterly Review, 1878 (Jan.); ii. ii. English

cyclopaedia, s. v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.;

Duncanson's Cyclopaedia, that.

MAURICE, Henry, D.D., an English divine, flour-

ished near the middle of the 17th century as chaplain
to the archbishop of Canterbury. He published a Vin-
dication of the Primitive Church and Diocesan Episco-

pacy, in answer to Baxter's Church History of Bishops

(Lond. 1685, 8vo) — Sermons (1682, 4to; 1744, 4to) — A

Discourse Concerning Diocesan Episcopacy, Answered to David

Clarke's Primitive Episcopacy (Lond. 1700)— Doubts concern-

ing Roman Infallibility. See Gibbon's Prepara-


ii. s. v.; Darling, Cyclopaedia, vol. ii. s. v.

MAURICE, Thomas, an English divine and scholar,

noted particularly for his studies of the antiquities of

India, was born about 1755 at Hertford, where his fa-

ther was then the head-master of the Christ's Hospital

school. After his father's death the family was im-

poveryed by an unfortunate marriage of the widow,

and his education proceeded irregularly till Dr. Parr, on

opening his school at Stanmore, was prevailed on to

receive him as a pupil, and treated him with great gener-

osity and kindness. Destined for the Church, he en-

tered at nineteen St. John's College, Oxford, whence he

removed next year to University College. After taking

his degree of B.A., he was ordained by bishop Lowth, and

held for some time the curacy of the large par-

ish of Woodford, in Essex, which in 1765 he resigned in

order to be ordained for a chapel at Epping, in order to

obtain greater leisure for study. His turn for historical studies had been fas-

terized at University College by his distinguished tutor

Lord Stowell, and he now began to concentrate his at-

tention on the history of India, for treating upon which

he made proposals in 1790 in a published letter address-

ed to the East India directors. The irriguous spirit of

the French Revolution, alarming Mr. Maurice's mind, in-

duced him to remodel his first work after it was near-

ly completed, and to devote a considerable proportion

of it to a vindication of the Hindu policy of the

government. In 1791 he came before the public with two volumes of his

Indian Antiquities: the rest were brought out at intervals,

the completion of the work being mainly owing to the

liberality of the earl of Harborough; and the sev-

eenth and last volume appeared in 1797. This work re-

mains to our day a trustworthy book of reference.

Meaning time he had undertaken a History of Hindostan,
the three volumes of which, in quarto, were published in

1798, 1798, 1799, and a second edition appeared in 1821.

In 1796 Earl Spencer presented him to the vicarage of

Wormleighton, in Warwickshire; next year he was ap-

pointed assistant librarian in the British Museum; in

1800 bishop Tomline obtained for him the pension that

had been held by the poet Cowper; and in 1804 he

received from the lord chancellor the vicarage of

Cudham, in Kent. His Modern History of Hindostan, in two

volumes, appeared in 1802 and 1804. Several other vol-

umes on Eastern history and theology, and attempts in

verse, succeeded this work; and one of his last under-
takings was his Memoirs, comprehending the History of

the Progress of Indian Literature, and Anecdotes of Lit-

erary Characters in the 17th and 18th Centuries. Years.

Of this work the three volumes appeared in 1819, 1820,

and 1822. He died March 30, 1824. See English Cyclopaedia, s. v.; Allibone,

Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.; Gorton, Biog. Dict. s. v.

MAURITIUS and the THEOBATIC LEGION. The

legend concerning St. Mauritius and his follow-soldiers

originated with Eucherius, bishop of Lyons († about 430),

and was first published in A.D. 1662, by the Jesuit Francis

Chiffletus, from an old martyrology in the Abbey of

St. Claude, in the Jura. A recension of this legend was

admitted into the martyrology of the Legion, which is drawn from martyrologies of a later date, and

was composed by a monk connected with the cloister

of St. Maurice, who bore the same name as the bishop,

but flourished nearly a century later. Much has been

written for and against the authenticity of the legend, but

the results of modern criticism seem to indicate that

basis of truth underlies the story. The evidence in its

favor reaches to the 4th century, while the adverse proof

rests chiefly on the improbability of the events narrated.

It relates that during the wars of the emperor Maxim-

ian with Diocletian, two legions, known as the legio II.

Thracica, were ordered from the East to reinforce his

army. It was composed entirely of Christians, and was led by

Mauritius. While the emperor rested at Octodurum (now

Martigny, at the foot of Mount St. Bernard), the bulk of

this legion fled to St. Maurice, in the present canton of

Wallis, excepting two cohorts, which were sent to Tréves.

The army was at this time employed in persecuting Christians, in which service the Theobatic

legion was ordered to co-operate. They refused to obey,

and the emperor, in a rage, commanded the decimation

of the legion. As they remained firm, even after a sec-

ond decimation, Maximian ordered the massacre of the

entire body. Eucherius states that at this period a leg-

ion numbered 6000 men, and clearly asserts that the

greater portion of this legion perished at St. Maurice,

while the martyrrology of St. Mauritius adds that of-

cers were sent to Tréves to execute a similar punis-

ment on the two cohorts stationed there. A similar leg-


den occurs in Simeon Metaphrastes, according to which a St. Mauritius with seventy of his soldiers was exec-

uted by order of Maximian; but this was probably a

Greek adaptation of the Latin story. Grave doubts are

cast upon the legend by the great number of fugitives

from this massacre which constantly meet us, and by

the improbability of the sacrifice of so large a body of

troops in time of war. See De Lisle, De la Virté du Martyre de la Legion Théobienne (1787); the Acta SS.
MAURY


MAURUS, a pupil of Benedict of Nursia, is chiefly known by the account given of him by the monks of the Congregation of St. Maur (q. v.). His history is mainly legendary. He is said to have been the first to introduce the Benedictine rule into France; to have founded its first convent in France at Glenfeul, in the province of Anjou, and to have died in 684, after having performed a great number of miracles. Such at least are the main points to be gathered from his biography, much mixed up indeed in regard to dates, which appeared ed in the 9th century. Gregory of Tours makes no mention of him whatever. This, however, appears certain, that France was the field of his labors, for his name was known there before his biography appeared. Yet all the Mauromonasteris do not lead us back to him; thus, for instance, that at the foot of the Vosges is named after an abbot of the 8th century. Mabillon and Ruinart vainly tried to prove the correctness of the old biography (Acta Sanctorum. ord. S. Bened. sec. i, 274 sq. ; Annales ord. S. Bened. sec. i, 107 sq. ; 629 sq.) which held that he was a Protestant. Many Catholic writers have found ample reason to doubt its genuineness.—Herzog, Recht-Eckleyp., ix, 201. (J. N. P.)

MAURUS, RABANUS. See RABANUS.

MAURY, JOHN SIFFREIN, a French prelate, and noted also as a pulpit orator, was born June 26, 1746, at Vau- reas, in the Venaissin, of poor but respectable parents. He displayed at a very early age great eagerness for learning, and being destined by his parents for the ecclesiastical profession, he was placed at the Seminary of St. Gerde, at Avignon, to pursue his theological studies. About 1766 he proceeded to Paris, in the expectation of earning a subsistence by the cultivation of his talents. Though he was without friends in that city, his first publication attracted considerable notice. Encouraged by this early success he took orders, and devoted himself to the study of pulpit eloquence. In 1772 an Eloge on Fénelon, which he published, was favorably received by the French Academy, and caused him to be appointed vicar-general of the bishop of Lombez. He had not proceeded far in his new career than he became very popular as a preacher. A panegyric of St. Louis, which he delivered before the French Academy, and one of St. Augustine before an assembly of the clergy, met with so much success that king Louis XVI appointed him preacher to the court, and presented him with the living of the small farm of Freneval, in the diocese of Bayeux. In 1785 he delivered his panegyric on St. Vincent de Paul, which is esteemed a masterpiece; shortly after he had the honor to be chosen a member of the Academy in the place of the lyric poet Le Franc de Pomponian, and the following year the valuable benefice of the priory of Lioris was conferred upon him. At the assembly of the States-General in 1789 he was named deputy of the clergy for the bailiwick of Péronne, and soon took a prominent part in the debates. From the first he enlisted himself on the aristocratic side, where his energy, eloquence, and peculiar talent at reply rendered him a formidable antagonist to Mirabeau. His imposing and impassioned oratory, though it expressed opinions hostile to the great majority of the assembly, was often listened to with admiration and greeted with applause, not only by the forces on his side, but also by the of the ancient régime, and by the witty frequenter of the Parisian salons, who styled them archi-priestly despatches, in allusion to their military tone, and their imitation of the style and manner of Napoleon's bulletins. After the capitulation of Paris in November, the 5th of March, 1795, he was deprived of the Bourbons of the administration of his diocese; and, in their to maintain all his power the new constitution; and, in case of any priest's refusal, it was declared that he should be held to have renounced his benefices. To this constitution the pope had refused his assent, on account of its hostility to the interests of the Church, and the oath was indignantly refused by the great majority of the clergy. When the day arrived for the taking it by the bishops and clergy of the Assembly, an infuriated mob surrounded the hall, threatening death to all who should refuse. On this occasion also Maury displayed his usual intrepidity, and boldly advocated the independence of his order. "Strike, but hear me," was his exclamation, when the last efforts of his impiation eloquence in that Assembly were interrupted by the increased tumult, and political antipathy that closed the stormy session of the National Assembly, Maury, who could lend no further aid to the prostrate cause of royalty and religion, quitted his native country, and, at the invitation of Pius VI, took up his residence at Rome. He was there received with the highest distinction, and the loss of his benefices in France was more than compensated by his speedy elevation to the highest positions in the gift of the Roman Church. In 1792 he was named archbishop of Nicaea "in partibus infidelium," and afterwards appointed apostolic nunus to the Kingdom of France, in the effort for the restoration of emperor Francis II. This mission accomplished, in 1794 he was elevated to the dignity of a cardinal, and was made a cardinal of the church of Rome with the government of France under Napoleon (1804); thereafter he embraced the cause of the first consul, and was permitted to return to France. This position, which was deemed not to be in union with the tenor of his former conduct, subjected him in after times to the reproaches and persecutions of the party whom he had served with so much personal hazard. Napoleon gladly received the approaches of so distinguished a member of a Church whose establishment he was restoring in France; an interview with his successor at Paris, on the 1st of December, became the prelude to the fall of Maury and the fall of Pius VI. After Napoleon there had arisen much disagreement. Cardinal Maury was a warm and sincere admirer of the emperor, and he not only espoused his cause in the disputes with the head of the Church, but took every occasion, which the frequent victories of this chief afforded him, of testifying his gratitude for the expressions of admiration in his mandates to the clergy of his diocese. These mandates, written in a style of the most florid eloquence, do not remind us of the imposing and energetic orator of the National Assembly; they were written at a period when the ideas of the ancient régime, and by the witty frequenter of the Parisian salons, who styled them archi-priestly despatches, in allusion to their military tone, and their imitation of the style and manner of Napoleon's bulletins. After the capitulation of Paris in November, the 5th of March, 1795, he was deprived of the
MAZZIM
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sentiment for his adherence to Napoleon's fortunes, for
they forgot his former daring and powerful support of
the rising of 1813. He then returned to Rome, where
he was imprisoned during one year by the orders
of the pope; he was afterwards allowed to live in retire-
ment on a pension which was given to him in com-
pensation for his resignation of the see of Monte Fias-
co in the following year. He retired in deep contempt
by the ingratitude of his former party, and that of the pontifi-
cate, to whose elevation he had been instrumental, he died on
the 11th of May, 1817. "Notwithstanding his extraor-
dinary eloquence," says the duke of Abrantes, who knew him intimately, "the abbe Maury had been be-omerly, that is to say, in the condition that he
continued under the empire, a man of talent rather
than a man of sense, and a curate of the time of the
League, rather than an abbe of the reign of Louis XIV."
She adds that his figure was in the highest degree dis-
agreeable, but the description she gives of it appears
rather a caricature than a portrait. His principal work,
Essais sur l'Eloquence de la Chaire (8 vols. 8vo), pub-
lished after his death by his nephew, Louis Siffrein
Maury, still maintains its well-merited popularity. His
mind was formed to appreciate the eloquence of Masoli-
dol, Renouard, and Bounie, and his criticisms on the
other French divines are in general as correct as they
are temperate. In his review, however, of English pul-
pit oratory, he manifests a want of acquaintance with the
writings of its most celebrated preachers, such as
Jenkin and Sherlock, and Bowdler. He selected Blair as
the best model of English eloquence, and the comparison
which he draws between him and Masolindo is
necessary most unfavorable to Blair. His own pan-
eugy of St. Augustine is esteemed one of the finest
pieces of French pulpit eloquence. He is also supposed,
conjointly with the abbé de Berthomont, to be the author
of a work entitled Lettres sur l'Etat actuel de la Religion
de l'Eglise en France. See Vie du Cardinal Maury
(1827), by Poujoulat; Le Cardinal Maury, Sa Vie et Ses
Oeuvres (1856); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.;
Monthly Review, vol. lxix (1812), English Cy-
nic.-

Mathis'zim (CZ. Sept. Maiuzs, v. r. Mazsz, Vulg. Maiu-
zioni). The marginal note to the A. V. of
Dan. xi, 38, "the God of forces," gives, as the equiva-

cent of the last word, "Mauziz, or gods protectors,
or munitions." The Geneva version renders the Hebrew
as a proper name both in Dan. xi, 38 and 39, where the
word occurs again (marg. of A. V. "munitions"). In
the Greek version of Theodotion, given above, it is trea-
ted as a proper name, as well as in the Vulgate. The
Sept., as at present printed, is evidently corrupt in this
passage, but ἐγραφα (ver. 37) appears to represent the
word in question. In Jerome's time the reading was
different, and he gives "Deum fortissimum" for the
Latin translation of it, and "Deum fortissimum" for
that of Aquila. He ridicules the interpretation of Por-
phyry, who, ignorant of Hebrew, understood by "the
god of Mauziz" the statue of Jupiter set up in Modin,
the city of Mattathias and his sons, by the generals of
Antiochus, who compelled the Jews to sacrifice to it,
"the god of Modin." Theodoret retains the reading of
Theodotion (Μαυςίς being evidently for Μαυζίς),
and explains it of Antichrist, "a god strong and
powerful." The Pesbho-Syriac has "the strong god,"
and Junius and Tremellius render it "Deum summi
roboris," considering the Hebrew plural as intensive, and
interpreting it of the God of Israel. There can be little
doubt that "Mauziz" is to be taken in its literal sense
of "fortresses," just as in Dan. xi, 19, 38, "the god of
fortresses" being then the deity who presided over
strongholds. But beyond this it is scarcely possible to
connect an appellation so general with any special ob-
ject of idolatrous worship. Grotius conjectured that
Mauziz was a modification of the name ΑΛΛΟς, the
war-god of the Phoenicians, mentioned in Julian's hymn

The sun (Reyow, Addit. ad Seidenlin "De Dea Syria," p. 276). Can we suggested without quoting "money," the
name of a mere Roman god, all powerful. By others it has been interpreted to be Mars, the tutelary deity of Antiochus Epiphanes,
who is the subject of allusion. The only authority for
this supposition exists in two coins struck at Leodecis,
which are believed to have on the obverse the head of
Antiochus, deeply impressed by the ingratitude of his
former party, and that of the pontificate, to whose
elevation he had been instrumental, he died on the
11th of May, 1817. "Notwithstanding his extraordin-
ary eloquence," says the duke of Abrantes, who knew
him intimately, "the abbe Maury had been be-

MAXCY

First (Harrane, s. v.), comparing Isa. xxxiii. 4, where the reference is to Tyre, "the fortress of the sea," makes דָּאָש equivalent to דָּאָש וָאמֶר, or even proposes to read for the former דָּאָש, the god of the
"stronghold of the sea," i.e. Melkart, the Tyrian Her-
cules. A suggestion made by Mr. Layard (Nimrud, ii. 456, note) is worthy of being recorded, as being
at least as well founded as any already mentioned.
After the Antiochans, the Assyrians Vardan, the Avicynian Verdun, the Hittite engraved upon a lion, and crowned with a tower or mural
coronet, which, we learn from Lucian, was peculiar to the Shamitic figure of the goddesses," he adds in a note,
"May she be connected with the 'El Mauz, the de-

shepunt pahrov, or fortress,' and as 'El shepunt pahrov,' or fortress, or 'El shepunt pahrov,' or fortress, for the

Maw (יוֹבְכָה, kollow, only occurs in Deut. xviii, 3), the rough
vertebri or eckettus of ruminating ani-
mals, which is the second of their four stomachs (Aris-
totle, Hist. anim. ii. 17). So the Vulg., Onkelos, Saadia,
and Kimchi interpret; but Josephus (Ant. iv. 4), Philo
(ii. 255, ed. Mang.), after the Sept. (γροτοφος, i.e. ὄ-
τωστος), understand the fourth stomach, or omasum,
esteeved a great delicacy (like tripe) among the ancients
(comp. Bochart, Hieroz. i. 571 ed. Lips.).

Mawmoulaine or Malvouline, William de, a
Scottish cathedral prelate, supposed to be from
France, flourished in Scotland about the opening of
the 18th century. He was made bishop of St. Andrews
in 1692; established many monasteries in that country,
and was active in promoting a crusade to the Holy
Land.

Mawson, Matthias, D.D., an English divine of
the 18th century, became master of Corpus Christi Col-
lege, Cambridge, in 1782; subsequently rector of
Hastock, Essex; bishop of Llandaff in 1738; was tran-
slated to Chichester in 1740, and in 1754 to Ely. He
died about 1771. Bishop Mawson published only occa-

MAXCv, Jonathan, D.D., a Baptist minister
and noted American educator, was born in Attribhrough,
Mass., Sept. 2, 1768; graduated at Brown University
in 1787, and immediately became a tutor in that institu-
tion. Deciding for the ministry, he was licensed to preach
April 1, 1799, and was on Sept. 8, 1791, ordained pastor
of the First Baptist Church of Providence, R. I.
He was on the same day also elected both a trustee and
professor of divinity in the college, and in July, 1792,
became president. His pastoral relations he severed
September 8, 1792. In 1802 he accepted the presid-
cy of Union College; and in 1804, the newly-estab-
lishment South Carolina College having chosen him for its
first president, he needed the call, in the hope that a
Southern climate would improve his health, which had
become much impaired. Over this institution he con-
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continued to preside, with almost unprecedented popularity, until his death, June 4, 1520. Dr. Maxey was one of the most accomplished pupil orators and scholars of his time, distanced by few. He was well versed in philosophy, criticism, metaphysics, logic, politics, morals, and philosophy. His character was very amiable and his piety sincere. His death was that of the believer in Jesus, and his memory is widely revered. He published a large number of works, including addresses, sermons, etc., which after his death were gathered in a volume, entitled The Literary Remains of the Rev. Jonathan Maxey, D.D., with a Memoir of his Life, by Romeo Elton, D.D. The most valued of his publications were his sermons on the existence of God, frequently republished. See Sprague, 1844, 187, Christian Remains, vol. ix; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.; Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog., s. v.

Maxentius. See Constantine.

Maxfield, Thomas, a noted early Methodist lay-preacher, flourished in the latter part of the 18th century. He was one of Wesley's converts at Bristol, and was appointed to pray and expound the Scriptures, but not to preach, at the Foundery, in London, during Mr. Wesley's absence. Maxfield, however, being a young man of spirit, accepted of the invitation to expound the Scriptures, from the young people of the Foundery. He was greatly respected by the people, who, assembling in vast crowds, and listening with earnest attention, insensibly led him to deviate from this restriction and begin to preach. Wesley was informed of this irregularity and came to the Foundery, and accused him of his prejudices for "Church order" being still strong. The mother of Wesley counselled him to hear Maxfield preach before reproving him, adding, "But take care what you do respecting that young man; he is as surely called of God to preach as you are." Wesley heard him, and, after some hesitation, and in the power of truth, he objected no longer. Thus Maxfield became the first of the innumerable itinerant lay-preachers, who have spread the Gospel throughout the world more successfully than any other class of the Christian community. Wesley promoted his welfare in every way, introduced him in London to a social position superior to his birth, by which he was enabled to make an advantageous marriage, and obtained ordination for him in Ireland from the bishop of Londonderry, who favored Wesley in that country.

Maxfield was present at the first Methodist Conference held at London, England, June 26, 1774. Maxfield also attended the third Conference assembled at Bristol, May, 1776. He shared the persecution to which the followers of Wesley were subjected; was at one time seized and imprisoned for the king's service, thrown into a dungeon, and offered to the committee of a shutting them out. This being a revival in London, great excitement was produced by an honest madman, Bell, formerly a life-guardman, who had become a local preacher, and supposed that he had performed a miraculous cure. Possessing more enthusiasm than judgment, he became fanatic in public meetings, and greatly excited his hearers. He unfortunately obtained much influence over Maxfield—the latter was not naturally an enthusiast—and made him a companion in his fanaticism. Both the Wesleys conversed with Maxfield on the subject, telling him what they disliked in his conduct. In some matters he had been unjustly blamed, in others he promised to change; the evil, however, was not remedied, but seemed rather to increase. Then Mr. Wesley wrote a long letter to Maxfield, plainly telling him of the errors of his teaching and conduct, and of his tendency to separation from the Wesleys. The doctrines advocated by Maxfield and Bell were erroneous, inasmuch as they taught that a person saved from sin need not examine himself, need not pray in private, need only believe; that believing makes man perfect, and that the power of the Holy Spirit would find no one, thus saved could be taught by any one who was not.
Augustine friar, Maximilian addressed the Roman pontiff, and entreated him to heed this difficulty as "a question which was dividing Germany." But in the very year in which the discussion at Leipzig came off Maxi-
milian died (1519), and left it for his successor Charles V to further the cause of Protestantism by a blind obedi-
ence to the dictates of an incompetent Roman pontiff. His men, liberal in notion, learned and much read, and the
learned men were greatly encouraged by him. Indeed
he himself was an author, producing several works in prose and verse. See Hegewisch, Gesch. d. Regierung
Maximilians I (1762; new ed. Leipzig, 1818); Haltius,
Geschichte der Kaiser Maximilian (1520); Reiss, Kaiser
Maximilian I (Berlin, 1864); Lichnowsky, Gesch. d. Houses
Habsburg; Vehe, Memoirs of Austria, i, 238 sq.; Couce,
Hist. of the House of Austria, i, 278 sq.; Kohlrausch,
Hist. of Germany, p. 284 sq.

Maximilian II, emperor of Austria, son of empe-
ror Ferdinand I, and of Anna of Hungary, was born at
Vienna Aug. 1, 1527. He was educated in Spain by
Charles V; took part in the war of Smalcald (1544-48)
against the French; became viceroy of Spain in 1549;
on his return to Germany, about 1551, he made the
two-League alliance; in 1552 became governor of Hun-
gary. In September, 1562, he was crowned king of Bo-
hemia; elected king of Rome at Frankfurt in Novem-
ber of the same year; king of Hungary at Presburg in 1563;
and finally succeeded his father as emperor of Germany in July, 1564. He made war against the Turks until 1567, but their arms reigned in
peace. During his youth his preceptor, Wolfgang
Stiefel, had made him acquainted with the Protestant
 tenets, and he showed himself favorable to the Refor-
mation, living on very friendly terms with the Protes-
tant princes (Fischer, Hist. of the Reforma-
tion [N. Y. 1878, 8vo, p. 420]). Yet he did not allow their doctrines free
scope throughout his empire, as the majority in the
states was opposed to it, and the Protestants themselves,
divided into Lutherans and Calvinists, were engaged in
strife with each other. From the manner in which he
sought the friendship and alliance of Roman princes, it
must appear that Maximilian II never allowed his pri-
ivate convictions to rule him as a monarch, but that all
was made subservient to the interests of the empire.
Some will even have it, as Vehe (see below), that he was at one time a convert to the Protestant religion (Fischer, Hist. of the Reformation, i, 211). He, however, grant-
ed the Protestants in 1568 liberty to worship God
according to their conscience throughout Austria, and
commissioned D. Chrytus to draw up a Protes-
tant liturgy for Austria. Although he was op-
posed to the Jesuits, and subjected to many
restrictions, he yet, by his toleration, permitted them
access and great influence in his own family. He
died Oct. 12, 1576. See J. F. Miller, Epistola
Ferdinandi I et II (Pesth, 1808); Koch, Quellen z.
Gesch. M. II (Leipzig, 1867-81); Ranke, Historisch-
politischer Zeitscrift. (1862, p. 276 sq.); and the same
reprinted in Deutsche Gesch. (1868), vol. vi; Bernard
Raupach, Evang. Oesterreich, vol. i and ii; Lebret,
(Ulm, 1780), vol. ix; Maurenbrecher, in Sybel's Histor.
Zeitschrift, 1862, p. 351 sq.; E. Reimann, in the same
journal, 1866, p. 1 sq.; Coxe, Hist. of the House of
Austria, ii, 4 sq.; Vehe, Memoirs of the House of
Austria, i, 217 sq.; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, xi, 29; Herzog, Real-
Encyklop. ix, 204.

Maximilian I, Julius VEBUS, Roman emperor, was a
native of Thrace, and a shepherd in his youth. He
fine figure, great height, and strength attracted the notice of
the emperor Severus, who enrolled him in his guards. Maximian advanced rapidly, but did not serve under either Marcianus or Heliogabalus. During the reign of
Alexander Severus he came to Rome, was made senator and
chief of a newly-formed legion, took an active part in
the wars against the Persians and Alamans, and soon
gained great influence over the soldiers. When Alex-
ander Severus was killed at Mayence, March 19, 235, the
groups appointed Maximian his successor, and the sen-
ate, frightened, confirmed the election. He remained,
however, with the army, and made several expeditions
into Germany. His disposition was naturally cruel, and
he gave full scope to it when on the throne. Two con-
spiracies against him which were discovered led to fear-
ful massacres; in the first, it is said, over four thousand
persons were executed. He also opposed Christianity, and
particularly persecuted the bishops who had been
most favored by Alexander. About the same time some
earthquakes occurred in the empire, particularly in Cap-
padocia, and the people became enraged against the Chris-
tians, whom they accused of being the cause of all the evils which befell them, and the emperor allowed
free scope to all barbarities the people chose to inflict
on them. The persecution, indeed, broke out only in
some parts of the empire, so that Christians could flee
before it; but as the Christians had of late become used
to toleration, this sudden visitation of persecution fell
severely upon their heads, and caused much suffering
(comp. Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. vi, 28; Firmianus, in Cyrill.
Ep. 75; Origen, Comment. in Mott. xxvi, 9). Finally his
soldiers, tired of his tyranny and cruelty, murdered him,
with his son, at Aquileia, March 8, 286. Max-
imian was only regretted by the inhabitants of Thrace
and Pannonia, who were proud of having an emperor of
their own; the other parts of the empire rejoiced over
his death. The legendary poet of the 10th century
assigned to the reign of Maximian the fabulous par-
tydom of St. Ursula, a British princess, and her com-
pany of eleven thousand (according to others, ten thou-
sand) virgins, who, on their return from a pilgrimage to
Rome, were murdered by heathens in the neighborhood of
Cologne. This incredible number has probably arisen from the misinterpretation of an inscription, like
"Ursula et Undecimilla" (which occurs in an old missal of
the Sorbonne), or "Ursula et XI M. V., i. e. Martyres
Virgines, which, by substituting militia for martyris,
was increased from eleven martyrs to eleven thousand vir-
gins. Some historians place the fact, which seems to
form the basis of this legend, in connection with the
retreat of the Huns after the battle of Chalons, 451th
(Schaff). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. ix, 207; Smith,
Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, ii,
698; Schaff, Church Hist. i, 170; Gieseler, Ecclesiastical
History, i, 115.

COST OF Maximilian I.

Maximilian II, DAKA, Roman emperor, was originally
an Illyrian peasant, who served in the Roman armies, and
was raised by Galerus, who was his relative, to the rank
of military tribune, and lastly, A.D. 303, at the time of
the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian, to the
 dignity of Caesar, receiving for his share the government
of Syria and Egypt. After the death of Galerus, in 311,
Maximian and Licinius divided his dominions between
them, and Maximian obtained the whole of the Asi-
atic provinces. Both he and Licinius behaved ungrate-
fully towards the family of Galerus, their common ben-
efactor. Valeria, the daughter of Diocletian and widow
of Galerus, having escaped from Licinius into the de-
ominations of Maximian, the latter offered to marry her,
and on her refusal banished her with her mother into
the deserts of Syria. He gained unenviable notoriety
MAXIMUS

by his severity towards his Christian subjects, and made war against the Armenians. A new war having broken out between Licinius and Maximin, the latter advanced as far as Adrianople, but was defeated, fled into Asia, and died of poison at Tarsum in 313. — English Cyclopedia, a. v.

Col. of Maximin II.

Maximus Alexander, called also the Cynic Philosopher, was born in the fourth century, in Alexandria, of Christian parents of rank. He united the faith of an orthodox believer with the appearance and conduct of a cynic philosopher, and was greatly respected by the leading theologians of the orthodox party. Athanasius, in a letter written about A.D. 371 (Epist. ad Maxim. Philosoph. in Opp. i, 917, etc., ed. Benedict.), compliments him on a work written in defence of the orthodox faith. Tillemont and the Benedictine editor of the works of St. Augustine (Steele, in Orig. Christiana, zxx), misled by the virulent invectives of that father, attempt to distinguish between this Maximus and the one to whom Athanasius wrote, for the reason that Athanasius could never have approved of so worthless a character. They also distinguish him from the Maximus to whom Basil the Great addressed a letter (Ep. 41, Paris, 1839) in terms of great respect, discussing some points of doctrine, and soliciting a visit from him; but they are not successful in either case. The Maximus Scholasticus, however, to whom Basil also wrote (Ep. 49), was a different person. In A.D. 374, during the reign of the emperor Valens, in the persecution carried on by Lucius, Arian patriarch of Alexandria, Maximus was barbarously scourged and banished to the Oasis, on account of his zeal for orthodoxy, and the acrracity with which he aided those enduring the same persecutions (Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. zxx, c. 13, 14). He was released at the end of four years, probably on the death of Valens; and it was soon after this event that he presented to the emperor Gratian at Milan his work De Fide, written against the Arians (compare Jerome, De Viris Illustribus, c. 127), and which was not rejected by the emperor. It was, however, not published; but what in the same work or in another is not certainly known; and he disputed ably against the heathens. He appears to have returned from Milan and visited Constantinople, where Gregory Nazianzen had just been made patriarch, A.D. 379. Gregory received him with the greatest honor, and pronounced an oration (Orat. zxxv) in his praise, where his warm panegyric cause the commendations of Athanasius and Basil to seem exceedingly tame. He welcomed him at his table, treated him with much confidence and regard, but was subsequently grievously disappointed in him. Whether in the succeeding events Maximus was himself ambitious or merely the tool of others, does not appear. Profiting by the sickness of Gregory, and supported by some Egyptian ecclesiastics, sent by Peter, patriarch of Alexandria, under whose guidance they professed to act, Maximus was ordained, during the night, patriarch of Constantinople, in the place of Gregory, whose election had not been perfectly canonical. This bold proceeding greatly excited the indignation of the people, with whom Gregory was popular. The emperor Theodosius, whom they generally applied, showed him no favor, the latter withdrew to Alexandria, from whence he was speedily expelled by his patron Peter (see Gregory Nazianzen, Carmen de Vita sua, vv. 760-1029). The resignation of Gregory did not benefit Maximus, whose consecration was challenged by a peace or concord, the second general council, and the presbyters whom he had ordained declared not to be presbyters (Concil. Constantinopol. can. 8, sec. Dionys. Exiguum; Cepiola. 6, sec. Isidor. Mercat; apud Concil. vol. i, col. 609, 810, ed. Hardouin. Maximianus, and Successores, I, 9). The patriarch was sent to the patriarchate; but, though the Italian bishops seemed inclined for a time to second his efforts, he met with no permanent success. The invectives of Gregory Nazianzen against Maximus (Curmius, sec. De Vita sua, l. c. In Iesu, vs. 18, etc.; In Maximi) were written after their struggle for the patriarchate, and contrast strongly with his former praises in his twenty-fifth Oration, to which some of Gregory's admirers, to conceal the inconsistency, prefixed the name of Heron or Hero (In Laudem Herois; Jerome, De Viris Illustr. l. c.), which the friend of Maximus, the work of Gregory, De Fide, which is well spoken of by Jerome, is lost. (See Athanas, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, l. ; Soso- men, H. E. vii. 9, cum not. Vale; Tillemont, Mémoires, iv. 443, etc.; Cave, Hist. Lit. ed ann. 388, l. 276, ed. Ox- ford, 1740-42; Fabricius, Bibl. Graecos, iii. 520.)—Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. vol. ii. s. v.

Maximus Confessor, a leading champion of orthodoxy in the Monothelite controversy (q. v.), was born at Constantinople in 680. At an early age he became private secretary to the emperor Heracleius, but, deciding for the ecclesiastical state, he resigned his position, and, in 710, became the archdeacon of Chrysosipilas (Scutari), near Constantinople, and in a short time became its abbot. The dangers which threatened the state at the time induced the emperor to attempt a reconciliation between the parties engaged in the Mon- othletic controversy (q. v.), by means of a compromise, which declared that Christ had accomplished the work of redemption by one manifestation of his will as the God-man, (μιαν θρησκευτικὴν ἰσπραγγίαν). The patriarchs Sergius, of Constantinople, and Cyrus, of Alexandria, as heads of the controversy parties, agreed in 689 to unite in this formula, and many of the Monophysite faction returned to the Church; but several of the orthodox opposed the compromise strongly, as practically endorsing Monophysite views. With a view to put an end to these troubles, the emperor in 693 published an edict, known as the Euthanas (q. v.), which prohibited all controversies on the question whether in Christ were one or two operations, but which itself plainly inculcated the doctrine of one will. Maximus, who had in the mean time removed to Africa, now entered the lists in defence of the orthodox view, and unequivocally re- nounced all the arguments hitherto used against the Church. His course was favored by Gregorius (or Georgius), the prefect of North Africa, who sought an opportunity to renounce his allegiance to the Byzantine court; and under his protection Maximus exerted himself to the utmost to carry on the Monothelitic cause, manifesting a special zeal against the Monophysite Severians in Egypt and Crete, and against the Mono- thelites. His discussion with Pyrrhus, the patriarch of Constantinople, who had fled to Gregorius on being charged with complicity in the murder of the emperor Constantine, was held in July, A.D. 645, and resulted in the signum triumph of Maximus. The records of this disputation belong to the most interesting writings of the Monothelite controversy. In the following year the bishops of Africa and the neighboring isles, influenced by Maximus, held a number of synods which condemned Monothelitism, and called on Theodore, bishop of Rome, to support their views with his authority. Maximus now went to Rome, accompanied by Pyrrhus, who formally recanted his late opinions, and was recognised by the pope as the rightful patriarch of Constantinople; and thus the influence of orthodoxy was formed which promised a complete triumph. But Maximus was the only disinterested party to the agreement. Gregorius fell in a battle with the Saracens in A.D. 647; Pyrrhus hastened to take back his renunciation, and was made a bishop of Cyzicus; and the pope disappointed in the hope of seeing his supremacy recognised in the East as well as in the West,
anathematized him. Maximus was again compelled to
counter the labor of controversial writings. He was
now recognized at the imperial court as the soul of the
opposition; and when he resisted the edict of Constans
II, promulgated in A.D. 648, and known as the Typus
(q. v.), Gregorius, an envoy of the Byzantine court, did
not hesitate to put him in his cell, and attempt to
shake his firmness. The monk, however, refused to
make any concessions, since he regarded that edict as
dechristizing Caesar to the level of a being without will
or energy, and denied the right of the emperor to inter-
fer in dogmatic questions. On the 1st of May, Maximus,
more than any others, induced that pope to
convalesce the first synod of the Lateran (in 649); and
there can be no doubt that he originated the resolu-
tions there adopted, which condemned Monothelitism
and the imperial edict. Thereafter Maximus entered a
cloister, and was lose to the detailed record of his
life. We meet him again when apprehended, under or-
ders from Constantinople, perhaps at the same time as
pope Martin I, and brought to trial in 655. The pro-
ceedings (of which the records are quite full) show
that the aim of the emperor was simply to secure his ap-
pellation as a menace to the interests of peace; but the
monk remained firm, and declared with tears that the only means of securing peace was the
recall of that instrument. Hence the treatment he re-
ceived became harsher; and when, after his third trial, he
was arrested in maintaining his synod con-
vened by the patriarchs of Constantinople and of An-
tioch advised the emperor to banish him, and he was
taken to the castle of Bizya, in Thrace, later to the mona-
stery of St. Theodore, near Rhegium, and finally to
Perberis. His exile was protracted more than a year,
during which period frequent attempts were made by
bishop Theodosius of Cassarea, and by special agents of
the emperor to induce him to recant, but always with-
out success. He was finally condemned to be scourged,
and to lose his tongue and his right hand, that he might
no longer be able either to speak or write, and afterwards
to be incarcerated in the castle of Shenmarti, in the coun-
try of the Lacinians, where he died, Aug. 13, 652. His
influence, however, continued to be felt. A few years
later the emperor Constans II fell a victim to the homicide
he had aroused chiefly by his persecution of this faith-
ful champion of the Church, and in A.D. 690 the church
gave her sanction to the doctrines so heroically defend-
ed by this monk in the first Trullan council (q. v.).

As a writer Maximus is distinguished by a rare combi-
nation of dialectic power with mystical profundity.
His mind was receptive rather than creative, and in his
writings, which are Eustratian and Arisotelian,
Chalcedonian orthodoxy, the theology of the Greek fathers, and the
ideas of a Christian mysticism, which includes both the
subjective asceticism of the Egyptian monks and the hier-
rarchical tendencies of the Areopagite system, all meet
and coalesce. The mysticism of the Pseudo-Dionysius
exerted the greatest influence over him, and from it he
derived his principal thoughts; and it is chiefly be-
cause of his authority that the wide-spread influence of
this system upon the theology of the Middle Ages was
possible. The influence exerted on Scotus Eriugena by
the writings of Maximus was extremely important; Baur
asserts that Eriugena merely developed the ideas of
Maximus, and commented on them; and other writ-
ers have shown in detail that the essential features of
the system of Eriugena are drawn from Maximus, and
mediately through him from the Areopagite. This
monk thus becomes important as a connecting link be-
tween the ideas of the East and West, between the early
fathers and the Middle Ages, and as a forerunner of
scholasticism; and in his genius, character, piety, learn-
ing, literary and ecclesiastical influence, as well as in his
eventful life, he appears one of the most remarkable
Christian thinkers and martyrs. His works have been
largely transcribed and read, but there is no complete
edition. Combes has published a collection in two
volumes, folio (Paris, 1875). Catalogues have recorded
the titles of fifty-three, his letters being mentioned as
one work. Of these, forty-eight have been printed.
They may be classed as exegetical, which treat the
Scriptures in allegorical style; commentaries on
the Church fathers; dogmatico-polemical; moral and asceti-
çal; epistolary; and theological, and were written in the
Latin Church Aug. 13; by the Greek Church
Jan. 21. See Herzog, Real-Encyclop. xx, 114 sq.; Wet-
zer and Welte, Kirchen-Lex. xii, 785 sq.; Kurtz, Church
Hist. i, 205 sq.; Harwick, Hist. of the Middle Ages, p.
172; Gieseler, Eccl. Hist. i, 856; Von Millan, Hist. of
Lat. Christianity, ii, 274 sq.; Neander, Hist. of Christian
Dogmas, ii, 423 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman
Bios, and Mythol. s. v.

Maximus the Greek, a celebrated personage in
Russian Church history, was born at Arta, in Albania,
towards the end of the 16th century. After studying
at Paris, Florence, and other cities then distinguished
as seats of learning, he took the monastic vows at the
church of Mount Athos. The grand duke Vassili I
tavo-
itch, having requested the patriarch of Constantinople
to send two persons to arrange and describe a vast num-
ber of Greek manuscripts and books that had recently
been discovered in some part of the palace, Maximus was selected, and accordingly set out for Moscow. He
was directed by Vassili to examine the books, and to se-
lect such as were most deserving of publication; but as
he was then wholly ignorant of the Slavonic tongue,
he had first to prepare a Latin version, which was after-
wards rendered into Slavonic by the monks of the
Palex. He used the translations of a Paslair with a commentary,
and Chrysostom's Homilies on St. John, were produced.
Desirous of returning to his convent, it was only at the
instances of the Czar, who wished him to revise the ear-
er translated books of the Greek Church, that he de-
cided to remain, and he then undertook this task, for
which he was now qualified by a successful mastery of
the Slavonic. The diligence with which he executed
it, resulting in many corrections, tended however only
to raise up numerous enemies against him, among the
rest Daniel the metropolitan. But what more immedi-
ately endangered his safety was the commission
which he opposed Vassili's divorce from his first wife, Salome
(on account of barrenness), and his marriage with the
princess Helena Glinsk (comp. Duncan, Hist. of Russia,
p. 450). Maximus was condemned by a synod, excom-
municated, and imprisoned in the Greek monastery at Tver in 1525. In this confinement he was for some time treated with great rigor, though the
bishop of Tver interceded for him. At length removed
to the Monastery of St. Sergius, he died there in 1536.
A great number of works by him are extant, chiefly in
manuscript, on a variety of subjects—dogmatical, polem-
ic, philosophical, etc., from which considerable infor-
mation has been derived with regard to the opinions
and prejudices of the clergy and people in that age; nor
was he at all timid in reproving the abuses and vices of
the times. This alone would account for the persecu-
tion which he drew down upon himself; but after his
death even those who had been among the more violent
against him admitted his innocence, nor was it long be-
fore his memory came to be regarded as that of a holy
man and a martyr. — English Cyclop. s. v.; Rose, New

Maximus of Jerusalem (Hierotheoumonos), a
Greek ecclesiastical writer, flourished in the latter part of
the 24th century. Jerome (De Viris Illustr. c. 47)
speaks of Maximus as writing on the questions of
the origin of evil and the creation of matter, and as hav-
ing lived under the emperors Commodus (A.D. 180-192) and
Severus (A.D. 192-211), but he does not state that
office he held in the Church, or whether he held any;
nor does he connect him with any locality. Honorius
of Autun (De Scripture. Eccles. i, 47), extracting from
Jerome, mentions the name of Maximus; and Rufinus,
translating from Eusebius, who has a brief passage relating to the same writer (H. E., xvi, 27), gives the name in the same form; but it is probably incorrect. A Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem, lived in the reign of Antonius Pius or Marcus Aurelius, or the early part of that of Commodus, somewhere between A.D. 156 and 163; and it is possible, though both Eusebius and Jerome mention the bishop (Eusebius, Chronic. and Jerome, Euseb. Chronic. Interp.), they do not either of them identify the writer with him; and it is remarkable that in the last given by Eusebius of the bishops of Jerusalem, in his Histor. Eccles. (v, 27), the names of the second, and his successor Antoninus do not appear. It is uncertain, therefore, whether the writer and the bishop are the same, though it is extremely probable they were.

The title of the work of Maximus noticed by Jerome and Eusebius (for the two questions of the origin of evil and the cause of matter appear to be comprehended in one treatise) was De Materia. Eusebius has given a long extract from it (Prop. Evang. vii, 21, 22). A portion of the same extract is inserted, without acknowledgment, in the Dialoga Aetiamonti de recta Deum Fide, or Contra Marcionem, sec. iv, commonly ascribed to Irenaeus, but in reality, and only after his time. It is also quoted in the Philocalia, c. 24, compiled by Gregory Nazianzen and Basil the Great almost entirely from the works of Origen. In the inscription to the chapter they are said to be from the Preparatio Evangelica of Eusebius; and their being contained also in the supposed work of Origen, De Recta Fide, is affirmed in a probably interpolated sentence of the concluding paragraph of the chapter (Delaune, Opera Origina, i, 800 sq.). This passage, apparently the only part of Maximus's work which has come down to us, is given in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland (ii, 146), who identifies the author with the bishop, and gives his reasons for so doing in the Prolegomena to the volume, c. 6; see also Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 196, 93; Tillemont, Memoires, ii, 706, note xiii on Origen.

There was a third bishop of Jerusalem of this name, besides the two previously mentioned, who lived in the reign of Constantine the Great and his sons. He suffered in one of the later persecution of the heathen emperors, apparently under Maximian Galerius (Philostor., H. C. iii, 13). His sufferings in the cause of Christianity, and the influence of his position, led him to excommunicate the people of Jerusalem, among whom he officiated as priest, that when he was appointed by Macarius, bishop of that city, to the vacant bishopric of Diocletianopolis, the multitude would not permit his departure, and Macarius was forced to nominate another in his place. According to some accounts, Macarius repeated almost immediately of the nomination of Maximus to Diospolis, and readily acquiesced in his remaining in Jerusalem, taking him for his assistant in the duties of the episcopal office (Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. ii, 28). Upon the death of Macarius (some time between A.D. 331 and 335), Maximus succeeded him, and was present at the Council of Tyre, A.D. 335, when Athanasius was condemned. Sozomen records (Hist. Eccles. ii, 25) that at this council Paphnutius, a bishop of the Thebae or Upper Egypt, and himself a confessor, took Maximus by the hand and said to him, "You are the place; for," said he, "it does not become us, who have lost our eyes and been humbled for the sake of religion, to join the council of the wicked." This appeal was in vain, and Maximus was induced, but unwillingly, to subscribe to the decree condemning Athanasius. The same Maximus, who had acceded to this step, and, at a synod of sixteen bishops of Palestine, joyfully admitted Athanasius to communion when returning from the Council of Sardica, through Asia, to Alexandria. Sozomen relates (Hist. Eccles. iv, 20) that Maximus was deposed by the influence of Acacius of Cesarea and Patrophilus (A.D. 849 or 850), and Cyril (St. Cyrilus of Jerusalem) appointed in his place; but if there is any truth in this statement, the death of Maximus must have very shortly followed his deposition (Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. ii, 25, 185, 186; xi, 9, 6; Thaon, Lc. i, c. 144, iii, 6; Theodoret, Lc. i, Philosophiag, Lc. i, Le Clerc, Origs. Christian., vol. iii, col. 156).—Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. vol. ii, s. v.

Maximus. Philosopher. Different parties of that name are known in ancient history.

1. A heathen eclectic-Platonic philosopher and conjuror, who was teacher to the emperor Julian, and had great influence over him.

2. A heathen, of Madaura, in Africa, is known to us by an interesting letter to Augustine. In consequence of his consciousness of the downfall of heathenism, he seeks to uphold a philosophical but impotent monotheism, which, in the worship of several deities, sees only the adoration of a higher of supreme deity who imparts to them their power; but he reproaches the Christians with wishing to have that God all to themselves, and visiting the graves of the dead (martys). Regardless of the new life which Christianity awakened, or of the divine energy of its exclusiveness, he finally exclaims, characteristically, "Trabam solumque vulnera." The answer of Augustine is somewhat haughty and ironical (August. Opp. ii, 25 sq., ed. Venet.).

3. Eusebius mentions a Christian philosopher of that name in the 2nd century, giving an interesting fragment of a work of his on the question, then much discussed, of the origin of evil (Prop. Evang. vii, 21 fin., 22; Hist. Eccles. vii, 27). He has been by some considered as the author of the Dialoga c. Marcionem, formerly and erroneously attributed to Origen; but Gieseler (Stud. u. Krit. 1880-92, p. 380) successfully opposed this view.

4. Another Maximus, who represented himself both as a philosopher (cynic) and a Christian, and gave much trouble to Gregory of Nazianzus, at Constantinople.

Hertzog, Real-Encyklop. xii, 208.

Maximus, a bishop of Turin, was born towards the close of the 4th century, and early in the 5th was elevated to the episcopate. But little is known of his life. His signature is affixed to a document expressing the approval by the bishops of Northern Italy of pope Leo's letter to Flavian on Eutychianism (Leo, Opp. ed. Quesnel, p. 291). Among the signatures to the acts of a synod held at Rome in A.D. 405, his name appears immediately below that of pope Hilarius, the successor of Leo, a circumstance which marks him as the oldest bishop of the assembly. His writings, chiefly homilies, are rich in descriptions of the life of the Christians, at a time when paganism, although tolerating to its fall, was still powerful among the rural population, and when the empire was trembling before the power of the invading hordes of barbarians. During the irruption of Attila he displayed a lofty faith in God, and succeeded in arousing his people from their despair, which had determined them to forsake their homes and seek safety in flight. The people of Turin obeyed his counsel, and their city was spared. But when the Huns departed from Italy, and the citizens purchased a share of their spoil, including slaves, he did not hesitate to condemn their conduct, and even compared them to wolves following in the track of lions, in order to gorge themselves on the flesh torn from the fallen prey. His efforts to cure the still prevailing idolatry, particularly the cultus Diana aevorum numinis, the practice of the priests in inflicting wounds on themselves to do honor to their goddess, etc., and also defended the orthodox doctrines of the Church against Eutychians, Nestorians, Pelagians, and Manicheans. The best edition of his works is that published at Rome in 1784, found in Migne, vol. lxi. See also Schönemann, Bihl. Hist. Lit. (Leips. 1794), ii, 607 sq.; Acta Sacnt. June 25th; Biogra-
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phie, Universelle, vol. xxvii. s. v.; Herweg, Real-Enclop.
d. 12, 206 sq.; Wetzlar u. Weltcr, Kirchen-Lex., xlii, 782 sq.

Maximus of Tyre, a Neo-Platonic philosopher, author of
which place of his abode, flourished in the
2d century as teacher of philosophy and rhetoric, first
in Greece and afterwards in Rome, whither he made two
journeys, one under the reign of Antoninus, another un-der
that of Commodus. He may be ranked with Plineus,
Quintus Curtius, and others of whom we shall have
contemporary mention, and therefore of whom
very little is known. We have extant of his works
forty-one 

\[\text{Διηθεγματικα} \]

or dissertations, upon various argu-
ments, a MS. copy of which was first brought out of
Greece into Italy by Janus Lacarsi, and presented to
Lauresiaci. From this copy a Latin translation
was made, and published by Cosmus Paccius, ar-"
archbishop of Florence, in 1519; then in Greek by
Henry Stephens in 1557; then in Greek and Latin by Daniel
Hein us in 1697; by J. Davis in 1703; by Reiske in
1774, and since, in 4to. These dissertations are enter-
taining, curious, and instructive, and have gained the
author high encomiums among the learned. The fol-
lowing examples will give some idea of the subject
of Maximus's dissertations: "On Plato's Opinion res-
pecting the Deity;" "Whether we ought to return Injuries
done to us as an Active or contemplative Life is to be preferred;" "Whether Soldiers or Husband-
men are more useful in a State;" "On the Daumenion of
Socrates;" "Whether Prayers should be addressed to
the Deity," etc. The dissertations have been translated
into French by Morel (Paris, 1607), by Fornay (1764),
and by Dumas (1802); into Italian by Petro de Bardi
(Venice, 1642); and into German by C. T. Damm (Ber-
lin, 1764). There is, we believe, no English translation
of this author. Isaac Casaubon, in the epistle dedica-
tory of his Commentaries upon Persica, calls him "mel-
ritisimus Platonicensim;" and Peter Petit represents him as
"auctorim ipsi velimim eleemosynam in philosophia ad
spectrum" (Misc. Observat., li. e. 20). He has spoken
a good deal of himself in his thirty-seven dissertation, and
seemingly in a style of panegyric, for which his editor
Davis has accused him of indecency and vanity;
but Fabricius (Bib. Graec. lib. iv. c. 23) has defended him
very well upon this head by observing that Davis did
not sufficiently attend to Maximus's purpose in speaking
thus of himself; "which was," he says, "not at all with
a view of praising himself, but to encourage and pro-
mote the knowledge of those lessons in philosophy which
they heard from him with so much applause."
Some have confounded Maximus of Tyre with Maximus Ephe-
bus, the preceptor of Julian the Apostate. See Gen.
Biox, Dict. s. v.; Smith, Dict. Greek and Roman Biox.
and Mythol. s. v.; English Cyclopaedia, s. v.

Maxwell, Lady Darcy, an eminently pious Meth-
odist, who by birth and rank belonged to the nobility
of Scotland, is noted for her great works of philanthropy.
She was the youngest daughter of Thomas Brisbane,
County of Ayr, and was born about the year 1742.
In her own home she received the rudiments of an edu-
cation, but subsequently completed it in the city of Edin-
burgh. At the age of sixteen she resolved for a time in
London with her uncle and aunt, lord and lady Lothian,
to enjoy the advantages of being presented at court.
In 1759, soon after her return from London, she married Sir
Walter Maxwell. This union seemed to open before her
a bewildering vista of future joys and happiness;
but it was by no means all that she had bright
expectations; at the end of that period her husband
and child were taken from her, and she was left a widow
at nineteen. When tidings of her little one's death, with
in six weeks after that of her husband, were conveyed to
her, without any outbreak of grief, or even a murmur, she
expressed a desire to be of use to God and her heart,
and she shall have it!" "God brought me to myself by afflic-
tion," she frequently said. It was while overwhelmed
by these heavy trials that she became acquainted with
the Methodists. The early ministry of John Wesley
and George Whitefield was generally respected in Scott-
land. Many of the higher classes approved their labors;
ministers of the Establishment, members of the univers-
ity, and persons of rank and title mingled in their audi-
cences. It is supposed that some of the ministers of Wesley and Whitefield, first induced lady
Maxwell to hear them. However that may be, it is
certain that on June 16, 1764, Mr. Wesley preached to a
large congregation in Edinburgh, and from that time
 corresponded with her ladyship, his influence aiding
greatly in removing her views, and guiding her deter-
minations through life. From the time of her husband's
death she had resided in Edinburgh or the vicinity.
Her benevolence here was unusually great. Seeking
to relieve misery in every form, there was scarcely a pub-
lic or private charity for the repose of age, the su-
port of youth, the relief of the poor, the care of the sick,
or the spread of the Gospel, to which she did not con-
tribute. In 1770 she established a school in Edinburgh
for the purpose of affording education and Christian
instruction to poor children—this school was always the
objects, but they were successful; its entire management
and superintendence remained with herself, and, as
the benefits flowing from it became manifest, pecuniary aid
was furnished by others. At the time of her death
her husband children had profited by this praise-
worthy charity, and it is still in active operation. The
school's embraces each day was exceedingly ex-
emplary; she usually rose at four o'clock, and attended
the Wesleyan chapel at five, morning preaching being
then customary; after breakfast she discharged the
duties of the head of a family in her own house; from
eleven to twelve she spent the time in interceding with
God for her friends, the Church, and the world; the
remaining hours of the day she devoted to reading, writ-
ing, exercising, and acts of benevolence. Her evenings,
when alone, were occupied with reading, chiefly divin-
y; and, after an early supper, and committing her
family to the care of the great Father who was over all,
and spending some time in praising God for his mer-
cies, she retired to rest. In this manner, for nearly fifty
years, she walked with her God. Her outward reli-
gious life had its varieties, but they were the varie-
ties of advance; her inner religious life also had its
those of the beautiful morn-
ing, which shines brighter and brighter unto the
perfect day. In person, lady Maxwell was above the
medium height, exceedingly straight and well propor-
ted; her features quite feminine, but strongly intel-
ligent; her voice very soon and penetrating, and her
tender. She died July 2, 1810, passing away as peace-
fully and joyfully as she had lived: the society to which
she belonged losing its oldest member, the world one of
its best habitants, and the Church universal one of its
brightest ornaments. See Lancaster, Life of Lady Max-
well (N. Y. 1849, 12mo); Colens, Heroes of Methodism,
p. 76.

Maxwell, Robert, one of the Scottish lords of the
regency during the absence of James V in France, de-
serves a place here for his action in the first Parlia-
mament of Mary queen of Scots (1548), where he introduced a
bill to allow the reading of the Bible, and vigorously pressed in spite of the opposition of
the lord chancellor, the bishops, and priests. He died
in 1546.

Maxwell, Samuel, an American divine and edu-
cator, was born in Berkshire County, Mass., about 1805;
was educated at Amherst College (class of 1829);
subsequently became principal of the preparatory
department of Marietta College, Ohio, and later a professor in the
 collegiate department of the same institution,
and remained there until his death, which occurred January
24, 1867. He was also in the employ of the American
Missionary Association in his last years.

Maxwell, William, LL.D., an American educa-
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May, B. H., a Dutch Reformed minister, was born at Lynn, Norfolk, England, Jan. 29, 1735. He received a good preparatory education, and studied for the ministry at Hoxton College, near London; was ordained in 1815 over the Independent Church at Bury, Lancashire, and subsequently preached in Rochford, in the south of England, and Croydon, Surrey. In 1814 he came to America, and in 1855 became a member of the Classis of Washington, and pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church in Northumberland; in 1856, pastor of the Church in Schuylerville; in 1859, of the Twenty-first Street Church, New York; in 1884 accepted the appointment of secretary to the Pennsylvania Colonization Society; and in 1889 became secretary of the Pennsylvania Seamen's Friend Society, in which connection he served until near his death, August, 1898. Mr. May was an instructive and evangelical preacher, a man of refined taste and correct judgment, and a frank, open-hearted Christian. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1800, p. 209.

May, James, D.D., an Episcopalian, was born at Chester County, Pa., Oct. 1, 1805. He entered Jefferson College, Pa., in 1822; graduated with distinction; commenced the study of law, but finally entered the theological seminary at Alexandria, Va. He was ordained by bishop White in 1827, and first settled in Wilkesbarre, Pa., where he remained ten years. In 1836 he became rector of St. Paul's parish, Philadelphia. While there he was engaged with Dr. Clark, then rector of St. Andrew's Church, Dr. Tyng, then rector of the Church of the Epiphany, and with Dr. Sudards, then and still rector of Grace Church, in the editorial management of the Episcopal Recorder. His position at this time, he says, was a very hard one, and he was week by week restricted in foreign travel. Two years were thus spent abroad. After his return, he accepted the position of professor of pastoral theology and ecclesiastical history in the Alexandria Seminary, his alma mater. The outbreak of the rebellion in 1861 closing the operations of that school, he removed to Philadelphia, and became professor of ecclesiastical history and systematic theology in the divinity school just organized. He remained there until his death, Dec. 18, 1863. But few men have so thoroughly won the affections of those with whom they came in contact. Always an impulsive man, he was by no means a person of cold and unimpassive temper, but full of deep feeling. He has influenced the training of hundreds now in the ministry, who will greatly miss his counsel, and the encouragement and sympathy and personal sentiments gave them. He was remarkable for the unvarying symmetry and depth of his Christian character, and seemed like one inspired by Gospel principles, rather than controlled by them, so perfectly natural and habitual was his manifestation of them. See Am. Ch. Rec. 1804, p. 150.

May, Samuel Joseph, an eminent Unitarian minister, was born at Burlington, Mass., in 1817, and, after preaching several years as a Unitarian minister at Brooklyn, Conn., became general agent of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. Afterwards he assumed a pastorate at South Boston, Mass.; from 1842 to 1845 was principal of the Lexington Normal school; and finally, in 1845, settled in the Unitarian ministry at Syracuse, New York. There the remainder of his life was passed, and he was identified with every movement for the moral, intellectual, and social improvement of the people, and came to be regarded as the leading spirit in every measure of benevolence. In all matters of education he was very active, and to him, as much as to any man in Syracuse, it is due that its public schools are so successful and maintain such high character. He resigned the pastorate July 1, 1871. Mr. May devoted his energies especially to the anti-slavery cause for many years. He was one of the first members of the New England Society in 1832, and a member of the Philadelphia Convention of 1833 which formed the Anti-Slavery Society. He was author of Recollections of Amen. Anti-slavery (1869). See Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.; New Amer. Cyclop. 1871, p. 496.

Maya (Sanskrit, Illusion) is a term applied by the Hindoos, in a philosophical or mystical sense, to that power which caused or created the visible phenomena of the universe. The Hindoos, like Berkeley and other European philosophers, assumes that external objects have no absolute existence, but that they are mere impressions of the mind. The Maya, in Hindu cosmology, is, according to some, that mighty goddess the wife or consort of Brahman. See Moor, Hindu Mythology, s.v.; Wilson, Sanscrit Dictionary, s.v.; Thomas, Dict. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

Mayence, a German town, beautifully situated on a sloping hill on the left bank of the River Rhine, is analyzed in ecclesiatical history as the seat of an archiepiscopal see, and as the seat of several important Church councils. See Mayence, COUNCILS OF.

Mayence as an Archbishopric and Bishopric.—We have no trustworthy information as to the early history of this archbishopric. Attempts have been made to prove that the Christian Church was established there by St. Crescent, based on the passage in 2 Tim. iv, 10, "Crescent (is departed to Galatia)"; and Jerome and other writers also favor the opinion of Gaul having been Christianized by Crescent. Ado, however, in his Mergamopium, written about 560, is the first to refer to the action of Crescen at Vienna. Still as no documents referring to it until the 10th century, which may, however, be accounted for by the fact that the city was three times destroyed by fire up to that period. According to the ecclesiastical tradition, Crescen, a pupil of the apostle Paul, came to preach the gospel there as early as the year 82, became the first bishop of Mayence, and died a martyr in 103. The list of bishops up to the 6th century is all of later origin; according to it, Crescen was succeeded by Aureus, who was murdered by the Vandals when they took the city in 451. Sidonius, about 466, began the restoration of the town and of the church; Sigbert then became bishop about 589, and is said to have received from king Childerich the oxyn bearing a likeness of that prince and of his wife, which is still retained among the jewels of Mayence. In 612 Leonius (Leutigaus) caused war between Theodorek and Thoedebek. We then find in the list Ruthelmas (Rudulin), Landwald, Lupoald (Leowald), Higbert (Hichbert, f. 712), Gerold, who died at the hands of the Saxons in 748. He was succeeded by his son Gerwilo or Ge-wilbe, who in 744 marched with Carismian against the Saxons, and was defeated on the field of Haver. In 745 he was deposed, Bonifacius appointed in his place, and the bishopric transformed into an archbishopric, with the sanction of pope Zachary, in 749. In 755 or 754 Bonifacius resigned in favor of his pupil Lul-ius, who, however, did not reside long on the see; in 769 he was deposed, Bonifacius replaced him on the see; in 790; he labored diligently for the interest of the arch-
adoption of the tithing system in 778. He died Oct. 16, 796. His successor was Riculf, who founded the school of the Church of St. Alban at Mayence, and died Aug. 9, 818, the very year in which Constantine called a council at Mayence (see below). Haïsulf, Jan. 28, 827, introduced canonical life in the abbascopie; yet the manner in which he conducted his reforms was by far more liberal according to canonical rules, but by the king, with the consent of the clergy and people. This was the case with Otgar, 826-47; Rabanus Maurus, 847-56 (who called a council, by order of Louis of Germany, in the year of his ascension to the archbishops chair); Charles, son of king Pepin I of Aquitania, and nephew of Louis the German, 868-83, who was also arch chancellor of the empire, a dignity which was retained by his successors; Liutbert, who marched against the Bohemians in 872, and against the Sobrians in 874; defeated the Normans, who had ascended the Rhine, in 898, and died Feb. 17, 895. Sunzo (Sunderbold) fell fighting against the Normans in 891. Hatto I played an important part in the history of Germany during the reign of Louis the Infant and Conrad I, and died Jan. 18, 913. His successor, Henger, died in 927. Hildibrand, who successfully disputed against Cologne and Trier the right to crown the king, and crowned Otto I at Aix-la-Chapelle in 936, died in 937. Friedrich was exiled to Hambig or Fulda by the emperor Otto I, as a rebel; was recalled in 954, but repeatedly accused of treason, and executed by his successor; was afterwards buried in 954. He was succeeded by Wilhelm, a natural son of Otto, who died in 968. Of Hatto II (968-70), the tradition says that he was devoured by mice. Ruprecht died in 974. Willigis received the pallium from pope Benedict VII, together with the privileges of the archbishopric at all the German councils and of crowning the king. To remind him always of his low origin (his father was said to have been a wagoner), he caused a wheel to be erected on the walls of his palace, and this is said to be the origin of the wheel on the arms of the archbishops of Mayence. In 978 he laid the foundations of the new cathedral (which, however, was burned down on the day of its consecration in 1009), and died in 1011. Next follow Archibald (Erkenbald), 1011-21; Aribon, 1021-81; Barlo of Oppershofen, 1031-51, who finished the new cathedral, and consecrated it Nov. 19, 1037. He received on this occasion the pallium from pope John XIX, and the right to act as papal legate whenever no other person appeared invested with that authority in his diocese. The succeeding incumbent was Leopold (Laitpold), count of Bogen, 1051-59. Sigfrid I, count of Luxemburg, was made bishop in 1059, but he died, but in vain, to procure a divorce between Henry IV and Bertha, and proclaimed—yet without effect—in 1075 the edict of celibacy of Gregory VII. After 1077 he took the part of the anti-kings, and crowned Rudolf of Swabia and Hermann of Luxembourg. He died in 1084. Wezilo (1084-98) was deposed of at the Council of Hallerstadt, and put under ban for maintaining that those of the secular clergy who lost their estates were no longer subject to ecclesiastical jurisdiction; he subsequently receded from this position. Under Ruther (1098-1100), a revolution broke out against the Jews in Mayence, and the archbishop, fearing the anger of the emperor for having taken an active part in it, fled to Thuringia, whence he returned only after a lapse of eight years. Adelbert I, count of Saarbruck (1109-37), was elected by Henry V, yet sided against him in 1120, and put in prison; he died in 1136, having been deposed and excommunicated for his opposition, and only released in 1115, when the people of Mayence rose in arms to secure his liberation. Adelbert showed his gratitude by granting the citizens of Mayence the charter (releasing them from the jurisdiction of the imperial treasury, and from the badge of service), which was inscribed on the door of the cathedral in 1125. In 1120 he fled again before the emperor, after whose death, in 1125, he assembled a diet for the election of a king. This is the first instance of the appearance in the history of Germany of the electors, among whom the archbishop of Mayence held the first place. Adelbert II, brother of the preceding, held the office 1138-41. Mar- culf, 1141-42, was the first archbishop elected according to canonical rules, with the concurrence of the people. Henry I, 1142-55, was appointed by Conrad III, supported by his son, and crowned by emperor; he was hated by the clergy for his severity, and they accused him before the pope of squandering the funds of the Church and of immorality. He was deposed in 1158. Under Arnold I, of Seelenbownen (1153-60), the partisans of his predecessors, newcomers Hermann, count of the Palatinate, invaded the diocese and laid the land waste. Arnold retaliated, and peace was only restored at the emperor's return from Italy in 1156. Arnold having promised the emperor to accompany him in his next journey to Rome, and to employ his influence to settle the difficulty then existing between him and the pope, he sought to levy a tax on the diocese to defray his expenses; but the citizens resisted, and the emperor refusing to take the part of the citizens, they murdered the archbishop in 1160. The emperor now appointed Conrad I, in spite of the opposition of the chapter; the new archbishop, however, on being requested to recognize the anti-pope, Pascal, fled to Alexander at Rome, and was made archbishop of Salzburg. His place was filled in 1165 by Christian I, count of Buch, chancellor of the emperor Fredric I. He proved true to that office in his part in the battle of Mauterndorf, when he was arrested there in 1180 by the count of Monte Ferrara, remained a prisoner until 1181, and died in the neighborhood of Rome in 1183. The title of arch chancellor of the empire, which the archbishops of Mayence had often received in the 10th century, became permanent now. After the decease of Christian, Conrad I became again archbishop of Mayence. The late prelate had already set up a claim on the estates of the extinct house of Franconia in Thuringia and Hesse; Conrad brought it forward again in 1184, but was opposed by the landgrave Lewis III, and a lengthy strife ensued. In 1197 Conrad took part in a crusade, and died in 1200. Sigfrid II, the elder, count of Eppstein (1200-30), obtained in 1208 the direction of the bishopric of Worms, and in 1228 the right to crown the kings of Bohemia (which was exercised by his followers until 1345). Sigfrid III, of Eppstein, nephew of the preceding (1290-49), finding the finances in very bad condition, levied, with the assent of the chapter, on all benefits a tax amounting to one twentieth of their income. On the other hand, it was enacted that the archbishop was to be chosen by the chancellor and the other members of the chapter, and that every future archbishop should be strictly held to submit to that rule. In 1232 Sigfrid obtained from the king the abbey of Lorch, and restored the cathedral, which was consecrated in 1239. He favored the deposition of emperor Frederic II, and supported Henry Raspe, and afterwards William of Holland (this is commemorated by three statues to be seen in the cathedral of Mayence, the centre one representing the archbishop, the one on his right Henry Raspe, and the other William of Hol- land). He died in 1258. Sigfrid IV, taking advantage of the death of his predecessor, attempted to annex his possessions to Thuringia, but was opposed by landgrave Henry and Sophia of Brabant, and the dispute lasted seven years. Sigfrid died in 1259, and was succeeded by Christian II, of Bolanden, who resigned in 1261. Gerhard I (1251-59), was imprisoned for ten years, and only restored to his position because he is alleged in 1257 by king Richard of England, whom he afterwards supported as a candidate to the imperial crown. Under him the cathedral canons of Mayence ceased to lead the communitar life. Werner of Eppstein, nephew of Sigfrid III, (1259-1268), confided the see of Mayence to a chapter of chaplains, and from 1269 to 1271, he signed with the title of arch-bishop of Mayence and then concluded a treaty with the duchess Sophia of Brabant in 1268, by which he obtained Grunberg and Frankenbourg; in 1271 he bought WILDEBERG, AMORBACH, SCHNEEBERG, and WILBACH from Ulrich of De-
ren, and in 1278 the castle of Bockenheim from count Henry of Sponheim; he took an active part in the election of Rudolph of Hapsburg as emperor of Germany. After a vacancy of two years, Henry II was appointed archbishop in 1286; he was disliked by the clergy for his strictness, and died in 1288. Gerhard II, of Eppestein (1295–1305), was elected emperor, but afterwards sided in his deposition, and in the election of Albrecht of Austria: he used his influence with both emperors for the aggrandizement of his archbishopric. He was also somewhat distinguished as a legislator; his decrees for the Count-Gerhard Gedlohs, his chancellor, are copied; King Albert hired him not assigning him the second rank among the electors, he protested, and obtained an imperial decree, under date of Sept. 28, 1298, placing him and his successors in the first rank; the same decree confirmed them also in the title of archbishop of Mainz. In the death of Albrecht (1296–20) improved greatly the finances of the diocese by his economy, and was a strict promoter of ecclesiastical discipline. Matthias, count of Bubeck and landgrave of Burgundy (1221–28), first sided with emperor Louis of Bavaria, but afterwards with the pope, and enlarged the estates of his see; after his death, which occurred in 1228, pope John XXII appointed Henry III, count of Burenburg, but the chapter elected archbishop Baldwin of Tieve; the latter governed the diocese during the difficulty, and added to it a part of the village of Birkenfeld, and the manors of Botzwangen, Eisheim, and Odenheim. On Nov. 12, 1286, Baldwin voluntarily surrendered his claim, and Henry was now accepted by the chapter, after promising to take sides with Louis of Bavaria, and to surrender the strong places of the diocese into the hands of the chapter. In 1292 he engaged not to tax the inhabitants of Mayence, or those of the suburbs, without their consent; in 1330 he released them from the ecclesiastical punishments they had incurred for injuring the clergy, and in 1331 absolved them from their promise to repay the Jews sums advanced by them to the city. He obtained jurisdiction over Eschel, Duderstadt, and Gimboldhausen; on the other hand, Olmütz and Prague were detached from Mayence, and, in consequence, the archbishops of Mayence lost the right to crown the kings of Hungary. He finally got into difficulties by his fidelity to emperor Lewis, and was deposed by pope Clement VI in 1346, yet continued to exercise his functions until his death in 1353. Gerlach, who had been appointed by the pope in 1346, was now recognized by all as archbishop. The difficulties between him and his predecessor had greatly injured the diocese: the funds had been exhausted; the monasteries and abbeys had become much relaxed, and the respect of the people had diminished in consequence; Gerlach, however, added to the diocese the castles of Itter and Altenfels, Baltenburg, the village of Badenheim, and the half of Geismar. At this time the Golden Bull, in which the high position of the archbishop of Mayence as dean of the electoral college was officially recognized, was given to the public. Gerlach died Feb. 12, 1371. His successor, John I, duke of Luxemburg, died in 1373. Louis, son of margrave Frederick the Ernest, was now appointed by both the pope and the emperor, while the chapter elected Adolph I, of Nassau, bishop of Spire, who took up his residence at Erfurt; the difficulty lasted until 1380; Adolph remained archbishop of Mayence, while Louis was made archbishop of Magdeburg, and retained the regalia until his death. Adolph was long at war with the English, and the possession of his possessions in that province; he founded the University of Erfurt, and died in 1390. His successor, Conrad II, of Weinsberg, persecuted the Waldenses, of whom there were a number in his diocese, and entered into a league with the emperor, Henry V. The emperor sent the Flagellants. He died Oct. 19, 1396. John II, count of Nassau, brother of Adolph I (1386–1419), took part in the deposition of emperor Wenzel, and, in consequence of being suspected of having had a share in the murder of the emperor elect, duke Frederick of Brunswick, as he sheltered the murderer, he became involved in a war with Brunswick and Hesse, which lasted until 1401: he added to his diocese Wetterau and Ardeck, besides several villages. Conrad III, count of Stein, was in 1422 appointed with the consent of the emperor to succeed his brother, but, being opposed by Louis of Heidelberg, he resigned that office in 1423: he added to the diocese the city of Steinheim, and enacted strict regulations for the conduct of the clergy. Under him the citizens of Mayence continued to complain of the exemption from taxes enjoyed by the clergy; he persevered in setting the question. He died in 1434. His successor, Dietrich I, of Erbach, was more fortunate, and put an end to the troubles in 1488, with the aid of two commissioners of the Council of Basle. His whole time was taken up in quarrels with the pope and emperor; the Pragmatic Sanction of Mayence, of which he was the author, and in which he recognized the Council of Basle, the suppression of the annates, and the general restoration of canonical election, was rejected, while the Concordat of Aachaffenburg, which held the contrary views, was accepted. Dietrich died in 1493, and was succeeded by Diether (Dietrich II), count of Isenburg-Budingen; the latter, however, found a rival in count Adolph of Nassau, whom Frederick, elector of the Palatinate, supported by force of arms; Diether was besieged in Heidelberg July 4, 1461, and obliged to flee. In 1462 he was deprived of the see, pope Pius II, for receiving money from the annates (which the pope had arbitrarily raised from 10,000 to 21,000 florins). Adolph II, count of Nassau, was now made archbishop, and a war commenced between Diether, supported by Bavaria and the Palatinate, and Adolph, upheld by Bavaria and Wurttemberg; a treaty was finally concluded, Oct. 25, 1463, Diether renouncing his claims. The city of Mayence, which was stormed by Adolph in 1462, lost all privileges. After the death of Adolph, Sept. 6, 1475, Diether was again appointed archbishop; but now commenced a strife about the city of Mayence: the cathedral chapter claimed it for its own, while the citizens demanded their liberty, and rebelled against the chapter; they were finally defeated, and the city remained subject to the archbishop, who made it his residence; he built the palace of Martinsburg, and founded the University of Mayence, which was opened in 1477; he also restored to the diocese the estates of Algesheim and Olm, and died May 7, 1482. Albert I, duke of Saxony, was son of the elector Ernst (1482–84). His successor, Berthold, count of Henneberg, accompanied emperor Maximilian as arch-chancellor of the empire, but he took the side of the empire against the peace throughout the country, and in the institution of the imperial chamber of justice; he also introduced great improvements in the ecclesiastical and conventual discipline, and laid the grievances of the Germans with regard to ecclesiastical affairs before the court of Rome. He died Dec. 21, 1504. Jacob of Liebenstein (1504–8) added Koetheim and part of Klingenfurst to the diocese. Uriel of Genimengen (1508–14) ordered the examination of the clergy, and strictly opposed concubinage among them. Albrecht of Brandenburg, archbishop of Magdeburg, was made archbishop of Mayence in 1514; he loved grandeur, wasted the funds of the diocese, and abused the sale of indulgences; he took part in the league against the Protestant princes; being attacked by the landgrave of Hesse, he purchased peace at the expense of 40,000 thalers. In 1529 he originated the Edict of Ferrara, and in a league against the emperor; afterwards sought to restore peace among the different religious parties, and was one of the principal promoters of the peace of Nuremberg. He died Sept. 24, 1545, highly respected both by the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans, and not only in Germany, but in other parts of Christendom. Sebastian of Heusenstam (1545–55) labored to improve the administration of the diocese, and also to restore the influence of Romanism; he
subscribed to the Interim of 1548. During his reign Albrecht Alcibiades of Brandenburg invaded the diocese, and took Mayence; he made the citizens swear allegiance to the king of France, demanded a contribution of 600,000 ducats from the archbishop and chapter, and, as they were unable to pay that amount by the time stipulated, he burnt down the archiepiscopal palace and several churches; the archbishop himself fled to Eislefeld, where he died in 1555. His successor, Daniel of Homburg, endeavored to restore the archiepiscopal glory and former splendor; he introduced the Jesuits into Mayence and in Eichsfeld, and surrendered education into their hands; he took part also in the attempts of reconciliation between the Protestants and Romanists, added his diocese the county of Lahr (Rieneck), the county of Kusel, and all the Bassebaviasean territory to the Electorate of Mayence. He died March 22, 1582. He was succeed—
ed by Wolfgang of Dalberg (1582 to April 5, 1601). John Adam, of Bicken (1601 to Jan. 10, 1604), and John Suicard, of Kronberg, strictly enforced all the old ecclesiastical rules, and restrained the Protestants. Under Suicard the diocese began to feel the effects of the Thirty Years' War, which was then raging; it suffered especially from the inroads of Mansfeld and Christian of Brunswick, against whom he called for the assistance of the Spaniards. He died July 6, 1629. Anselm Casimir of Eichstät was proclaimed bishop from Mayence when that city was taken by Gustavus Adolphus, Dec. 23, 1638; he retired to Cologne, and the diocese was, until the Treaty of Prague, in 1635, occupied by Swedish and French troops, who greatly impoverished the country— not only by burning, but in the imperial forces. In 1685 the archbishop returned to Mayence, but the diocese became again the theatre of war in 1685, he fled again before the French armies, and in 1647 made a treaty with Turenne. Mayence remained in the possession of the French, and the archbishop went to reside at Frankfort, where he died, Oct. 9, 1647. His successor, John Philip, of Schönborn, prince bishop of Würzburg, resigned soon after his election, for the Swedes, after the expiration of the peace of Westphalia, expelled themselves for the secularization of the diocese, and the archbishop was only maintained through the intervention of Saxony; it lasted, however, by exemption, the archbishop of Verden and Halberstadt. On the occasion of the coronation of Ferdinand IV at Regensburg, John Philip came in conflict with the archbishop of Cologne over their respective prerogatives. He was also in difficulty with the Elector of Mayence, and finally took the city by force in 1664. Philip also quarrelled with Saxony about the town of Erfurt, which was finally added to his diocese in 1665. He then devoted all his attention to internal improvements; he gave regulations to the country, Mayence in 1659; in 1661 he established a theological seminary; an 1663 was also made bishop of Worms. In 1667 he joined the league against France. By a treaty concluded Aug. 24, 1692 with Brunswick, he gave up the district of Eichsfeld, with the exception of Duderstadt, Giebolsdáh, and Herleshausen. He died, June 3, 1678. Dom. Damian Hartard, of Leyen, died Dec. 6, 1678. Charles Henry, duke of Metternich-Winneburg, was elected in 1679, and died on Sept. 27 of the same year. Anselm Franz, of Ingelheim, surrendered Mayence to the French in 1688, and took up his residence at Erfurt; but the marshal of Uxelles had to return to Mayence to the duke of Lorraine, Sept. 8, 1698, the archbishop returned to it. In 1691 he joined a league against France. By a treaty concluded Aug. 24, 1692 with Brunswick, he gave up the district of Eichsfeld, with the exception of Duderstadt, Giebolsdah, and Herleshausen. He died, Jan. 10, 1702. John Philip, nephew of John Philip, took the part of Austria against Spain in the War of Succession. In 1704 the diocese of Kronberg was joined to the diocese by succession. In 1714 the strife between the archbishop and the Palatinate was brought to a close by the former giving up his claim to Böckelnheim, and receiving in exchange New Bamberg. He died Jan. 30, 1729. Francis Louis, count of Neuburg, bishop of Breslau and Worms, and also archbishop of Trèves, died April 19, 1732. Under Philip Charles, of Ellte-Kemenpehn, Alten- nau, together with five vilages, was added to the diocese. He died March 21, 1743. John Frederick Charles, count of Ostein, remained neutral in the Austrian War of Succession, and his diocese suffered severely from the French in consequence; in 1746 the grand duke of Tuscany, with his armies, took possession of the whole town of Mayence. In 1752 the two other ecclesiastical electors in trying to emancipate the German episcopacy from the dominion of Rome; by a decree of Dec. 23, 1768, he abolished a number of festivals, and by another of July 30, 1771, he enacted several reforms in the diocese. He encouraged industry and agriculture, founded charitable institutions, and established the administration of the diocese on a regular basis; on Jan. 30, 1778, he entered into an agreement with Saxony concerning Trefurt and Mulhouse, by which he surrendered the jurisdiction of Protestant districts to that state. On July 16, 1778, Saxony took possession of Joseph, of Eichthal, who became also bishop of Worms, followed in the footsteps of his predecessor, introducing many reforms in the Church; he endowed the University of Mayence with the convents of Karthaus, Alten- münster, and Reichenklaren in 1781, when he died Oct. 15, 1784, he had added seventeen prebends, and also directed that theological studies should no longer be pursued in convents, but only in the University of Mayence. The archbishop had heretofore been partisans of Austria, but he sided with Prussia when Frederick the Great opposed the plan of equipping France with armies. He died July 25, 1782. He was succeeded by Count Theodor of Dalberg, as archbishop, metropolitan, and primate of Germany. The see was transferred to the cathedral of Regensburg, and received jurisdiction over the whole of the former ecclesiastical provinces of Mayence, Trèves, and Cologne, lying on the right shore of the Rhine, with the exception of the part belonging to Prussia, and also over the whole province of Salzburg, in Bavaria. The archiepiscopal of Mayence became the simple bishopric, subject to the archbishop of Mechlin, and including only the territory of the old archiepiscopal on the left shore of the Rhine. The first bishop was Joseph Louis Colmar, appointed Oct. 3, 1802, who governed his diocese exclusively under French inspiration. Mayence was taken by the allies May 17, 1814; Colmar died Dec. 15 of the same year. A vicar-general was then appointed. In 1829 the bishopric of Mayence was, by a papal decree, detached from Mechlin and subjected to Freiburg. Joseph Vitus Burg was appointed bishop Jan. 12, 1830; he divided the diocese into deaneries, and died March 3, 1851. His successor was Count Charles H. of Bucquoi, general, John Jacob Humann, died Aug. 19, 1834. Peter Leopold Kaiser issued complete diocesan statutes in 1837, and died Dec. 80, 1848. Leopold Schmid, pre- fessor of theology and philosophy at the University of Giessen, was appointed bishop of Mayence by pope Pius IX, Feb. 22, 1849, but he was not confirmed.
Schmid, Ub. d. jüngste Maimer Biechevski, Giessen, 1850); and William Emanuel von Ketteler was made bishop in his place, March 29, 1850. Since Ketteler's accession, the bishopric of Mayence is noted as the gathering-place of all Jesuit ultramontanists. How this Roman see in Germany will continue its opposition to all order of state rule, now that the Jesuits have been expelled, is holding a long and heated debate. (2) The most important council was held at Mayence in 1225, called by emperor Frederick II. It is by some called "a synod of Germany." Forty-seven canons were published, which relate to the incontinence of the clergy, and simony. The sixth declaration that ex-communicated priests who dare to perform any clerical function while under excommunication shall be deposed and excommunicated, both from ecclesiastical and civil life, without hope of being ever restored, shall be treated as infamous, deprived of the power of leaving their property by will, and never again permitted to hold any kind of ecclesiastical benefice. (Not to be found).

Another very large body assembled in council at Mayence in 1548, called together by Sebastian Heusden, archbishop of Mayence, with the deputies of the bishops of his province and the principal of his clergy. Forty-seven canons were published concerning the faith, and fifty-seven canons of discipline. Among the first canons which we find are those which attempt to establish any kind of discipline or order, according to the faith of the Church; it is further stated that man was created with righteousness and endowed with grace, but that he was possessed of free-will; afterwards the fall of man and his justification are spoken of, and it is declared that this justification proceeds from the grace of God; that it is given before any merit; that this justification is given when man receives the Holy Spirit, with faith, hope, and charity, which gifts it declares to be inherent in him, and not merely imputed, so that man is not only accounted righteous, but is so in reality, without any merit, but by God's grace and righteousness communicated to him; that the charity which justifies must be accompanied by good works, of which grace is the source and principle (canons 7 and 8). The council, moreover, in the canons of faith, set forth the doctrine of the sacraments, and decided, against the heretics, that they are not bare ceremonies, but effectual signs of grace, which they are, by divine operation, the means of conveying to those who receive them worthily.

With regard to ceremonies, it is decreed that such ought to be retained as are of the order and rite of the Lord's Supper, which is the Lord's Supper; among these are reckoned the sacraments, churches, altars, images, holy vestments, banners, etc.

As to images, the council decrees that the people should be taught that they are not set up to be worshiped, and that none ought to be set up in churches which are not in worship. It is declared that the goods of this life are nothing in comparison with the life to come, and that piety. Curates are also enjoined to remove the image of any saint to which the people flocked, as if attributing some sort of divinity to the image itself, or as supposing that God or the saints would perform what they prayed for, in favor of that particular image, and not otherwise. Afterwards the following matters are treated of: devout pilgrimages, worship of saints, prayers for the dead, and the law of fasting.

Among the fifty-six canons of discipline and morality, we find it ruled (in canon 61) that when the lesser festivals fall on a Sunday, they shall be kept on some day following or preceding; that apostate monks, upon their return to his convent without the bishop's permission; that preaching shall not be allowed; and that monks shall not be admitted to private houses; that care shall be taken that all schoolmasters be sound Catholics, etc. Finally, it is declared that the council received the acts of the holy canonical councils, and yielded entire submission to the catholic, apostolic, Roman Church in all things (Conc. vii. 1, and Leand. Mon. 18, Isid. 11, and 12).
Mayer, John, D.D., an English divine, flourished in the early part of the 17th century. But few memoirs have been discovered to furnish any satisfactory account of his personal history. It appears from his preface that he was ordained to the minor order of the clergy, and afterwards employed him for public services as a clergyman for many years. In 1634 he became minister of Reydon, in Suffolk. He published Theological Treatises and Commentaries on the English Catechism (Lond. 1621, 4to):—A Commentary on the Old and New Testaments (rare; 6 vols. fol., and 1 vol. 4to, 1561, 47, '92, 53). See Allibone, Dict. Brt. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.; Darling, Cyclop. Biblio-. vol. ii, s. v.

Mayer, Lewis, D.D., a noted American divine of that branch of the Christian Church denominated the German Reformed, was born at Lancaster, Pa., March 26, 1783. On receiving a liberal education in his native place, he removed to Frederick, Md., where he devoted his attention for some time to a secular calling. He was fond of reading and study. Having become conscious of a call to the holy ministry, he pursued his theological studies with great zeal and success, under the direction of the Rev. Mr. Wagner, of Frederick, Md. He was licensed and ordained in 1807, and became pastor of a church in Shepherdstown, Va., where he labored till 1821. In that year he was called as pastor to York, Pa. In 1825 he resigned his charge, having been called by the Synod of the German Reformed Church to assume the presidency of the theological seminary then established at Carlisle, Pa., and afterwards located at York, Pa. In this position he labored with great zeal till 1855. His health giving way he retired to private life, and lived in York, Pa. He devoted his remaining strength to the preparation of a History of the German Reformed Church, only the first volume of which, however, has been published. This volume is chiefly occupied with an account of the Reformation in Switzerland. His labors were brought down to 1770. Dr. Mayer published also a Treatise on the Sin against the Holy Ghost, and Lutheran Subjects. With regard to his theological works he also edited for some years the Magazine and the Messenger of the German Reformed Church. He died Aug. 25, 1849. See biographical sketch by the Rev. E. Heimer, prefixed to Dr. Mayer's History (Phil. 1850, 8vo, pp. 477).

Mayer, Philip Frederick, D.D., a distinguished American Lutheran minister, was born April 1, 1781, in the city of New York, where he continued to reside till he reached his majority. His earlier years were spent at the German school attached to the Lutheran Church. His preparation for college was made under the direction of Mr. Davis. He graduated with the first honors of his class at Columbia College, New York, in 1799, then under the administration of Dr. W. S. Johnson. He spent three years in the prosecution of his theological studies, under the instruction of the Rev. Dr. Kunse, one of the most learned men of his day. He was licensed to preach the Gospel in 1802, and soon after took charge of the Lutheran Church at Lunenburg (now Athens), N.Y. In 1806 he resigned this position, and accepted a call as pastor of St. John's (Lutheran) Church, Phila- delphia. This was the first exclusively English Lutheran congregation formed in this discharge of his duties Dr. Mayer devoted himself with conscientious fidelity and uniring zeal. He was unwearied in his efforts to promote the good of his
own flock, as well as faithful and constant in his aims to advance the welfare of the whole community. He never withheld his influence from any object which met his deliberate and cordial approval. In 1808 he was associated with bishop White, Dr. Green, Dr. Rush, and others in the formation of the society of the immediate ancestors, the first institution of the kind organized in the United States, of which he continued to be an active and efficient manager, and was at the time of his death the presiding officer. He was also the senior member of the board of trustees of the University of Pennsylvania. He was a member of the board of trustees of the Pennsylvania Hospital, the Deaf and Dumb Asylum and of the Philadelphia Dispensary, and was actively connected with other ecclesiastical institutions. Liberal and enlarged in his views, he was at some time identified, either as a patron or director, with every philanthropic enterprise of a catholic spirit in his adopted city. He retained his pastoral connection with the Church till his death, which occurred April 16, 1858. Dr. Mayer was no ordinary man, or he could never have so successfully sustained himself for so long a period among the same people, and enjoyed in so eminent a degree the regard and confidence of the whole community. He was a man of clear intellect and quick perceptions, united with great delicacy of taste and keen discernment. He was a ripe scholar, thoroughly acquainted with the whole range of English literature, and in the department of the Holy Scriptures, he was altogether master. He received his D.D. from Columbia College, New York, and the University of Pennsylvania. (M. L. S.)

Mayhew, Experience, a noted American divine for years actively engaged in missionary labors among the Indians, was born Jan. 27, 1678. His father, grandfather, and great-grandfather were all most successfully engaged as missionaries to the Indians before him. In March, 1694, about five years after the death of his father, he began to preach to the Indians, taking the oversight of five or six of their assemblies. The Indian language had been familiar to him from infancy, and he was employed by the commissioners of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in New England to make a new version of the Psalms and John, which work he executed with great accuracy in 1709. He died Nov. 29, 1758, aged eighty-five. He published a sermon entitled All Mankind by Nature equally under Sin (1724): — Found and saved (1729), in which he gives an account of the lives of thirty Indian ministers, and about eighty Indian men, women, and youth, worthy of remembrance on account of their piety: — Letter on the Lord's Supper (1741): — Grace Defended (1744), in which he contends that the offer of salvation made to sinners in the Gospel contains the most important promise of the grace given in regeneration. In this he says he differs from most Calvinists; yet he supports the doctrines of original sin, of eternal decrees, and of the sovereignty of God in the salvation of man. His son Zechariah succeeded him in the missionary field, making five generations thus engaged. The age attained by the Mayhews is remarkable: the first, Thomas, died aged ninety; Experience, eighty-four; John, grandson of the first John, eighty-nine; his brother Jeremiah, eighty-five; Dr. Matthew, eighty-five; Zechariah, seventy-nine. — Indian Comp. Appendix, p. 306, 307; Chauncey's Remarks on Lawdaff's Sermon, p. 23; Cyclop. Rel. Knowledge, a v.

Mayhew, Jonathan, D.D., a celebrated American divine, was born at Martha's Vineyard Oct. 8, 1720. He was a descendant of Thomas Mayhew, the first English settler of that island. In early childhood Jonathan gave indications of great vigor of mind and a strong will. He was fitted for college by his father, who was a very correct man. During his course at Harvard he was distinguished not only as a fine classical scholar, but also for his skill in dialectics and his attainments in ethical science. He graduated with great honor in 1744. Three years later he received a call from West Church, in Boston, and continued in this station for the remainder of his life. On the day first appointed for his ordination only two clergymen of those invited were in attendance, owing, no doubt, to his extreme rationalism; and even these two refused to act, other ministers in the city considering the whole proceeding a mistake. But the call was not withdrawn, and had to be convoked, June 17, after which the new candidate was duly installed in office. Mr. Mayhew's liberal opinions were so unpopular in Boston that he was for some time excluded from membership of the Boston Association of Congregational Ministers. In 1750 the degree of doctor honoris causa conferred upon him by the University of Aberdeen. His publications excited great attention not only in this country, but also in England. In 1755 he published a volume of sermons on the Doctrine of Grace. At the close of one of these sermons there is a note on the Divinity of the Trinity, which was offensive alike to those who did and did not endorse his general views. Subsequently the doctor himself appears to have regretted having written it, and he unsuccessfully endeavored to prevent its being published in the London edition. Dr. Mayhew was at this time scribe of the Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers. In 1763 the Rev. East Arthur published a pamphlet entitled Considerations on the Institution and Conduct of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, occasioning a violent controversy, in which Dr. Mayhew bore a prominent part. Dr. Mayhew was extensively known throughout Great Britain and many foreign countries, and received addresses from such men as Lardner, Benson, Kippis, Blackburn, and Hollis. He died July 9, 1766. Dr. Mayhew possessed a mind of great acuteness and energy, and in his principles was a determined republican. He had no little influence in producing the American Revolution. Among his best-known publications are the following: Seven Sermons (1749, 8vo) — A Discourse concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-resistance to the Higher Powers (1750, 8vo). See Mr. Bancroft's notice of this sermon, and his eloquent tribute to Mayhew, in his Hist. of the United States, iv, 60-62. — Thanksgiving Sermons for the R e a l l e a m o t, 1766: — Sermons to Young Men (1767, 2 vols. 12mo). See Memoir of the Life and Writings of the Rev. Jonathan Mayhew, by Alden Bradford (1836); Riche, Bibl. Amer. N o r a , i, 140, 145, 158; Allibone, Dict. Eng. and Amer. Authors, a v.; Sprague, Amasa Amer. Pulpit, vii, 22 sq.

Mayhew, Thomas, a Trinitarian Congregational minister, son of Thomas Mayhew, the governor of Martha's Vineyard, was born in Southampton, England, about 1621; emigrated with his father to New England in 1631; resided for a few years in Watertown, Mass.; and in 1645 was given the ministry in establisht at Edgartown, Martha's Vineyard. Being deeply affected by the intellectual and moral degradation of the Indians, and possessing good natural talents, and a considerable knowledge of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, he determined to devote himself to preaching to the natives of the island. He soon acquired their language, commenced his pulpit ministrations in 1646, and labored among them so faithfully that in 1650 he had 100 converts, and in 1662, 282, among whom were eight pastors or priests. In 1657 he sailed for England to obtain aid from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; but the ship in which he had taken passage was lost at sea, and never heard of. Cotton Mather says that " he was so affectionately esteemed by the Indians that many years afterwards he was seldom named without tears." He wrote, in connection with the Rev. John Eliot, a Discourse, or a Reply to Mr. Greford's Progress of the Gospel among the Indians in New England; — Sprague, Amasa American Pulpit, i, 181; Drake, Dict. American Biography, a v.

Maymburg. See MAMBURG.

Mayne, James S., a Presbyterian minister, was born in R availgh, near Coleraine, Antrim County, Ireland, in 1826. He received a careful academic education.
tion in his native country, and in 1853 came to America; graduated at Princeton College with honor in 1857; studied divinity at the theological seminary at Princeton, N.J.; was licensed in 1859, and in 1860 commenced his labors at May's Landing, Atlantic City, and Abeccon, N.J., where he died Aug. 30, 1860. Mr. Mayne was one of the four outstanding divines in the Episcopal Church and a noted painter. See Wilson, Prob. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 108.

Mayne, Jasper, an English divine and poet, was born in Devonshire in 1654. At the age of nineteen he entered Christ-church College, Oxford, and in 1671 secured the degree of M.A. He took holy orders, became a popular preacher, was presented by his college to two neighboring livings, and continued at the same time his residence at Oxford. He was ordained a D.D. in 1686. At the time of Cromwell's usurpation, being firmly devoted to the cause of Charles I., he was deprived of his student's place, and soon lost both of his vicarages. His spirit, however, remained unbroken, and in 1652 we hear of his holding a public disputation with a noted Anabaptist preacher. Subsequently he retired, until the Restoration, as chaplain in the family of the earl of Devonshire; in 1660 he was restored again to his living, was made chaplain in ordinary to the king, a canon of Christ Church, and archdeacon of Chichester. He died in 1692. Dr. Mayne published in 1665 a translation of a part of Lucia's Dialogues, also several sermons and scattered poems.

Maynooth College. In consequence of the English Reformation, the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland lost all its rights and possessions. At the Synod of Dublin, in 1654, seventeen bishops out of nineteen endorsed the Act of Uniformity, and, upon the principle that "ubi episcopus ibi ecclesia," the English Reformed Church was declared the only legal Church in Ireland. The Roman Catholics were therefore compelled to worship in private, and to get their priests educated abroad. With the assistance of foreign princes they established, during the years 1542-1556, a number of seminaries in Spain, Italy, and the Netherlands (namely, at Salamanca, Alcalá, Lisbon, Evora, Décas, Antwerp, Tourmey, Lille, Rome, Praga, Carpanica, Toulouse, Bordeaux, Potsiers, Nantes, Bouley, and Paris). As most of the students were poor and dependent on the ariostocracy of Ireland, a great attachment grew up between them and the class by whom they were patronized. But in consequence of the French Revolution intercourse between Ireland and the Continent became more difficult. The Irish colleges of France and Brabant were closed, and the Jesuits, who were the apportioned of organizing a seminary at home. The most opposite political parties agreed in supporting this measure: the aristocracy from fear that the young priests might imbib the democratic ideas abroad, and the democrats from the hope of gaining over to their views the priests, who had hitherto always sided with their patrons. The middle classes especially thought to find in home-bred priests useful auxiliaries to their emancipation. When therefore the Roman Catholic prelates submitted to the lord lieutenant of Ireland their plan of establishing a college, he immediately approved; the Irish Parliament, composed of Protestants, sanctioned it, voted an appropriation of £20,000, and readily obtained the approbation of the Parliament of England in 1785. A board of trustees was organized, consisting of four Protestants, the Irish lord chancellor, three chief justices, six Roman Catholics, and ten bishops. Hickey, who had been eminently active in organizing the whole affair, was elected president of the college. The whole care and management of the college was vested in this board of managers. The four Protestant members were changed every five years (being replaced by election of the abbots and, and, together with three Roman Catholics, fulfilled the duties of inspectors, yet without the power of interfering with either the doctrines or the discipline of the college. The most liberal among the Roman Catholics wished the college to be established at Dublin, the seat of the University, and where members of the different denominations were already studying harmoniously together. But the Roman Catholic bishops opposed this, as they desired their priests to be educated under stricter discipline. The board of managers therefore chose the place of Maynooth, eleven miles from Dublin, and commenced building a seminary for fifty students on a piece of land purchased from the duke of Leinster. When the Irish Parliament was incorporated with the English, in 1801, an appropriation was made to the College of Maynooth amounting to £20,000 a year for the next twenty years. In 1808 some £18,000 more was voted for the purpose of enlarging the seminary, as it was inadequate to educating the number of priests required. Indeed in that year there were 478 obliged to study abroad, chiefly in France, while there were only 200 to 250 attending at Maynooth. The seminary continued a long time without attracting much attention; even the report of the board of trustees, presented in 1836 to Parliament, did not throw much light on the real character of the institution; in fact, the true state of things was rather covered up, and in 1840 in a meeting of the college. But when O'Connell's agitation broke out, it became apparent that its principal champions were priests educated in Maynooth College. It was also found that the alumni of Maynooth took an active part in the Roman Catholic emancipation in 1829 by unfavouring the election. The institution was now re-instituted for the purpose of suppressing democratic ideas, seems thus to have become a centre of political as well as religious agitation. But the interior workings of the institution remained hidden from the public gaze until a zealous Protestant minister, McGhee, procured the theological textbook of Peter Deen, used at Maynooth, which was published to the extent of three thousand copies in 1804; another edition of the same number appeared in 1832. This work, which breathes to the utmost the Roman Catholic spirit of aggression and persecution, and upholds the most offensive doctrines of that Church, was considered there as the highest authority, and gives a striking contradiction to the statement so often made by interested parties that the Roman Catholicism of the 19th century is animated by an entirely different spirit from that of former times. These revelations provoked much opposition to Romanism, and a growing desire to abrogate the privileges of the Romanists. June 28, 1835, a great meeting was held at Exeter Hall, which was followed by others in various cities of England and Scotland. It was proved that the Roman Catholic college was religious, had the implication of heresies, still claimed to relieve from oaths, retained auricular confession, with all its attendant evils, and all from unequivocal passages in the aforesaid textbook. Numberless pamphlets were published on this occasion; Protestant associations were formed in Ireland to defend evangelical freedom, and chief among these were found the Orangemen. The old hatred between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants was thus revived, and trouble with Ireland seemed imminent. On the side of the Roman Church the "liberator of Ireland" gained credit for his action by his fiery denunciations of the English; his attitude became so threatening that the government was obliged to prosecute him for high treason. This repressed the rebellion in its very infancy, but at the same time embittered the feelings of the Roman Catholic population. Previous experience had shown that persecution could indeed weaken, and almost destroy, but never conquer Ireland; and this was still more the case with regard to their Church, which the Roman Catholic Irish clung to the more as it was weaker and more oppressed. The attempt was, therefore, made to try whether the kindred would succeed where harshness had failed. The occasion was favorable, the insurrection was suppressed, and, if the victors met the vanquished as friends, much might be gained. This Irish question
proved almost insurmountable to the English government. Cabinet after cabinet were wrecked upon it, without arriving at any result. And this is not to be wondered at, for the civil as well as religious relations in Ireland had for a long time been in so abnormal a state that all attempts at reform seemed either inefficient or dangerous. Every effort to improve the condition of the peasantry, and the mitigation of the excess of mortality, while every assistance rendered to the weak and oppressed, but de facto national Church of Ireland, exasperated the Protestant element of the population. The passage of any bill concerning Ireland was a most complicated affair, for the government of the Roman Catholic prelates had assured Peel that the passage of his new bill would be thankfully received by the Roman Catholics as a pledge of conciliation. But hardly had the bill been presented to the House of Commons when a storm of opposition arose. The Protestants felt the additions undue, and the Catholic leaders demanded a modification of it, and to petition against a bill which would modify the Protestant character of the administration. A large meeting, chiefly of Dissenters, was held at Exeter Hall, March 18, 1845, and a Central Anti-Maynooth Committee organized to oppose the bill, and to overwhelm the Parliament with petitions. On April 3 Peel presented the bill to the House of Commons. He attempted to prove that there were but three ways of acting: to maintain things as they were, to suppress the usual appropriation, or to increase it. The first he declared impracticable, as insufficient a sum for the purpose could not gain much gratitude for the donors; the second, he said, was still less advisable, as the withdrawal of assistance to which they had been accustomed for fifty years would not fail to exasperate the Irish; but the third he looked upon as a certain remedy. He therefore proposed to raise the annual appropriation for Maynooth to £80,000, making it a part of the regular budget, and thus transforming the grant into a donation; he moreover proposed to incorporate the board of trustees, and to vote a special grant of £20,000 for building purposes. Besides, the Roman Catholics were pressed by the king to appoint five inspectors appointed by the crown, who, however, would leave the control of the doctrines and discipline to the three Roman Catholic inspectors. The opposition was headed by Sir R. Inglis. He attacked the bill on religious ground, as opposed to Protestant principles. He did not mean to withdraw the usual appropriation, but wanted Roman Catholics, like Dissenters, to educate their ministers at their own expense. All those opposed to the Established Church sided with him. The bill received 216 votes against 114 at the first reading. This, however, was but the prelude. At the second reading the struggle commenced in earnest and lasted through six sittings. They first argued about the new principle, which converted a yearly grant into a donation, for this gave to the previously ignored Roman Catholic Church a legal existence and official recognition. The friends of the bill sought to defend this principle in various ways. Some claimed that it was the duty of the Parliament to care for Maynooth, either because, by uniting with itself the Irish Parliament, it had assumed its charges, or as a sort of restitution for the former possession of the very Church in Rome has been deprived. Yet the assumption of the liabilities of the Irish Parliament did not guarantee the continuance of the grant longer than twenty years more, and, on the other hand, calling £36,000 a restitution, when the yearly income from the confiscated Church land amounted to over £600,000, sounded like bitter mockery. Others preferred to take the broader ground of moral obligation, claiming that it was necessary to aid oppressed and impoverished Ireland. Others again, leaving the past to consider only the future, argued from the point of view of a conciliatory and, if possible, conciliatory measure, and the better education of the priests, would open a new era to Ireland. None of these views satisfied Gladstone, who, after criticizing them all, finally arrived at the negative principle that the support granted to Maynooth should only be withdrawn at the last extremity, as it would have the effect of consequences on the relation existing between England and Ireland. Some even sought to treat it as a mere educational question. Still the majority could not blind themselves to the fact that it really involved the weighty and difficult question of the relation between the English government and the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. The opponents of the bill had an easier task. They could readily attack it from an abstract religious standpoint. They divided themselves, however, into two groups, sections, according to the ground they took. The Churchmen and some of the people did not oppose the continuation of the former support, but its increase; the Dissenters, as a body, opposed this, like all other government support towards churches. Both parties clamored loudly against the abuses of the Church of Rome, its papal influence on the people, its particularity the Jesuitical spirit insinuated at Maynooth. Yet Parliament perceived that something must be done to allay the hostile feelings in Ireland, and the bill passed the second reading with 233 votes against 176. After another protracted and severe struggle, it received the third reading by 217 votes against 149. The discussion of the bill in the House of Lords was a repetition of that in the House of Commons. The most eminent jurists decided in favor of the bill. Brougham established a precedent in bringing forward a previous act in which the principle of dotation was clearly expressed. On the bench of bishops, six voted in favor of the bill; among them the archbishop of Armagh and the bishops of Norwich and St. David. The bill finally went through with 181 votes against 50, and received the royal sanction on June 80, 1845. While the bill was under discussion in Parliament, the Church in Ireland was very explosive. A large meeting was held on April 18 at Covent Garden, in which both Churchmen and Dissenters took part. Other meetings were also held in the principal cities. The Dissenters were especially active. The Churchmen asserted their opposition: 1, that by increasing the grant to the seminary, the papacy would be legally recognized in Ireland; 2, that the practice of employing government funds for the support of religion is wrong in principle; 3, that there were special objections to the bill under consideration, namely, the Jesuitical tendencies of Maynooth, the danger of the influence over the masses of a more thoroughly-educated clergy, the evil of binding the clergy to the support of the government, leading them to oppose the progressive social tendencies of the people; and, finally, the spirit of aggression inherent to the papacy. Some of the Dissenters, however, who criticized this platform too indelicate; they wanted the bill rejected wholly on anti-State-Church principles, and on May 2 formed a special committee at Salter’s Hall, distinct from the original Central Anti-Maynooth Committee. On May 10 they held a meeting at Crosby Hall, in which 300 ministers and 400 laymen (principally Baptists, Presbyterians, Independents, and Calvinistic and Arminian Methodists of the new connection) took part. They urged the Roman Catholics to decline the assistance of the government to their Church for their own sake and that of their institution. Sir Culling Earlely, president of the Central Committee, spoke in a quite different tone in a letter to O’Con-
nell. He accused the Roman Catholic leader of inconsistency if he accepted the new grant, and threatened to use every means in his power to gain his end. An Anti-Maynooth Committee was also organized at Dublin, and in a meeting held on June 5 an address to the House of Lords was drawn up, which received 867 signatures. A petition for the emancipation of the clergy was also submitted. In the whole there were some 10,000 petitions drawn up against the bill, which received about 1,130,000 signatures. The government, however, remained unmoved, and the excitement gradually subsided. It was thought that now the Roman Catholic party would rest satisfied, and be truly reconciled; yet at one of the very first synods held by them the royal colleges were excommunicated and the national school condemned. The Roman Catholic prelates in Ireland—Cullen, Slattery, and M'Hale—had already attracted considerable attention by their Ultramontane views, but at this last outrage the old opposition spirit kindled again into a flame. Spooner provoked a visitation of Maynooth College by a bill he proposed May 11, 1852. Yet more moderate advice prevailed: it was claimed that the papal aggression in no wise affected Ireland, but rather England, and that the most Ultramontane among the Irish prelates, Cullen, was educated at Rome, not at Maynooth. Spooner finally withdrew his motion. Yet every year, for some time after, the proposition of stopping the appropriation was renewed; and was not dropped until quiet had been fully restored in Ireland, and general harmony re-established.

The agitation of the Irish population in late years, provoked, no doubt, in a great measure in Ireland, as in Poland, by the immaculate emigrations of the pontiffs of Rome, has led the government of England to consider the propriety of granting the three millions of Irish Romanists such liberty in worship and education as should make them as fit subjects as the other twenty millions of the northern isles who enjoy the protection of the British crown, and worthy associates of their English-speaking neighbors. In 1868 Mr. Gladstone, whose very earliest work had been "marked by a plain inclination to elevate the Church above the State," and "the very maiden-days of his political career, had "exhibited an unflagging tenacity for the whims, the complaints," and the growing claims of his friends the papal prelates," was called to the premiership of Great Britain, to establish, if possible, perfect accord between the English and Irish people. Almost the sole aim of the policy which the new premier inaugurated was the conciliation of the Romanists of Ireland. For this one purpose was broadened until the sooner had he succeeded Mr. Disraeli than he urged the disestablishment of the Church of England principles as the ecclesiastical principles of Ireland. His success in this attempt is now a matter of history. See IRELAND. Flattered by the easy victory gained in his first effort, Mr. Gladstone followed it by a proposal for the establishment of compulsory education and denominational schools. Herein, also, he succeeded, but only measurably. Encouraged by these repeated successes, he has lately come forward with a scheme which only a few days after his return from Italy, in April (1870), thwarted him in, and even now holds him in suspense. His new scheme now on foot is a proposition to dismantle Trinity College, long the eyesore of Romanists, and to found an immense educational establishment, called the Irish University, in which Catholics shall study only their own history and philosophy. Provision is made for a different system to be endowed with a vast revenue from the stipulation of Trinity and the wrecks of the Established Church. Both Dissenters and Conformists are alarmed at the step Mr. Gladstone seems determined upon. Even Romanists disfavor the proposal, for if of the three or four millions of Catholic Irish it is probable that not one third of suitable age can read and write. The greatest opposition, however, has come from Rome, and suddenly the premier of Great Britain finds himself confronted by those whom he had always had reason to look upon as his chief supporters. Well has it lately been said that "the policy of Rome knows neither friendship nor gratitude; to serve the Church it strikes indiscriminately at its friends or foes; and the British statesman has shown himself no match for the Italian priests, who have revealed nothing less than the total subjugation of its Protestant population to a priestly despotism." The endowment of Maynooth, and later the establishment of the queen's colleges, and even the open doors of Trinity, cannot and will not pacify Rome. She seeks control of Ireland both in Church and State; and as long as the papacy shall remain tainted by a nest for temporal power, both England and Prussia will find defilement and abasement, aye, not infrequently rebellion in the ranks of those of her subjects who claim fidelity to the hierarchy. The last days certainly are teaching even the most liberal-minded politicians that the Church of Rome is built upon a foundation which is political as well as ecclesiastical, and that the severe measures, as inaugurated by Bismarck, will alone save the Protestant world from ruin and decay.

Mayo, Daniel, a Presbyterian divine of some note, was born at London or on the Scottish border, in 1672. He was educated first at home, then went abroad and studied for some time in Holland under Witsius. On his return to England he preached successively at Totton Fields, Westminster, at Kingston-upon-Thames, and at Hackney, and finally settled permanently at Silver Street, London, where the church he directed was opened in 1738. Mr. Mayo was associated with some of the most eminent men of considerable talents, great zeal and activity, combined with prudence. Besides publishing many sermons, he wrote, in continuation of Henry's Exposition, a Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. See Albion's, Dictionary of British and Amer. Authors, n. v.; Brown, Cyclop. of Religious Knowledge, n. v.

Mayotta, one of the Comoro Islands in the Indian Ocean, since 1848 under the control of the French, is situated in latitude 12° 34'—18° 4' S., and longitude 44° 59'—15' 43' E., covering some twenty-one miles from north to south, with an average breadth of six or seven miles; if, however, the dangerous coral reefs which surround the island be included, the whole occupies a space of thirty miles north and south, and twenty-four miles east and west, and contains a population of about 8000, mostly Romanists. The surface of this island is very uneven, and is studied with volcanic-looking peaks, some of which exceed 3000 feet in height. Its shores are in some places lined with mangrove swamps, which are uncovered at low water, and are productive of malaria and fever; it is in most parts capable of cultivation, predominantly that of sugar, the only article exported. The French themselves live mainly on the island of Gaomain. Its main source of income is the collection of reefs on the east side of Mayotta. A governor and colonial officer are residents, and some 100 French soldiers, besides some natives, were stationed there. The Roman Catholic Church alone has a hold here.

Mayow, Robert Wynn, an English divine, was born at Saltash, in the latter half of the 17th century (17??); was educated at Eton College; and, after serving several curacies in succession, removed to Arundel, near Manchester, but there he died, only three months after removal, in 1817. Mr. Mayow is highly spoken of as a pulpit orator. A noted English writer has observed that he was "one of his order for great humor and strong feeling, which the two possessed in common. He published Plain Preaching, or Sermons for the Poor and for People of all Ranks (Lond. 1816, 12mo);—Sermons and Miscellaneous Pieces, to which is prefixed a Memoir"
of his Life (1822, 12mo).—Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s. v.

Mayr, Beda, a Benedictine monk, was born at Du-
ittingen, in Bavaria, in 1742. He entered the cloister at
Donauwörth in his twentieth year. Finely cultivated,
and classed with the best talent of his day, he sought
relief from the dulness of convent life by teaching mat-
ematics, poetry, rhetoric, philosophy, canon law, and the-
ology. He was charged with being liberal to excess,
and from his supposed and distrustful manner of the
Roman Catholic Church. His principal work, Defence of
the Natural, Christian, and Catholic Religion, accord-
ing to the Necessities of our Time, was published at Augs-
burg in 1787, and is still mentioned. He died April 28,
1794. A list of his works is given by Düring, Gelehrte
Theol. Deutschlands, vol. ii, s. v.; see also Weisg und
Welte, Kirchen-Lexicon, vi, 955. (G. M.)

Mayr, Cölestin, a German theologian, was born
April 21, 1679, at Donauwörth. In 1696 he entered the
Benedictine Order at Augsburg; later he became a stu-
dent at the University of Salzburg, where in 1711 he
was appointed professor of philosophy. In 1718 he ob-
tained the professorship of polemical theology, and the
inspection of the Salzburg schools. About this time he
was made doctor of divinity. In 1714 he was appointed
ecclesiastical counsellor of the duke of Salzburg, and at
the same time became professor of scholastic theology.
In 1726 he was appointed vicar-apostolic in Kufstein,
in 1719 pro-chancellor, and in 1728 chief rector.
In 1731 he retired from academic life, and thereafter held
an official relation to the cloister Linzheim, in Neuburg,
where he died, March 19, 1753. Mayr enjoyed great
prestige as a writer of theology, but his productions
have never been collected in book form. They consist
mainly of dissertations and contributions to different
journals. For a list of his writings, see Düring, Gelehrte

Maysart. See MEYSA RT.

Mazarin, Jules (properly Guillo Mazarino), car-
dinal, the celebrated prime-minister of king Louis XIV
of France, the successor of cardinal Richelieu, and inaugu-
ratior of a reign noted for attainments in arms, lan-
guage, fine arts, literature, industry, and a superior de-
gree of splendor, was born of a noble Sicilian family
July 14, 1602, most probably at Pescina, near the lake
of Celano, in Abruzzo Città, though in the letters of nat-
uralization he pretended he was born in France in 1602. It is stated that he was born at Rome. It is certain, however,
that he received his education at the Eternal City, and
hence, no doubt, the mistake as to his native place. In
1619 Mazarin went to Spain to pursue the study of juris-
publicum, probably at the Parliaments of Seville; he pro-
sessed, but returning to Rome in 1622, a little later he
entered the military service, and was given a captain's
commission in 1625. Soon after this he entered the service of the Church, and was employed as companion of
the papal legate to France, and in this mission dis-
played great political talents. In the difficulties arising
out of the contested succession to the duchy of Mantua,
in which France supported the pretensions of the count
De Nevers, while the emperor of Germany, the king of
Spain, and the duke of Savoy supported those of the duke
of Guastalla, Mazarin was sent by pope Urban to Turin
as the assistant of cardinal Sacchetti. The latter at
once perceived his talent, gave him his entire confidence,
and in fact devolved upon him the entire management of
the negotiation. It was not immediately successful, for
in 1629 Louis XIII in person invaded Savoy, took
Sevres, and placed the pretensions of the king of
Spain. Mazarin was selected by Moreau in the Bibliographie des Mazarinades [Paris, 1860-51, 3 vol, 2 vol, 8vo]; a selection of them was published by Moreau under the title Choix des Mazarinades [ibid. 1864, 2 vol, 8vo]. After the revolution of 1830, Mazarin was banished from the court, but Paris making his removal a condition of its submission,
he retired again from the court, and it was not till
Feb. 3, 1658 that he made a triumphant entry into the capital, where he was received with significant silence. Yet after a time the skill, patience, and perseverance of Mazrani triumphed, and he regained his former popularity and acquired his former power. See here article Louis XIV, p. 526, col. 1. After governing France with great energy and success, Louis XIV was arriving at an age when he felt the capacity and desire to sway the sceptre himself, Mazrani died, March 9, 1661. In 1690 some letters, written by Mazrani during the negotiation of the peace of the Pyrenees, were published; additional letters were published in 1693, and in 1745 others were added, the whole arranged under the title of Lettres du Cardinal Mazrani, où l'on voit le secret de négociation de la Paix des Pyrénées. "They were written for the information and instruction of the young king, and form useful examples of clearness and precision in diplomatic writings." His person was remarkably handsome, and his manners fascinating, and from an opponent he turned Anne of Austria, the queen-regent during Louis XIV's minority, into his friend, if not secretly affianced companion, as has been asserted with much appearance of truth. "Mazarin," says Mignet (Mém. relatifs à la succession d'Espagne), "is the most active and inventive mind, a character rather supple than feeble. His device was 'ça Temps et moi.'" Under his administration the influence of France among the nations was increased, and in the internal government of the kingdom the principles of despotism were established on which Louis XIV afterwards acted. The administration of justice, however, became very corrupt, and the commerce and finances of the country sank into deep depression. It is admitted that as a financial administrator he was far inferior to Richelieu. Mazrani was very industrious and very avaricious, and had acquired in various ways, fair and foul, an immense fortune, amounting to 12,000,000 livres, which he offered to the king shortly before he died; afraid, it is thought, that it might be rudely seized from his heirs. Louis declined the restitution, which was perhaps what the wily minister expected. In his will Mazrani made many and large bequests to students and literary enterprises; indeed, he had always proved himself the friend and patron of learning. The College Mazrani was founded at his wish, to receive students from the provinces acquired by the "peace of the Pyrenees," and to this same institution he presented his library, of immense value and size. See the Memoirs of Mazarin's contemporaries, Retz, Madame Motteville, La Rochefoucauld, Turenne, Grammont, etc.; Mme. de Longueville, etc., by Victor Cousin. Mazarin's correspondence with the victorious Duke of Capedigué, Richelieu, Mazrani, la Fronde et la Régence de Louis XIV (Paris, 1835, 8 vo. 8vo); Saint-Aulaire, Histoire de la Fronde; Bazin, Histoire de France sous le Ministère du Cardinal Mazarin (Paris, 1882, 2 vol. 8vo); Voltaire, Œuvres de Louis XIV; Guizot-Priost, Vie du Cardinal Mazarin (1862); John Calvert, Life of Cardinal Mazarin (1870); Sismondi, Histoire des Francs; Grammont, Memoires; V. Cousin, La Jeunesse de Mazarin; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale; Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.; English Cyclop. s. v.; Fraser's Magazine, November 1834, February 1832.

Mazdak (Mazdeka), a Persian religious enthusiast, flourished towards the close of the 5th century (he is believed to have been born about a.D. 470). He professed to be a prophet, and, securing many followers, declared for a community of property. Gaining in strength among the people, he found favor finally also in the eyes of his ruler, king Kobra, and the system of communism was adopted, effecting great changes in the social order. The revolution, however, lasted only a short time, and gradually the old order of things was restored.

Mazel, Abraham, a leader of the French Carmaïsards, was born at Saint-Jean-du-Gard some time about the middle of the 17th century. After the insurrection of the Cévennes in 1702 he was imprisoned, but, escaping from his captors, he determined to bring the people to a more determined stand, and while engaged in this work was killed in a skirmish near Uzès in 1710. See Court, Histoire des Carmaïsards. See CARMASARDS.

Masxiz (Maszip, r. d. Ziriac), given by erroneous Greek writers, is in place of the Hebrew Mattathiah (Exx x, 43).

Masolin, Silvestro, an Italian theologian, is usually known by the surname Prioris (after the name of his birthplace, Prierio). See PRIERIA.

Mâzor (Heb. Mozaor), יָּשָׁר, a name occurring only in the original, and which the translators of the A. V. ("beasieged places," 2 Kings xiv. 24; Isa. xxxvii. 26; "fortified cities," Micah vii. 12; "defense," Isa. xix. 6) have confounded with a word of the same form signifying a fortress (as in Ps. xxxi. 22; Hab. ii, 1, etc.). Gesenius, however (Thesaur. Heb. p. 815), regards it as the title of a Egypt, and apparently Lower Egypt, as, in three out of the four passages where it occurs, it is in the phrase יָשָׁר אֵרָם, the streams or canals of Egypt, i.e. the branches of the Nile (Isa. xix. 6; xxxvii. 26; 2 Kings xiv. 24; and that it comes from the Egyptian word meduru, a kingdom; perhaps the sign. of the dual form Mirizmar, מִרְצִים, q. d. double Egypt (comp. Josephus, Ant. i, 6, 2). Others (see Bochard, Phaleg, iv, 24), as probably the Hebrews themselves, considered Egypt to be so called as being strongly fortified (see Deod. Sic. i, 81). See EGYPT; FORTRESS.

Maszaroth (Heb. Masszaroth), מַסָּרָה, a word found only in the plural, and occurring but once, Job xxxviii. 32, probably by an interchange of liquids for "פָּרָה, plancts," 2 Kings xxiii., 5), an astronomical term, probably meaning the twelve signs of the Zodiac (see Hirzel, Delitzsch, and Conant, severally, ad loc.). See ASTRONOMY. "The Peshto-Syriac renders it by igalato, the Wain, or Great Bear; and J. D. Michaelis (Suppl. ad Lex. Heb. No. 1891) is followed by Ewald in applying it to the stars of the northern crown (Ewald adds the southern), deriving the word from מֶשֶׁר, a crown. First (Hanan, s. v.) understands by Massaroth the planet Jupiter, the same as the star of A莫斯 v. 26. But the interpretation given in the margin of our version is supported by the authority of Gesenius (Thes. p. 669). On referring to 2 Kings xxiii., 5, we find the word מַסָּרָה, massaroth (A. V. the planets), differing only from mazzaroth in having the liquid i for yod, and in the massaroth the twelve signs, as in the Vulgate. The Sept. there also has מַסָּרָה, which points to the same reading in both passages, and is by Suidas explained as the 'Zodiac,' but by Procopius of Gaza as probably 'Lucifer, the morning star,' following the Vulgate of Job xxxviii. 32. In later Jewish writings massaroth are the signs of the Zodiac, and the singular, massar, is used to denote the single signs as well as the planets, and also the influence which they were believed to exercise upon human destiny (Selden, De Die Syr. Syn. i. c. 1). In consequence of this, Jarchi, the most ancient commentator, and the remaining commentators, have confounded mazzaroth and massaroth, though their interpretations vary. Aben Ezra understands 'stars' generally; but R. Levi ben-Geeshon, 'a northern constellation.' Gesenius himself is in favor of regarding mazzaroth as the older form, signifying strictly 'preeminences, and in the concrete sense, 'stars that give warnings or premonitions,' from the usage of the root יָּשָׁר, massar, in Arabic. He deciphered, as he believed, the same words on some Cilician coins in the inscription יָּשָׁר, יָּשָׁר, which he renders as a prayer, 'my thy pure star (shine) over us') (Mon. Phoena. p. 279, tab. 86). Mazzocchi (or Mazzocco), Alessio Simmaco, an Italian antiquary and Orientalist, was born at Santa Maria di Capua in 1684, and afterwards flourished
MAZZOLA

as professor of Greek and Hebrew at Naples. He died in 1771. Mazzocchi was celebrated for his learning far beyond the borders of his native land. His many treatises (written in Latin and Italian) were elaborate and scholarly. The Papal Academy of Inscriptions recognised his services to the world by making him a member of its body. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Mazzola, Girolamo Bedolo, an Italian painter, pronounced the most distinguished pupil of Parmigianino, whose works he painted for about 1568. He excelled as colorist and in perspective. Among his most valuable productions are those falling within the domain of sacred art. The most worthy of notice are his Madonna with St. Catherine and Miracle of the Multiplication of the Loaves. See Vasari, Lives of the Painters; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Mazzola (or Mazzuola), Girolamo Francesco Maria, an eminent Italian painter, surmounted Il Parmigianino, the Parmesan, born at Parma in 1568. He visited Rome in 1582, and was employed by Clement VII to execute a number of works in that city. His style, formed on that of Correggio and Raphael, is characterised by exceeding grace of form and softness of coloring. It was said by Mazzola's admirers that "the spirit of Raphael had passed into him." Mazzola was the first Italian artist who engraved with aqua fortis. He died in 1640. Among his masterpieces are the Madonna della Rosa, in the gallery of Dresden; an Annunciation, in the principal church of Vaduz; the Madonna with St. Margaret, St. Jerome, etc., in the Museum at Bologna; the Madonna dello Lungo Coll, at Florence; and the Vision of St. Jerome, in the National Gallery, London. See Vasari, Lives of the Painters; Alla Vita di F. Mazzola (1784); Mrs. Jameson, Memoirs of Early Italian Painters; Belloni, Crni intorno alla Vita ed alle Opere di F. Mazzola (1844); Morlarta, Memoria della Vita di F. Mazzola (1846).—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, vol. xxxiv, s. v.

McAdam, Thomas, a ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church, was born April 10, 1777, near Ballymena, Ireland. Being an ardent friend of liberty, the oppressive measures of the British government led him to take an active part in the efforts made to obtain freedom in Ireland; in consequence of which he incurred the suspicion of the officers of the law, and being in danger of losing his life by a summary arrest in 1787 he left his native land for America. He was subsequently engaged in teaching in Philadelphia; was for a considerable time at the head of the mathematical and English school connected with the University of Pennsylvania; was for many years an elder in the Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia; and in 1858 was licensed by the Western Reserve Conference, and ordained by Washtenow Presbytery; in 1855 accepted a call to the Church in Howell, Mich., where he labored until his death, Sept. 12, 1860. Mr. McAdam was a man of noble and generous impulses, dignified in manners, intelligent, and truthful. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 176.

McArthur, James P., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Jackson, N. Y., October 22, 1827; graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.; studied theology, first in the Associate Seminary, Canonsburg, Pa., and afterwards in the seminary at Xenia, Ohio; was licensed by the Presbytery of Alleghany in 1851, and for many years treasurer of the Board of Missions of the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. He died Nov. 16, 1844. Mr. McAdam was a man of noble and generous impulses, dignified in manners, intelligent, and truthful. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 159.

McAuley, William, an Associate Reformed Presbyterian minister, was born in the north of Ireland about 1780. He was an eldership, and a disinterested, churchman, of the highest order, as he was intended for some literary profession, and when about fifteen years old he was entered as student at the University of Glasgow, where he gained high distinctions. Both students and professors regarded him as a youth of singular promise. Upon graduation he at once entered upon the study of theology, under the well-known and venerable John Brown of Haddington, the professor of theology to the Associate Burgher Synod of Scotland, and was one of the last class of students taught by that great and good man. William McAuley was licensed to preach in 1794; ordained by the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church and was ordained by that body in 1796, as minister of the Associate congregation of Tulliallan, and there he labored acceptably until 1794, when he emigrated to the United States. Here he was received by the Presbytery of Washington (Synod of New York), and was installed in charge of the Associate congregation of Kortright, Harpersfield, and Stamford, Delaware County, N. Y. As the country developed, his churches grew in power, and divisions becoming necessary, he was finally confined in his labors to Kortright alone. He held his post for over half a century, and died in the harness March 24, 1851. Mr. McAuley deserves to be remembered as one of the pioneers of American Protestantism. His task was one requiring energy and perseverance, and both these qualities he possessed in an eminent degree. Though frequently left to struggle against poverty and sickness, and burdened with the care of a large family, he never faltered, and unhesitatingly pressed forward to advance the interests of his Master's cause. Says Dr. John For- snyth (in Sprague's Annales of the American Pulpit, ix, 78): "That he was not an ordinary man, all, I think, will admit, who knew him. His single fact that as a preacher 'force' as a preacher was considered as 'unfaltering' by the grandchildren and great-grandchildren of those who seventy years ago or more settled in a wilderness, which, through their instrumentality, has been made to blossom as the rose... In the central portions of Dela- ware County there are thousands who, though they never saw him, yet, from what their fathers have told them, will cherish with affectionate veneration the name of William McAuley."

McBride, Matthew, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia April 27, 1800; graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1821, and studied in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; was licensed in 1855 by the Philadelphia Presbytery, and became a pastor in Mount Vernon, Iowa, where he remained until 1861, when, compelled by impaired health to resign, he returned to Philadelphia. He next became the archdeacon of the diocese of New York, and in 1868 was licensed by the Western Reserve Conference, and ordained by Washtenow Presbytery; in 1855 accepted a call to the Church in Howell, Mich., where he labored until his death, Sept. 12, 1860. Mr. McBride was a man of much devotional piety, and labored zealously in building up the Church. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 191.

McBride, Robert, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Franklin Mills, Ohio, in May, 1825; graduated with honor at Oberlin College, Ohio; subsequent- ly studied at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, and in 1858 was licensed by the Western Reserve Conference, and ordained by Washtenow Presbytery; in 1855 accepted a call to the Church in Howell, Mich., where he labored until his death, Sept. 12, 1860. Mr. McBride was a man of much devotional piety, and labored zealously in building up the Church. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 191.

McBryde, Thomas Livingston, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Abbeville District, S. C., Feb. 28, 1817; pursued his literary course in Franklin College, Athens, Ga., graduating in 1837; entered the theological seminary in Columbia, S. C.; and in 1859 was licensed to preach by Harmony Presbytery. He was appointed missionary to China in 1839, and sailed for Singapore in March, 1840; in 1843 returned to this country on account of failing health; and afterwards became pastor successively of Providence and Rocky River Churches in Abbeville District, S. C., and Hopewell Church, Pendleton, S. C., in which latter place helabored till he died, April 15, 1863. He received the degree of D.D. from Erskine College, S. C. Dr. McBryde was an able minister, a sound divine, and a wise counselor. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 655. (J. L. S.)
McCaine, Alexander, an American divine of note, was born in Tipperary, Ireland, in the year 1768. He was educated in England, and was called for the ministry of the Church of England; but, enlisting to the United States in 1791, he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and in 1797 entered the itinerant ministry, and filled several important pulpits until 1821, when he became one of the highly-spirited and important men of the movement which so lately has been successfully carried—lay representation. In reply to the adverse decision of the General Conference of 1824, he published the somewhat elaborate History and Mystery of Primogeniture Company (1825), a work displaying rare ability. When the Methodist Episcopal Church was started, he became one of its zealous promoters, and was regarded as one of the most able and influential ministers of that body. He died June 1, 1856. He was particularly noted with the pen, and distinguished for his rare talents in the pulpit.

McCall, John A., a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Athens, Ohio, Feb. 23, 1854; graduated at Franklin College, New Athens, in 1859; studied theology in the seminary at Xenia, Ohio; was licensed by the Wheeling Presbytery in 1862, and in 1863 was ordained by the Xenia Presbytery, and had just accepted a call to Sillville, Ohio, when he was killed by a train, Oct. 25, 1863. Mr. McCall was a man of more than ordinary talents, and remarkable for his sober and studious habits. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 351.

McCall, Joseph Pinckney, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Mississippi; professed religion while young; joined the Methodist Church at eleven years old, and was licensed to preach. The war breaking out soon after, he went out as a volunteer in the Southern army. After the war he was received into the Methodist Episcopal Church South, and in due course was recommended to the Quarterly Conference and licensed to preach. In 1866 he was received into the Memphis Annual Conference, and was stationed at Wesley College, Rev. A. R. Wilson as preacher in charge. In 1867 and 1868 he served at the Tennessee State. His last appointment was Hickman Station, in Kentucky, where he labored faithfully until his death, April 8, 1870. Mr. McCall was an able and faithful minister of the Gospel, and the Church greatly mourned his early loss.—Minutes of the M. E. Church South, 1870, s.v.

McCalla, Daniel, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Newburyham, Pa., in 1748; graduated at Princeton College, N.J., in 1760; studied divinity in Boston; was licensed to preach July 20, 1772; taught an academy in Philadelphia; was ordained pastor of New Providence and Charleston, Pa., in 1774; acted as chaplain in the Revolutionary War; taught afterwards an academy in Hanover County, Va.; and was finally twenty-one years minister at Wappesaw, S. C. He died April 6, 1809. See Hollinghead, Sermons and Essays of D. McCalla (1810, 3 vols.); also Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

McCalla, William Latta, a Presbyterian minister, was born near Lexington, Ky., Nov. 25, 1788. He received his preparatory education under the supervision of his parents; graduated with honors at the Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky.; afterwards studied theology privately; was licensed in 1816, and afterwards ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Augusta, Ky.; in 1823 he went to Philadelphia, and was installed pastor of the Scotch Presbyterian Church, where he continued to labor until 1833, when impaired health prompted him to resign. Subsequently he took charge of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and under his pulpit ministration the Church became large and influential. In 1859 he resigned this charge, and spent some time as an itinerant minister in Texas; on his return to Philadelphia, he successively filled the Middletown and Ridley charges, in the vicinity of Philadelphia, and Union Church, on Thirteenth Street.

In 1858 he removed to St. Louis, Mo., and after preaching there some time became connected with the Female Seminary at St. Charles, Mo. In 1859 he assumed the pastorate of a Church in Louisiana, where he labored until his death, Oct. 12, 1859. Mr. McCalla possessed excellent pulpit talents; his expository style was rich and absorbing, his preaching close and pungent. He was the author of a number of pamphlets and papers; also Discourses with Alexander Campbell on Baptism; with Kneeland on Universalism; with Barker on Infallibility; a small volume on the Doctorate of Divinity; and Travel in Texas. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 99.

McCamber, John D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Rockbridge County, Va., April 9, 1781; graduated at Washington College, Lexington, Va.; subsequently studied theology with Isaac Anderson, D.D., at Maryville, Tenn.; was licensed in 1805, ordained by the Union Presbytery in 1807, and preached successively to the Strawberry Plains, Hopewell, and New Market churches, within the bounds of French Broad Presbytery. He died Sept. 28, 1859. Dr. McCormell was a faithful minister, a good preacher, and an earnest pastor. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 191.

McCarroll, Thomas, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Newlin, Pa., August 12, 1800, and entered the itinerancy in 1834 at the Philadelphia Conference, and in 1835 the New Jersey Conference. He labored as an effective minister for thirty-one years. He was three times appointed presiding elder, and was a member of the General Conference of 1852. A thorough student, an eloquent preacher, a faithful pastor, a gentle ruler, he was greatly beloved and esteemed in all his appointments. He died in East Newark, N.J., May 9, 1860.

McCarron, Michael, D.D., a Roman Catholic theologian of note, was born in the County of Monaghan, Ireland, in the year 1804. He received his early education in his native place, after the completion of which he entered Maynooth College to pursue his theological studies, and on graduation was ordained to the ministry. Soon after this he came to the United States. He was placed at St. James's Church (now the cathedral), in Brooklyn. Subsequently he was transferred to St. James's Church, New York, but very soon afterwards was appointed pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Sixth Avenue, where he remained several years. About the year 1857 the late archbishop Hughes conferred on him the pastorate of the large congregation of St. Mary's Church, No. Sixth Street, where he remained until his death, Feb. 23, 1867. At the time when Father McCarron arrived in this country, archbishop Hughes had been actively engaged in the work of education, and had succeeded in exciting a deep interest among the Catholics on the subject. Father McCarron, then in the vigor and prime of life, entered upon this work with the greatest zeal, and the results of his efforts in that noble cause were soon apparent, and are felt at the present time. Father McCarron received evidences of the respect and esteem of his associates by his advancement to the archiepiscopate of the archdiocese of New York. The date of this appointment is not known to us.

McCarron, Robert, D.D., an American Presbyterian minister, was born in New York City Sept. 30, 1791, and was educated at Columbia College. He chose the legal profession, and was engaged in his studies of jurisprudence, with the intention of devoting himself to the sacred ministry. He therefore entered the Theological Seminary of the Associate Reformed Church at New York, and pursued a theological course of study, and was licensed to preach in 1816. He was immediately called to the pulpit, but remained several years; then returned to New York to take charge of the Orange Street Church, which had at that time but thirty members. While he was the pas-
tor of this Church it was removed to Canal Street. When his connection ceased, in 1836, it numbered eight hundred members. In 1836 he accepted a call to the Church at Fort Carbon, Pa., and remained there four years. In 1840 he became the pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Goshen, N. Y.; in 1849 of the Union Church at Newburg, and in 1856 of the Westminster Church in Twenty-second Street (with which the Twenty- second Street Reformed Church was a united Church in New York City. This was his last pastoral charge. In 1862 his health, which for some time had been enfeebled, failing still more, he resigned his charge. He died at Yonkers, N. Y., March 12, 1865. "All who have known Dr. McCr- teer will remember him as one possessed of a genial nature, an easy, spontaneous hearted friendliness, in finding the most fitting expression in words and acts; as a sim- ple-minded, fervent Christian, whose love for the Sav- iour and his blessed Gospel was never concealed; and as an able minister of the New Testament, whose fervid eloquence when proclaiming the glad tidings of salva- tion, and in urging them upon the acceptance of persev- ring men, was seldom equalled. We have often listened with wrapt attention to his solemn appeals, while the tears which were flowing down his cheeks, and his tender words, were answered by the tears of his hearers. But at other times, when his words "were entered into rest" (The Observer, N. Y. March, 1865). The degree of D.D. was bestowed on Mr. McCratee by Columbia College in 1881. See New Amer. Cyclop. 1865, p. 586; Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 132.

McCrartey, John B., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Apollo, Armstrong Co., Pa., June 21, 1822; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa.; and in 1856, at the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.; was licensed in 1857, and in 1858 was ordained and installed pastor of the churches at Mount Washing- ton and Temperanceville, in the vicinity of Pittsburgh, Pa. In 1861 he accepted a call from the Twelfth Presby- terian Church, Baltimore, Md., and was installed its pastor May 2, 1865, where he labored until he died, May 14, 1865. Mr. McCratey was a man of superior abili- ties, a close student, and an excellent scholar. See Wil- son, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 165.

McCrartey, William D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Columbia Co., Pa., in 1806; graduated at Washington College, Washington, Pa., in 1823; studied theology at the Western Theological Seminary, Al- legany City, Pa.; was licensed in 1883, and in 1855 was ordained pastor of West Liberty Church, Pa.; afterwards labored in the latter church, Madison, and Harmony churches, Ohio, within the bounds of Steubenville and New Lisbon Presbyteries, and died July 27, 1883. Mr. Mc- Cratey was gifted with superior intellectual powers, logical and discriminating in his theological views, an ex- cellent scholar, and a successful minister. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 175.

McCaul, Alexander, an eminent Anglican divine, was born about the opening of this century, and was educated at King's College, London, where he afterwards became professor of divinity. He was also prebend of St. Paul's, London, since 1845. He is noted, however, not so much on account of the high positions he filled as an ecclesiastic, as for his missionary labors among the Jews, a task for which his great erudition and un- common familiarity with the Hebrew language and litera- ture particularly fitted him. He died in 1863. Dr. McCaul's works besides Sketches of Modern Jewish and the Jews (London, 1838), Sketches of The Old Paths, or a Comparison of Mod. Judaism with the Rel. of Moses and the Prophets (2d ed. 1866, 12mo); a lot of minor theological works, and a host of sermons; for a list of which see Darling. Cyclop. Bibl. ii. 1902.

McCullie, Thomas Harrin, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born near the middle of last century; graduated at Princeton College, N. J., in 1774; was ordi- nated minister in the western county of North Caro-

lia; was several years president of a college at Waynes- borough, S. C.; and died in Savannah, Ga., about 1800.

McCay, David, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lewiston, Pa., Feb. 17, 1816; was educated at Jeff-erson College (1839); studied theology at the Princeton Theological Seminary; was licensed by Hunting- ton Presbyterian in 1841; and in 1842 was ordained, and installed pastor of the united churches of Bethesda, Concord, and Callensburg, Pa., where he continued to labor for more than twenty years. In 1864 he was installed the chaplaincy of the 103d Regiment of Pennsylvania Volunteers, in which position he labored until his death, June 4, 1862. Mr. McCay possessed an intellect of high order, clear, comprehensive, and eminently practical: his attainments in science and literature were varied and exact; his piety deep, constant, and heartfelt. See Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 191.

McCheyne, Robert Murray, a celebrated Scotch preacher and evangelist, was born in Edinburgh, Scot- land, May 21, 1815. At five years of age he was quite proficient in English. When eight years old he entered the high-school, where for six years he maintained high rank in his classes. In November, 1827, he entered the University of Edinburgh and gained prizes in various departments of study. He studied modern languages privately; was proficient in gymnastic exercises, and in music and drawing. This last acquisition was advantageous to him afterwards in sketching scenes in the Holy Land. The death of his eldest brother, David, led to his conversion, or was the beginning of the great change in his life, and brought him to study for the ministry. In 1831 he entered upon his studies in theology and Church history in Divinity Hall, under the late Professor Dr. Welsh. In 1835 he removed to the Presbyterian of Arian, and was licensed to preach July 1. November 7 he began his labors at Larbert, a parish containing six thousand people, to whom he was a devoted pastor. He was also an intense student of the Bible, reading it in both the Hebrew and the Greek. In 1836 he was called to St. Peter's Church, Dundee, and was ordained there Nov. 24. This charge was large, and his labors were so constant that his health failed, and he was obliged to retire for a season of rest. During this vacation he went, with three other ministers, to the "missionary inquiry to the Jews." His health improved by his travels, and on his return he resumed his work at St. Peter's, where he remained until 1842, when his health again failed. He now undertook a preaching tour, with other ministers, through the north of England, preaching in the open air and in different denominations. On returning from England, he was obliged by failing health to have an assistant in his labors at Dundee. In Feb- ruary, 1843, he went on his last tour as an evangelist; on his return from which he was attacked by a fever, and died March 25, 1843. His death was a loss not to his own congregation but to denominational only, but to the whole Christian world. Mr. McCheyne was one of the most beautiful examples of the true Gospel minister. Whether among his own congregation, or in Palestine, or travelling as an evangelist, he was always preaching by his works and his holy and holy and his doctrine. It was pre-eminent as a preacher, as a pastor, and as a Christian, and did a great work not merely by the great number of conversions which took place directly or indirectly through his instru- mentality, but by the zealous spirit which he influ- enced into every department of Christian work. He had also fine talent for literary and scholastic pursuits. He wrote a number of pieces showing a taste for poetry, one of which—Grecian, but living Greece no more—was written at the age of seventeen. His letters from Palest- ine, his lectures, sermons, and letters, show an ability for which he was surpassed; but he had the full use of all his talents and powers to the service of Christ, and lived only for the salvation of men. His name will long be

McClanahan, Alexander W., a Presbyterian minister, was born near West Union, Adams County, Ohio, Nov. 29, 1821; graduated with honor at Miami University, Cincinnati, in 1844; and theology in the theological seminary at Oxford; was licensed in 1847 by the Chillicothe Presbytery; and in 1848 ordained. His first and only charge was at Decatur, Ohio. He died Oct. 29, 1862. Mr. McClanahan was noted for his great energy of mind. The spirit of prayer that he had a massive intellect, capable of broad and comprehensive views, and, when aroused to high mental activity, he wrote and spoke with rare power. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist., Almanac*, 1863, p. 359.

McClakey, John, an eminent Methodist Episcopalian minister, was born in Derry County, Ireland, Jan. 2, 1756. His parents, who were members of the Established Church of England, in 1772 emigrated to New Jersey; here John was converted in 1782, and, feeling that he was called of God to preach the Gospel, took the necessary steps to enter the ministry, and in 1786 became a member of the Conference as an itinerant; in 1787 was elected elder presiding in the Virginia District; in 1787-94, to Baltimore; in 1796, to Philadelphia; in 1796-99, presiding elder on New Jersey District; in 1799-1801, to New York City; in 1802, to Philadelphia; in 1812-15, presiding elder on Chesapeake District, and died at Chestertown, Md., Sept. 2, 1814. Mr. McClaconkey was a man of deep and earnest piety; versed in the Scriptures; and thousands of souls were converted through his efforts during a long and useful ministry. *Conference Minutes*, i, 257; *Sprague, A Monograph of the American Psalms*, vii, 125.

McClelland, Alexander, D.D., a noted (Dutch) Reformed preacher and educator, was born at Schenectady, N. Y., in 1754; graduated at Union College in 1809; studied theology with Rev. John Anderson, D.D., in Western Pennsylvania, and afterwards with Rev. John M. Mason, D.D.; was licensed by the Associate Reformed Presbytery, New York, in 1815; and, when nineteen years only, was elected pastor of Rutgers Street Presbyterian Church, New York, as successor of Dr. Milledoler. Here he remained seven years, and established his great reputation as a pulpit orator among the foremost men of his day. In 1822 he became professor of rhetoric, logic, and metaphysics in Dickinson College, Pa.; removed in 1829 to New Brunswick, N. J., as professor of languages in Rutgers College; and in 1829 was elected professor of Oriental literature and Biblical criticism in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church. He continued, however, to give instruction in rhetorical and belles-lettres in the college for several years. He resigned his place in the theological seminary in 1857; and, after a tour in Europe, returned to New Brunswick, where he lived in retirement until his death, Dec. 19, 1864. His published works consist of a few occasional sermons and pamphlets, and a volume on the *Canon and Interpretation of Scripture* (New York, 1860, pp. 229, 12mo). Dr. McClelland was in almost every respect a man sui generis. He was original in thought, in style of expression, in oratory, and in the professor's chair. He was humorous and witty, keen and strong, robust and masculine in all the attributes of manhood, and exacting to the last degree as a teacher. Inspiring his pupils with his own enthusiasm, he taught them to study and to think accurately for themselves. He gave very short lessons in Hebrew, and in all the grammar in which they were always in use, and he required critical accuracy in recitations. His written lectures on the Epistles to the Romans and Hebrews, and his oral criticisms on Isaiah and the Psalms; his condensed Hebrew Grammar, and his lectures on the Canon and interpretation of Script-
McCLINTOCK

change of this Church expiring by limitation in 1800, he accepted the appointment of pastor of the American church in Paris, then and now under the care of the American and Foreign Christian Union. While holding this position the great American civil war broke out, and Dr. McClintock was not a man to be idle in the time of his country's peril. Appreciating the value to the friend of the free world of the first inhabitants of Europe, he exerted himself to the utmost in diffusing a right knowledge of the merits of the controversy in which the American Union was involved. In these labors he availed himself of the aid of the count De Gasparin and the Rev. E. P. Austin of England. During the entire war his pen was never idle, and from the platform, whenever it was practicable, he made eloquent pleas for the national cause. During the period of his residence abroad, he was also corresponding editor of the Methodist, a paper established in 1809 in the city of New York. His letters kept the American public well advised of the fluctuations of European opinion in relation to the war. Upon his return home, in 1864, he was for a second time appointed to the pastorate of St. Paul's Church, but, finding his health unequal to the duties of the office, he resigned at the end of a year. In 1866 he was made chairman of the Central Centenary Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to which was given the work of organizing the commemoration of the introduction of 1746, of Methodism into the United States. Mr. Daniel Drew, of Boston, Mass., having secured his health, resigned his office of founding, in connection with this centennial commemoration, a Biblical and Theological School, Dr. McClintock was chosen its first president. The school was opened in the year 1867, at Madison, New Jersey, under the most flattering circumstances. It has been from the beginning an entire success. Dr. McClintock's health had, prior to his election to the presidency of Drew, shown symptoms of decline. Since 1848 he had been frequently prostrated by attacks of illness. From 1867 to 1870 a great decay of vitality was perceptible, and on March 4 of the latter year the "wheels of life stood still at last."

To the preparation of this Cyclopædia, Dr. McClintock had, in company with his co-editor, Dr. Strong, devoted many laborious years. To theology and its kindred studies his attention had through life been chiefly directed. He lived to see three volumes completed, and the fourth a state of forwardness. In the year 1847 he translated, with Prof. C. E. Blumenthal, Neander's Life of Christ, published by Harper and Brothers. In 1851 he prepared an essay on the Temporal Power of the Pope, which was at that time a political question of some importance. He contributed to the United States Theological Institutes, by Watson, Dr. McClintock supplied with an analysis, which is considered a model work of its kind. He was also a frequent contributor to the Methodist Quarterly Review, and an occasional one to several other periodicals. Since his death a volume of his sermons has been collected and published under the title Life-Writing Words (N. Y. 1871, 12mo). Dr. McClintock's versatility of talent is apparent even from this slight sketch. He was truly a manly-sided man. Yet his attainments were solid: an imperfect understanding of any subject he could not tolerate. The facility of acquiring knowledge he was very remarkable. He could track a subject, never losing the clue, through a labyrinth of books, until he came into full possession of it, both as a whole and in its details. The critical faculty was dominant in him. To systematize knowledge, to reduce it to form and completeness, was his delight. At the same time the fervor which makes the orator. His eloquence was of the highest order; in power to sway an audience he had few if any superiors. He was probably the most complete scholar that his Church has produced in the United States. His style of a writer was remarkable for clearness, precision, directness, and condensation. His personal qualities endeared him to hosts of friends; his death, in the midst of his years, has been deplored as a great loss to the cause of religion and learning in our country. (G. R. C.)

McCLURE, JOHN ALEXANDER, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington, Ky., Sept. 25, 1804. His education was received at a private school at Brick Pond, Woodford County, KY., his instructors being Messrs. Thompson and Daly, from the University of Dublin, Ireland. In 1828 he entered Princeton Theological Seminary, and in 1828 was licensed to preach. Subsequently he became a skillful archivist in determining the authenticity of some of the books of the Old Testament and one or two of the Epistles, he gave up preaching and entered upon the study of law. During this stage of his life he wrote Sketches of Western Adventurers, and otherwise contributed to the press of the day. He was admitted to the bar in 1839, and became a regular practitioner until 1849, when, his religious principles being revived, he was again, in 1851, licensed and ordained, and was called to the First Presbyterian Church, Indianapolis, Ind.; during his pastorate there he was elected president of Hanover College, Ind. In 1857 he accepted a call to Maysville, Ky., where he labored until the summer of 1859, when he was drowned. Dr. McClung was a man of brilliant intellect and rare eloquence; he was a polished scholar, a generous friend, and an humble Christian. See Wilson, Pred. Hist. Alumnus, 1861, p. 100.

McCLURE, Alexander Wilson, D.D., an American divine, was born in Boston, Mass., Oct. 14, 1808. He was educated at Yale and Amherst colleges and Andover Theological Seminary (class of 1880); was settled at Malden, Mass., 1880-41; then at St. Augustine, Fla., 1841-44; editor of the Christian Observer from 1844 to 1847; and pastor at Malden from 1848 to 1852. Leaving the Congregational body, he accepted a call to the First Reformed Church, Jersey City, N. J., and remained there three years (1852-55), when he became corresponding secretary of the American and Foreign Christian Union, 1865. His health having been impaired, he was sent in 1866 as chaplain of the union at Rome, Italy. In 1868, broken down by bronchial disease, he retired from public service, and lingered a great sufferer until his death, Sept. 20, 1865. The American Chapel in Paris was erected largely by funds which Dr. McClure secured with his own purse. Dr. McClure's contributions to the periodical press were of the most popular, including valuable articles for the Observer, the New Brunswick Review, and the Literary and Theological Review. He also published The Life-Boat, on Allegory:—Four Lectures on Ultra-Urbanism, a Series of Letters upon the Bible in the Public Schools, written in controversy with a Roman priest in Jersey City;—Lectures of the Chief Fathers of New England (2 vols.) and—The Translators Rewired, or Biographical Articles on the History of the Translators of the English Bible (New York, 1856, 12mo). The title is somewhat unfortunate, but the work is invaluable, the materials being drawn from the best sources in Great Britain and America, and with the utmost care for many years, to secure accuracy and fulness. Dr. McClure was a truly learned man engaged in genuine diachriatics, and a practical controversialist. Ardent and honest as the sunlight, abounding in good feeling, and simple in manners as a child, he was a man of positive convictions, fearless of consequences in the advocacy of truth and in assailing popular errors. Yet, with all his earnestness, the sweetest music of the world, Dr. McClure remained pre-eminently a devout and humble Christian minister. Chastened by many providential trials, his piety grew more serene, and beautiful, and deep with advancing infirmities and years. His prayers and preaching were solemn, tender, clear, serene. His thoughts were seen and felt by him as eternal realities, and his hearers often wereushed and melted under his reverential appeals. His death was triumphant. See Corwin, Man-
McClure, Arthur, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in East Tennessee, Feb. 16, 1801; was converted about 1819; entered the Tennessee Conference in 1822, and died Sept. 26, 1825. He was a young man of much promise, excellent in abilities and grace, and an eloquent and successful minister.—Conference Minutes, i, 650.

McClure, David, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Nov. 18, 1748, in Newport, R.I.; graduated at Yale College in 1769; was ordained missionary to the Indians near Pittsburgh, Pa., May 20, 1772. The mission was broken up by the troubles with England, and McClure became pastor in Northampton, Mass., Nov. 13, 1776; at East Windsor, Conn., June 11, 1776, and died June 25, 1820. He was chosen trustee of Dartmouth College in 1778, and made D.D. by the same in 1800. Dr. McClure published Sermons on the Moral Law (1795, Svo).—Memoir of the Rev. Eleazar Wheelock, D.D., in connection with the Rev. Dr. Parish (1810):— and a number of occasional sermons and addresses, and magazine contributions. See Sprague, Amasa, ii, 7.

McCombs (or McCoombs), Lawrrence, an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Kent County, in the State of Delaware, on the 11th of March, 1769. Little is known of his early education, but it is presumed, from the easy circumstances of his father, who was a man of wealth, and the high character of the schools and academies of the district in which he lived, that he early attainted to a good degree of intellectual culture. In 1792 he was admitted to the Philadelphia Conference on probation, and his first appointment was to the Newburgh Circuit, in the State of New York; two years later he was appointed to Long Island; in 1795, to New London; in 1796, to Middletown; in 1797 and 1798, to Poland; in 1799, to New London; in 1800, to Baltimore; in 1801, to Baltimore City; in 1802, to Baltimore City and Fell's Point; in 1804, to the Baltimore Circuit. In 1806 he asked and obtained a location, and selected a residence on the eastern shore of Maryland, near the head of the Chesapeake Bay. In this location he is said to have labored with unabated industry and devotion. In 1815 he re-entered the itinerancy, and took his place in the Philadelphia Conference; at that and in the following year he was appointed to Smyrna; in 1817, to Queen Anne's; and in 1818, to Kent. From 1819 to 1822 he was presiding elder of the Jersey District; in 1822 he was appointed to West and Salem Islands; in 1824 and 1825, to St. John, Charlotte, Philadelphia; and in 1826, to Wilmington. In 1827 and 1828 he was presiding elder of the East Jersey District; from 1829 to 1832, of the Chesapeake Bay; and in 1838, of the South Philadelphia District. In 1834 he was appointed to St. Paul's Church, Philadelphia; in this year, however, he was constrained, by his rapidly-failing health, to relinquish his active position and become a supernumerary. In 1835 he took his place among the retired and infirm, after having performed an unprecedented amount of labor, and left the impress of his energetic character wherever he went. He closed his useful and eventful life June 11, 1836. An intimate friend, also a minister, the Rev. J. Kennaday, has left this beautiful tribute to his memory: "In his religious character Mr. McCombs blended great zeal and fidelity with a very unmortified spirit. No hazardous venture, which he estimated in the course of duty, nor could any provocation betray him into petulance or resentment. Meek in spirit, intrepid in purpose, gentle and social in manner, he was greatly respected in the pulpit, and ever welcome to the hospitality of the numerous circles which he respected as the man of God. He was strong in faith, much in prayer, and a great reader of the Bible. His intellectual character was developed more in the uniform strength of his faculties than in the marked prominence of any one or more of them. His perceptions were quick and clear, and his judgment sober and impartial. He had a fine imagination, which, being restrained and regulated by his admirable taste, gave beauty and warmth, as the artists say, to all his pictures. In union with these traits, there were some physical qualities which contributed largely to his power and success. His personal appearance was very attractive. In stature he was full six feet in height, with a finely-developed form; though not corpulent, the breadth of his chest indicated the prodigious strength which enabled him to perform his almost gigantic labors. The general expression of his countenance betokened intelligence, gentleness, and energy, while his full, frank face was illumined by his ever-kindling eye. His voice was full, clear, and of great flexibility, sweeping from the lowest to the highest tone, and modulated in the most delicate manner, in beautiful harmony with his subject. In preaching in the field, which was his favorite arena, I used to think he was quite an approach to Whitfield. Such was his known power at camp-meetings that the announcement that he was to be present on such an occasion would draw a multitude of people from great distances. . . . I have thought that in some respects there was a striking resemblance between him and the late distinguished Dr. John M. Mason, of New York, whom I often heard in my boyhood." See Sprague, Amasa, Amer. Preachers, vii, 210 sq. ; Conf. Min., ii, 492.

McConaughy, David, D.D., LL.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Menalien township, York County, Pa., Sept. 29, 1774, and graduated at Princeton College, Carlisle, in 1796; studied theology for two years; was licensed in 1797, and preached frequently as a missionary in Philadelphia and New York; accepted a call from the United Christians of Upper Marsh Creek and Conewago in 1800, and remained pastor till 1822. During this connection he visited Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York in behalf of the Gettysburg Church, and as a minister and a teacher rendered important services. At an early period he interested himself much in the cause of temperance by appointing meetings, preaching, and forming a society of which he himself was president. He removed to Washington in 1832 to the presidency of the college, which he resigned in 1849. He died Jan. 29, 1852. Dr. McConaughy published A Brief Summary and Outline of Moral Science (1838).—Discourses, chiefly Biographical, of Persons connected with Historical Information (1850).—Three Discourses on the Doctrine of the Trinity and on Infant Baptism. — See Sprague, Amasa, Amer. Preachers, iv, 199.

McConnell, William L., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Canonsburg, Pa., Sept. 19, 1829; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa.; studied theology in the Associate Reformed Seminary, Alleghany, Pa., and was licensed and ordained by Alleghany Reformed Presbyterian in 1885. He accepted a call to Hanover Church, and subsequently to West Newton, Pa., where he labored until failing health compelled him to resign. He died July 18, 1866. See Wilson, Proc. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 663.

McCook, Robert J., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in South Carolina in 1818. He was educated at the Lander College, S.C., and was licensed and ordained by the South Carolina Conference in 1836. He was a man of large intellect, with marked ability in the classics, but he was not a suitable subject for college work. He was a man of very modest habits, and was not disposed to take part in intellectual discussions. He was a man of great energy, and was always ready to take his part in any undertaking that was of public utility. He was a man of great piety, and was always ready to take his part in any undertaking that was of public utility. He was a man of great piety, and was always ready to take his part in any undertaking that was of public utility.
McCoombs, See McCoombs.

McCorkle, Samuel Eubulus, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Harris Ferry, Lancaster County, Pa., Aug. 28, 1746, and graduated at New Jersey College in 1772; was licensed in 1774, and, after laboring for two years in Virginia, accepted a call from the congregation of Tazewata in 1777. About 1785 he opened a classical school named Zion Parnassus, which he continued ten or twelve years. He died Jan. 21, 1811. Dr. McCorkle published Four Discourses on the great First Principles of Deism and Revelation contrasted (1797)—Three Discourses on the Terms of Christian Communion—Two Occasional Sermons. See Sprague, Annals, iii. 846.

McCoy, Isaac, a Baptist minister, was born in Fayette County, Pa., June 13, 1784; was licensed to preach in 1805, and began work as a missionary. Oct. 15, 1810, he was ordained pastor of the Church at Maria Creek, in Clark County, Ind., where he remained some eight years, making occasional missionary tours in the surrounding country. In 1818 he was appointed a missionary to the Indians, and in May, 1820, removed to Fort Wayne, where he established a church; in the fall of the same year he removed to Carey, on the St. Joseph River, in 1829, to the Indian country, now Kansas. In 1842 he became the first corresponding secretary and general agent of the American Indian Mission Association, at Louisville, Ky. He died June 21, 1846. He published a History of Baptist Indian Missions, embracing remarks on the former, present condition, and future prospects of the aboriginal tribes (1840, 8vo). See Sprague, Annals, vi. 541.

McCracken, John Steele, a Presbyterian minister, was born near Cincinnati, Ohio, April 25, 1804. His opportunities in early life for acquiring knowledge were poor. In 1833 he entered the preparatory department of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, and graduated in 1836; studied theology under the care of the first Presbytery of Ohio of the Associate Reformed Church, and subsequently attended the theological seminary at Alleghany City, Pa., and the seminary at Oxford; was licensed in 1841, and then went out as a missionary among the Indians in eastern Iowa; in 1843 he accepted a call from the Church at Kenton, Ohio, where he labored until his health gave way. He died April 1, 1863. Mr. McCracken was an able exponent and a sound theologian; his judgment was eminently just and critical; his disposition charitable and liberal. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 392. (J. L. S.)

McCracken, Samuel W., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Lexington, Ky., Jan. 12, 1800; was educated at Miami University (class of 1831); studied theology at Maryville, Tenn., and was elected professor of mathematics in the college at Maryville; was afterwards chosen professor of mathematics in Miami University; was licensed by Ohio First Presbytery in 1835, and in 1836 was ordained; in 1839 accepted a call to Hopewell Church, Ohio, and resigned his professorship in the university; here he continued to labor until his death, Oct. 10, 1859. Mr. McCracken maintained a high reputation for talent; prudent and far-sighted, his counsels were always worthy of consideration; opposed to all expediency, he made experience the basis of action. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 209. (J. L. S.)

McCrary, W. H., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Tennessee Jan. 17, 1821; was educated at Bethel College, and licensed in 1849, after teaching school for several years; was ordained in 1854. He died Sept. 14, 1858. Mr. McCrary was a good preacher, a successful teacher, and a fine theologian. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 286.

McCreary, Jonathan Sharp, a Presbyterian minister, was born near New Galilee, Pa., April 15, 1828; enjoyed in early life the advantage of religious instruction, discipline, and example; graduated at Franklin College in 1852; studied theology in the Associate Seminary at Canonsburg (class of 1855); was licensed by the Associate Presbytery of Ohio in October of the same year; was ordained and installed pastor of the Associate congregation of Cadiz, and there continued to labor until 1862, when he volunteered in the service of the government. While in the army he continued to preach, and perform every other ministerial duty as occasion offered, until he was killed, Sept. 7, 1864. Mr. McCreary was endued with a clear and penetrating intellect; his education was comprehensive, his style logical and energetic, his manner positive and emphatic. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 255.

McCrie, Thomas, D.D., a noted Scotch divine, celebrated as a writer on ecclesiastical history and polemics, was born at Dunse, in Berwickshire, in November, 1772. "Dr. McCrie's parents," says his biographer, "being connected with that branch of the secession usually termed Anti-Burghers, he was brought up under . . . the primitive strictness of that communion . . . and received his early religious training under the importance of which he was ever afterwards so strenuous an advocate, and of the success of which he was himself a striking example." After securing the rudiments of education at the parish school of his native place, he entered the University of Edinburgh, and in 1791 commenced his theological studies. In 1796 he was licensed to preach by the Associate Presbytery of Kelso, and he immediately afterwards was chosen pastor of a congregation of the same body in Edinburgh, where he served the following ten years, applying himself with great assiduity to the discharge of his professional duties, and occasionally publishing able pamphlets on some of the gravest and most difficult subjects of theological inquiry. The differences of opinion, and the appearance of New-Lights with peculiar doctrines quite unknown to the primitive belief of the "Secession Church," caused McCrie in 1800, with five friends, among them the celebrated Bruce, to separate from the "General Associated Synod," and to form the "Constitutional Associate Presbytery," avowing "strict adherence to the principles of the original secession." (Here compare Hist. Sketch of the Origin of the Secession Church, by the Rev. A. Thomson, and the History of the Rise of the Relief Church, by the Rev. Gavin Struthers [Edinburgh, 1856, 12mo].) During the controversy which this change provoked he gave himself largely to the study of history, and carried on not a little of his great countryman, John Knox, that zealously applied himself to the composition of a Life of John Knox (Edinb. 1812, 8vo, and often), a masterly work, that combines the highest excellences of which biography is capable, and was by his contemporaries regarded as "a literary phenomenon." It placed the name of McCrie at once in the foremost ranks of living historians. His last literary honors were conferred on him (compare Hetherington, Hist. Ch. of Scotland, ii. 399). He received from the University of Edinburgh the honorary title of D.D., being the first Dissenter to whom that honor was awarded; and his book, besides passing through several editions in Scotland, was translated into most of the languages of Europe. Encouraged by the success of his first literary effort, Dr. McCrie published, as the fruits of his researches, regarding a later period of ecclesiastical history, the Biography of Andrew Melville, a celebrated champion of Presbyterianism in the reign of James VI of Scotland. This work, composed on the same principle of combining the memoirs of an individu-
form piety. He lived above reproach, and died honored by all who knew him." —Conference Minutes M. E. Ch. South, 1870, s. v.

**McCutch en, James B.,** a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born near Murfreesboro, Tenn., Aug. 26, 1829; professed religion in his fourteenth year, and joined the Methodist Church; was licensed to preach, and joined the Memphis Annual Conference in 1852; was appointed to Camleau Circuit in 1853; Mount Pinson in 1854; Tashomingo in 1855; Clinton Circuit in 1857; Paducah Circuit in 1858; Murray Circuit in 1860; and Tashomingo Circuit in 1861. During this year he was elected chaplain of the 7th Kentucky Regiment C. S. A. In this service he continued till the close of the war, when he resumed his place as a travelling preacher, and was appointed in 1866 to Cageville Circuit; in 1868 to Trenton Circuit, and again to Cageville Circuit. He died Aug. 26, 1870. "Brother McCutch en was a self-made man, having received but a limited education in his youth, but by industry and hard study he had acquired a very good foundation of education, and no mean acquaintance with the Latin and Greek languages. His preaching was a plain, plain introduction, exhibiting a large acquaintance with the sacred Scriptures, and with the standard literature of the Church. He was not of a polemical turn of mind, but when our causes were attacked, he always showed himself a fearless champion and a trusty, worthy defender. But few men ever prepared to defend our doctrines than he was, and yet he cherished a noble catholicity of sentiment and feeling that did credit at once to his head and heart. He was not merely acceptable, but popular and useful, making many friends wherever he went." —Conference Minutes M. E. Ch. South, 1870, s. v.

**McDer m on, James C.,** a Presbyterian minister, was born in Amelia County, Va., April 1, 1799; was educated in what were known as the Old Fields Schools of Virginia; was early made a ruling elder in the Church, and at once identified himself with the cause of temperance. He was licensed in 1823, and in 1825 was ordained and installed pastor over the New Market and Missouri churches, in Campbell County, Va. He died Sept. 15, 1867. Mr. McDer m on was a good and useful man, and an earnest apostle of temperance in his region. See Wilson, Pref. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 347.

**McDer m o tt, Thomas,** a Presbyterian minister, was born in Monmouth County, N. J., in 1819; was educated in the Lawrenceville High School, N. J.; studied divinity in the theological seminary at Princeton (class of 1833), and was licensed and ordained by New Brunswick Presbytery as pastor of the Church in Stillwell, N. J.; in 1838, removed to Ohio as pastor of Hubbard and Unity churches; in 1844 accepted a call to Clarksville Church; and in 1846 resigned to become pastor of Chippewa Church, where he remained until compelled to resign because of failing health. He died June 6, 1861. Mr. McDer m o tt was a devoted preacher; earnest in his work, and industrious in his efforts. See Wilson, Pref. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 109.

**McDonald, Andrew,** a Scotch minister, was born at Leith in 1757; was educated at the University of Edinburgh; was ordained deacon in 1775; pastor of a congregation at Glasgow in 1777; subsequently removed to London, and devoted himself to the authorship of light literature, and died in the great English metropolis, "a victim to sickness, disappointment, and misfortune," in 1780. A list of his works is given by Albion, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, ii, 1165.

**McDonald, Daniel, D.D.,** an Episcopal minister in America, was born near Bedford, Westchester County, N. Y., about 1787, and was educated at Middlebury College. Having taught for some time, he was ordained in 1810, and became rector of St. Peter's, Auburn, N. Y. He subsequently took charge of the academy in Fair-
field, Herkimer Co., where he superintended the preparation of candidates for holy orders. In 1821 he was made D.D. by Columbia College; removed to Geneva, and served for many years as missionary in the village of Waterloo. He became professor in the College of Geneva in 1825, and continued so until his death, March 24, 1851. He published works as _A Sermon in the Churchman's Magazine, and A Series of Articles in the Gospel Messenger_, signed P. See Sprague, Annu., v, 529.

McDonald, John, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Broome County, Va., July 25, 1754; was educated in Ohio University, Athens, Ohio; was licensed and ordained as a Presbyterian in 1786 and, installed pastor of the Church in Burlington, Ohio. He was subsequently served as missionary in Kentucky; in 1832 labored in Manchester and Huntington churches, Ohio; and from 1856 in the Pleasant Prairie Church, Ill., until his death, Aug. 15, 1866. Mr. McDonald was possessed of rare mental strength and discriminating powers; extensive religious and literary acquirements; sterling piety, and unassuming humility. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 184.

McDonogh, John, an American philanthropist, a merchant of New Orleans, was born at Baltimore in 1782, and in 1800 removed to the Southern city, where, after having by hard labor and strict economy amassed an immense fortune, he delighted to serve the cause of humanity. He founded free schools and asylums for orphans, and also aided greatly the cause of the "American Colonization Society." He established himself a considerable time in the Southern States, and sent thither many of his own negroes, after having previously provided them with a thorough education and a trade. He died Oct. 26, 1850. See Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog., s. v.

McDowell, Alexander, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland, and came to this country in 1778, and was licensed in 1779, and afterward itinerated through portions of Maryland and Virginia, until, in 1741, he was ordained as an evangelist to Virginia, and subsequently to itinerate in New Castle Presbytery; in 1748 took charge of White Clay and Elk River churches; in 1752 was appointed principal of the Synod's school, which he afterwards removed to Elkhorn, Md., and in 1767 to Newark, Del. He continued to labor as a teacher and preacher until his death, Jan. 12, 1792. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 48. (J. L. S.)

McDowell, John, D.D., a Presbyterian minister (O.S.), was born in Belminster, Somerset County, N.J., Sept. 3, 1812. He was educated at Princeton College, where he graduated A.B. in 1831; studied theology with Dr. Woodthull, of Freehold; and was licensed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick in 1804. In December of that year he was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Elizabethville, where he remained until 1833. During his ministry there 1144 persons were added to the church. In May, 1833, he became pastor of the Central Church, Philadelphia, which, from small beginnings, grew to be a strong church under his ministry. In 1846 he accepted a call to the new Spring-garden Street Church, where again his talent for organizing and establishing a society was very successfully employed. He remained in this parish till his death, February, 1863. He published a _System of Theology_ (2 vols.); _Bible Class Manual_ (2 vols.); _Bible Questions_; etc. For nearly fifty years he was a trustee of Princeton College, and was largely connected with the theology of the church from its foundation. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Alm., 1864, p. 186.

McDowell, William Anderson, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born May 15, 1789, at Lamington, Somerset Co., N. J.; in 1809 graduated at Princeton, where he acted as tutor for several months; completed his theological course in 1818; was licensed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick, and ordained and installed pastor at Bound Brook. In 1814 he became pastor of the Church of Morrisville, N. J.; but after a residence of nine years his health obliged him to resign; in 1823 he was installed by the Charleston Union Presbytery, served for several years, and in 1832 became moderator of the General Assembly, and secretary of the "Board of Domestic Missions of the Presbyterian Church" (Phila.). He subsequently visited the South; and preached occasionally in New Jersey, where he died, Sept. 17, 1851. See Sprague, Annu., iv, 495; Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864.

McElhany, William G., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Huntingdon, Pa.; graduated at Jefferson College, Pa., in 1847; studied theology in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Canonsburg, Pa.; and in 1850 was licensed by Charleroi Presbytery; in 1855 was ordained and installed pastor of the Church in Holoben, N. J., which he had served until his death, May 29, 1860. Mr. McElhany was a sound evangelical preacher. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Alm., 1861, p. 209.

McFarland, James, a Presbyterian divine, was born in March, 1800, at Dunbarton, within the present limits of the city of Glasgow, Scotland. He entered the grammar school in Glasgow when seven years old. He next passed to St. Andrew's College, and afterwards to the divinity school of the Established Church, and was licensed to preach the Gospel at the age of twenty-one. During his college course he served as private tutor to an only son of a branch of the great family of Argyle. At the age of twenty-six he became the assistant and successor of the Rev. Dr. Musshet, at Shettleston, a suburb of Glasgow. Soon after he was called to the largest and most numerous congregation in the whole of Scotland at Aberbrothick, a seaport and manufacturing town between Montrose and Aberdeen, situated on the German Ocean. In the year 1835 Mr. McFarland came to New York, and a little later went to Delaware County, settled by Scotch people, many of whom were the associates and schoolmates of his boyhood. After a few years he removed to Ulster County, and in 1838 was called to be the pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church of Bloomingdale. During his ministry in that place the church was erected in the neighboring village of Rosendale, principally through his personal efforts. Unusual accessed were made to the membership, and he continued as pastor of the united congregations until the year 1844, when he was called to a large and flourishing congregation at Canajoharie. In 1848 he became the pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church of English Neighborhood, where he remained seven years. After a brief visit to Canada, he returned to Ulster County as pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church of Exous and St. Remy Chapel. In 1861 he relinquished his charge of St. Remy, and the next year became minister of a Presbyterian congregation in Galway, Fulton County. From this date until his death his ecclesiastical relations were with the Presbyterian body. In 1866 he left Galway, and became pastor of a congregation at Port Washington, a pleasant summer retreat on the Narrows River, Montauk County, N. J. He died March 26, 1870. Mr. McFarland was distinguished for his scholarship. He was an excellent linguist. "As a preacher, Mr. McFarland was careful in his preparations, which he delighted in making even to the last. There was the care in language, both correctness in treatment, and such use and application of the truth as was suited to excite the spirit of devotion, to awaken love and reverence, and to administer satisfying consolation to the penitent and mourner. His positions
McFarland, James Hunter, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Harriusburg, Pa., March 10, 1809; was converted in 1827, and soon after licensed to preach. He was admitted to the presiding elder of the Franklin Circuit in 1839. His ministerial charges were Trenton Circuit, Essex, Bergen Neck Mission, Plainfield, Westchester, Bristolton, Dover, Elkon, Agency for Dickinson College, Westminster, Columbia, Eighth Street, Philadelphia, presiding elder of Reading District, Frankford, Bordentown, and Paterson Associations. In 1835 he was appointed to the New Jersey Conference, his health failed, and he was transferred to the Philadelphia Conference as a supernumerary. In June, 1862, he was appointed chaplain of the United States Hospital in Philadelphia, and in this relation he prosecuted his ministry to the close of his life, March 25, 1863. His last words were addressed to his wife: "Mother, I am dying! Lord Jesus, take me!" McFarland was for more than twenty years a corresponding member of the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia, and was also a member of the Eastern State Historical Society. He was a faithful and devoted minister of Christ, and did the work of an evangelist successfully. He was warm in his friendship, faithful to the demands of duty, and above everything that looked like a compromise of Christian principle."—Cygert.

McFarlane, Jesse, a female preacher of the Society of Friends, was born about the year 1842; commenced preaching at seventeen, at first to girls and women, but later also to men. After eight years of this service, she became the wife of Dr. Brodie, of Edinburgh, and spent the remainder of her life in more private activity, for the cause of her Master. She died about 1869. Her preaching was impressive, her life one of uncommon purity and devotion, her death triumphant. She wrote a paper on the scriptural authority for the preaching of women, which is inserted in a memoir of her life, in a Memoriam Jessie McFarlane, by J. G. (1882. 12mo). See Friends Review (Phila.), Oct. 12, 1872.

McFerrin, James, a distinguished minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Washington County, Va., March 25, 1784. His ancestors emigrated from Ireland to this country about the year 1740. His father was a farmer, his mother a strict observer of the Lord's day, and esteemed for his sobriety, good judgement, and intelligence. Mr. McFerrin's educational advantages were very limited, the years of his minority being passed on his father's farm, where, however, he acquired habits of industry, sobriety, and enterprise. On his twentieth birthday he was married to Jane Campbell Berry; shortly after which event he removed from Virginia to Rutherford County, Tenn. The country was new, the settlements exposed to depredations by the Indians; hardships and dangers were consequently inseparable from such a condition of things. Mr. McFerrin gave great attention to military tactics, in which he became thoroughly skilled, and, on the breaking out of the war with Great Britain in 1812, he was called into service, and, as captain of a company of volunteers, was engaged in a campaign against the Creek Indians under that renowned man, general Jackson. On account of his brave conduct at the battle in which the Indians were defeated, Mr. McFerrin was elected colonel. In his thirty-sixth year his whole course of life was changed, the result of which was that he thenceforth devoted the rest of the world to the ministry. In 1829 he became a member of the Tennessee Annual Conference, and was appointed to the Jackson Circuit, in the northern part of Alabama. He had charge of this circuit two years. The two subsequent years (1828 and 1829) he travelled the Limestone Circuit, and at the close of this period removed to the vicinity of Courtland, Ala., where he purchased a farm, and remained for several years. This was in the Franklin Circuit, which he travelled in the years 1828 and 1829. During this period he attended the General Conference held in Pittsburg in 1828. He was appointed to the General Conference held in Philadelphia in 1832, held in Philadelphia. At the close of his labors on the Franklin Circuit he was made presiding elder of the Richland District, which he travelled four years. In the year 1838, having determined to remove to Western Tennessee, he deemed it proper to locate for one year, till he should be settled in his new home. In 1838 he was returned to the conference, and appointed to the Wesley Circuit, which he travelled two years. His next appointment was to Randolph and Harmony, for one year; and to the Wesley Circuit for one year (1839), which proved to be the last of his itinerant life. Among his papers is the following record, made in 1839: "Since I joined Conference, Nov. 25, 1823, I have preached 2068 times, baptized 575 adults and 813 infants, and have taken into society 8963 members." Mr. McFerrin died Sept. 4, 1840.

McGaughey, William G., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Bedford County, Tenn., Jan. 12, 1813. He was a gentlemanly and0 able man, and devoted minister of Christ, and did the work of an evangelist successfully. He was warm in his friendship, faithful to the demands of duty, and above everything that looked like a compromise of Christian principle."—Cygert.

McGavin, William, a celebrated Scotish layman and writer, was born in the parish of Auchinleck, Ayrshire, Aug. 12, 1778. His parents were in very moderate circumstances, and young McGavin therefore enjoyed but slender educational advantages. While yet a boy he was apprenticed to a bookseller's shop in Edinburgh, but soon made himself a host of friends by the great literary talent he displayed in frequent contributions to the local newspapers. He was intrusted with the care of an elementary school, which he conducted with skill, though he hated the drudgery of teaching. He took an early opportunity to quit the rostrum, and to seek a livelihood in the counting-house. He became the agent of the British Linen Company's banking establishment in Glasgow. Although this business connection gave him great care and responsibility, McGavin's fondness of writing would not allow him to withdraw altogether from literary labors, and, by habits of unwarried industry, he was enabled to command leisure for the publication of many valuable religious tracts. An ardent opponent of Romanism, he attacked it in a series of papers entitled the "Protestant" (1806-18), which Dr. Robert Hall (Review of Birt's Popery) pronounced "the fullest delineation of the papist system, and the most powerful confutation of its principles, in a popular style." McGavin also edited John Howie's Scotch Worthies, and John Knox's Hist. of the Reformation, and frequently preached to the poor and the humble in the suburbs of Glasgow. He died in 1832. See Chambers's and Thomson's Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen (1865), vol. iii., s. v.; Jamieson, Dict. of Belg. Biog. s. v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brt. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s. v. 1840.

McGee, William C., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Paterson, N. J., Aug. 15, 1816, and was educated
McGILVARY, Archibald B., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in the Isle of Skye, coast of Scotland, towards the close of the last century. He came to this country in 1806, joined the South Carolina Conference in 1832, and died at Greenville, S. C., June 5, 1863. Before the war he was prominent, modest, and agreeable, a man, a faithful, and good citizen. As a minister of Christ, he was holy, laborious, and useful. — Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South, ii, 445.

McGlashan, Alexander, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Queenston, Canada, Feb. 25, 1812; pursued his preparatory studies in Geneva, N. Y.; graduated at Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y., and in 1840 at the theological seminary in Auburn, N. Y. He was licensed and ordained as an evangelist in 1843, and afterwards commissioned by the American Tract Society as a general agent to the Southern States. While in this employ he built a mariner's church in Mobile, Ala.; subsequently his services were transferred from the tract and colportage efforts to the cause of the Seaman's Friend Society. In 1859 he again removed to the North, and in 1868 commenced work for the cause of the sailor in New York City, where he established a new church, called the Church of the Sea and Land. In 1866 he removed to St. Catharine's, Canada, where he remained until his death, Sept. 9, 1867. Mr. McGlashan was a man of extraordinary Christian zeal, peculiar talents, and marked success. See Wilson, Preach. Hist. Almanac, 1840, p. 378.

McGorral, Bernard, a Roman Catholic priest, was born in Ireland in 1818; went to Paris to pursue an academic course, and there also studied theology; emigrated to this country early in 1842; was engaged for several months as professor of French at St. John's College (Fordham, N. Y.); afterwards became a missionary priest to the West, where he labored for nearly eighteen years, building fifteen or sixteen churches. About 1860 he removed to Brooklyn, where he built the present church of St. Vincent de Paul. He died Oct. 25, 1865. — New Amer. Cyclop. 1866, p. 654.

McHenry, barnabas, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in one of the eastern counties of Virginia Dec. 10, 1767; was converted when only fifteen years of age, and shortly after joined the Church. Called to preach the Gospel, he entered the itineracy in May, 1787, and was appointed to Yadkin Circuit. Thereafter he successively served the cause of his Master in the following appointments: in 1788 at Cumber-land Circuit; in 1789 at Danville; in 1790 at Madison; in 1791 at Cumberlaid; was placed in charge of the district in 1792, and in 1798 of an enlarged number of circuits; in 1794 he was sent to Salt River Circuit; in 1795 was located on account of impaired health; in 1819 was readmitted, and appointed presiding elder of Salt River District, Tennessee Conference, but his health again failed him, and he was finally obliged to retire from active work, and take the place of a supernumerary. He died at Mount Pleasant, near Springfield, Ky., June 16, 1833. "Barnabas McHenry," is the testimony of one, "was a man of strong mind and able in argument. He stood upon the walls of our Zion and defended her bulwarks. In the all was his ministry." Bishop Bacon says, "Of the early years of his ministry little is known, except vague yet cherished traditions of the beauty, unction, and eloquence of his preaching, together with the dangers and hardships to which he was exposed as a pioneer missionary in the wilderness of the South." McHenry led the West Virginia Conference, where a single community produces few such men as Barnabas McHenry and Valentine Cook. They were men by themselves, and their memory would adorn the history of any Church or age. — See Sprague, Annals of the American Church, i, 40, sq.; Finley, Sketches of the M. E. Church South; Minutes of Conference, 1854, 1855, 1856.

McIlvaine (or McIlvain), Charles Pettry, D.D., an eminent divine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Burlington, New Jersey, June 16, 1799. His father, Joseph McIlvaine, was a leading lawyer and United States senator from New Jersey at the time of his death, in 1826. Charles graduated in 1816 at Princeton; was admitted to deacon's orders July 4, 1820, by bishop White, and, having labored in Christ Church, Georgetown, Md., he received two years later priest's orders from bishop Kemp of Maryland. In 1825 he was consecrated bishop of the episcopal diocese of the United States Military Academy at West Point. In 1837 he became rector of St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., where he remained until 1882, when he was consecrated bishop of Ohio. While rector at Brooklyn, he also held the office of president of the society for the purchase of evidences of religion and sacred antiquities in the University of the City of New York. In the episcopacy, Dr. McIlvaine quickly made a name for himself as a man of learning, and of unusual kindness of disposition, not only in his own Church, but among all Christians, both in this country and in Europe. For the last ten years or more he was looked upon as the representative of the Low Churchmen of the Protestant Episcopal Church. In his death (which occurred at Florence, Italy, while on a journey for recreation, March 14, 1873), irenic theology has lost one of its ablest advocates, and the Evangelical Association one of its most active promoters. Bishop McIlvaine was a large contributor to theological literature. His Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity (9th ed. 1857, 12mo, reprinted in England and Scotland), delivered in New York University in 1851, were published by subscription of the Council, and have gone through many editions. During the early part of the controversy arising out of the Oxford tracts, appeared his Oxford Divinity Compared with that of the Romish and Anglican Churches (Phila. 1841, 8vo; Lond. 1841, 8vo), which the Edinburgh Review pronounced "as one of the most indispensable contributions of the Oxford school." In 1856 he published a volume of sermons entitled The Truth and the Life. He also compiled two volumes of Select Family and Parish Sermons (Columbus, Ohio, 1863, 2 vols. 8vo). His other works of a minor character are, The Sinner's Justification before God (N. Y. 1850; Lond. 1851, 12mo). — The Holy Catholic Church (Phila. 1850; Lond. 1844, 16mo). — No Priest, no Alter, no Sacrifice, but Christ (N. Y. 12mo). — Lond. 12mo. — Valedictory Offering; Five Sermons (1859, 12mo) — A Word in Season to Candidates for Confirmation: — The doctrines of the Prot. Episc. Church, as to Confirmation: — Chief Denyer of the Church: — The Truth and the Life; a Series of Twenty-two Discourses (N. Y. 1855, 8vo; Lond. 1855, 8vo); this volume was published at the request of the Convention of the Diocese of Ohio, together with A Memoir of the Rev.Cha. Simon, both published in New York; and contributed articles to the N. Y. (quarterly) Review, the Episcopal (monthly) Observer, the London (monthly) Christian Observer, the Protestant Churchman (New York), the Episcopal Recorder (Phila.), and the Western Episcopalian (Gainesville, Ohio). In 1857 L.L.D. was conferred on him by the University of Oxford, and in 1888 that of L.L.D. by the University of Cambridge. He was distinguished for the soundness and clearness.
McIVER, J. W., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born Sept. 19, 1835; professor of religion in 1858; joined the Memphis Conference in 1861, and filled the Chulahoma and Good Springs circuits. He joined the Confederate army in the late civil war. In 1865 and 1866 he was appointed to the Richland and Cassida circuits; and in 1867 to the Iuka Circuit. He died suddenly, of illness on his way to an appointment, Jan. 17, 1868. "Brother McIvor was a very promising young preacher, much beloved by all the people where he preached, and it is with feelings of deepest sadness that we record his early death." See Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South, iii, 246.

McKay, William, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Columbiana County, Ohio, July 7, 1825; pursued his academic course at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa.; studied theology at the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany City, Pa.; was licensed by the Presbytery of Alleghany, and immediately took temporary charge of the Church at Yellow Creek; but, owing to ill-health and other causes, had to give up his labors. He died Jan. 19, 1863. Mr. McKay possessed an extensive knowledge of the Scriptures, and was well versed in theology. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 187.

McKean, James W., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lawrence County, Pa., April 30, 1833; was educated at Richmond College and Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa. (class of 1859), and at the Western Theological Seminary; in 1862 was licensed and ordained by the Ohio Presbytery, with a view to labor among a domestic missionary in the Lake Superior region; in 1863 was elected principal of the Synodical School at Hopkinton, Iowa, where he continued to labor until May, 1861, when he enlisted in the service of his country. He died while in camp, July 9, 1864. Mr. McKean was an accurate scholar, a good teacher, and a model of Christian piety. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 137.

McKean, Joseph, D.D., LL.D., a Congregational minister, was born April 19, 1776, in Ipswich, Mas.; graduated at Harvard College in 1794; entered the ministry, and was ordained pastor in Milton, Mass., Nov. 17, 1797; resigned Oct. 3, 1804; was elected professor of mathematics in Harvard College in 1806, but declined, and was chosen Boylston professor of rhetoric in 1809. He remained in this position until his health failed. He died in Boston, March 17, 1819, and published a Memoir of the Rev. John Eliot, S.T.D., in the Hist. Coll., and several occasional sermons and addresses. See Sprague, Amals, ii, 414.

McKern, Richard, a Baptist minister, was born in Rawdon, Ireland, Aug. 22, 1804, and emigrated with his parents, while yet a youth, to the British possessions in the West Indies. In 1812 he was appointed superintendent of schools by the government of New England. In 1820 he was converted under the preaching of elder James Munro, a Baptist evangelist, and in 1821 finally joined the Baptists; he began preaching in 1826, and March 10, 1828, became the pastor of a congregation at Rowdon. In May 1829, he was called upon to assume the pastorate of a Baptist congregation at Windsor also, and he thereafter preached both at Rowdon and Windsor until about 1856, when ill health compelled him to withdraw from the ministry. Deprived of the advantages of academic training, he had prepared for himself a course of study while in the ministry, and in 1839 matriculated at King's College, and there graduated in due course of time, and took his degree of B.A. In 1842, his health still too feeble to enter the ministry, he removed to Dartmouth, and established himself in business. He died Aug. 17, 1860, acknowledged by all who knew him to have been "a conspicuous example of unbending Christian integrity, and earnest, steadfast devotion to the cause of Christ." "As a preacher," says one of his contemporaries and associates, "Mr. McKern commanded the full attention of his audience. His manner was earnest and energetic; his subjects practical, and treated with clearness and precision. Their application to the heart and conscience was with great power. His language was free and copious, his voice excellent, and capable of great modulation. As his subject required, he was earnestly winning and persuasive, or denounced with fearful energy the corruptions of the ungodly." See The Christian Messenger (Hali fax), Oct. 17, 1860.

McKendree, Benjamin, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in Boston, Mass., Nov. 28, 1783. He was graduated at Williams College in 1804, and at the Union Theological Seminary in 1808, and was ordained in 1807. He was married in 1813 to Miss Sarah H. Jones, of Cairo, Mass., who died in 1829. In 1818 he was installed as minister of the New Church in Fitchburg, Mass., and in 1823 to the First Church of that city. He died Sept. 30, 1842. He was the author of several works on theology and religion.

McKendree, Joseph, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in King William County, Va., July 6, 1757. He was the subject of frequent religious impressions in youth, but he failed to find peace. He was an adjutant and commandant in Washington's army for several years, and was present at the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown, Sept. 19, 1781; in 1783 he was converted, during the great revival that occurred under the labors of the Rev. John Easter; and entered the itinerancy June 17, 1786. In 1796 he was made presiding elder; in 1801 was sent by the bishops to preside over Kentucky District, and to have general superintendence of the Western Conference, then embracing Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Western Virginia, and part of Illinois; and in 1806 was presiding elder on Cumberland District, with the same supervision of the Conference. At the General Conference in Baltimore, May, 1808, McKendree was finally passed by the highest office in the church—the episcopacy. He died March 5, 1835, at his brother's, near Nashville, Tenn., having preached faithfully almost fifty years, been twelve years a presiding elder, and nearly twenty-seven years a bishop in the Church. Bishop McKendree was one of the last among the preachers and pastors of his age. From the time of his first efforts he was marked as a man of the most vigorous genius, the most genuine modesty, and the most devoted piety. Although not classically educated, his broad and grasping mind went on acquiring and growing in depth and strength, till it had deepened with all that could yield at will a vast and varied knowledge. His imagination was grand and fervid, but always healthy; and could give to his knowledge the freshness of romance, or to his judgment the spell of prophecy. His utterance was
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copious and forcible, and his voice rich, deep, and flexible. These elements of mind and means, employed by a man of the sanctest heart and the purest faith, and the Holy Ghost, made him not only the most truly eloquent bishop that his Church has ever possessed, but one of the best preachers of any Church or age. As a pastor, his administrative abilities were unrivaled. He found the economical methods of the Church crude and indefinité, and improved them to a systematic vigor; and he was a distinguished promoter of her benevolent institutions. As a man and a Christian he was honored by every class of society. His labors were mighty in laying the deep foundations of evangelical religion in the Mission of the Valley, and his efforts to this end are still a power in the churches, and his memory is blessed. See Minutes of Conferences, ii, 402; Life, by B. St. J. Fry, in the M. E. S. S. Library; and that by Bp. Paine, of the M. E. Church South (Nashville, 1862, 2 vols., 12mo); Sumner, Biosk. Sketches, p. 48; Walshe, Heroes of Methodism, p. 55; Bennett (W. B.), Memorials of Methodist in Virginia (Richmond, 1871, 12mo), p. 290 sq.; McFerrin, Hist. Meth. in Tennessee, i, 366; Redford, Hist. Meth. in Kentucky, ii, 28. (G. L. T.)

McKENNAN, James William, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington, Pa., Sept. 3, 1804; graduated at Washington College, Pa., in 1822, and then studied law at Millersville, Pa.; subsequentiy commenced the study of theology with Dr. John Anderson, of Upper Buffalo Church, Pa.; was licensed by Washington Presbytery in 1828, and in 1829 was ordained and installed pastor of the United churches of Lower Buffalo and West lineage, Pa. In 1835 he accepted a call to Indianapolis, but owing to infirm health he had to resign. He was afterwards engaged in teaching in Wheeling, and at Moundsville, Va., and also as rector in the preparatory department, and adjunct professor of languages in Washington College. He died July 29, 1861. Dr. McKenzie's character was truly remarkable in candor, benevolence, and meekness; in simplicity and directness of purpose; in strength of faith and zeal. His sermons were characterized by plainness and directness of style. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 192.

McKINLEY, John, a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., July 18, 1815. He was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, which institution he entered when not quite fourteen years of age, and there he graduated with the first honor of his class in 1838. From his very childhood he was deeply versed and looked to the profession of his life, and he therefore, immediately upon the completion of his college course, entered upon the study of theology at the theological seminary of his Church, then under the care of Dr. Samuel B. Wylie. In 1835 Mr. McKinnie was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Philadelphia. After filling various minor appointments, he was in 1838 called to the pastorate of the Reformed Presbyterian Church at Milton, Pa. Here he labored acceptably and successfully until 1841, when failing health compelled him to withdraw from active work. His labors had been too long, for he failed rapidly, and died Oct. 5 of the same year. All who knew him recognized in his death the extinction of one of the bright lights of the Church." (His only publication is a series of articles on the Slave Trade, which appeared in a weekly periodical at Milton, Pa.) "He was a man of cultivated intellect, of sound and discriminating judgment, of generous sympathies and noble impulses, and fervent piety." See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, ix, 57 sq.

McKINLEY, Calvin, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Wallkill, Orange County, N. Y., Jan. 12, 1819. He received a good academic education, afterwards studied divinity in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Newbury, N. Y., and was licensed and ordained in 1856. He labored successively at Millport, McKen-
Kinney never was exceeded in the boldness of its outline and in the distinctness and prominence of its features. His eloquence was in perfect character. His habit, associated with the name of the Church of Jesus, was ever set upon its recommendation and enforcement; and it was when descending upon the grand Gospel theme of a crucified Saviour or asserting the Church's rights or, when with well-sustained pathos, he mourned the wrongs of Zion, that his mind assumed a gigantic and astonishing form. His discourses, clear, copious, strong, and full of pertinent and often brilliant figures. He has frequently, in his public discourses, caught a flame from the working of his judgment, imagination, and feelings; and then his conception, riveted in the simplicity, energy, and vividity of his language, and the breadth of his allusions, produced an astonishing effect. In America, whose republican institutions he had long loved, the land of enterprise and freedom, was the field which just suited the genius of McKinney; there his powers had full scope for development and exercise.

McKinney, John, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Bellefonte, Pa., Aug. 26, 1797; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1817; studied theology in the seminary at Princeton, N. J., and was licensed by Philadelphia Presbytery in 1824; was ordained and became pastor of the Church at Wisconsin, Ohio, in 1829; subsequently became pastor of the Church at Alexandria, Pa., and still later a supply at Oswego, Ill. He died in 1867. Mr. McKinney's life was one of real sacrifice and great usefulness; he was mild, affectionate, trustworthy, and eminently righteous. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 181.

McKinnon, J. M., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Esqueguing, C. W. His early education was commenced at Oneida Institute, in N. Y., in 1837; in 1838 he placed himself under the tuition of Dr. Rae, in Hamilton, C. W. His collegiate studies were pursued in Queen's College, Kingston, C. W., and Knox College, Toronto. In 1844 he was licensed, and became pastor successively of the St. Thomas, Owen Sound, and Beckwith churches. He died Dec. 24, 1865. Mr. McKinnon was a man of sterling integrity and conscientious fidelity; he possessed a competent knowledge of the languages, but excelled in the logical and mathematical faculties. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 478.

McLachlan, James, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Glasgow, Scotland, in 1797; was educated in the Glasgow University, and studied divinity in the theological seminary of the Old Burgher section of the Scottish Church. He graduated in 1827, and continued in that denomination; as a missionary to Southern Africa, under the patronage of the London Missionary Society, but after two years' residence at the Cape of Good Hope he was compelled by ill-health to return. In 1830 he was made chaplain of the Seamen's Chapel in the city of Glasgow; but, becoming dissatisfied with his ecclesiastical connection, he joined the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and in 1838 was sent by the Scottish Synod of the Church to Canada West as their missionary. Subsequently he accepted a call from the congregation at Lisbon, N. Y., where he labored for the next six years, Nov. 19, 1834. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 292.

McLain, John, a Presbyterian minister, was born near Bloomsburg, Ohio, April 2, 1824; was educated at the South Salem Academy, Ohio, and studied theology with Dr. Carothers and Rev. H. S. Fullerton, and for a short time under the mind assumed a gigantic and astonishing form. His discourses, clear, copious, strong, and full of pertinent and often brilliant figures. He has frequently, in his public discourses, caught a flame from the working of his judgment, imagination, and feelings; and then his conception, riveted in the simplicity, energy, and vividness of his language, and the breadth of his allusions, produced an astonishing effect. In America, whose republican institutions he had long loved, the land of enterprise and freedom, was the field which just suited the genius of McKinney; there his powers had full scope for development and exercise.

McLane, James Woods, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in Charlestown, N. C., in 1794; received his preparatory training in Phillips' Academy, Andover, Mass.; graduated with high honor at Yale College in 1828, and in 1834 at Andover Theological Seminary; was licensed by the Andover Congregational Association in 1835; was shortly afterward ordained pastor of the Madison Church, Presbyterian Church in New York, and labored there until 1856, when he became pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Williamsburg, L. I. There he labored with untried zeal until 1863, when he resigned on account of failing health. During his ministry Dr. McLane contributed frequently to the religious press; was for many years director of the American Bible Society, and prepared for this society an improved standard edition of the Bible. He was also for many years collector of the Union Theological Seminary, and secretary of the Church Erection Fund. He died at Brooklyn, N. Y., Feb. 26, 1868. Dr. McLane was a man of fine talents and scholarship; as a preacher, earnest and practical; as a writer, bold and uncompromising. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 168; Appleton, New Amer. Cyclop., 1864, p. 595.

McLaurin, James, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Perthshire, Scotland, in 1796; graduated at the University of Edinburgh; and became pastor of Glascow Church, in 1824. He was licensed and ordained by the presbytery of the Church of Scotland. In 1840 he emigrated to the United States, became pastor successively of the Plainfield and Paw Paw churches, within the bounds of Kalamazoo Presbytery, Mich., and subsequently preached at Birmingham and Fentonville, Mich. He died May 11, 1860. Mr. McLaurin was an able and learned minister. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 161.

McLean, Alexander, a Presbyterian minister, was born in the Island of North Uist, Scotland, in March, 1827. His early advantages were poor—his boyhood being constant a battle for existence against the strong arm of Romanism. He graduated at the Edinburgh University, and afterwards studied theology; while thus engaged he was associated with the Rev. Mr. Hall in the Glasgow Home Mission work. In 1855 he came to Canada, and in 1856 was ordained pastor of the East Puslinch congregation, where he remained till his death, May 25, 1864. Mr. McLean was an effective minister, and an ardent laborer in the mission work. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 872.

McLean, Charles G., D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Armagh County, Ireland, March 17, 1797; was educated at the Belfast Grammar School, and studied theology under the Rev. Dr. John M. Mason, of the Associate Reformed Church; was licensed in 1812, and ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church near Gettyburg, Pa., during which period he became an Independent. In 1844 he accepted a call from the Reformed Dutch Church at Fort Plain, N. Y., and in 1852 emigrated to the West, and, in connection with his son-in-law, established a female seminary at Indianapo-lis, Ind. He died July 4, 1860. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 101.

McLeod, Alexander, D.D., a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born in the Island of Mull June 12, 1774. His father and grandfather were ministers of the Church of Scotland. In 1792 he came to America and entered Union College, where he graduated in 1798. He was licensed by the Reformed Presbyterian Synod of New York, and in 1802 was ordained pastor of the First Reformed Presbyterian Church. His first publication was Negro Slavery Unjustifiable (N. Y. 1802). In 1803 appeared Menscheg governing the Na- tions; in 1816, Ecclesiastical Catechism: —The Gospel Ministry: —Lectures on the Prophecies of the Old and New Testa- ment: —Life, Labors, and Principles of True Godliness. He was the chief organizer of the American Colonization Soci-
McLeod, Cornelius, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born about 1820; joined the Church when but a boy; entered the South Carolina Conference in 1837, and for nearly thirty years labored faithfully and zealously for the cause of the Redeemer. His last appointment was Richland Fork Mission. He died April 3, 1866. "McLeod was a successful laborer, and his name is still beloved by those for whom he labored. Remarkably amiable, he won without effort the affections of those with whom he was associated; and now, though he has passed away, he lives in the hearts of his people."—Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South, III, 17.

McLeod, Norman, D.D., one of the most noted Scotsmen, was born in Crumplehamp, Argyllshire, June 3, 1812. He was early destined for the ministry by his father, who was at the time of Norman's birth parish minister of Campbeltown, and Norman was to make the fourth generation of the McLeods in the ministry of the Scotch Kirk. To fit him properly for the religious work he was to occupy, he was sent, in the near future, his father accepted a parish near Glasgow, and Norman made his preparatory studies for college at Glasgow. His academic education he obtained at Edinburgh, and he then travelled for some time in Germany and the northern countries of Europe. On his return to Scotland he studied theology at Edinburgh, enjoying especially the counsel and instruction of the celebrated Dr. Chalmers. He was licensed to preach in 1888, and "with the Norse tongue in him, and a vigorous Celtic imagination," he soon found a parish ready to receive him, and was ordained pastor of Loudon, in Ayrshire. Here he labored faithfully until 1843, the year so eventful to the Scotch Kirk. See SCOTLAND. Though Norman McLeod had been a pupil of Dr. Chalmers, and greatly esteemed the doctor, he refused to leave the establishment, and even opposed the Free Church movement. In consequence of this decision to remain a Churchman, many offers of promotion came to his door, and he finally accepted the parish of Dalkeith, where he resided until 1851, when he was called to the Barony Church of Glasgow, whither he removed, and "substantially began the career of his life," among a congregation of from eleven to twelve hundred adults, who, by his guidance not only walked themselves in the path of righteousness, but were the means of promoting Christian holiness and ameliorating the condition of the poor and the forsaken. "Commonly," says his biographer, Dr. Walter G. Smith (in Good Words, Aug. 1873, p. 513), "he preached thrice every Sabbath, besides conducting a large class of his own; and his preaching was no mere stringing together of theological commonplaces, but the expression of earnest thought about the highest things, filled with the wisdom and counsel of God. He had the body of men whom he had to lead unto every good work." Aside from his parish work, extended as it was far beyond the labor usually performed by three ministers, he edited for ten years the Edinburgh Christian Magazine, a periodical of the old religious type, which, while it existed, did much good to the people who read it, but proved a heavy loss both to publisher and editor. In spite of McLeod's connection with this literary venture, Mr. Strahan, the well-known British publisher, had not to court the services of Dr. McLeod when in 1860 the publication of Good Words was projected. The manner in which the doctor replied to the invitation is well worthy of the Christian minister of Glasgow (comp. Contemporary Review, 1872, July, p. 29 sq.). The success of Good Words as a literary venture has been almost unprecedented in the annals of magazine literature. "Wherever the English language is read it has familiarized the people with the great leaders of theological thought; has brought into the cottage specimen of the council of the eminent artists; has diffused information on secular truth; and has been the means of introducing to the poor, poets of eminence and writers of wholesome fiction. Its pages, too, were often graced with the kindly productions of the editor's own pen. Many of the works, now published, which were, and of deservedly popular industry, first appeared in Good Words." A recognition of his able services came to Dr. McLeod in his later years from a quarter where, as a member of the Church outside the Anglican establishment, he could hardly have expected so much—we refer to his appointment, upon the death of Dr. Robert Lee, to the chaplaincy to the queen of England, a honor which never before fell to the lot of any Scotch minister except William Carstairs. In the midst of these varied labors, while still in fullest sympathy with the great work, out of his heart, of the Church, and its progress, and doing its full share of the task, death came upon him, June 16, 1872, causing a loss deeply felt not only by his own Church, but by all evangelical denominations, by the rich and the poor, the high and the low; for it must be borne in mind that his genius, his influence, was great, not only through the door of the Church, but "he considered no work foreign to him if it could be called his Master's business." "Perhaps no other minister of the Church of Scotland was so generally beloved as Mr. McLeod in the days of his usefulness, and of hope for its progress, and of deservedly high popularity, first appeared in Good Words." His death came at an age when it was thought that there could be a successor. Glasgow had known him for many a year as a most unpretentious and yet most indefatigable worker for his brethren's weal in this life and beyond this life; and money-making Glasgow struck work in the middle of the week to show that it had lost its best citizen. It should not be omitted here that Dr. McLeod strove hard to advance the cause of the Indian Mission scheme of the Church of Scotland by not only obtaining for it the contributions of the Church, but by inducing men and women of both high and low degree and education to take the work of preaching the Gospel to the people of India. He himself visited India only a short time before his death to inquire into the success of the Mission and to advance its interests more ably. His latest speech before the last Assembly he attended was to revive the mission at the Edinburgh Church. See SCOTLAND.

McLeod, Xavier Donald, a Roman Catholic priest, was born in New York about 1821, and was the son of the celebrated Presbyterian divine, Dr. Alexander McLeod. He was educated at Columbia College; studied theology; took orders in the Episcopal Church in 1845; sailed for Europe in 1850, and while abroad embraced Roman Catholicism. After his return to this country he devoted himself to the publication of several works of a secular nature, besides a Life of Mary Queen of

McLoughlin, F. T., a Roman Catholic priest, was born in the parish of Aglais, Upper Canada, in 1836; was educated at the College of St. Michael, Toronto; studied in the Theological Seminary in the State of New York, and was ordained priest in Brooklyn for that diocese; died in New York Aug. 3, 1868. "He won, by his attention to the best interests of his people, the sincere admiration of all."—New Amer. Cyclop. 1865, p. 550.

McLure, Daniel Milton, a Presbyterian minister, was born near Flat Rock, S. C., Dec. 385; pursued his studies at Davidson College, N.C., and subsequently at Oglesby University, Ga. (class of 1858); studied divinity in the theological seminary at Columbia, S.C.; and in 1861 was licensed to preach, and supplied a Church in Alabama. In 1864 he was regularly ordained and installed pastor of Williamsburg Church, and died Oct. 25, 1865. Mr. McLure's mind was of more than ordinary strength; independence and clearness characterized his thoughts, deliberation and study formed his opinions. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 447.

McMahon, William, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Dumfries, Prince William County, Va., about 1785; was converted at a camp-meeting held near Oldtown, Md.; was appointed class-leader by Peter Cartwright, and afterwards licensed to exhort by the Rev. James Quinn, and soon after to preach, and was received into the travelling connection in 1811. His first appointment was Silver Creek, in the territory of Indiana; in 1812 he was sent to Kentucky, where he remained four years, and travelled the Lexington, Shelby, Jefferson, and Fleming circuits. Under the influence of this ministry thousands were awakened and converted. In 1816 he was transferred to the Mississippi Conference to take charge of a district. He started on his journey with bishop Roberts, but was taken sick at Nashville, and there transferred by bishop McKendree to the Tennessee Conference, and was appointed to Nashville Circuit. After that time he became one of the leading minds of the Tennessee and Memphis Conferences. His health having failed, he located, and removed from North Alabama to De Soto County, Miss., in December, 1864; was readmitted into the Conference at the Conference held at the Memphis Conference, held in the fall of 1841, and was appointed to Holly Springs District, where he remained four years. He continued in the regular work, preaching with a power and success such as but few men ever had, until his health gave way. For several years before his death he sustained either a supernumerary or a superannuated relation. He died about 1867 or 1868.

"Few men, during the present century, have exerted a greater influence upon Methodism in the South. For fifty years he held up the cross and preached the doctrines of Christianity in Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi, leaving holy foot-prints, and winning votaries to Christ. He was in many respects a most remarkable man. No one ever had the reputation that he had in North Alabama and Mississippi."—Conference Minutes of the Miss. E. Church South, 1870, s. v.; McCormick, Methodism in Tennessee, ii, 426; Bedford, Hist. Meth. in Kentucky, i, 252.

McMaster, Erasmus D., a noted Presbyterian divine, was born in Pennsylvania, Feb. 4, 1806; graduated at Union College, N.Y., in 1827; was licensed to preach in 1829; was ordained in 1831, and made pastor at the South Hanover Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh, Pa.; was president of the South Hanover College, Indiana, from 1838 to 1845; and of Miami University, Ohio, from 1845 to 1849; was professor of systematic theology in the New Albany Theological Seminary from 1849 to 1866; and was then appointed to the same chair in the theological seminary of the Northwest. He died at Chicago, Illinois, Dec. 10, 1866. Possessed of a vigorous and thoroughly cultured mind and a well-balanced judgment, McMaster succeeded in all he attempted. "His expositions of Scripture and his religious addresses and sermons were exceedingly rich and instructive, and held the attention of all his hearers; while his influence over his students was unbounded." He published several sermons and addresses, and minor theological treatises. See Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s. v.; New Amer. Cyclop. 1866, p. 663.

McMaster, Gilbert, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland, Feb. 13, 1778; came to this country when yet a child, and was educated at Jefferson College, Pa., where he graduated in 1803; was ordained August 8, 1808, and was pastor of Duquesne Church, N. Y., from 1808 to 1846, and of the Church at Princeton, Ind., from 1846 to 1848. He died at New Albany, Ind., March 15, 1854. His works are: An Essay in Defence of Some Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity:—An Analysis of the Shorter Catechism (1815):—An Apology for the Book of Psalms:—The Moral Character of Civil Government considered (1829):—Thoughts on the Church Union of 1846 (1847):—Practical Religion, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 368; Sprague, Annals Amer. Pulps, ix, 46 sq.; Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s. v.

McMillan, Edward, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cumberland County, N. C., Sept. 2, 1804; was educated under Rev. Samuel Doanell and Rev. J. R. Bain, Tenn.; was licensed by Shikellamy's Association in 1827, and ordained in 1828; labored in 1829 in Moulton, Ala.; in 1835, in Bethany, Tenn.; in 1849, in Gallatin, Tenn.; in 1856, in Carlinville, Ill.; and in 1862 became chaplain in the army, in which service he died, Aug. 27, 1864. Mr. McMillan as a preacher was clear and analytical; he was a Christian, comforting, prayerful, as a man naturally kind, noble, and generous. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 220.

McMillan, Gavin, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Antrim County, Ireland, Feb. 6, 1787, and was brought to Charleston, S. C, in August of the same year. He began his education under Rev. John Kel, and pursued his classical studies under the care successively of John Orr, Rev. Thomas Donnelly, Rev. E. Newton, and Mr. Campbell; in 1817 he graduated with honor at the South Carolina College, S.C.; afterwards studied divinity in the Reformed Presbyterian Seminary in Philadelphia, Pa.; was licensed by the Reformed Philadelphia Presbytery at the session of 1821, and in 1822 was installed pastor of Beech Woods Church, at Morning Sun, Ohio, where he labored for fifty years. In 1839 and 1861 he was moderator of the Synod. He died Jan. 25, 1867. Mr. McMillan was eminent as a scholar and theologian; clear and instructive as a preacher; wise and trustful as a counselor. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 590.

McMillan, Gavin Riley, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Fairfield District, S. C., Dec. 24, 1824; was educated in Miami University, Athens, Ohio; graduated in 1848, at the University of the South, any of the two Presbyterian Churches in Philadelphia, Pa.; was licensed in 1850, and in 1851 was ordained pastor of the Neshannock and Hermon churches, in Pennsylvania. In 1859 he accepted a call to the First Reformed Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, but owing to failing health resigned in 1860. Since he settled in the city of his birth, he became president of the Union Female Seminary at Xenia, Ohio. He died Jan. 9, 1865. Mr. McMillan was a man of good talents—the judgment predominating over the imaginative, the practical over the speculative; truthfulness, simplicity, and humility were the principal traits of his character. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 895.

McMillan, Hugh, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Chester District, S. C., February, 1794; pursued his collegiate studies at the University of Penn-
sylva, and graduated with the highest honor: was soon after elected professor of languages in Columbia College; but, determining to consecrate himself to the ministry, he entered the theological seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa., and in 1828 was licensed to preach. In 1821 he was ordained to the Gospel ministry in the Rock Creek Church, Chester District, S. C. His reputation as a profound linguist being now well established, at the public solicitation he founded an academy at the Brick Church for the primary education of young men. In 1828 he accepted a call to become pastor of the united congregations of Cross-Creek, Warren, and Pine Run, Pa., where he labored for thirty years with great acceptance. Subsequently he studied theology at the Western Theological Seminary in Allegheny City; was licensed in 1852, and ordained and installed pastor of the congregations of Warren and Pine Run, Pa., where he labored until his death, Aug. 1, 1864. Mr. McMillan possessed a clear mind, a warm heart, and a most unassuming spirit; his talents were of a high order; cultivated by thorough education; his sermons were of the richest ingredients and finest mould. See Wilson, Prefab. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 218. (J. L. S.)

**McMullen, James Porter**, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Abbeville District, S. C., July 21, 1811; graduated at Franklin College, Athens, Georgia, in 1838; studied theology privately, under the direction of his brother, Rev. Dr. McMullen, and in 1841 was licensed and ordained pastor of the United Churches of Mt. Zion, Concord, and Carthage, Ala., and afterwards took charge of Pleasant Ridge and Bethsaida churches, in Greene and Pickens counties, Ala. In 1866 he was appointed by the Executive Committee of Domestic Missions of the General Assembly of the Church south to labor in the Army of Tennessee, in which service he was killed in battle, May 16, 1864. Mr. McMullen was a man of exalted mind and great force of character. See Wilson, Prefab. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 341.

**McMurray, William, D.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in Salem, N. Y., in 1784; graduated at Union College in 1804; was tutor in same in 1806-7; was licensed to preach by the Associate Reformed Church in 1808; settled at Lansingburg, N. Y., in 1808-9; entered the Reformed Church as pastor at Rhinebeck Flats, N. Y., in 1812-20; then removed to Market Street Reformed Dutch Church, New York, and died in 1837. His character was distinguished for its beautiful balance and harmony of excellent and gentle qualities. His ministry was remarkable for its fervor, diligence, and uniform success. His Church in New York grew from very small and humble beginnings, and chiefly among a poor people in the Dutch suburbs, to a membership of between five and six hundred communicants. Besides frequent contributions to the periodical press, Dr. McMurray published several valuable occasional discourses (1825, 1833).—Sprague, Annuals, vol. ix.; Corwin, Manual (Dutch) Reformed Church, s. v. (W. D. R. T.)

**McNair, John, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born near New Market, Pa., May 28, 1806. He was reared with an earnest regard to his spiritual welfare, and at an early age made a profession of religion. He was educated at Newton Academy, then at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., graduating in 1839; studied theology at Princeton Seminary, N. J.; was licensed in 1841, and ordained in 1843. He labored for several years as a missionary in Pennsylvania, Indiana, and New Jersey; but subsequently he was called to Lancaster, Pa., where he continued to labor for eleven years. During the re- sulting scandal and trial on the anti-masonic war was over returned and took charge of the Church in Strasburg, Pa. He died Jan. 27, 1867. Dr. McNair was retiring in his manner and deportment, possessing, however, a firmness and integrity of purpose which made itself felt in his expressed opinions. His sermons evidenced a high order of talent, being eloquent, yet plain and easily comprehended. See Wilson, Prefab. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 132.

**McNeil, Angus Currie**, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Robeson County, N. C., May 4, 1812. He early exhibited an intense fondness for learning, and, though he had to struggle against adverse influences, managed to secure a good primary education; his final preparation for college was received in the Donaldson Academy in Fayetteville, N. C., where he discharged the twofold duties of teacher and pupil until 1858, when he entered the University of North Carolina, where he engaged in the study of theology. He was ordained in the Union Seminary at Prince Edward, Va., was licensed in 1845, and ordained and installed pastor of Carthage, Union, and Cypress churches in North Carolina. In 1852 he accepted a call to the pastorate of Centre Ridge Church, Ala., which relation existed until his death in 1889. Mr. McNeil was an able minister, an eloquent orator, and a fine scholar. See Wilson, Prefab. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 110.

**McNeil, James E., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Fayetteville, N. C., May 28, 1825; entered North Carolina University at Chapel Hill, N. C.; after one year went to Yale College, New Haven, and subsequently graduated at Doughton College, Newark, N. J., in 1844; studied divinity in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, for two years, and afterwards graduated at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed in 1848, and in 1849 ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Pittsborough, in Chatham County, N. C.; was master of the corresponding secretaries of the American Bible Society at New York in 1858; in 1861 was elected associate editor of the North Carolina Presbyterian, which position he held until 1862, when he entered the Confederate army. He was killed in battle, March 31, 1865. Mr. McNeil was a man of strong will, and greatness in the evidence of thought and action; his distinct individuality was indicative of the highest executive ability; his earnestness and vigor made him effective in every sphere. See Wilson, Prefab. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 356.

**McNeil, David**, a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born in Scotland in 1829; came to this country while yet a youth; graduated at Rutgers College in 1841, and at the New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1844. He consecrated himself to the work of domestic missions, for which he was peculiarly fitted by his constitutional vigor and enthusiasm, by his unusual gifts as a public speaker, and by the depth and activity of his piety. He combined the "ingrumin per- servidum Scotorum" with a truly American practicality, and with a consuming zeal which dared all difficulties and endured all trials "for Jesus's sake." Few preachers could be more intensely earnest and solemn in dealing with the higher themes of the Gospel. His ministry appeals to the consciences and the hearts of his hearers. One of his sermons on the last judgment seemed to the writer of this notice as if it were almost inspired. Its realizing power was awful and sublime. But he was equally at home in appealing to the tenderest sensibilities of the tenderest and most masterful music, so deep in all the chords of his mighty harp at will. His devotion to his missionary work in Michigan and Indiana, where all of his ministry was spent, was self-consuming. He
lived for the Church of God until his earthly career closed in 1854. His great thought and last uttered wish was in full accordance with his high theological belief and experience. "Oh, that I may be made perfectly holy!"

He was settled successively at Centreville and Constantine, Mich. (1849-52); at South Bend, Ind. (1852-54), and at Constantine (1854-52). But his influence was powerful in all the Reformed churches of the Western States, among which he was a pioneer and a master builder. (W. J. K. T.)

McNelly, George, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born on Drake's Creek, Davidson (now Sumner) County, then territory south of Ohio, now State of Tennessee; was licensed to preach in August, 1814; entered the traveling connection in the autumn of the same year; was ordained deacon in 1816, and elder in 1818, by bishop McKendree. His ministerial life was spent in Tennessee, Ohio, and Kentucky. His educational opportunities were limited, but by hard study, pursued in the midst of the abundant labors of a Methodist itinerant, he obtained a good knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and also of the sciences. He stood quite high, not only as a preacher, but also as a theologian. See McFerrin, Methodism in Tennessee, ii, 384.

McNulty, John, a Presbytery minister, was born at Killala, Ireland, in June, 1829; was educated at Belfast, Ireland, and, after reaching the United States, in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Newburg, N. Y., Union Theological Seminary, New York City, and the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. In 1858 he was licensed, and in 1854 was ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Richland City, Wisc.; in 1856 accepted a call from the Church of Caldonia in De Korte, Wisc., where he labored zealously until he died, May 15, 1861. Mr. McNulty was a devoted and zealous worker in the cause of Christ. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 111.

McPheters, William D.D., a Presbytery minister, was born in Augusta County, Va., Sept. 28, 1778; was educated at Liberty Hall, Lexington, and was licensed in 1802. Soon after he preached in various parts of Kentucky, extended his labors to Ohio, and took charge of the Church at Danville, Ky., and of a male school. In 1804 he visited the counties of Greenbriar and Monroe. Subsequently he served at New Lebanon and Winding Cove, and was employed as a steward and superintend of Bethel Church. He wasordained in 1806, and took charge of the academy and congregation in Raleigh, N. C., where he remained several years. In 1808 he was principal of a school in Fayetteville, and was afterwards agent of the Domestic Mission Assembly. He died Nov. 7, 1842.—Sprague, Am. salts, iv, 504.

McPherson, John Brakine, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Iredell County, N. C., Aug. 17, 1806; was educated at the academy at Beattie's Ford, N. C.; spent one year in the Union Theological Seminary, Virginia, and finished his studies privately under the Rev. E. H. Morrison, of Davidson College, N. C.; was licensed in 1836, and for several months labored as a missionary in North Carolina. In 1842 he was ordained, but for ten years more continued to labor in the mission work; in 1852 he was called to Prospect Church, in Rowan County, N. C.; in 1855 removed to Cherokee County, and labored there until 1859. He died April 9, 1860. Mr. McPherson was characterized by a patient perseverance and devotion to duty, indicative of the highest grade of spiritual life. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 102.

McPherson, Joseph A., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in West El- ciania Parish, La., Dec. 19, 1835; was educated at the Centenary College, Jackson, La. (class of 1858); spent several years in teaching; entered the Mississippi Conference in 1859; and was appointed to Bolivar Circuit; in 1860 he was transferred to Fort Adams Circuit, and died June 18, 1861. He was a faithful and able minister of the Gospel, and the Church greatly lamented his early loss.—Conference Minutes of the M. E. Ch. South, ii, 917.

McQueen, George, Jr., a Presbyterian missionary, was born in Schenectady, N. Y., in 1826; graduated at Union College, N. Y. in 1849; studied at the seminary at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed and ordained by the presbytery of Albany in 1852, and soon after sailed for Africa, as a member of the Corisco Mission, where he labored until he died, March 25, 1859. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 75.

McReynolds, Robert Young, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Allen County, Kentucky, in 1818; was converted in his sixteenth year; was licensed to preach in his nineteenth year, and joined the Kentucky Conference in 1825. In 1842 he transferred to the Rock River Conference, and was stationed at Galena; in 1843 he was transferred back to the Kentucky Conference, and continued in the regular work until 1845, when he located until 1867. He was next readmitted to the Louisville Conference, and appointed to Portland; in 1868 to Shepherdsville Circuit, and in 1869 to Litchfield Circuit. He died Aug. 25, 1877. Mr. McReynolds was "a bountiful, happy, cheerful, happy, Christian, very zealous and useful in the ministry."—Conference Minutes of the M. E. Ch. Church South, 1870, n. v.

McSwain, William Adney, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Montgomery (now Jasper) County, N. C., Nov. 5, 1814; was converted and joined the Church in 1831; was licensed to preach in 1836, and entered the South Carolina Conference in 1838. He served on the following circuits: Pleasant Grove in 1848; Rutherford in 1844-45; Union in 1846-47, and again in 1854; Neuberry in 1848, and again in 1833-34; Black Swamp in 1849-50. In 1851-52 he was pastor of Trinity Church, Charleston; in 1853 of Spartanburg station; in 1857 tract agent of his Conference; from 1859-62 presiding elder on the Cokesbury District; in 1863-64 pastor of Ninety-six, and in 1865 Lawrence Circuit. He died Jan. 7, 1866. Besides the trustworthiness indicated in his appointments, he served as a delegate to the last two sessions of the Southern General Conference, and was elected to that which was to meet in 1862, and was at the time of his death president of the Sunday-school Society of the South Carolina Conference. A man of rare and varied abilities, ever attained that measure of ability, degree of eminence, and width of popularity which constituted that honor which was so cheerfully and universally awarded by the Church and world to this self-made man. Possessed of great versatility of genius, gifted with all social and conversational powers, and blessed with a singular descriptive faculty, he was well qualified, from his vast fund of general information, to give life, interest, and information to the fireside or social circle. His appearance in the pulpit, his engaging address, flow of language, and tone of voice, and ease and naturalness of manner, his own interest in the subject, with the general persuasiveness of his style, gave to his sermons, which evinced much thought and research, an effectiveness which was only equaled by the great popularity of the preacher himself. He was a favorite divine with all sects of Christians and all classes of people. See Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South, iii, 17.

McVeagh, Daniel Cleghorn, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Caledonia, Livingston County, N. Y., Oct. 10, 1818; graduated at Union College in 1844; pursued his theological studies in the Seminary of the Associate Reformed Synod of New York; and in 1847 was licensed to preach. He travelled for two or three years as a probationer, and in 1850 was ordained and installed pastor of the Associate Reformed Church of Lyndon, where he labored for sixteen years. He died Sept. 7, 1868. Mr. McVeagh was a faithful pastor,

McVickar, John, D.D., an eminent clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at New York in 1787, and was educated at Columbia College (class of 1804), and at Cambridge University, England. He entered the ministry in 1811 as rector at Hyde Park, N.Y., and remained there until 1817, when he was appointed professor of moral philosophy, rhetoric, and belles-lettres in Columbia College. The duties of this position he discharged until 1857, when ill-health obliged him to retire from active duties. In recognition of his services he was created Emeritus professor. He also acted as chaplain on Governor's Island. He died at Bloomingdale, N.Y., Oct. 29, 1868. Dr. McVickar was the author of several valuable works; among them the following deserve our notice: Early Years of Bishop Hobart (1834) — The Professional Years of Bishop Hobart (1836) — A Memoir of the Rev. Edmund D. Griffin, appended to the "Remains of the Rev. E. D. Griffin" (1831, 2 vols. 8vo). See Life of the Rev. John McVickar, D.D., by W. A. McVickar (N.Y. 1871); *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1868; Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* a.v.; Allibone, *Dict. Brul.* and *Amer. Authors*, ii, 1198.
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